

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ES.1 Introduction

ES.2 Purpose of this Draft EIS/EIR

ES.3 Proposed Project

ES.4 Alternatives to the Project

ES.5 Environmental Impacts

ES.5.2 Impacts of the Proposed Project and Alternatives

Based on the NOI, NOP, and the scoping process for this Draft EIS/EIR, the following issues have been determined to be potentially significant or are required to be analyzed, and are, therefore, included in this Draft EIS/EIR.

- Aesthetics and Visual Resources
- Air Quality and Meteorology
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology
- Groundwater and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Land Use
- Noise
- Transportation and Circulation

- Marine Vessel Transportation
- Utilities and Public Services
- Water Quality, Sediments, and Oceanography

Sections 3.1 through 3.13 discuss the anticipated potential environmental effects of the proposed Project and alternatives. These issues are discussed in each section, and mitigation measures to avoid the impacts or to reduce the impacts to a less than significant level are proposed whenever possible. In addition, Chapter 5, Environmental Justice, evaluates the potential for the proposed Project to result in high and adverse impacts that disproportionately affect low income and/or minority populations. Summary descriptions of the significant impacts, mitigation measures, and residual impacts for the proposed Project and alternatives are provided in Table ES-3. This table also presents significant cumulative impact results and environmental justice impact determinations.

ES.5.2.1 Unavoidable Significant Impacts

Table ES-3 identifies unavoidable significant impacts associated with the proposed Project and alternatives. This Draft EIS/EIR has determined that implementation of the proposed Project or one or more of the alternatives would result in significant impacts on:

- Air Quality and Meteorology;
- Biological Resources;
- Geology;
- Land Use;
- Noise;
- [Transportation/Circulation; and](#)
- [Water Quality, Sediments and Oceanography.](#)

No feasible mitigation measures are available that would avoid all of the potential impacts or reduce all impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, potential impacts to these resource areas are considered significant and unavoidable.

Under CEQA, the proposed Project and all five alternatives have significant impacts on Air Quality and Meteorology because the air emissions from construction and operation could not be mitigated to less than significant even with the application of all feasible mitigation measures. In addition, for all alternatives that include the Harry Bridges Buffer Area, although the mitigation would result in less than significant health impacts, there are potential health effects to people using the Harry Bridges Buffer Area due to diesel emissions from Port operations as a whole and other area roadways and industries (see Section 3.2).

The No Project alternative has much higher unavoidable significant impacts on Air Quality than the other alternatives because there would be no mitigation applied to

terminal operations. It is also the only alternative that has significant, unavoidable impacts to public health (i.e., cancer risk).

All alternatives also have significant impacts on Geology due to the seismicity issue, for which there is no feasible mitigation. All of the alternatives except the No Project (Alternative 1) have unavoidable significant impacts on Noise (during construction phases). All alternatives except Alternative 4 have ~~The No Project Alternative has~~ unavoidable significant impacts on Transportation/Circulation (because no mitigations would be constructed) and the Alternative 1 has unavoidable significant impacts on Land Use. The Omni Terminal Alternative's significant impacts on Air Quality and Meteorology are less than those of the proposed Project and the other alternatives because of fewer vessel calls and lower overall activity. Finally, all alternatives except Alternatives 4 and 5 have unavoidable significant impacts on Water Quality, Sediments and Oceanography.

Under NEPA, only three of the alternatives (the proposed Project, the Project Without the 10-acre Fill, and the Reduced Wharf) were evaluated for impacts because the other alternatives would not involve activities requiring a federal permit. Compared to No Federal Action, all three alternatives have significant, unavoidable impacts on Air Quality and Meteorology (including cancer risk for the proposed Project and Alternative 2), Biology, ~~and~~ Geology (seismicity), and Water Quality, Sediments and Oceanography. but not on any other resource area.

ES.5.2.2 Summary of Significant Impacts that Can Be Mitigated, Avoided, or Substantially Lessened

Table ES-3 identifies the significant impacts that can be mitigated, avoided or substantially lessened. This Draft EIS/EIR has determined that implementation of the proposed Project or one or more of the alternatives would result in significant impacts that can be mitigated to less than significance on:

- Biological Resources;
- Cultural Resources;
- Groundwater and Soils; and
- Utilities and Public Services.

Under CEQA, placement of fill in the Northwest Slip for implementation of the proposed Project would cause a permanent loss of aquatic habitat, a significant impact on Biological Resources that would be mitigated to a less than significant level by the application of existing habitat mitigation credits (see Section 3.3). None of the other alternatives include fill, and thus do not require mitigation of impacts on biological resources. All of the alternatives except the No Project Alternative have the potential to disturb paleontological resources during construction of the Harry Bridges Buffer Area, but that impact would be mitigated to less than significant (see section 3.4). All of the alternatives except ~~the No Project and~~ the Omni Terminal would have significant impacts on Ground Transportation at certain intersections in the study area due to the increased amount of truck traffic generated by container terminal operations. Those

impacts would be mitigated to less than significant by modifications to those intersections. The No Project Alternative would have significant impacts (see above) that could not be mitigated because no intersection improvements could be implemented, and the Omni Terminal would have less than significant impacts because of its much lower activity levels compared to the other alternatives. [All alternatives except Alternative 1 would have significant impacts to Groundwater as well as Utilities and Public Services, which would be mitigated to less than significant levels.](#)

Under NEPA, only the proposed Project, the Project Without the 10-Acre Fill, and the Reduced Wharf alternatives were evaluated for impacts because the other alternatives would not involve activities requiring a federal permit. Only the proposed Project would have a significant, but mitigable, impact on Biological Resources. None of the alternatives would have significant impacts on Cultural Resources as the potential to encounter paleontological resources would occur outside the federal jurisdiction and is independent of the issuance of federal permits. All three alternatives would have significant impacts on Ground Transportation that would be mitigated to less than significant by improvements to the affected intersections.

There were no resource areas in which potentially significant impacts could be mitigated to a level less than significant for all alternatives considered under CEQA and NEPA.

ES.5.2.3 Summary of Less than Significant Impacts

Based on the environmental review in this Draft EIS/EIR, as summarized in Table ES-3, no significant impacts are expected under both CEQA and NEPA from the proposed Project or alternatives in the following environmental issue areas:

- Aesthetics and Visual Resources
- ~~Groundwater and Soils~~
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- ~~Utilities and Public Services~~
- ~~Water Quality/Sediments/Oceanography.~~
- Marine Vessel Transportation.

ES.5.3 Environmentally Preferred and Environmentally Superior Alternative

ES.6 Public Comment