

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

SECTION SUMMARY

This section characterizes the existing hazards and hazardous materials within the proposed Project area and assesses how the construction and operation of the proposed Project would alter them. The analysis provided in this section evaluates the proposed Project in terms of its compliance with applicable safety and security regulations and LAHD policies, potential to interfere with an existing emergency response or evacuation plan, the risk of upset due to terrorism, and its potential to increase the likelihood of an accidental spill, release, or explosion of hazardous materials. The primary features of the proposed Project that could contribute to increased risks include activities associated with the demolition of the existing buildings, timber wharf, finger piers, and other ancillary structures, excavation and grading, dredging, and creation of the two CDFs. An analysis of potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials associated with the alternatives is detailed in Chapter 6, Analysis of Alternatives.

Section 3.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, provides the following:

- A description of existing environmental setting in the Port area;
- A description of the existing hazards and hazardous materials stored at the Project site;
- A list of liquid bulk facilities within close proximity to the Project site;
- A description of applicable local, state, and federal regulations and policies regarding hazardous materials or hazardous substances that may require special handling if encountered during construction of the proposed Project;
- A discussion on the methodology used to determine whether the proposed Project adversely changes the existing physical conditions or increase the probability of hazardous spills or releases;
- An impact analysis of the proposed Project; and,
- A description of any mitigation measures proposed to reduce any potential impacts, if applicable.

Key Points of Section 3.7:

The proposed Project would expand the existing ALBS, and its operations would be consistent with other uses and facilities in the Project area and Fish Harbor.

The proposed Project would not result in a significant impact related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials, as explained below:

- The proposed Project would not conflict with applicable safety and security regulations.
- The proposed Project would not increase the frequency or severity of consequences to people or property from exposure to health hazards related to an accidental release.

- 1 • The proposed Project would not substantially interfere with an existing emergency response or
2 evacuation plan or require a new emergency or evacuation plan, thereby increasing the risk of
3 injury or death.
- 4 • The proposed Project would not substantially increase the public health and safety concern as a
5 result of an accidental spill, release, or explosion of hazardous materials due to a tsunami.
- 6 • The proposed Project would not substantially increase the likelihood of a spill, release, or
7 explosion of hazardous materials due to a terrorist attack.
- 8

3.7.1 Introduction

This section addresses the environmental setting and potential impacts of hazards and hazardous materials related to the proposed Project. This section evaluates the potential impacts of hazards and hazardous materials related to the proposed Project, and the potential for accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment. This section also describes impacts on public health and safety that could result from the proposed Project. These potential impacts include releases of hazardous materials associated with construction and operation of the proposed facilities. The potential risks of inundation associated with tsunami-related flooding are discussed in Section 3.5, Geology. Potential health and safety impacts associated with encountering contaminated soil and groundwater during construction are discussed in Section 3.6, Groundwater and Soils.

3.7.2 Environmental Setting

3.7.2.1 Hazardous Materials

A hazardous material is any material that, because of its quantity, concentration, or physical or chemical characteristics, pose a threat to human health and/or the environment, and any substance designated by the USEPA to be reported if a designated quantity of the substance is spilled into the waters of the U.S. or is otherwise released into the environment. Classes of hazardous materials that may be transported at the Port include:

- Corrosive materials — solids, liquids, or gases that can damage living material or cause fire
- Explosive materials — any compound that is classified by the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) as A, B, or C explosives
- Oxidizing materials — any element or compound that yields oxygen or reacts when subjected to water, heat, or fire conditions
- Toxic materials — gases, liquids, or solids that may create a hazard to life or health by ingestion, inhalation, or absorption through the skin
- Unstable materials — those materials that react from heat, shock, friction, and contamination, and are capable of violent decomposition or autoreaction, but which are not designed primarily as an explosive
- Radioactive materials — those materials that undergo spontaneous emission of radiation from decaying atomic nuclei
- Water-reactive materials — those materials that react violently or dangerously upon exposure to water or moisture

3.7.2.2 Government Lists of Environmental Records on Site and in the Vicinity of the Project Site

A computerized government records search performed by Environmental Data Resources Inc. (EDR), as summarized below, was completed in October 26, 2010 to identify potential areas of groundwater and/or soil contamination on site, or within up to 1.5 miles

1 from the center of the Project site (see Appendix E1 a summary of the government lists
 2 and Appendix E2 for the EDR Executive Summary) (EDR, 2010). The records search
 3 included numerous government databases such as those of registered USTs, operators
 4 who are hazardous waste generators, former landfills and sites with known hazardous
 5 materials release.

6 The Project site is located on 1046 South Seaside Avenue San Pedro, CA 90731. It is
 7 possible to have a single site/facility in several environmental databases, such as when
 8 the same USTs appear listed under more than one corporation name (i.e., Al Larsen Boat
 9 Shop, Al Larsen Marina, Berth 258, America Pacific Marina, and White Pier). As such,
 10 on any list there may be multiple listings of a single site/facility or source. The EDR
 11 report lists 1046 South Seaside Avenue as the target property. Results where the search
 12 returned a location within 1.5 miles of the ALBS are given in Table 3.7-1. Appendix E1
 13 includes the description of the regulatory lists returning a positive result from the
 14 database search.

Table 3.7-1: Summary of Environmental Database Search Results for ALBS

Database	Target Property	Search Distance (Miles)	Results Per Distance				Total
			< 1/8	1/8 - 1/4	1/4 - 1/2	1/2 - 1	
Federal Records							
Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and liability Information System (CERCLIS)		1.00	0	0	0	1	1
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act-Large Quantity Generators (RCRA-LQG)	X	TP	1	1	2	4	8
Small Quantity Generators (RCRA-SQG)		1.00	4	1	9	17	31
Emergency Response Notification System (ERNS)	X	TP	57	21	21	43	142
Hazardous Materials Incident Reporting System (HMIRS)		1.00	0	0	3	1	4
Toxics Release Inventory Systems (TRIS)		1.00	0	0	1	0	1
FIFRA/TSCA Tracking Systems (FTTS)		1.00	1	0	2	0	3
HIST FTTS		1.00	1	0	2	0	3
Integrated Compliance information System (ICIS)		1.00	1	1	3	2	7
Department of Transportation, Office of Pipeline Safety (DOT OPS)		1.00	0	0	1	0	1
Facility Index Systems (FINDS)	X	TP	10	6	25	27	68

Table 3.7-1: Summary of Environmental Database Search Results for ALBS

Database	Target Property	Search Distance (Miles)	Results Per Distance				Total
			< 1/8	1/8 - 1/4	1/4 - 1/2	1/2 - 1	
State and Local Records							
HIST Cal-Sites		1.00	0	0	0	1	1
ENVIROSTOR		1.00	1	0	0	3	4
CA Bond Expenditure Plan		1.00	0	0	0	1	1
Solid Waste Facilities/Landfill Sites (SWF/LF)		1.00	0	0	0	1	1
Waste Discharge System (WDS)	X	TP	2	5	2	7	16
Waste Management Unit Database System/State Water Resources Control Board (WMUDS/SWAT)		0.50	0	0	1	0	1
Cortese		1.00	1	0	0	1	2
Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST)		1.00	2	0	3	7	12
Facility Inventory Database (CA FID UST)		1.00	1	1	4	15	21
Spills, Leaks, Investigation and Cleanup Cost Recovery (SLIC)		1.00	3	1	3	8	15
Underground Storage Tank (UST)		1.00	0	1	4	6	11
HIST UST		1.00	1	1	3	9	14
Aboveground Petroleum Storage Tank (AST)		1.00	1	0	0	1	2
Statewide Environmental Evaluation and Planning System (SWEEPS UST)		1.00	1	1	9	12	23
California Hazardous Material Incident Report System (CHMIRS)	X	TP	26	8	16	17	67
LA Co. Site Mitigation	X	TP	0	0	0	1	1
Deed		1.00	0	0	0	1	1
Voluntary Cleanup Program (VCP)		1.00	0	0	0	1	1
Drycleaners		1.00	0	0	0	1	1
Hazardous Materials System (Los Angeles Co. HMS)		1.00	0	1	0	1	2
Construction, Demolition, and landclearing (CDL)		1.00	0	0	0	1	1
RESPONSE		1.00	1	0	0	1	2
HAZNET	X	TP	18	6	31	59	114
Emissions Inventory (EMI)	X	TP	1	3	14	14	32
Non-generating hazardous waste (RCRA-NonGen)		1.00	1	0	1	2	4
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)	X	TP	3	4	4	7	18
HIST Cortese		1.00	2	0	2	9	13

Table 3.7-1: Summary of Environmental Database Search Results for ALBS

Database	Target Property	Search Distance (Miles)	Results Per Distance				Total
			< 1/8	1/8 - 1/4	1/4 - 1/2	1/2 - 1	
<i>EDR Proprietary Records</i>							
EDR Historical Auto Stations		1.00	0	2	2	10	14
EDR Historical Cleaners		1.00	0	0	0	15	15

Source: EDR, October 26, 2010

Notes: TP = Target Property

Sites may be listed in more than one database

3.7.2.3 Existing Conditions in the Vicinity of the Project Site

This section presents a discussion of hazards and hazardous materials that are potentially present within the vicinity of the Project site. Hazards include fires, explosions, and releases of hazardous materials. This section focuses on a review of nearby facilities that may use, handle, or store large quantities of hazardous materials, or have the potential to cause fires, explosions, or a release of hazardous materials during implementation of the proposed Project.

Numerous federal, state, and local agencies regulate the storage, use, transport, generation, and handling of hazardous materials. Applicable regulations are discussed further in Section 3.7.3.

Within the Port, the handling, storage, and transport of hazardous material are generally limited to container terminals, liquid bulk storage facilities and tank farms, and existing gas and petroleum pipelines, as described below and shown on Figure 3.7-1.

Nearby Liquid Bulk Facilities. There are seven liquid bulk facilities located within the Port, comprising a total of 114 acres, and handling various types of commodities (i.e., liquid gas and crude oil). ExxonMobil Oil Corporation operates two on Terminal Island in the vicinity of the proposed Project: Southwestern Terminal One (Berths 238-240C) located adjacent to the proposed Project site at 799 S. Seaside Avenue and Southwestern Terminal Two located at 510 S. Pilchard Street. Together, the 31.4-acres of tank farm contains 26 storage tanks with a total capacity of approximately 2.3 million barrels. The ExxonMobil/General Petroleum (Berths 258-259) Facility, located immediately north of the proposed Project site, is a marine fueling station with approximately 90,000 gallons of bulk fuel storage (General Petroleum, 2003). Both ExxonMobil and ExxonMobil/General Petroleum handle petroleum products such as fuels, lubricants, and other liquid organic products (POLA, 2011).



**CDM
Smith**

Legend

- Al Larson Boat Shop
- Liquid Bulk Facilities
- Container Terminal

**Port of Los Angeles
Al Larson Boat Shop
Improvement Project**

Liquid Bulk and Container Terminal Facilities

Figure 3.7-1

1 **Nearby Container Terminal Facilities.** There are four container terminal facilities
2 located within approximately 1.0 mile of the Project site. In the order of nearest to
3 farthest, these facilities include: 1) APL (Berths 302-305 and proposed Berth 306)
4 located on Pier 300, approximately 0.5 mile east of the Project site (across Fish Harbor);
5 2) Evergreen Marine Terminal/STS (Berths 226-236) located 0.5 mile north of the
6 Project site; 3) APM Terminals (Berths 401-404) located 0.75 mile southeast of the
7 Project site, at Pier 400 (south of the Pier 300 Channel); and 4) California United
8 Container Terminal (Berths 405-406) located 0.75 mile southeast of the Project site in the
9 Pier 300 Channel Turning Basin. Each of these facilities is greater than 200 acres in size,
10 with the exception of the 100-acre California Unified Terminal, and handles
11 containerized cargo.

12 The LAHD estimates that the Port, as a whole, handled approximately 265,039 containers
13 in 2009 that contained hazardous materials (PIERS, 2010). This is the approximate
14 capacity of 58 container ships. Based on the annual Portwide container volume of 7.26
15 million TEUs for fiscal year (FY) 2009, hazardous materials in containers represents
16 approximately 3.65 percent of the total containers handled in the Port during FY 2009
17 (July 1- June 30). As indicated by the National Response Center's (NRC) 2006-2010
18 data, there have been several minor releases of hazardous materials from containers or
19 other sources within the Port, but none have resulted in serious injuries or deaths. No
20 deaths have resulted from releases of hazardous materials at the Port, and no injuries
21 associated with accidental releases of hazardous materials have been reported at those
22 liquid bulk storage facilities closest to the proposed Project site, as identified above.¹

23 **3.7.2.4 Existing Conditions at the Project Site**

24 This section presents a breakdown of the nature of the results from the EDR report (Table
25 3.7-1 and Appendix E2) associated with the Project site and a discussion of hazards and
26 hazardous materials that are potentially present at the existing ALBS site.

27 Below is a breakdown of the nature of the results from the EDR report associated with
28 the Project site:

- 29 • The Project site is listed on the CHMIRS database for spills of petroleum, hydraulic
30 oil and unknown hazardous materials into the harbor. The site is listed in 2000, 2003,
31 2004, and 2006.
- 32 • The Project site is listed on the WDS database for having been issued waste
33 discharge requirements for constituents such as biological oxygen demand (BOD),
34 Hardness, total residual fluorine (TRF), chloride, inorganic salts and heavy metals
35 (under NPDES Permit No. CA0061051 Order No. R4-2007-0030).
- 36 • The Project site is identified as a RCRA Large Quantity Generator, producing 1,000
37 kilograms (kg) or more of hazardous waste during any calendar year. There are
38 currently no violations.
- 39 • The Project site is listed on the NPDES list for having been issued a NPDES permit
40 authorizing storm water industrial operations.

¹ The National Response Center (NRC) is the federal government's national communications center, which is staffed 24 hours a day by U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) officers and marine science technicians. The NRC is the sole national point of contact for reporting oil, chemical, radiological, biological, and etiological discharges into the environment anywhere in the U.S. and its territories. The NRC's spill data for 1982 through 2010 are available at: <http://www.nrc.uscg.mil/download.html>

- 1 • The Project site is listed on the Los Angeles County Site Mitigation List (LA Co. Site
2 Mitigation).
- 3 • The Project site is listed on the HAZNET database for paint sludge, waste oil, mixed
4 oil and organic solids. The waste listed in the HAZNET includes unspecified solvent
5 mixture wastes, off-specification, aged or surplus organics, unspecific organic liquid
6 mixture, organic solids, paint sludge, and waste oil.
- 7 • The Project site is listed on the EMI database for having toxics and criteria pollutant
8 emissions data collected by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and other
9 local agencies. The Project site has several permits issued by the SCAQMD.
- 10 • The Project site is listed on the ERNS database for reported releases of oil and
11 hazardous substances.
- 12 • The Project site is listed on FINDS to provide information on water quality, air
13 pollutants, permit tracking, hazardous waste shipments to and from the site.

14 **Hazardous Materials Transport and Release.** Unlike other tenant sites of the Port, the
15 Project site does not support container transport operations or backlands for cargo storage.
16 The facilities at Berth 258 (i.e., size, timber wharf, finger piers, and marine railways) are
17 not capable of handling containerized shipping activities or cargo transport/storage.

18 ALBS does not support activities related to the transport or storage of large amounts of
19 hazardous materials or waste. The only hazardous materials use and storage at the ALBS
20 site are small quantities used for boat building and maintenance operations.

21 The proposed Project site includes several buildings that contain small amounts of
22 hazardous material and/or hazardous wastes, as listed in Table 3.7-2. ALBS currently
23 contracts with various contractors to manage all waste oil accumulated from on-site
24 operations. According to the ALBS Hazardous Materials System Business Inventory List
25 (LAFD, 2002), the maximum quantity of waste oil is approximately 800 gallons. The
26 waste oil is contained on site in an 800-gallon AST for less than 90 days, and then the
27 contractor transports the waste oil off site to Industrial Service Oil Company, Inc. in Los
28 Angeles, which is a recycling facility approved to accept waste oil (ALBS, 2010). The
29 90 day hazardous waste storage area is located in the southern portion of the ALBS
30 facility (near the marina), which is not part of the Project site.

31

Table 3.7-2: List of Hazardous Materials Stored at ALBS

Type of Material	Quantity	Storage Unit/Type
Spray Paint	100	Cans
Propane	80	Gallons/Cylinder
Waste Oil	800	Gallons/AST
Oxygen	11,200	Cubic Feet/Cylinder
Aeso Kroil	34	Each
3M Super77 Adhesive	12	Each
TRL-1 Dry-release Teflon	4	Each
Marine Moly	3	Cans
Splash Zone	2	Quarts
Auto Body Filler	5	Quarts
Contact Cement	8	Quarts
Starting Fluid	4	Cans
Dolfinite Bedding Compound	3	Quarts
Rapid Tap Lubricating Oil	15	Cans
Jasco Wood Preservative	4	Gallon
Ospho Rust Preventative	3	Gallon
Corroseal	2	Gallon
Wood Varnish	1	Quarts
Laquer Thinner	3	Quarts
Acetone	4	Gallon
Hydraulic Oil	1	Gallon
Motor Oil	9	Quarts
All Purpose Grease	24	Cans
Antifreeze	5	Gallon
WD-40	17	Cans
Brakleen	32	Cans
Never-seezs	13	Cans
Lubriplate	23	Each
Silicone	162	Tubes
Eureka Rust Preventative	3 ^a	Drums
Tectyl 84 Rust Preventative	2 ^a	Drums
Paint Thinners 'various'	80 ^b	Gallon
Paint 'various'	1,120 ^b	Gallon
Ethylene Glycol	2 ^a	Drums
Magnkote Plus Rust Preventative	3 ^a	Drums
Texaco Rust Compound H	16 ^a	Drums

Source: ALBS, 2011

^a denotes that material is stored in 55-gallon drums^b denotes that the material is stored in 1-gallon or 5-gallon containers

1 **Site Contamination.** There have been several site investigations conducted at the
2 Project site to identify and determine the extent of environmental contamination. Since
3 1993, there have been several investigations associated with the Project site and related to
4 the adjacent ExxonMobil/General Petroleum Facility located along the northern boundary
5 of the Project site. These reports are presented in detail in Section 3.6, Groundwater and
6 Soils, and are summarized below:

- 7 1. A *Phase I Preliminary Site Assessment* (PSA) was conducted for the ALBS site by
8 Tetra Tech, Inc. in 1993 (Tetra Tech, 1994). The database file review indicated that
9 the ALBS site was not listed with federal, state, or local regulatory agencies for
10 violations or enforcement actions. However, the ALBS site was identified as a
11 Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) small quantity generator (SQG)
12 site and was included on the Hazardous Waste Information System (HWIS) database.
13 The site inspection and documentation review found that the assessed property might
14 have potential environmental liabilities due to poor environmental safety practices
15 and inadequate site conditions. Soil or sediment in the unlined marine railways and
16 around the capped clarifier in the machine shop may have been impacted by
17 contamination as a result of direct contact with the waste materials (sandblast waste,
18 oils, paints, and solvents). The preliminary asbestos survey identified the linoleum
19 flooring material in the downstairs office area of the main building as positive
20 asbestos-containing building material (ACBM); however it was concluded that these
21 materials were categorized as Class I non-friable ACBM and were not likely to cause
22 any immediate health concerns for the employees. The PSA recommended leaving
23 the flooring material in-place (with monitoring and routine inspection) and
24 recommended that all identified Class I ACBM be abated by a qualified asbestos
25 abatement contractor prior to any physical disturbance or demolition of the buildings.
- 26 2. A *Site Characterization Report* was conducted for the Project site by Mesa
27 Environmental Services in 1997 (Mesa, 1998). The results indicated that the
28 northern and southern portions of the site exhibit elevated heavy metal concentration
29 including lead, copper, zinc, and tin. Elevated polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons
30 (PAHs) were also detected throughout the site. Detected polychlorinated biphenyls
31 (PCB) concentrations were at low to non-detect levels. In general, these types of
32 pollutants are consistent with the operational history of the ALBS site and adjacent
33 operations along Seaside Avenue and around Fish Harbor. One soil sample (northern
34 most extent of the site) contained elevated levels (27,000 ppm) of TPH (C4-C35).
35 Given the isolated but significant TPH contamination identified at one sample
36 location and the activities undertaken at the facility to the north of ALBS (the facility
37 was a fueling depot) it was recommended that at a minimum, results from recent soil
38 borings or groundwater well monitoring at the site be reviewed. However, since the
39 ALBS facility was paved with impervious material (i.e., concrete or asphalt), the
40 report determined that the materials beneath the surface have been encapsulated.
41 Given the lack of information concerning contamination of surrounding areas and the
42 potential for sources other than ALBS to have, at a minimum, contributed to the
43 contamination described in the report no remedial actions were proposed.

44 Based on their review of the site investigation, the LAHD submitted their comments
45 in a letter dated February 1, 1999. In the correspondence, the LAHD agreed that
46 there appeared to be wide distribution of contamination across the ALBS site, but
47 disagreed with the statement that "this contamination may not be specifically
48 attributed by ALBS individually but that it is a part of a larger scenario of general
49 contamination along Seaside Avenue and within Inner Fish Harbor". The letter
50 indicated that although there might be regional problems with PCBs and pesticides in

1 the sediments of Inner Fish Harbor, it did not change the fact that ALBS was
2 responsible for the contamination caused by its operations. The LAHD's concerns
3 for this facility were not only the existing contamination, but also lack of
4 preventative measures or operational controls to reduce or eliminate the sources of
5 contamination that continue to degrade the water and sediment quality of the Port.
6 The letter also pointed out that many of the metals detected (i.e., arsenic, copper,
7 lead) exceeded the Total Threshold Limit Concentrations (or TTLCs) and may also
8 exceed the Soluble Threshold Limit Concentrations (STLCs) or Toxicity
9 Characteristics Leaching Potential (TCLP) criteria. This could result in the
10 soils/sediments being classified as a California State Regulated Hazardous Waste or
11 Federal Regulated Hazardous Waste. Additionally, there may be a health and safety
12 concern regarding chronic worker exposures to high levels of carcinogenic metals.

- 13 3. A **Remedial Action Plan (RAP)** was prepared subsequent to the Site Characterization
14 Report for the contaminated areas at the ALBS site, as required by the LAHD to
15 address the existing environmental issues within the Port (EPCI, 2001).
16 Environmental issues, as determined by previous site assessment and characterization
17 reports, that were identified in the RAP include: TPH, PCBs, heavy metals (i.e., lead,
18 copper, zinc), and the storage of spent sandblast grit. Upon further investigation, it
19 was determined that the source of the TPH soil contamination was off site, and
20 LAHD determined that ALBS was not responsible for the remediation of the TPH.
21 In addition, based on historic and current operational activities at the site, ALBS was
22 determined unlikely to be the source of PCB contamination.

23 At the time the RAP was prepared, the LAHD indicated that the containment and
24 control of spent sandblasting grit was of immediate concern. Specifically, the
25 concern was related to the deposition of sandblast grit on the railways and
26 containment within the sandblasting booth and storage area of the ALBS. The RAP
27 identified the exposed soil at the railways and the near-site marine sediments and
28 rocks containing deposits of spent sandblast grit as an environmental concern, and
29 suggested actions to mitigate such impacts. Considering the development of the
30 ALBS site may involve construction of foundations into soils with high ground
31 water, the number of remedial technology alternatives is limited.

- 32 4. A **Draft Summary and Update Environmental Compliance Audit** was conducted for
33 ALBS in 2004 to update any changes, improvements, and corrections of previously
34 identified deficiencies from the environmental compliance audits in 1994 and 2002
35 (Tetra Tech. Inc, 2005). As part of the audit, ALBS was required to submit a list of
36 documents required for the operation of the facility. Table 3.7-3 and Table 3.7-4
37 identify all valid environmental permits and documentation required for ALBS.

38

Table 3.7-3: Inventory of Environmental Permits for ALBS

Regulatory Agency	Permit Name	Permitted Activities	Permit Number
SCAQMD	Open Abrasive Blasting Permit	To operate an open abrasive-blasting operation	F33552,F33553, F41657
	Open Spray Equipment Permit	To operate an open spray equipment	F33576
City of Los Angeles Harbor/Fire Department	Welding and Hot Work Permit	To conduct fire/spark producing operations	11-16
City of Los Angeles Fire Department	Hazardous Waste/Hazardous Materials Management Program Consolidated Permit	Compliance with the City's Hazardous Materials Release Response Plan (HMRRP) and Inventory Program	LAFD Facility ID No. 19051-009182
		Compliance with the City's Hazardous Waste Generator Program	
California State Lands Commission	Certificate of Adequacy for Reception Facilities-Oils	To handle oils and related waste from boats/vessels (including bilge water containing oils/fuels)	An inspection was done by the State Lands Commission in 2004 for preventing oil spills. No violations were found.
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (Los Angeles RWQCB)	National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit/ Notice of Intent (NOI)	Discharge of dry or wet season surface water runoff into any surface water bodies	CA0061051
	Water Discharge Requirement Permit	Discharge of dry or wet season surface water runoff into any surface bodies	Order No. R4-2007-0030
Department of Public Works Bureau of Sanitation	Industrial Wastewater Permit	Discharge of industrial wastewater into the sanitary sewer.	Permit No: 493136
USEPA/Cal EPA	Uniform Hazardous Waste Generator Identification Number	Generator's ID for disposing of regulated/hazardous waste	CAD981684327

1

Table 3.7-4: Environmental Documentation List for ALBS

Regulatory Agency	Record Type	Status
City of Lost Angeles Fire Department	Hazardous Materials Business Plan and Inventory	ALBS maintains a copy of the Business Plan at the facility.
	Hazardous Waste Generator Program	Currently ALBS does not have a Hazardous Materials Management Plan (HMMP). ^a However, ALBS maintains the following documents that contain the same information as a single HMMP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emergency Contingency Plan • Hazardous Communication Program • Water Pollution Control Plan • Spill Prevention Plan
SCAQMD	Paint Usage Records	Painting and coating usage charts that are readily available for review.
	SCAQMD Record Sheet	SCAQMD record sheets are available for review.
Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation /Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety	Maintenance and Repair (transformers, clarifiers, septic tank, etc.)	No documentation is currently available pertaining to the former clarifier in the machine shop.
Los Angeles RWQCB	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)	ALBS has a current SWPPP for the facility.
	WDR/NPDES Monitoring Report	ALBS has quarterly and yearly monitoring reports that are available for review.
Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC)	Manifest and Disposal Records	Manifest and disposal records are available for review. Generators' USEPA ID No. CAD981684327
Right-to-know	MSDS(Material Safety Data Sheet) Inventory Program	MSDS sheets are available for review.

^a An Environmental Compliance Program will be established for ALBS in place of a Hazardous Material Management Plan that includes the plans and programs listed herein.

The environmental compliance audit concluded that the ALBS is in compliance with all permits, environmental documents and housekeeping activities required by federal, state, and local agencies. However, there were minor recommendations on paperwork and housekeeping compliance that suggested creating a more accessible environmental documentation record system and develop more comprehensive cleanup measures.

In a report dated April 7, 2006, Richard R. Horner of the Santa Monica Baykeeper further summarized and commented on the deficiencies outlined in the 2005 *Draft Summary and Update Environmental Compliance Audit*. Mr. Horner concluded that ALBS needs a comprehensive and enforced program to bring its entire operation up to current standards. Since his report, ALBS has performed various improvements

1 (such as installation of a stormwater treatment system) and updated various permits
2 and plans (such as a updated WDR and updated Spill Prevention Plan),

- 3 5. **A *Site Assessment Program – General Petroleum Facility, Port of Los Angeles*** was
4 prepared in 1990, as part of the lease renewal process between ExxonMobil (then
5 Mobil Oil Corporation) and the LAHD (Harding Lawson Associates, 1990). The
6 Work Plan laid out a program to confirm the presence or absence of hydrocarbons in
7 soil and groundwater at the site from facility operations, and, if found, assess the
8 nature and extent of the hydrocarbons.
- 9 6. **A *Work Plan for Interim Remedial Action*** was prepared for the overexcavation and
10 post excavation sampling at the GP site (ERM, 2008). The proposed area of
11 excavation was bounded by the AST containment area and concrete walls. In
12 particular, soil samples were proposed to determine if total petroleum hydrocarbons
13 as gasoline (TPH-g) and diesel fuel (TPH-d), as well as VOCs remaining in the
14 subsurface.
- 15 7. **A *Soil, Soil Vapor, and Groundwater Site Assessment Summary and Additional***
16 ***Investigation Work Plan*** was prepared to summarize previous monitoring and
17 sampling activities. A Work Plan for further characterization of the GP site was also
18 prepared (Environmental Resources Management [ERM]-West Inc, 2009a). The
19 assessment included potential areas that may require additional soil, soil vapor, and
20 groundwater investigation, and to provide a description of the technical approach and
21 methodologies for implementation of additional investigation.
- 22 8. **A *RAP for the General Petroleum Resources Facility*** (ExxonMobil/General
23 Petroleum Facility) was prepared by ERM for the ExxonMobil/General Petroleum
24 site (GP site) located along the northern boundary of the Project site (ERM, 2009b).
25 The purpose of the RAP was to provide the details of the source removal and soil
26 remediation strategy to be implemented at the site, and on portions of the ALBS site
27 to the South, to mitigate the petroleum hydrocarbon impacts to soil and groundwater.
28 The site has operated as a marine fueling station since the 1940s. Fuel and oil storage
29 tanks are located in the southern portion of the GP site, adjacent to the ALBS site,
30 and include the following: five 20,000-gallon ASTs for fuel storage; three ASTs for
31 lubricating oil, and; one gasoline vehicle fuel station/island. According to the RAP, a
32 site investigation conducted in 1991 indicated that the subsurface soil at the site was
33 impacted by petroleum hydrocarbons. Total petroleum hydrocarbon (mostly diesel
34 range) concentrations were detected up to 66,000 mg/kg in site soils. An ongoing
35 quarterly groundwater monitoring sampling program began in 2001 at the site. The
36 RAP identified aromatic hydrocarbons (i.e. BTEX) and fuel additives associated with
37 gasoline and diesel fuels such as MTBE, TBA, and lead as chemical of concerns
38 (COCs). The strategy outlined in the RAP incorporated limited vadose zone soil
39 excavation, in situ remediation via biosparging, bioventing, soil vapor extraction
40 SVE, and limited ISCO.
- 41 9. **A *Supplemental Remedial Action, Limited In Situ Chemical Oxidation*** was
42 prepared to provide additional detail on the use of the limited ISCO and provide a
43 technical basis for selecting the oxidant for the limited ISCO most appropriate for
44 meeting the remediation goals (ERM, 2010). The supplemental RAP presented a
45 summary of the screening of four oxidants considered for the limited ISCO and
46 provided an overview of the selected oxidant, calcium peroxide that included
47 chemistry, a comparison of efficacy, application, availability, generation of by-
48 products, and safety.

1 10. A *Draft Comprehensive Site Investigation and First Quarter 2011 Groundwater*
2 *Monitoring Report for the General Petroleum Facility* (ExxonMobil/General
3 Petroleum Facility) was completed by ERM (ERM, 2011). The objective of the
4 investigation was to determine the extent of impacted soil, soil vapor, and
5 groundwater at the site. The investigation included two soil sampling locations in
6 northernmost area of the ALBS site. Lead was detected in both locations at
7 concentrations ranging between 40 to 7,900 mg/kg. Highest lead concentration was
8 detected at 4.5 feet bgs in the sample location that was adjacent (west/land side) of
9 Building D. Diesel Range Organics (DRO) was also detected at this location (4.5
10 feet bgs) at a concentration of 4,300 mg/kg. The report concluded that the elevated
11 DRO within the ALBS site was identified adjacent to the former railway line which
12 could be a source of diesel in soil.

13 The soil vapor data collected from the site indicated that constituents detected and
14 noted to exceed the CHHLs were not considered to present a significant risk to
15 human health given that there were no structures with the potential for indoor air
16 impacts within the radius of the inferred extent of these concentrations. No soil
17 vapor data was collected at locations within the ALBS site.

18 In addition to soil samples, there were four groundwater monitoring wells (MWs)
19 installed in 2007 at the northern area of the ALBS site, near Buildings D and C1
20 (between the buildings and the buildings and the pier). Refer to Section 3.6,
21 Groundwater and Soils, for groundwater monitoring results.

22 Overall, no new constituents of concern were identified as part of this site
23 investigation. The report concluded that the concentrations of COCs such as DRO,
24 GRO, benzene, and MTBE in soil and groundwater were within the range of
25 treatability for the methods outlined in the 2009 RAP.

26 11. A *2011 Work Plan and RAP Addendum* for ExxonMobil/General Petroleum site
27 (ERM, 2011b). The objectives of this document were: 1) complete the
28 characterization (lateral and vertical extent) of contamination at the GP site pursuant
29 to CWC Sections 13267 and 13304 Orders; and, 2) update the scope of RAP
30 activities based on the 2011 Draft Comprehensive Site Investigation (described
31 above). According to the Work Plan, COCs in soil were not fully delineated during
32 the 2011 site investigation. The Work Plan proposed additional soil boring to
33 delineate TPH to the north of the fuel storage area. It was not proposed to install
34 further borings to the west or south as there may be overlapping sources from the
35 former rail tracks and the ALBS. Based on the 2011 investigation results, the
36 proposed strategy to achieve site closure in 2009 RAP was revised, such as proposing
37 the installation of several biovent/biosparge wells within the ALBS site.

38 12. A *Supplemental RAP – Limited In Situ Chemical Oxidation* report to provide the
39 details of the revised strategy including the use of limited ISCO and the revised
40 excavation extent targeting the diesel area at the southeast corner of the GP site
41 (ERM, 2011c). The RAP selected activated sodium persulfate as the most effective
42 oxidant to treat hydrocarbon contamination. The RAP indicated that, the
43 implementation of the ISCO will be conducted in accordance with the RWQCB's
44 general WDR.

45 **Conclusion Regarding Soil Contamination Issues:** Contamination and remediation
46 of the landside portions of the Project site have been addressed in the ALBS facility
47 RAP and the GP site RAP. Due to access and operation restrictions, implementation
48 of the RAP associated with the Project site will occur as part of the phases associated
49 with construction of the proposed Project. Remediation and closure of the site prior

1 to placement of fill will require regulatory oversight by the Los Angeles RWQCB or
2 the DTSC, under oversight and approval of the LAHD, and coordination with
3 ExxonMobil/General Petroleum.

4 **3.7.2.5 Public Emergency Services**

5 Emergency response/fire protection for the Port is provided by the LAFD; landside and
6 waterside security is provided primarily by the Los Angeles Port Police (Port Police), in
7 addition to the United States Coast Guard (USCG) and Los Angeles Police Department
8 (LAPD). Two large fireboats and three small fireboats are strategically placed in the
9 Harbor. There are also fire stations equipped with fire trucks located in the Port and
10 nearby in the communities of Wilmington and San Pedro. Section 3.11, Public Services
11 and Utilities, provides further details regarding emergency response services.

12 Additionally, the West Coast and Alaska Tsunami Warning Center (WCATWC) operates
13 the federal data collection and warning system for tsunami hazards in its area of
14 responsibility (AOR), which includes the west coast of the US, Alaska, Atlantic Ocean
15 and seaboard, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and Gulf of Mexico coastal areas, as well as
16 the east and west coasts of Canada. The WCATWC collects seismic data from various
17 seismic networks throughout its AOR (National Oceanic and Atmospheric
18 Administration [NOAA], 2011a).² This data is processed, automatically and interactively,
19 to quickly determine the tsunami potential of an earthquake, and bulletins are issued
20 based initially on this first analysis of seismic data. If a tsunami could have been
21 generated, sea level data, tsunami models, and historical tsunami information are
22 analyzed to estimate impact level (NOAA, 2011b; 2011c).³

23 The WCATWC issues tsunami warnings within 10 minutes of an earthquake occurrence
24 when a potentially tsunami-producing earthquake is greater than 7.0 on the Richter in the
25 Pacific AOR. Warnings also may be issued when potentially tsunami-producing
26 earthquakes (greater than 7.5) outside the AOR occur and are likely to affect the AOR.
27 The geographic extent of the warning is based on the size of the earthquake, tsunami
28 travel times throughout the AOR, and expected impact zones (NOAA, 2008.)

29 Tsunami bulletins and warnings are broadcast by WCATWC through standard National
30 Weather Service (NWS) dissemination methods such as NOAA Weather Radio All
31 Hazards, the Emergency Alert System, and the Emergency Managers Weather
32 Information Network. State emergency service agencies receive the message through
33 FEMA's National Warning System and the NOAA Weather Wire Service. The states
34 immediately pass warnings to local jurisdictions (NOAA, 2008). The USCG also relays
35 the message via radio. The Safety Element of the City's General Plan identifies the entire
36 Port as an area that could be affected by a tsunami, and the areas south/southwest of the
37 Main Channel, including the Project site, and potential inundation areas (California
38 Department of Conservation, 2009). The LAHD has a Port-wide emergency notification
39 system in place to warn of tsunamis and other emergency situations by
40 telephone/email/text alerts (Malin pers. comm., 2011).

² The WCATWC's website provides detailed information related to tsunami warning and disaster preparedness, and is available at: <http://wcatwc.arh.noaa.gov/faq/frequently.php>.

³ Additional information pertaining to tsunami data and information is available through NOAA's National Weather Service and the NOAA National Geophysical Data Center websites at: <http://nthmp.tsunami.gov/media-corner/guidebook.php> and <http://www.ngdc.noaa.gov/hazard/tsu.shtml> respectively.

3.7.2.6 Homeland Security of the Port

3.7.2.6.1 Terrorism

Prior to the events of September 11, 2001, the prospect of a terrorist attack on a U.S. port facility or a commercial vessel in a U.S. port would have been considered highly speculative under CEQA and not analyzed. However, the climate of the world today has added this unknown factor for consideration (i.e., terrorism). There is limited data available to indicate the likelihood of a terrorist action aimed at the Port or the proposed Project would be; therefore, the probability of a risk of a terrorist action cannot be evaluated accurately without a considerable amount of uncertainty. Nonetheless, this fact does not invalidate the analysis presented herein. A terrorist action could be the cause of events described in this section, such as hazardous materials release and/or explosion. The potential impact of those events would remain as described herein.

Application of Risk Principles: Terrorism risk can be generally defined by the combined factors of threat, vulnerability, and consequence (US Department of Homeland Security, 2009). In this context, terrorism risk represents the expected consequences of terrorist actions taking into account the likelihood that these actions will be attempted, and the likelihood that they will be successful. Of the three elements of risk, the threat of a terrorist action cannot be directly affected by activities in the Port. The vulnerability of the Port, and other facilities and commercial operations can be reduced by implementing security measures. The expected consequences of a terrorist action can also be affected by certain measures, such as implementing security measures and emergency response preparations.

Additional information on the Ports Strategic Plan for Safety and Security (2007), which identifies 19 strategic initiatives in the primary areas of public safety, homeland security, and emergency preparedness that will allow the focus of efforts in those areas where it can achieve maximum effectiveness is discussed below in Section 3.7.2.7.2.

3.7.2.6.2 Terrorism Risk Associated With Commercial Facilities

Commercial facilities and vessels in the Port could be subject to terrorist action, which could include actions to vessels while at berth or during transit. These vessels could be subject to several types of actions, including an attack from the land, from the air, from the surface of the water, or from beneath the surface of the water. During their transit in the Port, some vessels (especially larger vessels) are highly restricted in their maneuverability.

Although the ALBS uses and stores various types and quantities of hazardous materials (see Table 3.7-2 for a list of hazardous materials stored at the ALBS site), typically facilities such as the ALBS have not historically been the focus of terrorist actions. In addition, there have been very few examples of terrorist actions attempted against commercial vessels since September 11, 2001. On October 6, 2002, a terrorist attack was attempted against the French-flagged crude oil tanker *Limburg*, which was carrying 397,000 barrels of crude oil from Iran to Malaysia. The ship was attacked off the coast of Yemen by a small boat laden with explosives. The *Limburg* caught fire and approximately 90,000 barrels of crude oil leaked into the Gulf of Aden. The *Limburg* did not sink. She was salvaged, repaired, and returned to service under the new name *Maritime Jewel*.

1 To reduce overall vulnerability and consequences related to terrorist actions, LAHD and
2 USCG have instituted numerous security measures since September 11, 2001, as detailed
3 below.

4 **3.7.2.7 Security Measures at the Port of Los Angeles**

5 Numerous security measures have been implemented in the Port in the wake of the
6 terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. Federal, state, and local agencies, as well as
7 private industry, have implemented and coordinated many security operations and
8 physical security enhancements. The result is a layered approach to Port security that
9 includes the security program of the LAHD and the existing ALBS. Briefly summarized,
10 the layered approach to Port security is guided by the following regulations and programs:

- 11 • Implementing the measures in the Maritime Transportation Security Act (MTSA) of
12 2003 (Title 33 CFR Parts 101-106);
- 13 • Implementing the measures in the International Ship and Port Facility Security (ISPS)
14 Code adopted by the International Maritime Organization (IMO) in 2003;
- 15 • Implementing the Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC) Program;
16 and
- 17 • Implementing Port security initiatives, such as expanding the Port Police,
18 establishing a vehicle and cargo inspection team, among others.

19 The USCG is responsible for enforcing the MTSA and ISPS Code regulations discussed
20 above. Although the ALBS is not required to have a Facility Security Plan, the facility is
21 serviced by an on-site security guard during weeknights and fulltime during weekends.
22 Vessels being serviced at the ALBS site may be separately held to vessel security
23 measures and requirements, as discussed below.

24 **3.7.2.7.1 Vessel Security Measures**

25 All cargo vessels 300 gross tons or larger that are flagged by IMO signatory nations
26 adhere to the ISPS Code standards. These requirements include:

- 27 • Ships must develop security plans that address monitoring and controlling access;
28 monitoring the activities of people, cargo, and stores; and ensuring the security and
29 availability of communications;
- 30 • Ships must have a Ship Security Officer (SSO);
- 31 • Ships must be provided with a ship security alert system. These systems transmit
32 ship-to-shore security alerts to a competent authority designated by the Flag State
33 Administration, which may communicate the company name, identify the ship,
34 establish its location, and indicate that the ship security is under threat or has been
35 compromised. For the west coast, this signal is received by the Coast Guard Pacific
36 Area Command Center in Alameda, California;
- 37 • International port facilities that ships visit must have a security plan, including
38 focused security for areas having direct contact with ships; and
- 39 • Ships may have certain equipment onboard to help maintain or enhance the physical
40 security of the ship, including:
 - 41 ○ Monitoring and controlling access;

- 1 ○ Monitoring the activities of people and cargo;
- 2 ○ Ensuring the security and availability of communications; and
- 3 ○ Completing a Declaration of Security signed by the FSO and SSO, which
- 4 ensures that areas of security overlapping between the ship and facility
- 5 are adequately addressed.

6 Vessels flagged by nations that are not IMO signatory are subject to special USCG vessel
7 security boarding prior to entering port. The existing ALBS, as well as the future
8 redeveloped site, services ships greater than 300 tons.⁴

9 **3.7.2.7.2 Port of Los Angeles Security Initiatives**

10 The Port's Strategic Plan 2010/2011 identifies eight safety and security initiatives.⁵
11 These initiatives support the strategic objective of maintaining the Port as a world-class
12 model for crime prevention, counter-terrorism detection, maritime security training, and
13 emergency incident response and mitigation. The initiatives in this area include:

- 14 • Public Safety
- 15 • Develop Port-wide and Citywide emergency operations contingencies
- 16 • Continue classes at the Maritime Law Enforcement Training Center
- 17 • Complete an audit of Safety and Security staffing
- 18 • Homeland Security/Emergency Preparedness
- 19 • Install a Port-wide emergency public notification system
- 20 • Continue to improve the capability of the Port to prevent or detect an event, to
- 21 respond to an incident, mitigate its effects on the Port and the community, and
- 22 resume critical operations
- 23 • Continue security upgrades at all critical locations

24 The Ports Strategic Plan for Safety and Security (2007) identifies 19 strategic initiatives
25 in the primary areas of public safety, homeland security, and emergency preparedness
26 that will allow focus on efforts in those areas where it can achieve maximum
27 effectiveness (POLA, 2007). The strategic initiatives are listed below under the three
28 primary areas along with a notation indicating their status:

- 29 1. Expanding Port Police and enhancement of its communications capabilities
 - 30 a. Establishing a 24-hour two-vessel presence (implemented)
 - 31 b. Establishing a vehicle and cargo inspection team (implemented)
 - 32 c. Establishing a Port Police substation in Wilmington (implemented)
- 33 2. Enhancing recruiting and retention of Port Police personnel (suspended)

⁴ The ALBS marine railways range from 100 to 1,250 tons with the ability to haul-out barges up to 60 feet wide by 250 feet long. The floating dry-dock is 200 feet long by 44 feet wide with the ability to haul-out vessels up to 1,000 tons (Contaminated Sediments Task Force Master Dredging Permit Application [Halcrow, 2009]).

⁵ The LAHD's current Strategic Plan, which is a five-year rolling plan designed to guide future development. Some of the initiatives are ongoing and have a future completion date, while others may be scheduled for implementation during FY 2010-2011. The current Strategic Plan contains the status of some initiatives, and is available here: http://www.portoflosangeles.org/planning/strategic_plan_2010-11.pdf

3. Expanding Port Police communications capabilities to include addition of dedicated tactical frequencies (in progress)
4. Enhancing security at Port facilities (in progress)
5. Implementing a Green/ Responsible Marina Program (implemented)

In the area of homeland security, the LAHD will continue to embrace technology, while focusing its efforts on those areas of particular interest to the Port. Current Port homeland security initiatives include:

6. Upgrading security at the World Cruise Center
7. Expanding the LAHD's waterside camera system
8. Establishing restricted areas for non-commercial vehicles and vessels
9. Installing additional shore-side cameras at critical locations
10. Continuing to implement the TWIC program
11. Promoting increased scanning at overseas ports
12. Updating long-range security plans for the Port
13. Developing a security awareness training program
14. Enhancing outreach to constituents

In the area of emergency preparedness, the LAHD will continue to focus on the response and incident mitigation aspects of its safety and security program. Most importantly, focus would be placed on the LAHD's role as a community and meeting the needs of and obligations to that community, and strengthening the partnership with agencies such as the LAPD and LAFD in the interest of the port community. Current Port emergency preparedness initiatives include:

15. Completing upgrades to the Department Operations Center
16. Beginning installation of a Port-wide emergency public notification system
17. Continuing development of our business continuity plan
18. Updating Emergency Procedure and Port recovery plans
19. Conducting a Real-Time Evacuation Exercise Involving the Port and the Community

3.7.2.8 Tsunami Hazards

As discussed in Section 3.5, Geology, there is the potential for tsunami inundation and flooding at some areas of the Port in the event of a large tsunami. The average of the lowest water level during low-tide periods each day is typically set as a benchmark of zero feet and is defined as the MLLW level. A tsunami hazard assessment (Moffatt and Nichol, 2007) provides a model to predict tsunami wave heights under several local faulting and landslide seismic events. The model specifically examined seven different earthquake and landslide-generated tsunami scenarios and considered local landfill configurations, bathymetric features, and the interaction of tsunami wave propagation to predict tsunami wave heights that could affect the Harbor. The model predicts tsunami wave heights with respect to mean sea level (MSL) rather than MLLW, which is a

1 reasonable, average condition under which a tsunami might occur (Moffatt and Nichol,
2 2007).

3 The tsunami hazard assessment identified the lowest deck elevations throughout the Port
4 using various sources of data. It is assumed that these elevations can be used as proxies
5 for certain areas of the proposed Project that are not specifically identified in the tsunami
6 report (i.e., the Outer Harbor area). The grade elevations that are the lowest within the
7 proposed Project area are those surrounding the West Channel and in the Cabrillo Marina.
8 These elevations are based on an aerial survey performed in February 1999 and
9 information from the LAHD. The grade elevation is very low in the area immediately
10 surrounding the West Channel; however, the adjacent buildings are set back from the
11 waterfront and are elevated slightly (Moffatt and Nichol, 2007). The lowest deck
12 elevations within the Port, as identified in the tsunami hazard assessment, range from 4.9
13 to 12.2 feet (1.5 to 3.71 meters) MSL.

14 Of the four local faulting scenarios modeled in the report, the Santa Catalina Fault (7-
15 Segment) scenario represents the worst-case earthquake, or local faulting event. Of the
16 two landslide scenarios modeled, the Palos Verdes Landslide II scenario represents the
17 worst-case landslide event. As indicated in the tsunami hazard assessment, the maximum
18 water levels were produced (or simulated) under the Palos Verdes Landslide II scenario.
19 This particular landslide simulation produced water levels in excess of 22.96 feet (7
20 meters). The maximum water levels were produced under the 7.6 earthquake Santa
21 Catalina Fault scenario (7-segment). This particular earthquake simulation produced
22 water levels of approximately 6.6 feet (2 meters). There is a potential for tsunami-
23 induced flooding within the Port, under these worst-case landslide and faulting scenarios.
24 In particular, a landslide event similar to the scenario described above could produce
25 flooding in areas of Pier 400, Navy Mole, and Cabrillo Beach. The anticipated water
26 levels from an earthquake event similar to the scenario described above are predicted to
27 occur in the East Channel and East Basin area of the Port. The highest water level under
28 either the faulting or landslide events is anticipated to occur in the Outer Harbor area and
29 the western side of Pier 400, as a result of an event similar in magnitude to the Palos
30 Verdes Landslide II scenario. See Section 3.5.2.2.3 in Geology for additional
31 information related to tsunami hazards within the Port and at the Project site.

32 **3.7.3 Applicable Regulations**

33 **3.7.3.1 List of Regulations**

34 Regulations applicable to the proposed Project are designed to regulate hazardous
35 materials and hazardous wastes. These regulations also are designed to limit the risk of
36 upset during the use, transport, handling, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials.
37 The proposed Project would be subject to various federal, state, and local laws and
38 regulations as described below.

39 **3.7.3.1.1 Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 40 Sections 6901-6987)**

41 The goal of Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), a federal statute passed
42 in 1976, is the protection of human health and the environment, the reduction of waste,
43 the conservation of energy and natural resources, and the elimination of the generation of
44 hazardous waste as expeditiously as possible. The Hazardous and Solid Waste
45 Amendments of 1984 significantly expanded the scope of RCRA by adding new

1 corrective action requirements, land disposal restrictions, and technical requirements.
2 The corresponding regulations in 40 CFR Parts 260-299 provide the general framework
3 for managing hazardous waste, including requirements for entities that generate, store,
4 transport, treat, and dispose of hazardous waste.

5 **3.7.3.1.2 Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, 49 CFR 171, Subchapter C**

6 The DOT, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and the Federal Railroad
7 Administration (FRA) regulate transportation of hazardous materials at the federal level.
8 The Hazardous Materials Transportation Act (HMTA) requires that carriers report
9 accidental releases of hazardous materials to DOT at the earliest practical moment. Other
10 incidents that must be reported include deaths; injuries requiring hospitalization; and
11 property damage exceeding \$50,000.

12 **3.7.3.1.3 USCG Title 33**

13 The USCG, through Title 33 (Navigation and Navigable Waters) and Title 46 (Shipping)
14 of the CFR, is the federal agency responsible for vessel inspection, marine terminal
15 operations safety, coordination of federal responses to marine emergencies, enforcement
16 of marine pollution statutes, marine safety (such as navigation aids), and operation of the
17 National Response Center for spill response, and is the lead agency for offshore spill
18 response. The USCG implemented a revised vessel-boarding program in 1994 designed
19 to identify and eliminate substandard ships from U.S. waters. The program pursues this
20 goal by systematically targeting the relative risk of vessels and increasing the boarding
21 frequency on high risk (potentially substandard) vessels. The relative risk of each vessel
22 is determined through the use of a matrix that factors the flag of the vessel, owner,
23 operator, classification society, vessel particulars, and violation history. Vessels are
24 assigned a boarding priority from I to IV, with priority I vessels being the potentially
25 highest risk and priority IV having relatively low risk. The USCG is also responsible for
26 reviewing marine terminal Operations Manuals and issuing Letters of Adequacy upon
27 approval.

28 **3.7.3.1.4 Hazardous Waste Control Law, California Health and Safety Code, 29 Chapter 6.5**

30 This statute is the basic hazardous waste law for California. The Hazardous Waste
31 Control implements the federal RCRA cradle-to-grave waste management system in
32 California. California hazardous waste regulations can be found in Title 22, Division 4.5,
33 Environmental Health Standards for the Management of Hazardous Wastes. The
34 program is administered by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control
35 (DTSC).

36 **3.7.3.1.5 Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act (42 U.S.C. 37 11001 et seq.)**

38 Also known as Title III of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA),
39 Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (EPCRA) was enacted by
40 Congress as the national legislation on community safety. This law was designated to
41 help local communities protect public health, safety, and the environment from chemical
42 hazards. To implement EPCRA, Congress required each state to appoint a State
43 Emergency Response Commission (SERC). The SERCs are required to divide their
44 states into Emergency Planning Districts and to name a Local Emergency Planning
45 Committee (LEPC) for each district. EPCRA provides requirements for emergency

1 release notification, chemical inventory reporting, and toxic release inventories for
2 facilities that handle chemicals.

3 **3.7.3.1.6 Hazardous Material Release Response Plans and Inventory Law** 4 **(California Health and Safety Code, Chapter 6.95)**

5 California's right-to-know law requires businesses to develop a Hazardous Material
6 Management Plan or a business plan for hazardous materials emergencies if they handle
7 more than 500 pounds, 55 gallons, or 200 cubic feet of hazardous materials. In addition,
8 the business plan includes an inventory of all hazardous materials stored or handled at the
9 facility above these thresholds. This law is designed to reduce the occurrence and
10 severity of hazardous materials releases. The Hazardous Materials Management Plan or
11 business plan must be submitted to the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA),
12 which is, in this case, the LAFD. The state has integrated the federal EPCRA reporting
13 requirements into this law; and, once a facility is in compliance with the local
14 administering agency requirements, submittals to other agencies are not required. In the
15 event of an emergency, operators at the ALBS have a Hazardous Materials Business Plan
16 in place to facilitate effective and safe management of any release.

17 **3.7.3.1.7 Los Angeles Municipal Code (Fire Protection – Chapter 5, Section 57,** 18 **Divisions 4 and 5)**

19 These portions of the Los Angeles Municipal Fire Code (LAFD) regulate the construction
20 of buildings and other structures used to store flammable hazardous materials, and the
21 storage of these same materials. These sections ensure that the business is properly
22 equipped and operates in a safe manner and in accordance with all applicable laws and
23 regulations. These permits are issued by the LAFD.

24 **3.7.3.1.8 Los Angeles Municipal Code (Public Property – Chapter 6, Article 4)**

25 This portion of the municipal code regulates the discharge of materials into the sanitary
26 sewer and storm drains. It requires the construction of spill-containment structures to
27 prevent the entry of forbidden materials, such as hazardous materials, into sanitary sewers
28 and storm drains.

29 **3.7.3.2 Other Requirements**

30 California regulates the management of hazardous wastes through Health and Safety
31 Code Sections 25100 et seq., and through the California CCR, Title 22, and Division 4.5,
32 Environmental Health Standards for the Management of Hazardous Wastes, as well as
33 CCR Title 26, Toxics.

34 The Safety Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan addresses the issue of
35 protection of its people from unreasonable risks associated with natural disasters (e.g.,
36 fires, floods, and earthquakes). The Safety Element provides a contextual framework for
37 understanding the relationship between hazard mitigation, response to a natural disaster,
38 and initial recovery from a natural disaster.

39 Numerous facilities handle, store, or transport hazardous materials in the Port. The Risk
40 Management Plan (RMP), an element of the PMP, was adopted in 1983, per California
41 Coastal Commission requirements. The purpose of the RMP is to provide siting criteria
42 relative to vulnerable resources and guidelines for the handling and storage of potentially
43 hazardous cargo such as crude oil, petroleum products, and chemicals. Vulnerable

1 resources are described as the personnel and facilities in the Port and adjacent areas,
2 which are subject to the hazards at the Port. These “vulnerable resources” include four
3 types of populations: residential, recreational, visitor, and workers at the Port. The RMP
4 provides guidance for future development of the Port designed to minimize or eliminate
5 the hazards to vulnerable resources from accidental releases, specifically the assessing
6 and considering of risk during the siting process for facilities that handle substantial
7 amounts of hazardous cargo, such as liquid bulk facilities. Although the existing ALBS
8 and proposed Project operations are not within an approved hazard footprint for the
9 siting of new liquid bulk facilities, nor is the ALBS identified as a facility that handles
10 substantial amounts of hazardous cargo, the site and proposed Project consists of workers
11 which are within approximately 0.5 miles of existing liquid bulk facilities.

12 Vessel Traffic Service (VTS) is a Public/Private partnership vessel traffic service for the
13 Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. VTS is jointly operated and managed by the
14 Marine Exchange of Southern California (a nonprofit corporation) and the Coast Guard
15 COTP. VTS is a cooperative effort of the State of California, USCG, Marine Exchange
16 of Southern California, Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, and is under the authority
17 of California Government Code, Section 8670.21, Harbors and Navigation Code,
18 Sections 445-449.5 and the Port tariffs of Los Angeles and Long Beach.

19 Port operations involving hazardous materials are governed by the LAFD in accordance
20 with regulations of state and federal departments of transportation (49 CFR Part 176).
21 Regulated hazardous materials in the Port may include maritime-use compounds, such as
22 chlorinated solvents, petroleum products, compressed gases, paints, cleaners, and
23 pesticides.

24 **3.7.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

25 This section presents a discussion of the potential impacts to hazards and hazardous
26 materials associated with the proposed Project.

27 **3.7.4.1 Methodology**

28 The proposed Project site was evaluated for the presence of hazardous substances that, if
29 present in sufficient concentrations in building materials planned for demolition or in soil
30 or groundwater, could result in environmental impacts to human health or the
31 environment if the proposed Project is implemented. This risk of upset impact analysis
32 focused primarily on the proposed Project site and surrounding facilities that could pose
33 an environmental concern, and on activities and operations at those facilities that could
34 create a hazardous situation. Previous site assessment/characterization reports, which
35 included limited subsurface analysis, were also reviewed to evaluate whether potential
36 hazardous materials quantities and/or releases exist at the ALBS.

37 A qualitative evaluation of potential impacts of the proposed Project was then made
38 based on the site-specific information and on the location of the nearby facilities. The
39 risk of upset impact analysis also included an assessment of the potential risk of
40 accidental explosion or releases of chemical materials, including hazardous substances
41 and petroleum substances, if the proposed Project is implemented. Specific attention is
42 paid to whether the proposed Project is consistent with Port programs and policies,
43 emergency and evacuation plans, and other applicable regulations. The proposed Project
44 was evaluated to assess whether demolition and the proposed increase in operations
45 would potentially conflict or interfere with existing contingency or emergency response

1 plans. This analysis considered whether a new or greatly revised contingency or
2 emergency plan would be required to incorporate the provisions of the proposed Project.
3 In addition, although limited data is available to indicate the likelihood of terrorist actions
4 aimed at the Port or the proposed Project and, therefore, the probability component of the
5 analysis described above contains a considerable amount of uncertainty, the likelihood of
6 a spill, release, explosion of hazardous materials due to terrorist actions is described.

7 **3.7.4.2 Thresholds of Significance**

8 Criteria for determining the significance of impacts related to risk of upset are based on
9 the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* (City of Los Angeles, 2006) and Port criteria. The
10 following factors are used to determine if the proposed Project would result in a
11 significant impact:

- 12 **RISK-1** Compliance with applicable federal, state, regional, local security and safety
13 regulations, and LAHD polices guiding Port development;
- 14 **RISK-2** Substantially increase the frequency and severity of consequences to people
15 or property from exposure to a health hazard related to a potential accidental
16 release or explosion of a hazardous substance;
- 17 **RISK-3** Substantially interfere with an existing emergency response or evacuation
18 plan or require a new emergency or evacuation plan, thereby increasing the
19 risk of injury or death;
- 20 **RISK-4** Substantially increase the public health and safety concern as a result of an
21 accidental spill, release, or explosion of hazardous material(s) due to a
22 tsunami; and,
- 23 **RISK-5** Substantially increase the likelihood of a spill, release, or explosion of
24 hazardous materials due to a terrorist attack.

25 **3.7.4.3 Impact Determination**

26 **Impact RISK-1: Construction and operation of the proposed Project** 27 **would comply with applicable safety and security regulations and** 28 **policies guiding development within the Port.**

29 The demolition of existing building and structures, dredging, and construction of the
30 proposed Project elements would require construction equipment that would use oil, gas,
31 or fluids during the normal operation. There could be accidental spills of oil or gas from
32 the equipment, which could result in potential health and safety impacts to construction
33 personnel, people and employees, and property occupying operational areas adjacent to
34 the Project site (i.e., the commercial and terminal operations in the Fish Harbor region of
35 the Port).

36 Potential releases of hazardous substances during construction would be addressed
37 through the EPCRA, which is administered in California by the SERC, the Hazardous
38 Material Release Response Plans and Inventory Law, and the California Hazardous
39 Waste Control Law, which would govern proper containment, spill control, and disposal
40 of hazardous waste generated during construction. In addition, construction would be
41 completed in accordance with the LAFC, which regulates the construction of buildings
42 and other structures used to store flammable hazardous materials, and the LAMC, which
43 regulates the discharge of materials into the sanitary sewer and storm drain systems. The
44 latter requires the construction of spill-containment structures to prevent the entry of

1 forbidden materials, such as hazardous materials, into sanitary sewers and storm drains.
2 The ALBS maintains compliance with these federal, state, and local laws through a
3 variety of methods, including internal compliance reviews, preparation of regulatory
4 plans, and agency oversight. The LAHD requires that these regulations be adhered to
5 during design and construction of the proposed Project. Implementation of increased
6 spill prevention controls, spill release notification requirements, and waste disposal
7 controls associated with these regulations would limit both the frequency and severity of
8 potential releases of hazardous materials.

9 Construction activities for the proposed Project would involve the handling and use of
10 certain amounts of hazardous materials. These materials may be directly related to
11 construction activities such as equipment oil and gas, or may be existing hazardous
12 materials used for normal operations (refer to Table 3.7-2). Any handling of hazardous
13 materials would comply with all applicable regulations discussed above. The potential
14 consequences of construction-related spills are generally reduced when compared to other
15 accidental spills and releases. This is generally because the amount of hazardous material
16 released during a construction-related spill is small, as the volume in any single piece of
17 construction equipment is generally less than 50 gallons, whereas facilities and vessels
18 have larger capacities (greater than 10,000 gallons). Construction-related spills of
19 hazardous materials are not uncommon, but the enforcement of construction and
20 demolition standards, including BMPs by appropriate local and state agencies (i.e., Port
21 Police, LAFD, and LAHD) would minimize the potential for an accidental release of
22 petroleum products and/or hazardous materials or explosions during construction.
23 Therefore, impacts related to compliance with applicable regulations and policies guiding
24 development in the Port would be less than significant.

25 Standard BMPs would also be used during construction to minimize runoff of
26 contaminants, in compliance with the State General Permit for Stormwater Discharges
27 Associated with Construction Activity (Water Quality Order 99-08-DWQ) and the
28 Project-specific SWPPP (see Section 3.13, Water Quality, Sediments, and Oceanography,
29 for additional information). Construction activities would include BMPs in accordance
30 with City guidelines, as detailed in the Development Best Management Practices
31 Handbook (City of Los Angeles, 2004). Applicable BMPs include, but are not limited to,
32 vehicle and equipment fueling and maintenance; material delivery, storage, and use; spill
33 prevention and control; solid and hazardous waste management; and contaminated soil
34 management. The proposed Project's plans and specifications would be reviewed by the
35 LAFD for conformance to the LAFC, as a standard practice. Implementation of
36 increased spill prevention controls associated with these BMPs would limit both the
37 frequency and severity of potential releases of hazardous materials.

38 Operation of the proposed Project would require compliance with all existing hazardous
39 waste laws and regulations, including the federal RCRA and CERCLA, and CCR Title 22
40 and Title 26. The proposed Project would comply with these laws and regulations, which
41 would ensure that potential hazardous materials handling would occur in an acceptable
42 manner. In addition, ALBS would continue to implement its Spill Prevention Plan to
43 prevent spills of substance, its Emergency Contingency Plan to provide evacuation
44 procedures during an emergency, its Water Pollution Control Plan to prevent polluting
45 materials from entering Fish Harbor, and its Hazardous Communication Plan to provide
46 vital information on hazardous materials in the facility. Implementation of increased
47 inventory accountability, spill prevention controls, and waste disposal controls associated
48 with hazardous waste laws and regulations would limit both the frequency and severity of
49 potential releases of hazardous materials. As stated above, the proposed Project plans and

1 specifications would be reviewed by the LAFD for conformance to the LAFC, and
2 operation of the proposed Project would be required to comply with all existing
3 applicable hazardous waste laws and regulations. Compliance with hazardous waste laws
4 and regulations would help ensure the safe development and operation of the expanded
5 ALBS. Therefore, operation of the proposed Project would comply with applicable
6 regulations and policies guiding development in the Port, and impacts would be less than
7 significant.

8 *Mitigation Measures*

9 No mitigation is required.

10 *Residual Impacts*

11 Impacts would be less than significant.

12 **Impact RISK-2: Construction and operation of the proposed Project**
13 **would not substantially increase the frequency and severity of**
14 **consequences to people or property from accidental exposure to**
15 **health hazards.**

16 The proposed Project site contains known and potentially unknown contamination related
17 to past uses and other uses in the Project vicinity. However, these areas are not expected
18 to pose an exposure risk to the public or to the environment under the proposed Project.
19 The following components of the proposed Project that could result in hazardous material
20 impacts on work personnel or sensitive receptors include:

- 21 • Demolition of buildings and structures, including finger piers and timber wharf
- 22 • Removal of building footings, concrete, and asphalt materials
- 23 • Excavation and off-site disposal of approximately 7,571 cy of contaminated soil
- 24 • Dredging, cement stabilization, and construction of CDF units
- 25 • General construction activities such as installation of utility infrastructure, grading,
26 and paving

27

1 The proposed Project would include the demolition and removal of existing buildings and
2 several structures within the Project area over three phases. These include: 1) Building D
3 in the northern portion of the ALBS site (approximately 3,440 sq ft); 2) part of the
4 Machine Shop Complex – Building C1 (approximately 2,677 sq ft); 3) small structures,
5 such as H1 (approximately 154 sq ft) and H2 (approximately 660 sq ft) 4) part of the
6 Office and Workshop Complex – Buildings A2 and A3 (approximately 4,054 sq ft and
7 3,767 sq ft, respectively); and, 5) a 200-foot creosote-treated timber wharf and four finger
8 piers associated with the existing marine railways. Additional information related to the
9 buildings and structures that would be demolished, as well as construction phasing
10 information, is provided in Chapter 2, Project Description.

11 Because the proposed Project includes demolition of buildings and structures,
12 foundations and footings, remediation of contaminated soils (by excavation and off-site
13 disposal), grading activities, installation of utility infrastructure, and removal of concrete
14 and asphalt materials, exposure risks are likely to be limited to on-site workers during
15 these activities or in the event that a potential accidental release of an unknown
16 contamination is encountered. Buildings and structures planned for demolition may
17 contain regulated building materials including asbestos-containing materials (ACMs)/
18 asbestos-containing building materials (ACBMs), lead-based paint (LBPs), PCBs, and
19 other chemicals. In addition, it has also been documented that there are TPH, DRO, and
20 lead-contaminated soils in the northern portion of the Project site. However, these
21 regulated materials and chemicals would be managed either prior to demolition or
22 construction or otherwise abated during construction. Because of this, these known
23 hazardous materials are not expected to be released during demolition, excavation, and
24 grading activities, and would therefore not pose a potentially significant impact to
25 workers. Demolition of buildings would be completed in compliance with all standards
26 and regulations discussed above (i.e., EPCRA, LAFD regulations, DTSC, SCAQMD, and
27 other state and federal regulations and guidelines) governing the demolition, remediation
28 of hazardous materials, and release of air contaminants during demolition activities.
29 Additionally, the proposed Project includes demolition which would include remediation
30 efforts to remove or contain the known ACMs/ACBMs in the office area, remediation of
31 the contaminated soil within Project site (particularly in the northern portion of the site)
32 and the spent sandblast grit near the marine railways (refer to Section 3.7.2.4), and any
33 other suspected hazardous contamination at the site (i.e., soil, groundwater, building
34 materials). Demolition activities could expose workers to ACM/ACBM, LBP, and/or
35 other hazardous materials (e.g., mercury-containing switches, equipment containing
36 PCBs), which could involve potential health hazards. Demolition activities would be
37 carried out in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations regarding management
38 of hazardous wastes, including South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1403,
39 Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Title 49, CFR, and California Health and
40 Safety Code Division 20, Chapter 6.5, which govern the removal, transport, and disposal
41 of hazardous wastes to minimize health and environmental impacts. Known or suspected
42 contaminated substances in structures and soil would be removed in accordance with
43 federal, state, and local regulations prior to demolition, thereby minimizing the exposure of
44 construction workers to contaminants, and minimizing the potential for releases of such
45 substances to the environment. Other than for site remediation, subsurface excavations
46 would be limited to creating foundational supports for building and other weight-bearing
47 components of the proposed Project, thereby minimizing the chance that construction
48 personnel would be exposed to on-site soil contamination.

49

1 The Project site is too far away from populated areas for the public to be exposed to
2 health hazards as a result of contaminated soil and building materials, but on-site workers
3 construction workers could be exposed. Standard procedures exist for protecting workers
4 from exposure to chemicals of potential concern. For example, OSHA and local
5 regulatory agencies (e.g., SCAQMD and fire departments) mandate controls to limit
6 exposure to workers and the public, including:

- 7 • Use of warning signs and containment areas
- 8 • Worker training
- 9 • Implementation of work plans and health and safety plans
- 10 • Reduction of dust emissions through the use of wet methods
- 11 • Use of personal protective equipment by workers

12 Construction activities would involve the use of equipment that contains oil, gas, or
13 hydraulic fluids that could be spilled during normal usage or during refueling. Construction
14 and demolition activities would be conducted in accordance with standard practices and
15 BMPs in accordance with the Los Angeles Municipal Code (Chapter 5, Section 57,
16 Division 4 and 5; Chapter 6, Article 4). Quantities of hazardous materials that exceed the
17 thresholds provided in Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code would be
18 subject to a Release Response Plan (RRP) and a Hazardous Materials Inventory (HMI).
19 Implementation of increased inventory accountability and spill prevention controls
20 associated with this RRP and HMI, such as limiting the types of materials stored and size of
21 packages containing hazardous materials, would limit both the frequency and severity of
22 potential releases of hazardous materials, thus minimizing potential health hazards and/or
23 contamination of soil during construction/demolition activities. These measures would
24 reduce the frequency and consequences of spills by requiring proper packaging for the
25 material being shipped, limits on package size, and thus potential spill size, as well as
26 proper response measures for the materials being handled. As detailed in Section 3.6,
27 Groundwater and Soils, all contaminated soil encountered during construction of the
28 proposed Project would be handled, transported, remediated, and/or disposed of in
29 accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations and in
30 accordance with the conditions under LAHD leasing requirements.

31 Operation of the proposed Project would not involve the handling of significant amounts
32 of hazardous materials beyond those needed for normal boat building/maintenance
33 operations. The proposed Project would include an increase in vessels serviced at the
34 Project site. Although there would be an increase in the amount of waste oil and
35 hazardous materials used at the site overall, no increase is anticipated in the amount of
36 waste oil or hazardous materials stored at the site due to shortened holding times and
37 replacement cycles. Operation of the proposed Project would comply with lease and
38 regulatory operational requirements, including BMPs and compliance with the state and
39 federal requirements for the transport, handling, and storage of any hazardous materials
40 during proposed Project implementation, as described under Impact RISK-1. In addition,
41 as part of the proposed Project's environmental compliance program (i.e., the Emergency
42 Contingency Plan, Hazardous Communication Program, Water Pollution Control Plan,
43 and Spill Prevention Plan) would help protect and train personnel on how to manage
44 hazardous materials. For instance, containment booms are often used to control any
45 possible exposure to persons, property, or environment during most repair operations.
46 This would control any potential release into Fish Harbor. In the event of a spill, the

1 spilled material would be contained within a confined area for immediate clean up using
2 appropriate cleanup methods. Implementation of such standards and hazardous materials
3 handling requirements would minimize the potential for an accidental release of
4 hazardous materials and/or explosion during operation of the proposed Project.

5 Based on the active remediation or abatement of hazardous materials on site, and
6 compliance with regulations governing handling of hazardous materials such as fuels and
7 lubricants, neither construction nor operation would substantially increase the frequency
8 or severity of consequences to people or property as a result of accidental releases of
9 hazardous substances. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

10 *Mitigation Measures*

11 No mitigation is required.

12 *Residual Impacts*

13 Impacts would be less than significant.

14 **Impact RISK-3: Construction and operation of the proposed Project** 15 **would not substantially interfere with an existing emergency** 16 **response or evacuation plan, thereby increasing the risk of injury or** 17 **death.**

18 Emergency response and evacuation planning is a shared responsibility among the LAPD,
19 LAFD, Port Police, and USCG. Construction of the proposed Project would occur on-
20 site, in Fish Harbor, or within the immediate vicinity of the ALBS, and is not expected to
21 interfere with emergency responses or evacuation plans. As a standard procedure for
22 activities occurring on Port property and within the Port area, the contractor would
23 coordinate with the agencies responsible for the Emergency response and evacuation
24 planning: the LAPD, LAFD, Port Police, and USCG. Construction and demolition
25 activities would be subject to emergency response and evacuation systems implemented
26 by LAFD.

27 Traffic control measures would be implemented for any construction that is required
28 within the street (Seaside Avenue). During proposed Project construction, emergency
29 access would be maintained to all surrounding facilities. The proposed Project would
30 incorporate planning to assure that possible interference with emergency response and
31 evacuation plans does not occur. As such, emergency access to these sites would not be
32 adversely impacted during construction.

33 Project contractors would be required to adhere to all LAFD emergency response and
34 evacuation regulations, ensuring compliance with existing emergency response plans.
35 Therefore, construction of the proposed Project would not substantially interfere with an
36 existing emergency response or evacuation plan or increase the risk of injury or death,
37 and impacts would be less than significant.

38 Operations at the existing ALBS would continue under the proposed Project. The
39 proposed Project would demolish four existing buildings and construct two CDF units to
40 create additional space for the existing ALBS operations to expand. The proposed
41 improvements would be constructed essentially within the existing ALBS boundary;
42 however, construction of the CDF units, boat hoists (600-ton and 100-ton), and
43 associated pier structures would be partially constructed within Fish Harbor. The

1 additional space would be used as dry-dock for boat building and maintenance activities.
2 The redeveloped ALBS would support similar activities as the currently configured boat
3 shop. The future operations at ALBS would not interfere with any existing plans because
4 the proposed improvements would be confined to the existing ALBS, and future activities
5 would be consistent with current activities.

6 The proposed Project would continue to operate as a boat shop and operations would be
7 confined to the Project site and would not result in blockages of roads or routes that can
8 be used for evacuations. Therefore, proposed Project operations would not interfere with
9 any existing emergency response or emergency evacuation plans or increase the risk of
10 injury or death. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

11 *Mitigation Measures*

12 No mitigation is required.

13 *Residual Impacts*

14 Impacts would be less than significant.

15 **Impact RISK-4: Construction and operation of the proposed Project** 16 **would not result in a substantial increase in public health and safety** 17 **concerns as a result of the accidental release, spill, or explosion of** 18 **hazardous materials due to a tsunami.**

19 As discussed under Impact GEO-2 in Section 3.5, Geology, elevation at the Project site
20 ranges from 10.1 feet above MSL (7.3 feet MLLW) along the timber wharf to
21 approximately 14.8 feet MSL (12 feet above MLLW) in the upland areas. Under the
22 worst-case local faulting scenario (Santa Catalina Fault [7-Segments]), the predicted
23 shoreline tsunami water level at the Project site (Fish Harbor) is anticipated to range from
24 3.9 to 5.2 feet above MSL. Under the worst-case landslide scenario (Palos Verdes
25 Landslide II scenario), the predicted shoreline tsunami water level at the Project site (Fish
26 Harbor) ranges from 3.2 to 4.9 feet above MSL. Further, under the proposed Project, the
27 pier structures and the CDFs would be constructed to an elevation of approximately 14.8
28 feet MSL (12 feet MLLW) to allow for the site to drain inward towards to the new BMPs
29 and other drainage structures. This would increase the land elevation at the Project site
30 from approximately 10.1 feet MSL to 14.8 feet MSL. Redevelopment of the ALBS
31 waterfront and any facilities installed on the newly created CDFs would be at a higher
32 elevation. This would make the proposed Project less vulnerable to inundation and
33 flooding impacts caused by a tsunami. Future use of these fill areas could include
34 construction of structures or placement of equipment. However, measures to minimize
35 impacts from seiches or tsunamis, such as the breakwater and constructing facilities at
36 adequate elevation, are currently in place throughout the Port.

37 Although impacts due to seismically induced tsunamis and seiches are typical for the
38 entire California coastline, these impacts would not be increased by the construction of
39 the proposed Project. The potential is very low for a major tsunami to occur that would
40 cause the kind of results predicted in the tsunami hazard assessment discussed above and
41 in Section 3.5, Geology. In the unlikely event of a tsunami, the potential consequences of
42 such accidents would be small due to the localized, short-term nature of the releases. The
43 volume of spilled fuel is also expected to be relatively low. While there would be fuel-
44 containing equipment present during construction and operation of the proposed Project,
45 equipment would generally be equipped with watertight tanks, with the most likely

1 scenario being the infiltration of water into the tank and fuel combustion chambers and
2 very little fuel spilled. Thus, the volume spilled in the event of a tsunami would likely be
3 minimal, and not considered a significant environmental impact.

4 Under the worst-case scenarios (faulting and landslide), the maximum tsunami wave
5 height is not anticipated to breach the Project site. Considering the low risk of inundation
6 or flooding and the measures in place, construction and operational activities under the
7 proposed Project would not therefore, lead to an accidental release, spill, or explosion of
8 hazardous material(s) during construction or operational activities. Additionally, a
9 Portwide emergency notification system is in place that provides phone/text/email
10 notification of tsunami warnings or other emergency situations. Consequently, impacts
11 would be considered less than significant.

12 *Mitigation Measures*

13 No mitigation is required.

14 *Residual Impacts*

15 Impacts would be less than significant.

16 **Impact RISK-5: Construction and operation of the proposed Project** 17 **would not substantially increase the likelihood of a spill, release, or** 18 **explosion of hazardous materials due to a terrorist attack.**

19 The proposed Project site would be located primarily within the existing ALBS site and
20 would not therefore constitute a new potential target for terrorists. The redevelopment of
21 the existing ALBS site would improve the safety and efficiency of marine ship building,
22 expand the maintenance and repair capabilities of the operation, modernize the site in
23 order to comply with existing and future water quality regulations. These improvements
24 are not expected to make the existing ALBS site or Fish Harbor more attractive to
25 terrorists.

26 The probability of a terrorist attack is unlikely to change during construction of the
27 proposed improvements or operation compared to baseline conditions since
28 improvements would primarily be made within the existing ALBS site. The existing Port
29 security measures would continue to provide security in the Fish Harbor area and other
30 areas throughout the Port.

31 The potential for unauthorized access to the ALBS site during construction or in the
32 operational phase by land, water, and/or air would be unchanged or more stringent as a
33 result of the proposed Project. Existing Port security measures, as well as ALBS site
34 security measures, would counter any potential increase in unauthorized access to Fish
35 Harbor or the boat shop through the use of vehicles or vessels. Therefore, the proposed
36 Project would result in less than significant impact.

37 *Mitigation Measures*

38 No mitigation is required.

39 *Residual Impacts*

40 Impacts would be less than significant.

3.7.4.4 Summary of Impact Determinations

Table 3.7-5 presents a summary of the proposed Project's impact determinations related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials, as described in the preceding analysis. Identified potential impacts are based on federal, state, or City of Los Angeles significance criteria, Port criteria, and the scientific judgment of the report preparers, as applicable.

Table 3.7-5: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Hazards and Hazardous Materials Associated with the Proposed Project

Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Impacts after Mitigation
RISK-1: Construction and operation of the proposed Project would comply with applicable safety and security regulations and policies guiding development within the Port.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
RISK-2: Construction and operation of the proposed Project would not substantially increase the frequency and severity of consequences to people or property from accidental exposure to health hazards.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
RISK-3: Construction and operation of the proposed Project would not substantially interfere with an existing emergency response or evacuation plan, thereby increasing the risk of injury or death.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
RISK-4: Construction and operation of the proposed Project would not result in a substantial increase in public health and safety concerns as a result of the accidental release, spill, or explosion of hazardous materials due to a tsunami.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
RISK-5: Construction and operation of the proposed Project would not substantially increase the likelihood of a spill, release, or explosion of hazardous materials due to a terrorist attack.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant

3.7.4.5 Mitigation Monitoring

In the absence of significant impacts, mitigation measures are not required.

3.7.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts

No significant unavoidable impacts or risks related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials would occur as a result of construction or operation of the proposed Project.