

SECTION SUMMARY

The land use analysis evaluates the consistency of the proposed Project and alternatives with Port of Los Angeles Master Plan designations, City of Los Angeles General Plan designations, Municipal Code zoning designations, and other applicable plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over landside and waterside areas. Inconsistencies with land use policies are only considered significant impacts if the inconsistencies result in significant adverse effects on the *physical* environment. The analysis also addresses whether implementation of the proposed Project or an alternative would divide or isolate surrounding communities.

Section 3.10, Land Use, provides the following:

- A description of existing land uses in the Port area;
- A description of existing land use regulations and policies including a description of both the San Pedro and Wilmington Community Plans;
- A discussion on the methodology used to determine whether the proposed Project or alternatives result in a land use impact;
- An impact analysis of both the proposed Project and alternatives; and
- A description of any mitigation measures proposed to reduce any potential impacts, as applicable.

Key Points of Section 3.10:

The proposed Project would involve improvements to an existing container terminal, and its operations would be consistent with other container terminals and Port uses in the proposed project area.

Neither the proposed Project nor any of the alternatives would result in a significant impact in terms of land use under CEQA or NEPA. Specifically:

- The proposed Project and all alternatives would be consistent with the adopted land use/density designation in the Community Plan, redevelopment plan, or specific plan for the site;
- The proposed Project and all alternatives would be consistent with the General Plan and adopted environmental goals or policies contained in other applicable plans;
- The proposed Project and all alternatives would not cause secondary impacts to surrounding land uses; and
- The proposed Project and all alternatives would remain consistent with the Port of Los Angeles Community Plan zone designation for the proposed project site, which allows Commercial and Industrial uses (that is, General/Bulk Cargo and Commercial/Industrial Uses/Nonhazardous Uses).

3.10.1 Introduction

This land use analysis evaluates the consistency of the proposed Project with City of Los Angeles General Plan designations, Municipal Code zoning designations, and other applicable plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over landside and waterside areas. Inconsistencies with land use policies are only considered significant impacts if the inconsistencies result in significant adverse environmental impacts on the *physical* environment. This analysis also addresses whether implementation of the proposed Project or alternative would divide or isolate surrounding communities. Impacts from off-port truck and rail activities are discussed in other resource area sections, such as Section 3.2, Air Quality and Meteorology; Section 3.6, Greenhouse Gas Emissions; Section 3.7, Ground Transportation; and Section 3.12, Noise.

3.10.2 Environmental Setting

The proposed project site, as shown in Figure 2-3 (Chapter 2, Project Description), includes the existing 185-acre YTI Terminal, which includes 157 acres of berths and a container yard, 24 acres of TICTF on-dock rail, and 4 unused acres. The proposed project site is at 701 New Dock Street on Terminal Island. Terminal Island is in the Port of Los Angeles Community Plan area, with the community of San Pedro to the west and the community of Wilmington to the north. Channel waters surrounding the portion of Terminal Island where the proposed Project is located include the East Basin Channel and the Cerritos Channel to the north, the East Basin Channel to the west, the Seaside Avenue and SR-47 to the south, and SA Recycling at Berths 210–211 to the east.

The Port's existing container terminals on Terminal Island, including the proposed project site, are used primarily for general cargo and containerized terminal operations (Berths, 226–236, 302–305, and 401–406 [Pier 400]). Other uses in the proposed project vicinity include a variety of cargo handling operations, including container, liquid bulk, dry bulk, commercial fishing, seafood processing, and maritime support.

The proposed project site was constructed in the 1920s and was used for shipbuilding and dismantling operations, warehousing, and cargo terminals, and by oil and lumber companies. Portions of the site were used as cargo terminals dating back to the 1960s. In 1990, the YTI Terminal began operating at Berths 211–215 and in 1996 YTI took over operation of Berths 216–224.

3.10.2.1 Existing Land Uses

Port of Los Angeles

The LAHD administers the Port of Los Angeles, which includes 28 miles of waterfront and 7,500 acres of land and water area. The LAHD administers automobile, container, omni, lumber, cruise ship, liquid and dry bulk terminals, and commercial fishing facilities. Port facilities include slips for 6,000 pleasure craft, sport fishing boats, and charter vessels, as well as community facilities, which include a waterfront youth center, Cabrillo Aquarium, and the Maritime Museum. Major Port activities include commercial shipping and transfer of containerized cargo, liquid bulk cargo, break-bulk and dry bulk cargo, commercial fishing, recreation, and tourism.

1 Land Uses in the Project Area

2 The proposed project area is largely surrounded by industrial activities associated with
3 the Port Complex, as well as Harbor waters and marinas. Land uses immediately
4 adjacent to the proposed project area include the SA Recycling facility and the Evergreen
5 Container Terminal, which are further described below. Transportation infrastructure
6 uses in the vicinity include the Badger Avenue Lift bridge (rail bridge over the Cerritos
7 Channel), the Schuyler Heim Bridge (vehicle bridge over the Cerritos Channel), the
8 Vincent Thomas Bridge (connects Terminal Island with the San Pedro area), and the
9 Gerald Desmond Bridge (connects Terminal Island with the mainland in Long Beach).

10 Land uses in the proposed project vicinity support a variety of cargo handling operations.
11 Berths 226–236 include the Evergreen/STS container terminal to the southwest of the
12 proposed project area; the U.S. Customs Building is located to the south of the proposed
13 project area; the Navy Reserve Center’s former site is located to the southeast; the Shell
14 Liquid Bulk Terminal at Berths 167–169 and the Pasha Breakbulk Terminal at Berths
15 174–181 are located across the East Basin Channel to the north; and the Vopak Liquid
16 Bulk Terminal at Berths 187–191 is located across Cerritos Channel to the north.

17 As of April 2013, the nearest liveaboard tenants were moored within Newmarks Marina,
18 approximately 0.25 mile northeast of the proposed project site, off of Anchorage Road.
19 The liveaboard tenants rent mooring buoy/anchorage and facilities from Newmarks
20 Marina, and are the closest residential use. Farther north and west of the proposed
21 Project are the residential communities of Wilmington (about 1.0 mile north of the
22 proposed project site) and San Pedro (about 0.75 mile west of the project site),
23 respectively. However, Harbor waters and landside development physically separates the
24 proposed project site from both of these communities.

25 SA Recycling

26 SA Recycling, which is adjacent to and east of the proposed Project, maintains two deep
27 sea bulk loading facilities in the Port of Los Angeles, including one facility on Terminal
28 Island, east of and adjacent to the YTI Terminal. Constructed in 1962 at 901 New Dock
29 Street, SA Recycling includes two 1,500-foot-long berths within 26.7 acres (SA
30 Recycling 2013; POLA 2013b). This facility handles the bulk loading of scrap for export
31 and uses a metal shear and shredder on site before loading scrap metal onto rail cars.

32 Evergreen Container Terminal

33 Evergreen Container Terminal is immediately south of the YTI Terminal, on the southern
34 side of the Vincent Thomas Bridge at Berths 226–236. The terminal is about 205 acres in
35 size, with a total berth length of about 4,700 feet. The terminal includes eight post-
36 Panamax-plus cranes and serves three shipping lines (Evergreen, China Shipping, and
37 Zim) via on-dock rail facilities. Other features of the terminal include a maintenance and
38 repair facility, refrigerated container wash rack, transtainers, and top/side handlers.

3.10.2.2 Redevelopment Areas in the Proposed Project Vicinity

Two redevelopment areas are in the community of San Pedro: the Pacific Corridor Redevelopment Project area and the Beacon Street Redevelopment Project area. One redevelopment area is in the community of Wilmington: the Los Angeles Harbor Industrial Center Redevelopment Project.

The 693-acre Pacific Corridor Redevelopment Project Area, established in 2002, extends from the south side of Knoll Hill and is bordered by Capital Drive on the north, Gaffey Drive on the west, 22nd Street on the south, and Harbor Boulevard on the east. That project provides business incentives and other strategies and includes development/rehabilitation of commercial/retail uses, a “welcome park,” a transit center, improvements to pedestrian facilities, decorative street light replacements, additional parking, residential uses, and formation of an Arts District (CRA/LA 2010a).

The Beacon Street Redevelopment Project Area, established in 1969, comprises 60 acres and is bordered by 3rd Street on the north, Mesa Street on the west, 7th Street on the south, and Harbor Street on the north. The Beacon Street Redevelopment Project has transformed a blighted waterfront area into a modern downtown community, with new commercial, residential, cultural, and institutional uses. Major recent undertakings are acquisition and rehabilitation of the historic Warner Grand Theatre and development of a 14-screen movie theater complex (CRA/LA 2010b), a new Port Police headquarters building, and pedestrian facility improvements along 6th Street (between Harbor Boulevard and Palos Verdes Street).

The Los Angeles Harbor Industrial Center Redevelopment Project, also known as the Wilmington Industrial Park, is located on 232 acres of land in the Wilmington community situated just north of the East Basin of the Harbor. The Wilmington Industrial Park project is generally bounded on the north by Anaheim Street, on the east and south by Alameda Street and Harry Bridges Boulevard (formerly B Street), and on the west by Broad Avenue (CRA/LA 2010c). The Redevelopment Plan was adopted by the City Council on July 18, 1974. In keeping with the City General Plan for the development of industrial parks, the key goal is the creation of a healthy, active industrial center with the physical and economic strength to maintain itself. To reach that goal, the primary objective of the Plan is to entice labor-intensive industries into the industrial park to provide new employment opportunities. Current planned projects include cold storage facilities, grain handling facilities, and landscape buffers.

The LAHD is also in the process of implementing several development projects in the San Pedro and Wilmington communities, including the San Pedro Waterfront Master Plan, Wilmington Waterfront Master Plan, and future redevelopment of the Westway Terminal to develop the City Dock Marine Research Center. These development programs are aimed at strengthening economic development and enhancing community amenities. Specifically, objectives of the San Pedro Waterfront Master Plan include increasing public waterfront access, enhancing commercial opportunities, improving transportation and non-vehicular mobility around the waterfront, and growing the Port in a sustainable manner. Project elements include the creation of the San Pedro Downtown Harbor to include a public pier at 7th Street, improvements to the John S. Gibson park, a municipal fountain, enhancements to downtown San Pedro linkages, new harbors, new commercial development, enhancement of visitor attractions, development of a

1 waterfront promenade and open space, and a variety of transportation improvements.
2 The EIS/EIR for the San Pedro Waterfront Master Plan was certified in September 2009.

3 Objectives of the Wilmington Waterfront Development Project include connecting the
4 community with the waterfront, creating open space, enhancing the livability and
5 economic viability of the Los Angeles Harbor area by promoting sustainable economic
6 development, and developing an environmentally responsible project. Project elements
7 include commercial and industrial development and creation of visitor amenities such as
8 open space, plazas, a waterfront promenade, and a Waterfront Red Car Museum. The
9 EIR for the Wilmington Waterfront Development Project was certified in June 2009.

10 Construction has commenced on a number of the San Pedro and Wilmington
11 development projects, including the Westway Terminal decommissioning and
12 construction of the San Pedro Downtown Harbor.

13 **3.10.3 Applicable Regulations**

14 Land use and development within the Port and its vicinity are governed by several state
15 and local plans and policies, as described in this section.

16 **3.10.3.1 State Lands Commission**

17 The State Lands Commission has oversight responsibility for tidal and submerged lands
18 and administers the Tidelands Trust Act, the state law that governs how Port properties
19 can be used. Legislative authority is granted in trust to local jurisdictions. In 1911, the
20 City of Los Angeles was granted the tidal and submerged lands within its boundaries to
21 hold them in the public trust to be used for the public benefit, including the promotion of
22 commerce, navigation, and fisheries.

23 In 1970, the City of Los Angeles Tidelands Trust was amended to allow for a broader use
24 of “commerce.” These uses include commercial and industrial buildings, public
25 buildings, public parks, convention centers, playgrounds, small harbors, restaurants,
26 motels, hotels, and the protection of wildlife habitats and open space. However, the
27 LAHD was exempted from this expanded definition of “commerce.” On January 1,
28 2003, Assembly Bill 2769 went into effect and amended the City of Los Angeles
29 Tidelands Trust to provide the City with greater flexibility for both development and the
30 protection of wildlife and open space at and near the Port.

31 **3.10.3.2 California Coastal Commission**

32 The California Coastal Act (Coastal Act) of 1976 (PRC Section 30000 *et seq.*) was
33 enacted to establish policies and guidelines that provide direction for the conservation
34 and development of the California coastline. The Coastal Act established the California
35 Coastal Commission and created a state and local government partnership to ensure that
36 public concerns regarding coastal development are addressed. The following are the
37 policies of the Coastal Act that guide specific regulations pertaining to coastal zone
38 conservation and development decisions.

- 39 ▪ Provide for maximum public access to and recreational use of the coast,
40 consistent with private rights and environmental protection;

- 1 ▪ Protect marine and land resources—including wetlands, rare and endangered
- 2 habitat areas, environmentally sensitive areas, tide pools, and stream channels;
- 3 ▪ Maintain productive coastal agricultural lands;
- 4 ▪ Direct new housing and other development to urbanized areas with adequate
- 5 services rather than allowing a scattered, sprawling, wasteful pattern of
- 6 subdivision;
- 7 ▪ Protect the scenic beauty of the coastal landscape; and
- 8 ▪ Locate any needed coastal energy and industrial facilities where such facilities
- 9 will have the least adverse impact.

10 The Coastal Act also influences Port operations; it established the California Coastal
 11 Commission as the coastal management and regulatory agency over the Coastal Zone
 12 (PRC 30103), within which the Port of Los Angeles is included. The California Coastal
 13 Commission is responsible for assisting in the preparation, review, and certification of
 14 Local Coastal Programs/Local Coastal Plans (LCPs), which are developed by
 15 municipalities for that portion of their jurisdiction that falls within the coastal zone.
 16 Following certification of the LCP, regulatory responsibility is then delegated to the local
 17 jurisdiction, although the Coastal Commission retains jurisdiction over the immediate
 18 shoreline. The Port Master Plan (PMP) acts as the LCP for the Port of Los Angeles, as
 19 described below in Section 3.10.3.3.

20 Chapter 8 of the Coastal Act establishes specific planning and regulatory procedures for
 21 California “commercial ports” (defined as the ports of San Diego, Los Angeles,
 22 Long Beach, and Hueneme). The Coastal Act requires that a coastal development permit
 23 be obtained from the Coastal Commission for certain development within these ports.
 24 However, a commercial port is granted the authority to issue its own coastal development
 25 permits once it completes a master plan certified by the Coastal Commission.

26 The standards for master plans, contained in Chapter 8 of the Coastal Act, require
 27 environmental protection while expressing a preference for port-dependent projects.
 28 Additionally, Section 30701 establishes the number and locations of California ports.
 29 This section of the Coastal Act encourages existing ports to modernize and construct
 30 necessary facilities within their boundaries to minimize the need to build new ports in the
 31 state. It is environmentally and economically preferable to locate major shipping
 32 terminals and other existing maritime facilities in the major ports rather than creating new
 33 ports in new areas of the state. Each commercial port in California has a certified PMP
 34 that identifies acceptable development uses. If a port desires to conduct or permit
 35 developments that are not included in the approved PMP, that port must apply to the
 36 Coastal Commission for either a coastal permit or an amendment to its master plan.

37 **3.10.3.3 Port Master Plan**

38 The proposed Project is within in the Coastal Zone, which was established pursuant to the
 39 federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 and the Coastal Act. These acts require
 40 that planning and development within the Coastal Zone be compatible with coastal
 41 resources. Chapter 8 of the Coastal Act contains policies applicable to the portions of
 42 California ports within the Coastal Zone. Chapter 8, Article 3, of the Coastal Act
 43 stipulates that ports shall prepare and adopt master plans containing provisions within
 44 that chapter (PRC Sections 30710–30721). Port master plans are then certified by the
 45 Coastal Commission, and development projects authorized or approved pursuant to an

1 adopted and certified master plan are deemed to be in conformity with the Coastal Zone
2 Management Program.

3 The Port of Los Angeles Master Plan, originally adopted in 1980 and most recently
4 updated in August 2013 by the Board of Harbor Commissioners, establishes policies and
5 guidelines to direct the future development of the Port and to better promote and safely
6 accommodate foreign and domestic waterborne commerce, navigation, and fisheries in
7 the national, state, and local interests (LAHD 2013a). The PMP divides the Port into a
8 series of five planning areas, for which it identifies short-term plans and preferred long-
9 range uses. The proposed project site is in Planning Area 3, Terminal Island, which is
10 adjacent to and north and east of Area 4, Fish Harbor; the PMP designates the site for
11 Container land uses (as shown on Figure 3.10-1). The Container land use category is
12 defined by the PMP as “water-dependent uses focused on container cargo handling and
13 movement,” and provides development examples including container terminals, chassis
14 storage, on-dock rail yard, and omni-terminal.

15 The PMP states that Planning Area 3 focuses on container operations and identifies that
16 future projects will provide additional space for expanding container and liquid bulk
17 cargoes by clearing underutilized and vacant facilities, reconfiguring existing operations,
18 and expanding land and filling. The PMP identifies the fill areas for the expansion of
19 container and dry-bulk cargoes, and states that the land west of Pier 300 and south of Pier
20 400 may be expanded and/or filled to increase the container operations within Planning
21 Area 3.

22 **3.10.3.4 City of Los Angeles General Plan**

23 The City of Los Angeles General Plan is a comprehensive, long-term plan for the
24 physical development of the City. The City’s General Plan includes the following
25 citywide elements: Framework, Transportation, Infrastructure Systems, Housing, Noise,
26 Air Quality, Conservation, Open Space, Historic Preservation and Cultural Resources,
27 Safety, Public Facilities and Services, and Land Use.

28 The General Plan Land Use Element includes 35 local area plans, known as Community
29 Plans, as well as plans for the Port of Los Angeles and Los Angeles International Airport.

30 **Port of Los Angeles Plan**

31 The Port of Los Angeles Plan is the land use element that is intended to serve as the
32 official 20-year guide for the continued development and operation of the Port (City of
33 Los Angeles 1982 plus amendments). The primary purposes of the Port of Los Angeles
34 Plan are:

- 35 ▪ To promote an arrangement of land and water uses, circulation, and services that
36 contribute to the economic, social, and physical health, safety, welfare, and
37 convenience of the Port, within the larger context of the City;
- 38 ▪ To guide development, betterment, and change within the Port to meet existing
39 and anticipated needs;
- 40 ▪ To contribute to a safe and healthful environment;
- 41 ▪ To balance growth and stability;

- 1 ▪ To reflect economic potentialities or limitations, water developments, and other
- 2 trends; and
- 3 ▪ To protect investment to the extent reasonable and feasible.

4 The Port of Los Angeles Plan designates the northern and western portions of the Port as
5 Commercial/Industrial land uses, which are further classified as General/Bulk Cargo and
6 Commercial/Industrial Uses/Nonhazardous uses. General Cargo includes container,
7 break-bulk,¹ neo-bulk,² and passenger facilities. Commercial uses include restaurants
8 and tourist attractions, offices, retail facilities, and related uses. Industrial uses include
9 light manufacturing/maritime-related industrial activities, ocean-resource industries, and
10 related uses. The remainder of the Port to the southeast, including Terminal Island and
11 the YTI Terminal, is similarly designated and classified.

12 The following objectives from the Port of Los Angeles Plan are pertinent to the proposed
13 Project:

14 **Objective 1.** To maintain the Port of Los Angeles as an important local, regional, and
15 national resource and to promote and accommodate the orderly and continued
16 development of the Port to meet the needs of foreign and domestic waterborne
17 commerce, navigation, the commercial fishing industry, and public recreational needs.

18 **Objective 2.** To establish criteria and standards for the long-range orderly expansion and
19 development of the Port by the eventual aggregation of major functional and compatible
20 land and water uses under a system of preferences that will result in the segregation of
21 related Port facilities and operations into functional areas.

22 **Objective 3.** To coordinate the development of the Port of Los Angeles and the
23 development of adjacent communities as set forth in the San Pedro and Wilmington-
24 Harbor City Community Plans.

25 **Objective 4.** To assure priority for water and coastal dependent development within the
26 Port, while maintaining and, where feasible, enhancing the coastal zone environmental
27 and public views of and access to coastal resources.

28 **Objective 5.** To permit the Port to have the flexibility in its development processes to
29 adequately respond to the pressures and demands placed upon it by:

- 30 a. Changing technologies in the ocean and land movement of waterborne
31 commerce.
- 32 b. Changing patterns in the commodity mix and form of waterborne commerce.
- 33 c. Changing developments in the Port of Long Beach and the surrounding
34 residential and industrial areas adjacent to and affected by the Port.
- 35 d. Changing laws and regulations affecting the environmental and economic uses of
36 the Port.
- 37 e. Changes in other U.S. ports affecting the competitive position of the Port.

¹Break-bulk refers to cargo not held in containers, loaded individually and not in intermodal containers.

²Neo-bulk refers to cargo shipments consisting entirely of units of a single commodity, such as cars, lumber, or scrap metal.



K:\In\met\GIS\Projects\POL\A000070_13\mapdocs\Fig03_10_1_Exist_LU.mxd Date: 11/14/2013 26629



Figure 3.10-1
Port Master Plan Land Use Designations
Berths 212-224 [YTI] Container Terminal Improvements Project

1 **Objective 6.** To promote efficient transportation routes within the Port consistent with
2 external systems to connect employment, waterborne commerce, commercial, and
3 recreational areas.

4 **Objective 7.** To upgrade the existing rail transportation system to keep pace with Port
5 development and to abolish redundant trackage so that valuable land can be better used
6 and operations improved.

7 Applicable Policies from the Port Plan include:

8 **Policy 6.** The highest priority for any water or land area use within the jurisdiction of the
9 Port shall be for developments that are completely dependent on harbor water areas
10 and/or harbor land areas for operations.

11 **Policy 7.** Decisions to undertake individual and specific development projects shall be
12 based on considerations of alternative locations and designs to minimize environmental
13 impacts.

14 **Policy 10.** Necessary facilities to accommodate deep-draft vessels and to accommodate
15 the demands of foreign and domestic waterborne commerce and other traditional and
16 water-dependent facilities shall be maintained and developed to preclude the necessity for
17 new ports elsewhere in the state.

18 **Policy 13.** Road, rail, and access systems within the Port and connecting links with road,
19 rail, and access systems outside the Port shall be located and designed to provide
20 necessary, convenient, and safe access to and from land and water areas consistent with
21 the long-term preferred uses for the Port and consistent with the applicable elements of
22 the Los Angeles General Plan and the Local Coastal Program.

23 **Policy 15.** When an existing facility in the Port requires alteration or modifications to
24 maintain its level of service or improve the safety of the facility or its operations, such
25 changes shall be made regardless of the fact that the particular facility is not necessarily
26 designated to remain in its existing location on a long-term basis.

27 **Policy 18.** Port development projects shall be consistent with the specific provisions of
28 this Plan, the certified PMP, the California Coastal Act of 1976, and other applicable
29 federal, state, county, and municipal laws and regulatory requirements.

30 **3.10.3.5 Zoning Designations**

31 The zoning classification for the YTI Terminal at Berths 212–224 is [Q] M3-1 (Heavy
32 Industrial Zone). The site’s primary Heavy Industrial (M-3) designation has been
33 qualified, as indicated by the bracketed [Q] symbol. The “qualified” designation
34 indicates that a property so designated might be restricted or prohibited from some uses
35 ordinarily permitted in the underlying zone classification, and/or that development on
36 such designated sites may be required to conform to certain additional use standards.
37 Accordingly, the [Q] in this zone restricts uses to General Cargo, limited Port-related
38 commercial, industrial, and support uses. The zone limits the storage of hazardous
39 materials, liquid, or solid bulk that is flammable, explosive, or produces a flammable,
40 toxic, or suffocating gas (City of Los Angeles 2011). The industrial zoning designation
41 allows a building floor-area ratio of 1.5 times the buildable area of the lot.

3.10.3.6 San Pedro Community Plan

The proposed project site is entirely within the Port of Los Angeles Plan area; however, the San Pedro Community Plan area is immediately adjacent to the Port Plan's boundary. Accordingly, goals, objectives, policies, and associated implementing programs of the Community Plan addressing Port land uses and operations are considered in the San Pedro Community Plan (City of Los Angeles 1999a).

Relevant goals in the San Pedro Community Plan are as follows:

- The development of the Port should be coordinated with surrounding communities to improve the efficiency and operational capabilities of the Port to better serve the economic needs of Los Angeles and the region, while minimizing adverse environmental impacts to neighboring communities from Port-related activities;
- Future development of the Port should be coordinated with the San Pedro Community Plan, the Beacon Street Redevelopment Project, and development of the Central Business District of San Pedro; and
- Planning the remaining commercial and industrial development opportunity sites for needed job-producing uses that improve the economic and physical condition of the San Pedro Community Plan.

3.10.3.7 Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan

The Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan area is generally bounded by Sepulveda Boulevard, Normandie Avenue, Lomita Boulevard, the Los Angeles City boundary, Los Angeles Harbor, Harry Bridges Boulevard, John Gibson Boulevard, Taper Avenue, and Western Avenue. The Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan, adopted in 1999, sets forth goals to maintain the individuality of the community (City of Los Angeles 1999b).

Relevant goals in the Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan are as follows:

- To coordinate the development of the Port with surrounding communities to improve the efficiency and operational capabilities of the Port to better serve the economic needs of Los Angeles and the region, while minimizing adverse environmental impacts to neighboring communities from Port-related activities;
- To coordinate the future development of the Port with all adopted City Plans, the Wilmington Industrial Park Redevelopment Project, and the Enterprise Zone;
- To continue to develop and operate the Port to provide economic, employment, and recreational benefits to neighboring communities; and
- To assure that Port programs for land acquisition and circulation improvements will be compatible with and beneficial in reducing environmental impacts to surrounding communities caused by Port-related activities, as well as beneficial to the Port.

3.10.3.8 Southern California Association of Governments Regional Comprehensive Plan

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), finalized in 2008, integrates the major elements of planning for the region, including: Air Quality; Economy; Energy; Finance; Land Use and Housing; Open Space and Habitat; Security and Emergency Preparedness; Solid Waste; Transportation; and Water (SCAG 2008a). Continuing with the same principles on which the 2004 RCP was built, the 2008 RCP is built around the *Compass Growth Vision and 2% Strategy* adopted by the Regional Council in April 2004, which is based on four key principles: mobility (getting where we want to go); livability (creating positive communities); prosperity (long-term health for the region); and sustainability (preserving natural surroundings).

The RCP transportation policies are based on the adopted 2008 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RTP includes an action plan and constrained policies detailing measures that SCAG shall implement in support of the policies adopted by the SCAG Regional Council. The 2008 RTP establishes a transportation vision for the six-county region that includes Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, Ventura, and Imperial Counties (SCAG 2008b). The RTP is a multimodal plan representing a vision through the year 2035, and providing a long-term planning framework for meeting the region's transportation needs and addressing its challenges. The 2008 RTP transportation goals and policies include the following:

- Maximize mobility and accessibility for all people and goods in the region;
- Ensure travel safety and reliability for all people and goods in the region;
- Preserve and ensure a sustainable regional transportation system;
- Maximize the productivity of our transportation system;
- Protect the environment, improve air quality, and promote energy efficiency;
- Encourage land use and growth patterns that complement our transportation investments and improve the cost-effectiveness of expenditures; and
- Maximize the security of our transportation system through improved system monitoring, rapid recovery planning, and coordination with other security agencies.

3.10.3.9 Port of Los Angeles Strategic Plan 2012–2017

The Port of Los Angeles Strategic Plan has seven objectives, each with metrics that will be implemented to accomplish the LAHD's mission for the Port. The following objectives may be relevant to the proposed Project or an alternative:

- Develop and Maintain World Class Infrastructure
- Retain and Grow Market Share
- Advance Technology and Sustainability
- Optimize Land Use
- Create a Positive Workplace Culture

- 1 ▪ Increase Stakeholder and Community Awareness and Support
- 2 ▪ Strengthen Financial Performance

3 **3.10.3.10 San Pedro Bay Ports Clean Air Action Plan**

4 The LAHD, in conjunction with the Port of Long Beach and with guidance from
5 SCAQMD, CARB, and EPA, has developed the San Pedro Bay Ports Clean Air Action
6 Plan (CAAP), which was approved by the Los Angeles and Long Beach Boards of
7 Harbor Commissioners on November 20, 2006 (POLA/POLB 2006). Although the
8 CAAP addresses air quality issues and is addressed in detail in Section 3.2, Air Quality
9 and Meteorology, and Section 3.6, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, it is summarized here
10 because it relates to goals for the Port, as discussed in the San Pedro and Wilmington-
11 Harbor City community plans. The CAAP focuses on reducing diesel particulate matter,
12 nitrogen oxides (NO_x), and sulfur oxides, with two main goals: (1) to reduce Port-related
13 air emissions in the interest of public health; and (2) to disconnect cargo growth from
14 emissions increases. The CAAP includes near-term measures for project-specific
15 impacts implemented largely through the NEPA/CEQA process, new leases at both ports,
16 and Port-wide measures implemented by Port-supported programs, lease measures,
17 tariffs, and Memoranda of Understanding.

18 The CAAP consists of the following standards:

19 **San Pedro Bay Standards**

- 20 ▪ Reduce public health risk from toxic air contaminants associated with Port-
21 related mobile sources to acceptable levels.
- 22 ▪ Prevent Port-related violations of the state and federal ambient air quality
23 standards at air quality monitoring stations at both ports.
- 24 ▪ Reduce criteria pollutant emissions to the levels that will assure that Port-related
25 sources contribute their “fair share” to enable the South Coast Air Basin to attain
26 state and federal ambient air quality standards.

27 **Project-Specific Standards**

- 28 ▪ Projects must stay below the excess residential cancer risk threshold of 10 in
29 1,000,000, as determined by health risk assessments conducted during
30 NEPA/CEQA review and implemented through required NEPA/CEQA
31 mitigations associated with lease negotiations. Projects that exceed the
32 SCAQMD CEQA significance thresholds for criteria pollutants must implement
33 the maximum available controls and feasible mitigations for any emissions
34 increases.

35 **Source-Specific Performance Standards**

- 36 ▪ These standards include a series of measures that will be implemented through
37 Port lease requirements, tariffs, incentives, and the NEPA/CEQA environmental
38 review process.
- 39 ▪ Compliance with the Project-Specific Standards might require that an individual
40 terminal go beyond the Source-Specific Performance Standards or advance the
41 date of compliance with those performance standards.

- 1 ▪ The Source-Specific Performance Standards are targeted at the following five
2 source categories of mobile equipment and vessels that are part of Port-related
3 goods movement: (1) heavy-duty vehicles/trucks; (2) oceangoing vessels;
4 (3) cargo-handling equipment; (4) harbor craft; and (5) railroad locomotives.

5 The proposed Project includes air quality control measures outlined in the CAAP, both as
6 mitigation that would be imposed via permits and lease provisions and as standard
7 measures that would be implemented through lease agreements with other agencies and
8 business entities and with Port-contracting policies (POLA/POLB 2006).

9 On November 3, 2010, the Los Angeles and Long Beach Boards of Harbor
10 Commissioners approved the CAAP Update (POLA/POLB 2010). The 2010 update
11 includes new, far-reaching goals for reducing Port-related air pollution over the next ten
12 years. The focus of the CAAP Update is the same as the original CAAP, and includes
13 updates based on changes in federal and state regulations. The most significant addition
14 in the 2010 update is the San Pedro Bay Standards, which establish long-term goals for
15 emissions and health-risk reductions. Refer to Section 3.2, Air Quality and Meteorology,
16 and Section 3.6, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, for additional information on the 2010
17 update.

18 **3.10.3.11 Port of Los Angeles Sustainable Construction Guidelines**

19 The LAHD originally adopted the Port of Los Angeles Sustainable Construction
20 Guidelines in February 2008; they were last updated in November 2009. The guidelines
21 are used to establish air emission criteria for inclusion in construction bid specifications.
22 The guidelines reinforce and require sustainability measures during performance of the
23 contracts and balance the need to protect the environment, be socially responsible, and
24 provide for the economic development of the Port. Future resolutions are anticipated to
25 expand the guidelines to cover other aspects of construction, as well as planning and
26 design. These guidelines will be made a part of all construction specifications advertised
27 for bids.

28 Significant features of these Guidelines include, but are not limited to:

- 29 ▪ All ships and barges used primarily to deliver construction related materials for
30 LAHD construction contracts shall comply with the Vessel Speed Reduction
31 Program and use low-sulfur fuel within 40 nautical miles of Point Fermin;
- 32 ▪ Harbor craft shall meet EPA Tier 3 engine emission standards, as of
33 January 1, 2011;
- 34 ▪ All dredging equipment shall be electric;
- 35 ▪ On-road heavy-duty trucks shall comply with EPA 2007 on-road emission
36 standards for PM₁₀ and NO_x and shall be equipped with a CARB-verified Level
37 3 device;
- 38 ▪ Construction equipment (excluding on-road trucks, derrick barges, and harbor
39 craft) shall meet Tier 3 emission off-road standards. The requirement will be
40 raised to Tier 4 by January 1, 2015;
- 41 ▪ Comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 regarding Fugitive Dust in addition to other
42 fugitive dust control measures; and

- 1 ▪ Additional Best Management Practices (BMPs), based largely on Best Available
2 Control Technology, will be required on construction equipment (including on-
3 road trucks) to further reduce air emissions.

4 **3.10.3.12 Water Resources Action Plan**

5 The Water Resources Action Plan (WRAP) was prepared by the LAHD and the Port of
6 Long Beach, in coordination with each of the cities, the EPA, and the Los Angeles
7 RWQCB (POLA/POLB 2009). The WRAP was adopted by the Boards of both the
8 LAHD and the Port of Long Beach on August 8, 2009. The WRAP's purpose is to
9 provide the framework and mechanisms for the Ports to achieve the goals and targets that
10 will be established in the relevant Total Maximum Daily Loads discharge limits and to
11 comply with the Industrial Activities, Construction Activities, and Municipal permits
12 issued to each of the Ports and their respective cities and tenants through the National
13 Pollutant Discharge Elimination System program. The WRAP identifies multiple current
14 and potential control measures to minimize adverse effects to water and sediment quality.
15 These include Land Use Control Measures, On-Water Source Control Measures,
16 Sediment Control Measures, and Watershed Control Measures.

17 **3.10.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

18 **3.10.4.1 Methodology**

19 This analysis evaluates consistency or compliance of the proposed Project and
20 alternatives with adopted plans and policies governing land use and development. Land
21 use plans with policies applicable to development under the proposed Project and
22 alternatives were evaluated, including the City of Los Angeles General Plan and its
23 Elements, the City of Los Angeles Planning and Zoning Code, the Port of Los Angeles
24 Master Plan, and plans prepared by other agencies with jurisdiction over areas in which
25 the proposed Project might create a land use impact.

26 Inconsistency with a land use policy or objective is only considered a significant impact
27 if the inconsistency would result in a significant adverse effect on the physical
28 environment. Further, physical impacts on the environment that might result from an
29 inconsistency with land use policies or objectives are addressed in the appropriate
30 resource section, not in the analysis of land use.

31 This land use analysis also addresses the potential for the proposed Project or an
32 alternative to create physical incompatibilities between adjacent land uses or activities
33 that would result in a significant adverse effect on the physical environment. This is
34 accomplished through the evaluation of the extent to which off-site land uses could be
35 affected by physical division, isolation, or other disruptions caused by the proposed
36 Project or an alternative.

37 **CEQA Baseline**

38 Section 15125 of the CEQA Guidelines requires EIRs to include a description of the
39 physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of a project that exist at the time of the
40 NOP. These environmental conditions normally would constitute the baseline physical
41 conditions by which the CEQA lead agency determines if an impact is significant. The
42 NOP for the proposed Project was published in April 2013. For purposes of this Draft

1 EIS/EIR, the CEQA baseline takes into account the throughput for the 12-month calendar
2 year preceding NOP publication (January through December 2012) in order to provide a
3 representative characterization of activity levels throughout the complete calendar year
4 preceding release of the NOP. In 2012, the YTI Terminal encompassed approximately
5 185 acres under its long-term lease, supported 14 cranes (10 operating), and handled
6 approximately 996,109 TEUs and 162 vessel calls. The CEQA baseline conditions are
7 also described in Section 2.7.1 and summarized in Table 2-1.

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

14 **NEPA Baseline**

15 For purposes of this Draft EIS/EIR, the evaluation of significance under NEPA is defined
16 by comparing the proposed Project or other alternative to the NEPA baseline. The NEPA
17 baseline conditions are described in Section 2.7.2 and summarized in Table 2-1. The
18 NEPA baseline condition for determining significance of impacts includes the full range
19 of construction and operational activities the applicant could implement and is likely to
20 implement absent a federal action, in this case the issuance of a USACE permit.

21 Unlike the CEQA baseline, which is defined by conditions at a point in time, the NEPA
22 baseline is not bound by statute to a “flat” or “no-growth” scenario. Instead, the NEPA
23 baseline is dynamic and includes increases in operations for each study year (2015, 2016,
24 2017, 2020, and 2026), which are projected to occur absent a federal permit. Federal
25 permit decisions focus on direct impacts of the proposed Project to the aquatic
26 environment, as well as indirect and cumulative impacts in the uplands determined to be
27 within the scope of federal control and responsibility. Significance of the proposed
28 Project or the alternatives under NEPA is defined by comparing the proposed Project or
29 the alternatives to the NEPA baseline.

30 The NEPA baseline, for purposes of this Draft EIS/EIR, is the same as the No Federal
31 Action Alternative. Under the No Federal Action Alternative (Alternative 2), no
32 dredging, dredged material disposal, in-water pile installation, or crane
33 installation/extension would occur. Expansion of the TICTF and extension of the crane
34 rail would also not occur. The No Federal Action Alternative includes only backlands
35 improvements consisting of slurry sealing, deep cold planning, asphalt concrete overlay,
36 restriping, and removal, relocation, or modification of any underground conduits and
37 pipes necessary to complete repairs. These activities do not change the physical or
38 operational capacity of the existing terminal.

39 The NEPA baseline assumes that by 2026 the terminal would handle up to approximately
40 1,692,000 TEUs annually, accommodate 206 annual ships calls at two berths, and be
41 occupied by 14 cranes (10 operating).

3.10.4.2 Thresholds of Significance

The following criteria are based on the *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide* (City of Los Angeles 2006) and are the basis for determining the significance of impacts associated with land use consistency and compatibility resulting from development of the proposed Project or an alternative. There are no standard impacts thresholds for evaluating potential impacts to land use or development under NEPA; therefore, the CEQA thresholds listed below are used in evaluating potential impacts. A significant land use impact would occur if the proposed Project or an alternative is determined to be inconsistent with one of the standards listed, and the inconsistency results in a significant adverse effect to the environment. Therefore, the proposed Project or an alternative would have a significant impact related to land use if it would:

LU-1: Be inconsistent with the adopted land use/density designation in the Community Plan, redevelopment plan, or specific plan for the site, in a manner that results in a significant impact to the physical environment.

LU-2: Be inconsistent with the General Plan or adopted environmental goals or policies contained in other applicable plans adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact.

LU-3: Substantially affect the types and/or extent of existing land uses in the Project area.

LU-4: Cause a secondary impact to the surrounding land uses.

3.10.4.3 Impact Determination

Proposed Project

Impact LU-1: The proposed Project would be consistent with the adopted land use/density designation in the Community Plan, redevelopment plan, or specific plan for the site.

The proposed Project would include the continued operation of a container terminal on Terminal Island. Specifically, the proposed Project would result in the improvement of an existing container-handling facility to accommodate the projected fleet mix of larger container vessels. The continued use of the proposed project site as a container terminal would be consistent with the PMP Container land use designation and the description of Planning Area 3, which characterize current and planned land uses as serving container operations. Thus, the proposed Project would be consistent with the uses of the proposed Project site identified in the PMP for Planning Area 3.

Under the proposed Project, YTI Terminal operations would remain consistent with the [Q] M3-1 zone designation³ for the proposed project site, as well as with the Port of Los Angeles Plan General/Bulk Cargo and Commercial/Industrial Uses/Nonhazardous Uses designations. The proposed project site would remain a container terminal, and its

³ Cargo container storage uses are permitted by right in the M3 zone, per Los Angeles Municipal Code Chapter I, Article 2, Section 12.21.

1 operations would be consistent with zoning and designated uses in applicable land use
2 plans (Port of Los Angeles Plan and the PMP).

3 **CEQA Impact Determination**

4 As discussed above, the proposed Project would be consistent with the site zoning and
5 generalized land use designations in the Port of Los Angeles Plan. In addition, the
6 proposed Project would be consistent with the PMP's designated land uses for Planning
7 Area 3, and thus consistent with the overall intent of the PMP. Therefore, the proposed
8 Project would result in less-than-significant impacts under CEQA because it would be
9 consistent with site zoning and land use designations of applicable plans.

10 ***Mitigation Measures***

11 No mitigation is required.

12 ***Residual Impacts***

13 Impacts would be less than significant.

14 **NEPA Impact Determination**

15 The proposed Project would result in improvements that are not included in the NEPA
16 baseline. However, these improvements would not be inconsistent with adopted land use
17 designations or applicable plans such as the PMP, as discussed above. Therefore, the
18 proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact under NEPA.

19 ***Mitigation Measures***

20 No mitigation is required.

21 ***Residual Impacts***

22 Impacts would be less than significant.

23 **Impact LU-2: The proposed Project would be consistent with the** 24 **General Plan or adopted environmental goals or policies contained** 25 **in other applicable plans.**

26 The proposed Project would be consistent with the identified uses in the PMP, as
27 described under Impact LU-1. The PMP serves as the LCP for the California Coastal
28 Commission; however, due to the recent adoption of the PMP, the California Coastal
29 Commission has not yet reviewed or commented on the PMP. Because the PMP must be
30 approved and adopted by the California Coastal Commission, it was drafted with
31 consistency with the Coastal Act in mind; therefore, the proposed Project is anticipated to
32 be consistent with the Coastal Act. The proposed Project would be consistent with the
33 overall intent of the PMP, and also would be consistent with the preferred uses identified
34 in the PMP for Planning Area 3, which encompasses the proposed project site.

35 The proposed Project would be consistent with the Port of Los Angeles Plan, which gives
36 priority to water-dependent developments. Objective 1 of the Port of Los Angeles Plan is
37 to maintain the Port as an important local, regional, and national resource and to
38 accommodate the orderly development of the Port to meet the needs of foreign and
39 domestic waterborne commerce. Objective 4 of the Plan gives priority to water- and

1 coastal-dependent development within the Port to preclude the necessity for new ports
2 elsewhere in the state. Improvements to the existing YTI Terminal would be consistent
3 with Objectives 1 and 4.

4 The proposed Project would be consistent with the adopted objectives, policies, and
5 applicable plans contained in the City of Los Angeles General Plan by way of
6 consistency with the Port of Los Angeles Plan (see discussion under Impact LU-1) and
7 the San Pedro and Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plans. The San Pedro
8 Community Plan and Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan both contain a goal to
9 coordinate Port development with surrounding communities that improve the efficiency
10 and operational capabilities of the Port to better serve the economic needs of Los Angeles
11 and the region, while minimizing adverse environmental impacts to neighboring
12 communities from Port-related activities. The proposed Project would be consistent with
13 this goal, as it would implement environmental programs such as applicable CAAP
14 measures (see Section 3.2, Air Quality and Meteorology) and WRAP measures (see
15 Section 3.15, Water Quality, Sediment, and Oceanography). Other objectives in the San
16 Pedro Community Plans apply to geographic areas that the proposed Project would not
17 affect; therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with the San Pedro
18 Community Plan goals regarding Port development.

19 The Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan contains objectives for the LAHD to
20 coordinate development with the Wilmington Industrial Park Redevelopment Project and
21 to provide economic and employment benefits to neighboring communities. The
22 proposed Project would improve the existing YTI Terminal such that throughput capacity
23 would increase by an estimated 221,000 TEUs, and total throughput would increase by
24 approximately 695,891 TEUs over CEQA baseline levels by 2026. These increases in
25 throughput would contribute to increased economic benefits and employment
26 opportunities for local businesses and residents, and would thus be consistent with those
27 objectives. Consequently, the proposed Project would be consistent with goals and
28 policies in the San Pedro and Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plans.

29 The proposed Project is not expected to induce population migration into the area or
30 create a demand for new housing units, because new employment opportunities
31 associated with the proposed Project are expected to be largely filled by local labor (see
32 the discussion under Impact LU-4). As a result, the proposed Project would be consistent
33 with the RCP and the RTP developed by SCAG. The proposed Project would be
34 consistent with all applicable SCAG policies.

35 The proposed Project would require YTI to exercise an option to extend the existing lease
36 with LAHD in order to continue operations through 2026. The lease is an implementing
37 mechanism for CAAP measures applicable to the YTI Terminal (see Section 3.2, Air
38 Quality and Meteorology). Because applicable CAAP measures would either be
39 considered a project component or a mitigation measure identified in this EIS/EIR, the
40 CAAP would be implemented via the extended permit. In addition, construction of the
41 proposed Project would implement applicable elements of the Sustainable Construction
42 Guidelines and WRAP (BMPs during construction). Implementation of these plan
43 elements under the proposed Project would be consistent with environmental goals for
44 the Port as specified in the San Pedro and Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plans.

CEQA Impact Determination

As discussed above, the proposed Project would be consistent with the uses identified in the PMP, the Coastal Act, the Port of Los Angeles Plan, SCAG policies including the RCP and RTP, the CAAP, and Port-related goals in the San Pedro and Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plans (through implementation of applicable portions of the Sustainable Construction Guidelines and the WRAP). Because the proposed Project would be consistent with the General Plan and adopted environmental goals or policies contained in other applicable plans, impacts would be less than significant under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Impact Determination

As discussed above, the improvements and activities under the proposed Project would be consistent with goals and policies in applicable plans, planning goals/policies, and environmental goals or policies of the Port. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant under NEPA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact LU-3: The proposed Project would not substantially affect the types and/or extent of existing land uses in the project area.

Under the proposed Project, terminal improvements would be confined to the proposed project site at the YTI Terminal. These improvements would consist of land uses and operations that are similar to those that currently exist on and around Berths 212–224 and other container terminals on Terminal Island.

CEQA Impact Determination

As discussed above, the proposed Project would not significantly affect the types of land uses in the project area. Dredging at Berths 217–220 and 214–216, extending the 100-foot gauge crane rail, expanding the TICTF on-dock rail yard, reconfiguring and modifying the existing cranes, and adding new cranes would be consistent with other Port operations on Terminal Island and throughout the Port Complex. Terminal improvements and their operation would be confined to the proposed project site on Terminal Island, and would be comparable to those that currently exist in and around the project site and elsewhere on Terminal Island. The disposal of dredged material would take place off site and would be consistent with the uses (or permitted uses) of the site(s) where the reuse or disposal would occur. Consequently, impacts under CEQA would be less than significant.

1 **Mitigation Measures**

2 No mitigation is required.

3 **Residual Impacts**

4 Impacts would be less than significant.

5 **NEPA Impact Determination**

6 As discussed above, the proposed improvements would be implemented within the
7 existing 185-acre YTI Terminal on Terminal Island. The improvements would continue
8 to support similar container terminal operations as are currently supported, but would
9 enable a higher throughput volume and increased operational efficiency. Consequently,
10 the proposed Project would result in less-than-significant impacts to existing land uses or
11 land use types under NEPA.

12 **Mitigation Measures**

13 No mitigation is required.

14 **Residual Impacts**

15 Impacts would be less than significant.

16 **Impact LU-4: The proposed Project would not cause a secondary**
17 **impact to surrounding land uses.**

18 Secondary impacts refer here to the possible nexus between blighted conditions in
19 communities adjacent to the Port and activities at the Port. The term “blight” has been
20 used in a general sense to describe industrial conditions; however, “blight” has a very
21 specific legal definition under redevelopment law and mainly refers to substantial
22 physical deterioration of an area caused by physical or economic forces.

23 Adverse physical conditions include structures with serious code violations, buildings
24 that are dilapidated and deteriorated, inadequate lot sizes or configurations for existing
25 market conditions, or incompatible adjacent land uses that prevent the economic
26 development of those or other parcels. Adverse economic conditions include depreciated
27 or stagnant property values, abnormally high business vacancies or excessive vacant lots,
28 a lack of necessary commercial facilities that are normally found in neighborhoods (for
29 example, grocery stores or banks), residential overcrowding, an excess of businesses that
30 cater to adults, and crime rates that constitute a serious threat to public safety and
31 welfare.

32 In the City of Los Angeles, the Community Redevelopment Agency Board and City
33 Council are jointly responsible for making the determination that an area is in a blighted
34 condition. Once a determination of blight is made and a redevelopment plan is approved
35 by the City Council, redevelopment under the Community Redevelopment Law can
36 occur. Redevelopment is the responsibility of the Community Redevelopment Agency.
37 Redevelopment areas have been designated in areas close to the Port in San Pedro (the
38 Pacific Corridor Redevelopment Project area and Beacon Street Redevelopment Project
39 area) and in Wilmington (Los Angeles Harbor Industrial Center Redevelopment Project),
40 which are addressed in Section 3.10.2.2.

1 Additionally, the LAHD has implemented a number of actions designed to enhance
2 community quality of life and provide public access to visually stimulating and
3 historically relevant developments within and adjacent to the Port, including along the
4 San Pedro and Wilmington waterfronts.

5 One potential precursor of blight is depreciated or stagnant property values. Details
6 regarding trends in property values in communities adjacent to the proposed project site
7 are presented in Chapter 7, Socioeconomics. Residential property values in communities
8 adjacent to the Port have increased and decreased in recent years consistent with
9 Southern California real estate market trends. The proposed Project would not adversely
10 influence residential property values in the areas immediately adjacent to the Port. In
11 addition, changes in property value are dependent on numerous factors unrelated to the
12 Port, including monetary interest rates, ease of access to employment centers, availability
13 of quality education, and historic and existing land uses. The proposed Project would
14 increase the number of direct, indirect, and induced jobs and income in the region and
15 would result in other economic benefits. As a consequence, the proposed Project would
16 not result in blight impacts.

17 The proposed Project would also not induce substantial unanticipated growth, because
18 most new terminal employees would come from local sources in the Los Angeles area,
19 largely the existing International Longshore and Warehouse Union (ILWU) workforce.
20 The potential for substantial secondary growth is minimal, and any incidental potential
21 for secondary growth in the surrounding communities would be more generally
22 controlled by the Port and surrounding local and regional plans and policies that address
23 land use issues.

24 **CEQA Impact Determination**

25 As discussed above, the proposed Project would not result in secondary land use impacts,
26 including substantial unanticipated growth or blight. Therefore, secondary impacts on
27 land use would be less than significant under CEQA.

28 ***Mitigation Measures***

29 No mitigation is required.

30 ***Residual Impacts***

31 Impacts would be less than significant.

32 **NEPA Impact Determination**

33 As discussed above, the proposed Project is not expected to cause blight-related impacts.
34 As also discussed above, Project-related employment would be drawn from local sources
35 and so would not result in substantial unanticipated growth. Therefore, secondary land
36 use impacts would be less than significant under NEPA.

37 ***Mitigation Measures***

38 No mitigation is required.

39 ***Residual Impacts***

40 Impacts would be less than significant.

Alternative 1 – No Project

Under Alternative 1, no further Port action or federal action would occur. The LAHD would not implement any terminal improvements. No new cranes would be added and no dredging would occur. The No Project Alternative would not include extension of the 100-foot gauge crane rail, expansion of the TICTF on-dock rail yard, or backland repairs.

Under the No Project Alternative, the existing YTI Terminal would continue to operate as an approximately 185-acre container terminal. Based on the throughput projections, terminal operations are expected to grow over time as throughput demands increase. Under Alternative 1, the existing YTI Terminal would handle approximately 1,690,000 TEUs by 2026, which would result in 206 annual ship calls.

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

Impact LU-1: Alternative 1 would be consistent with the adopted land use/density designation in the Community Plan, redevelopment plan, or specific plan for the site.

CEQA Impact Determination

Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed project site would be 185 acres, which is the same as the CEQA baseline conditions. Terminal operations would be consistent with the [Q] M3-1 (Heavy Industrial zone) designation of the terminal site. No significant impacts under CEQA would occur, since this alternative would not alter the existing land use or terminal operations. Therefore, Alternative 1 would not result in significant impacts because it would be consistent with land use and density designations of applicable plans.

The Port of Los Angeles Plan and PMP contain objectives designed to accommodate the orderly and continued development of the Port to enable it to meet foreign and domestic waterborne commerce, navigation, commercial fishing industry, and public recreational needs. These objectives also provide the Port with the framework to accommodate forecasted growth. Under Alternative 1, the proposed project site would continue operating as a water-dependent use, and this alternative would not preclude future water-dependent uses and activities at the YTI Terminal, should they be considered in the future. Thus, implementation of Alternative 1 would be consistent with Port of Los Angeles Plan and PMP objectives and would result in a less-than-significant impact under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Impact Determination

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

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures are not applicable.

Residual Impacts

An impact determination is not applicable.

Impact LU-2: Alternative 1 would be consistent with the General Plan or adopted environmental goals or policies contained in other applicable plans.

CEQA Impact Determination

Under Alternative 1, no terminal development beyond the CEQA baseline conditions would occur. Alternative 1 would continue to operate the existing YTI Terminal, which would be consistent with the City of Los Angeles General Plan.

The Port of Los Angeles Plan and PMP contain objectives designed to accommodate the orderly and continued development of the Port to enable it to meet foreign and domestic waterborne commerce, navigation, commercial fishing industry, and public recreational needs. These objectives also provide the Port with the framework to accommodate forecasted growth. Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed project site would continue to operate as a container terminal, which is a water-dependent activity. Thus, implementation of Alternative 1 would be consistent with Port of Los Angeles Plan and PMP objectives and would result in a less-than-significant impact under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Impact Determination

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

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures are not applicable.

Residual Impacts

An impact determination is not applicable.

1 **Impact LU-3: Alternative 1 would not substantially affect the types**
2 **and/or extent of existing land uses in the Project area.**

3 **CEQA Impact Determination**

4 Alternative 1 would not improve the existing YTI Terminal, which would continue to
5 operate as a container terminal until 2026. Because this alternative would not result in
6 land use changes beyond CEQA baseline conditions, it would not directly affect the types
7 of land uses in the Project vicinity and there would be no impact under CEQA.

8 ***Mitigation Measures***

9 No mitigation is required.

10 ***Residual Impacts***

11 There would be no impact.

12 **NEPA Impact Determination**

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

16 ***Mitigation Measures***

17 Mitigation measures are not applicable.

18 ***Residual Impacts***

19 An impact determination is not applicable.

20 **Impact LU-4: Alternative 1 would not cause a secondary impact to**
21 **surrounding land uses.**

22 Alternative 1 would not adversely influence residential property trends in the areas
23 immediately adjacent to the Port. Changes in property value are dependent on other
24 unrelated factors including interest rates, ease of access to employment centers,
25 availability of quality education, and historic and existing zoning practices.

26 **CEQA Impact Determination**

27 Alternative 1 would not result in further improvements at the YTI Terminal, and the
28 proposed project site would continue to operate as a container terminal. Alternative 1
29 would accommodate increasing throughput over time, as its existing terminal capacity
30 allows, but, like the proposed Project, such growth would not be expected to result in
31 secondary land use impacts such as blight. Alternative 1 would result in increased
32 employment compared to the CEQA baseline but fewer employees compared to the
33 proposed Project, and would not induce substantial unanticipated growth because most
34 new employees would come from local sources in the Los Angeles area, largely the
35 existing ILWU workforce. The potential for substantial secondary growth under
36 Alternative 1 is minimal, and any incidental potential for secondary growth in the
37 surrounding communities would be more generally controlled by the Port and
38 surrounding local and regional plans and policies that address land use issues.

1 Consequently, Alternative 1 would not result in secondary land use impacts, including
2 substantial unanticipated growth or blight. Therefore, secondary impacts on land use
3 would be less than significant under CEQA.

4 ***Mitigation Measures***

5 No mitigation is required.

6 ***Residual Impacts***

7 Impacts would be less than significant.

8 **NEPA Impact Determination**

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

12 ***Mitigation Measures***

13 Mitigation measures are not applicable.

14 ***Residual Impacts***

15 An impact determination is not applicable.

16 **Alternative 2 – No Federal Action**

17 Alternative 2 is a NEPA-required no-action alternative for purposes of this Draft
18 EIS/EIR. This alternative includes the activities that would occur absent a USACE
19 permit and could include improvements that require a local permit. Absent a USACE
20 permit, no dredging, dredged material disposal, in-water pile installation, or crane
21 installation/extension would occur. Expansion of the TICTF and extension of the crane
22 rail also would not occur. The No Federal Action alternative includes only backlands
23 improvements consisting of slurry sealing; deep cold planing; asphalt concrete overlay;
24 restriping; and removal, relocation, or modification of any underground conduits and
25 pipes necessary to complete repairs. These activities would not change the capacity of
26 the existing terminal.

27 The site would continue to operate as an approximately 185-acre container terminal
28 where cargo containers are loaded to/from vessels, temporarily stored on backlands, and
29 transferred to/from trucks or on-dock rail. Based on the throughput projections, the YTI
30 Terminal is expected to reach its operating capacity of approximately 1,692,000 TEUs
31 with 206 ship calls by 2026.

32 **Impact LU-1: Alternative 2 would be consistent with the adopted**
33 **land use/density designation in the Community Plan, redevelopment**
34 **plan, or specific plan for the site.**

35 **CEQA Impact Determination**

36 Under the No Federal Action Alternative, minor backlands improvements would be made
37 (consisting of slurry sealing, deep cold planing, asphalt concrete overlay, restriping, and
38 removal, relocation, or modification of any underground conduits and pipes necessary to

1 complete the repairs) within the existing footprint of the terminal. Terminal operations
2 under Alternative 2 would be consistent with the [Q] M3-1 (Heavy Industrial zone)
3 designation of the terminal site. Since no substantive changes to on-site land uses or
4 terminal operations would be implemented under this alternative, no significant impacts
5 under CEQA would occur. Therefore, Alternative 2 would not result in significant
6 impacts because it would be consistent with land use and density designations of
7 applicable plans.

8 The Port of Los Angeles Plan and PMP contain objectives designed to accommodate the
9 orderly and continued development of the Port to enable it to meet foreign and domestic
10 waterborne commerce, navigation, commercial fishing industry, and public recreational
11 needs. These objectives also provide the Port with the framework to accommodate
12 forecasted growth. Under Alternative 2, the proposed project site would continue
13 operating as a water-dependent use, and this alternative would not preclude future water-
14 dependent uses and activities at the YTI terminal, should they be considered in the future.
15 Thus, implementation of Alternative 2 would be consistent with land use designations in
16 the Port of Los Angeles Plan and PMP, and would result in a less-than-significant impact
17 under CEQA.

18 ***Mitigation Measures***

19 No mitigation is required.

20 ***Residual Impacts***

21 Impacts would be less than significant.

22 **NEPA Impact Determination**

23 Alternative 2 would include only backlands improvements consisting of slurry sealing;
24 deep cold planing; asphalt concrete overlay; restriping; and removal, relocation, or
25 modification of any underground conduits and pipes necessary to complete repairs. No
26 construction of in-water or over-water features would occur under Alternative 2. The No
27 Federal Action Alternative would involve the same construction activities as would occur
28 under the NEPA baseline. Therefore, there would be no incremental difference between
29 Alternative 2 and the NEPA baseline. As a consequence, Alternative 2 would result in no
30 impact under NEPA.

31 ***Mitigation Measures***

32 No mitigation is required.

33 ***Residual Impacts***

34 There would be no impacts.

35 **Impact LU-2: Alternative 2 would be consistent with the General Plan**
36 **or adopted environmental goals or policies contained in other**
37 **applicable plans.**

38 **CEQA Impact Determination**

39 Under Alternative 2, only backlands development beyond the CEQA baseline conditions
40 would be implemented (slurry sealing, deep cold planing, asphalt concrete overlay,

1 restriping, and removal, relocation, or modification of any underground conduits and
2 pipes necessary to complete the repairs). Alternative 2 would continue to operate the
3 existing YTI Terminal, which would be consistent with the City of Los Angeles General
4 Plan.

5 The Port of Los Angeles Plan and PMP contain objectives designed to accommodate the
6 orderly and continued development of the Port to enable it to meet foreign and domestic
7 waterborne commerce, navigation, commercial fishing industry, and public recreational
8 needs. These objectives also provide the Port with the framework to accommodate
9 forecasted growth. Under the No Federal Action Alternative, the proposed project site
10 would continue to operate as a container terminal, which is a water-dependent activity.
11 Thus, implementation of Alternative 2 would be consistent with Port of Los Angeles Plan
12 and PMP objectives and would result in a less-than-significant impact under CEQA.

13 ***Mitigation Measures***

14 No mitigation is required.

15 ***Residual Impacts***

16 Impacts would be less than significant.

17 **NEPA Impact Determination**

18 Alternative 2 would include only backlands improvements consisting of slurry sealing;
19 deep cold planing; asphalt concrete overlay; restriping; and removal, relocation, or
20 modification of any underground conduits and pipes necessary to complete repairs. No
21 construction of in-water or over-water features would occur under Alternative 2. The No
22 Federal Action Alternative would involve the same construction activities as would occur
23 under the NEPA baseline. Therefore, there would be no incremental difference between
24 Alternative 2 and the NEPA baseline. As a consequence, Alternative 2 would result in no
25 impact under NEPA.

26 ***Mitigation Measures***

27 No mitigation is required.

28 ***Residual Impacts***

29 There would be no impacts.

30 **Impact LU-3: Alternative 2 would not substantially affect the types 31 and/or extent of existing land uses in the Project area.**

32 **CEQA Impact Determination**

33 Alternative 2 would include only improvements to backland areas of the existing YTI
34 Terminal (slurry sealing, deep cold planing, asphalt concrete overlay, restriping, and
35 removal, relocation, or modification of any underground conduits and pipes necessary to
36 complete the repairs). Under Alternative 2, the proposed project site would continue to
37 operate as a container terminal through 2026. Because this alternative would not result in
38 land uses changes, it would not directly affect the types of land uses in the proposed
39 project vicinity and there would be no impacts under CEQA.

1 **Mitigation Measures**

2 No mitigation is required.

3 **Residual Impacts**

4 There would be no impacts.

5 **NEPA Impact Determination**

6 Alternative 2 would include only backlands improvements consisting of slurry sealing;
7 deep cold planing; asphalt concrete overlay; restriping; and removal, relocation, or
8 modification of any underground conduits and pipes necessary to complete repairs. No
9 construction of in-water or over-water features would occur under Alternative 2. The No
10 Federal Action Alternative would involve the same construction activities as would occur
11 under the NEPA baseline. Therefore, there would be no incremental difference between
12 Alternative 2 and the NEPA baseline. As a consequence, Alternative 2 would result in no
13 impact under NEPA.

14 **Mitigation Measures**

15 No mitigation is required.

16 **Residual Impacts**

17 There would be no impacts.

18 **Impact LU-4: Alternative 2 would not cause a secondary impact to**
19 **surrounding land uses.**

20 **CEQA Impact Determination**

21 Alternative 2 would not adversely influence residential property trends in the areas
22 immediately adjacent to the Port. Changes in property value are dependent on other
23 unrelated factors including interest rates, ease of access to employment centers,
24 availability of quality education, and historic and existing zoning practices.

25 Alternative 2 would result in minor improvements on the existing YTI Terminal (slurry
26 sealing, deep cold planing, asphalt concrete overlay, restriping, and removal, relocation,
27 or modification of any underground conduits and pipes necessary to complete the
28 repairs). The proposed project site would continue to operate as it currently does.
29 Alternative 2 would accommodate increasing throughput over time, as its terminal
30 capacity allows, but, like the proposed Project, such growth would not be expected to
31 result in secondary land use impacts such as blight. Alternative 2 would result in
32 increased employment compared to the CEQA baseline but fewer employees compared
33 to the proposed Project, and would not induce substantial unanticipated growth, since
34 most new employees would come from local sources in the Los Angeles area, largely the
35 existing ILWU workforce. The potential for substantial secondary growth under
36 Alternative 2 is minimal, and any incidental potential for secondary growth in the
37 surrounding communities would be more generally controlled by the Port and
38 surrounding local and regional plans and policies that address land use issues.
39 Consequently, Alternative 2 would not result in secondary land use impacts, including
40 substantial unanticipated growth or blight. Therefore, secondary impacts on land use
41 would be less than significant under CEQA.

1 **Mitigation Measures**

2 No mitigation is required.

3 **Residual Impacts**

4 Impacts would be less than significant.

5 **NEPA Impact Determination**

6 Alternative 2 would include only backlands improvements consisting of slurry sealing;
7 deep cold planing; asphalt concrete overlay; restriping; and removal, relocation, or
8 modification of any underground conduits and pipes necessary to complete repairs. No
9 construction of in-water or over-water features would occur under Alternative 2. The No
10 Federal Action Alternative would involve the same construction activities as would occur
11 under the NEPA baseline. Therefore, there would be no incremental difference between
12 Alternative 2 and the NEPA baseline. As a consequence, Alternative 2 would result in no
13 impact under NEPA.

14 **Mitigation Measures**

15 No mitigation is required.

16 **Residual Impacts**

17 There would be no impacts.

18 **Alternative 3 – Reduced Project: Improve Berths 217–220 Only**

19 This alternative includes all components of the proposed Project except dredging and pile
20 driving at Berths 214–216. The following components of the proposed Project are
21 unchanged under the Reduced Project Alternative:

- 22 ▪ modifying up to six existing cranes;
- 23 ▪ replacing up to four existing non-operating cranes;
- 24 ▪ dredging 6,000 cy from a depth of -45 to -47 feet MLLW (with an additional
25 2 feet of overdredge depth, for a total depth of -49 feet MLLW), and installing
26 1,200 linear feet of sheet piles and king piles to support and stabilize the existing
27 wharf structure at Berths 217–220;
- 28 ▪ disposing of dredged material at LA-2, the Berths 243–245 CDF, or another
29 approved upland location;
- 30 ▪ extending the existing 100-foot gauge landside crane rail through Berths 217–
31 220;
- 32 ▪ performing ground repairs and maintenance activities in the backlands area; and
- 33 ▪ expanding the TICTF on-dock rail by adding a single rail loading track.

34 Under this alternative, there would be three operating berths after construction, similar to
35 the proposed Project, but Berths 214–216 would remain at their existing depth. This
36 alternative would require less dredging (by approximately 21,000 cy) and pile driving
37 and a shorter construction period than the proposed Project. Based on the throughput
38 projections, this alternative is expected to operate at its capacity of approximately
39 1,913,000 TEUs by 2026, similar to the proposed Project. However, while the terminal

1 could handle similar levels of cargo, the reduced project alternative would not achieve the
2 same level of efficient operations as achieved by the proposed Project. This alternative
3 would not accommodate the largest vessels (13,000 TEUs). The depth achieved at Berths
4 217–220 would only be capable of handling vessels up to 11,000 TEUs, requiring
5 additional vessels to call on the terminal to meet future growth projections up to the
6 capacity of the terminal. Therefore, under this alternative, 232 vessels would call on the
7 terminal in 2020 and 2026, compared to 206 vessels for the proposed Project.

8 Additionally, because of the higher number of annual vessel calls, this alternative would
9 result in a maximum of five peak day ship calls (over a 24-hour period) compared to four
10 for the proposed Project.

11 **Impact LU-1: Alternative 3 would be consistent with the adopted**
12 **land use/density designation in the Community Plan, redevelopment**
13 **plan, or specific plan for the site.**

14 Alternative 3 would include the improvements under the proposed Project with the
15 exception of dredging and pile driving at Berths 214–216. These activities would not
16 result in any changes in land use at the terminal or on adjacent lands, and would not be
17 inconsistent with site zoning or uses designated in land use plans. Alternative 3 would be
18 consistent with land use and density designations of applicable plans.

19 The Port of Los Angeles Plan and PMP contain objectives designed to accommodate the
20 orderly and continued development of the Port to enable it to meet foreign and domestic
21 waterborne commerce, navigation, commercial fishing industry, and public recreational
22 needs. These objectives also provide the Port with the framework to accommodate
23 forecasted growth. Implementation of Alternative 3 would continue the existing
24 terminal's water-dependent activities through 2026.

25 **CEQA Impact Determination**

26 Implementation of Alternative 3 would still facilitate a water-dependent use of port lands,
27 which would be consistent with Port of Los Angeles Plan and PMP objectives.
28 Therefore, this alternative would result in a less-than-significant impact under CEQA.

29 ***Mitigation Measures***

30 No mitigation is required.

31 ***Residual Impacts***

32 Impacts would be less than significant.

33 **NEPA Impact Determination**

34 As with the proposed Project, improvements under Alternative 3 would not be
35 inconsistent with existing land use plans or policies. Therefore, impacts related to
36 inconsistencies with applicable land use plans would be less than significant under
37 NEPA.

38 ***Mitigation Measures***

39 No mitigation is required.

1 ***Residual Impacts***

2 Impacts would be less than significant.

3 **Impact LU-2: Alternative 3 would be consistent with the General Plan**
4 **or adopted environmental goals or policies contained in other**
5 **applicable plans.**

6 Alternative 3 would include the improvements under the proposed Project with the
7 exception of dredging and pile driving at Berths 214–216. These activities would allow
8 the proposed Project site to continue to function at improved efficiencies compared to the
9 CEQA baseline and, like the proposed Project, would be consistent with the Port of
10 Los Angeles Plan, the Coastal Act, SCAG policies, and the uses identified in the PMP.
11 In addition, Alternative 3 would be consistent with goals for the Port, as stated in the
12 San Pedro and Wilmington-Harbor City community plans.

13 The Port of Los Angeles Plan and PMP contain objectives designed to accommodate the
14 orderly and continued development of the Port to enable it to meet foreign and domestic
15 waterborne commerce, navigation, commercial fishing industry, and public recreational
16 needs. These objectives also provide the Port with the framework to accommodate
17 forecasted growth.

18 **CEQA Impact Determination**

19 Implementation of Alternative 3 would continue the terminal’s water-dependent uses
20 through 2026, which would be consistent with Port of Los Angeles Plan and PMP
21 objectives and would result in a less-than-significant impact under CEQA.

22 ***Mitigation Measures***

23 No mitigation is required.

24 ***Residual Impacts***

25 Impacts would be less than significant.

26 **NEPA Impact Determination**

27 As with the proposed Project, Alternative 3 would not be inconsistent with applicable
28 plans, planning goals/policies, or environmental goals for the Port specified in other
29 applicable land use plans (i.e., San Pedro and Wilmington-Harbor City Community
30 Plans). Therefore, Alternative 3 would have a less-than-significant impact under NEPA.

31 ***Mitigation Measures***

32 No mitigation is required.

33 ***Residual Impacts***

34 Impacts would be less than significant.

1 **Impact LU-3: Alternative 3 would not substantially affect the types**
2 **and/or extent of existing land uses in the Project area.**

3 Alternative 3 would include the improvements under the proposed Project with the
4 exception of dredging and pile driving at Berths 214–216. Under this alternative,
5 terminal improvements would be confined to the proposed project site at the YTI
6 Terminal. These improvements would consist of land uses and operations that are similar
7 to and consistent with those that currently exist on and around Berths 212–224 and other
8 container terminals on Terminal Island. The disposal of dredged material would take
9 place off site and would be consistent with the uses (or permitted uses) of the site(s)
10 where the reuse or disposal would occur.

11 **CEQA Impact Determination**

12 The proposed features that would be implemented under this alternative would be
13 confined to the proposed Project site and would not result in land use changes in the
14 vicinity of the terminal area. Terminal operations under Alternative 3 would be
15 consistent with the designation [Q] M3-1 (Qualified Heavy Industrial zone) of the
16 terminal site. Thus, the proposed Project would not significantly affect the types of land
17 uses in the project area, and impacts under CEQA would be less than significant.

18 ***Mitigation Measures***

19 No mitigation is required.

20 ***Residual Impacts***

21 Impacts would be less than significant.

22 **NEPA Impact Determination**

23 As with the proposed Project, improvements under Alternative 3 would increase terminal
24 throughput capacity. However, these improvements would be consistent with the
25 existing site zoning designation (i.e., [Q] M3-1) and surrounding land uses. Therefore,
26 Alternative 3 would have a less-than-significant impact under NEPA.

27 ***Mitigation Measures***

28 No mitigation is required.

29 ***Residual Impacts***

30 Impacts would be less than significant.

31 **Impact LU-4: Alternative 3 would not cause a secondary impact to**
32 **surrounding land uses.**

33 Alternative 3 would not adversely influence residential property trends in the areas
34 immediately adjacent to the Port. Changes in property value are dependent on other
35 unrelated factors including interest rates, ease of access to employment centers,
36 availability of quality education, and historic and existing zoning practices.

37 Implementation of Alternative 3 would result in operational improvements. Alternative 3
38 would accommodate up to 1,913,000 TEUs, but such growth, like the proposed Project,

1 would not be expected to result in secondary land use impacts such as blight. In addition,
2 land use development in the surrounding communities would be more generally
3 controlled by the local and regional plans and policies that address land use issues.
4 Alternative 3 would not induce substantial unanticipated growth, since most new
5 employees would come from local sources in the Los Angeles area, largely the existing
6 ILWU workforce. The potential for substantial secondary growth under Alternative 3 is
7 minimal and any incidental secondary growth in the surrounding communities would be
8 more generally controlled by surrounding local and regional plans and policies that
9 address land use issues.

10 **CEQA Impact Determination**

11 Alternative 3 would not result in secondary land use impacts, including growth or blight.
12 Therefore, secondary impacts on land use would be less than significant under CEQA.

13 ***Mitigation Measures***

14 No mitigation is required.

15 ***Residual Impacts***

16 Impacts would be less than significant.

17 **NEPA Impact Determination**

18 Improvements under Alternative 3 would not result in secondary land use impacts,
19 including substantial growth or blight. Therefore, secondary impacts on land use would
20 be less than significant under NEPA.

21 ***Mitigation Measures***

22 No mitigation is required.

23 ***Residual Impacts***

24 Impacts would be less than significant.

25 **3.10.4.4 Summary of Impact Determinations**

26 Table 3.10-1 presents a summary of the CEQA and NEPA impact determinations of the
27 proposed Project and alternatives related Land Use and Planning, as described above.
28 This table is meant to allow easy comparison between the potential impacts of the Project
29 and alternatives with respect to this resource. Identified potential impacts may be based
30 on federal, state, or City significance criteria; LAHD criteria; and the scientific judgment
31 of the report preparers.

32 For each impact threshold, the table describes the impact, notes the CEQA and NEPA
33 impact determinations, describes any applicable mitigation measures, and notes the
34 residual impacts (i.e., the impact remaining after mitigation). All impacts, whether
35 significant or not, are included in this table.

Table 3.10-1: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Land Use Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Impacts after Mitigation
Proposed Project	LU-1: The proposed Project would be consistent with the adopted land use/density designation in the Community Plan, redevelopment plan, or specific plan for the site.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant
	LU-2: The proposed Project would be consistent with the General Plan or adopted environmental goals or policies contained in other applicable plans.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant
	LU-3: The proposed Project would not substantially affect the types and/or extent of existing land uses in the Project area.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant
	LU-4: The proposed Project would not cause a secondary impact to surrounding land uses.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant
Alternative 1 – No Project	LU-1: Alternative 1 would be consistent with the adopted land use/density designation in the Community Plan, redevelopment plan, or specific plan for the site.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Not applicable	No mitigation is required. Mitigation not applicable	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Not applicable
	LU-2: Alternative 1 would be consistent with the General Plan or adopted environmental goals or policies contained in other applicable plans.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Not applicable	No mitigation is required. Mitigation not applicable	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Not applicable
	LU-3: Alternative 1 would not substantially affect the types and/or extent of existing land uses in the Project area.	CEQA: No impact NEPA: Not applicable	No mitigation is required. Mitigation not applicable	CEQA: No impact NEPA: Not applicable
	LU-4: Alternative 1 would not cause a secondary impact to surrounding land uses.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Not applicable	No mitigation is required. Mitigation not applicable	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Not applicable

Table 3.10-1: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Land Use Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Impacts after Mitigation
Alternative 2 – No Federal Action	LU-1: Alternative 2 would be consistent with the adopted land use/density designation in the Community Plan, redevelopment plan, or specific plan for the site.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: No impact
	LU-2: Alternative 2 would be consistent with the General Plan or adopted environmental goals or policies contained in other applicable plans.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: No impact
	LU-3: Alternative 2 would not substantially affect the types and/or extent of existing land uses in the Project area.	CEQA: No impact NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: No impact NEPA: No impact
	LU-4: Alternative 2 would not cause a secondary impact to surrounding land uses.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: No impact
Alternative 3 – Reduced Project: Improve Berths 217–220 Only	LU-1: Alternative 3 would be consistent with the adopted land use/density designation in the Community Plan, redevelopment plan, or specific plan for the site.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant
	LU-2: Alternative 3 would be consistent with the General Plan or adopted environmental goals or policies contained in other applicable plans.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant
	LU-3: Alternative 3 would not substantially affect the types and/or extent of existing land uses in the Project area.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant
	LU-4: Alternative 3 would not cause a secondary impact to surrounding land uses.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant

3.10.4.5 Mitigation Monitoring

In the absence of significant impacts associated with land use, mitigation measures are not required.

3.10.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts

No significant unavoidable impacts to land use would occur as a result of construction or operation of the proposed Project or any of the alternatives.