3.8 LAND USE

3.8.1 Introduction

This land use analysis evaluates the proposed Project’s consistency with City of Los Angeles General Plan designations, Municipal Code zoning designations, and other applicable plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over landside and waterside areas. This analysis also addresses the impacts of the proposed Project and alternatives on surrounding communities, including container storage, truck use of neighborhoods, and property value trends. The proposed Project would result in less than significant or no impacts to Land Use.

3.8.2 Environmental Setting

3.8.2.1 Existing Land Uses

Port of Los Angeles

The LAHD administers the Port of Los Angeles, which includes 45 kilometers of waterfront and 3,035 hectares (7,500 acres) of land and water area. LAHD administers automobile, container, omni, lumber, cruise ship, liquid and dry bulk terminals, and commercial fishing facilities. Port facilities include slips for 6,000 pleasure craft, sport fishing boats, and charter vessels, as well as community facilities, which include a waterfront youth center, Cabrillo Aquarium and the Maritime Museum.

Major Port activities include commercial shipping and transfer of containerized cargo, liquid bulk cargo, breakbulk, and dry bulk cargo; commercial fishing; recreation; and tourism.
The West Basin

The West Basin includes the northwestern portion of the Port adjacent to the communities of Wilmington and San Pedro (Figure 2-1).

Located within this area is the Berths 136-147 Terminal, with a total area of 176 acres and total berth length of 2,100 feet. Berths 136-139 occupy the northern-central West Basin, bordered to the west by Berths 121-131. Berths 142-147 form the West Basin’s eastern edge at the terminus of Neptune Avenue; they are bordered to the east by the Pier A rail yard and to the south by the Conoco Phillips Corporation tank farm and marine oil terminal. Equipment and facilities on the proposed Project site includes thirteen existing shoreside cranes along the south- and west-facing waterfronts, a 28,000-square-foot maintenance shop, several small buildings, and surface parking. Backlands are used for storage of containerized cargo. The wharf at Berth 144 was reconfigured in the mid-1990s to accommodate large, modern container ships.

To the north, the West Basin is bordered by Harry Bridges Boulevard. Harbor Belt Line railroad follows the Harry Bridges Boulevard alignment bordering the West Basin, with trackage entering the West Basin marine terminals at several locations. Wilmington, north of the Port, is predominantly residential, including single family, medium-density, and high-density residential dwellings. Other area land uses include general and community commercial uses, with light and medium industry to the northeast.

The Los Angeles Housing Authority, in conjunction with its developer the Los Angeles Community Design Center, started construction on the new Dana Strand redevelopment project in 2005. The Dana Strand project is along “C” Street between Hawaiian Avenue and Wilmington Boulevard. That project will be built through four development phases with a total of 412 units, 8,700 square feet of commercial space for a computer lab or childcare facility, a 10,000-square-foot life-long learning center with class and office rooms, recreational space, and a play field. The 412 housing units include 120 rental apartments, 115 rental town-homes, 77 single-family homes, and 100 senior family units. Wilmington Recreational Center and Park are located between Bayview and Neptune avenues.

Prior to 2004, the proposed Harry Bridges Buffer Area was to be a 25-acre container storage/backlands expansion area for the Berths 136-147 Container Terminal Redevelopment Plan. As part of this expansion, Harry Bridges Boulevard was to be realigned north to C Street and a 20-foot-high sound wall was to be constructed along the north edge of the realigned boulevard (LAHD 1994). In preparation for this use, the Port acquired most of the properties in the area, either through negotiation or condemnation, and conducted required remediation activities at a cost of approximately $45 million. Based on community opposition and the growing recognition of the land use conflict of having a heavy industry use immediately adjacent to residential areas, the project was eventually modified to realign Harry Bridges Boulevard in its existing location and develop 25 of the acquired acres as open-space buffer (LAHD and PCAC 2004). With Harry Bridges Boulevard not being realigned north to C Street, an additional 5 acres became available, for a total of 30 acres available for the open-space buffer.
South of the West Basin, the Port’s West Bank lines the Main Channel. The West Bank is characterized by a mix of commercial and recreational uses and commercial fishing, with commercial shipping facilities to the south.

Facilities east of the West Basin include Slip 1, Mormon Island (primarily a marine oil terminal), and the Department of Water and Power’s Harbor Generating Station.

Bordering the West Basin to the west and northwest is John S. Gibson Boulevard, the Harbor (110) Freeway, and refinery facilities operated by Conoco Phillips, which occupies Berths 148-151 in the West Basin. West of the Harbor Freeway, in San Pedro, is an industrial district along Gaffey Street, with residential neighborhoods farther to the west.

The West Basin is bordered on the southwest by Pacific Avenue, Front Street, the Terminal Island (47) Freeway, and Knoll Hill, which has one residence and a temporary community dog park, for which the Port has received a public request to convert to a temporary little league baseball field. West of Knoll Hill is the Harbor (110) Freeway terminus at Gaffey Street, San Pedro’s commercial center, and single- and multi-family residential neighborhoods.

### Consolidated Slip/East Channel

The Consolidated Slip located to the south/southeast of the proposed new location of the Pier A rail yard currently contains slips occupied by recreational and live-aboard residential boats. The new rail yard boundary would be near Berths 200C through 200H. The northern portion of the Consolidated Slip area houses Leeward Bay, containing 169 slips, with an estimated five to ten percent of vessels housing live-aboard residents. These slips are currently operated on a month-to-month hold-over permit.

There are ten other recreational marinas in the Cerritos Channel/East Basin and Consolidated Slip area. These marinas include two small boat yards and occupy a combined total of 15.27 acres of land and 48.42 acres of water; they represent a combined total of approximately 1,451 boat slips with approximately 360 to 402 live-aboard residents. Permits became effective for this area in 1995 and have a term of 30 years (personal communication, Richard Alder 2005).

Island Yacht Anchorage No. 2, located at B 200 V-X, has approximately 116 slips. In 2002 the operator estimated that the area had approximately 35 live-aboard residential vessels with approximately 88 people living aboard. Only the marina’s water area is situated within City of Los Angeles-owned space. The landside area, which contains portable restrooms, trash containers and a parking lot, is located on land owned by the Port of Long Beach Harbor Department. The permits between Island Yacht Anchorage No. 2 and both Los Angeles and Long Beach contain reciprocal provisions whereby, should one permit be terminated, the other automatically terminates. Therefore, if and when Long Beach develops its land area, the marina will have to be relocated within the Port (personal communication, Richard Alder 2005).
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In addition, Island Yacht Anchorage No. 1, located at Berth 205B (under the Henry Ford Bridge), has 22 slips within the Los Angeles Harbor and an additional 78 slips located outside of Los Angeles Harbor water, lying in Long Beach Harbor Department’s abutting water area. These 78 slips have unrestricted live-aboard residential use, and the exact number of live-aboard residents occupying the area is unknown (personal communication, Richard Alder 2005).

3.8.2.2 Redevelopment Areas in the Proposed Project Vicinity

The Redevelopment Project areas described below are located near the proposed Project site and have been established to address blighted conditions. These areas are located outside the POLA jurisdiction and are subject to land use controls in the City’s General Plan and the applicable Redevelopment Plans. Although the Port does not have jurisdiction over these areas, some Port areas adjacent to the communities are being developed as buffers to Port industrial areas including the proposed Harry Bridges Buffer Area which is an element of the proposed Project. In addition, the Port is redeveloping waterfront areas for local and regional public access, economic development and recreational activity.

There has been some feedback from the community referring to Port conditions as causing “blight.” The public often uses the term blight in a general sense to describe industrial conditions; however, the term “blight” has a very specific legal definition under redevelopment law and mainly refers to deterioration of an area caused by physical and economic forces. California’s Community Redevelopment Law is codified in the Health and Safety Code Section 33000 et seq. This section defines blighted areas as having both adverse physical conditions and adverse economic conditions. Adverse physical conditions include structures with serious code violations, buildings that are dilapidated and deteriorated, inadequate lot sizes or configurations for current market conditions, or incompatible adjacent land uses that prevent the economic development of those or other parcels. Economic adverse conditions include depreciated or stagnant property values, abnormally high business vacancies or excessive vacant lots, a lack of necessary commercial facilities that are normally found in neighborhoods (e.g., grocery stores, banks, etc.), residential overcrowding, an excess of businesses that cater to adults, and crime rates that constitute a serious threat to public safety and welfare.

Scoping comments submitted for the Berths 136-147 Terminal EIS/EIR identified community concerns about the Project’s impacts associated with truck use in residential neighborhoods adjacent to the Port. For this reason and because of the proximity of the TraPac Terminal to residential areas of Wilmington, data was collected to identify existing truck use within and near residential areas in Wilmington with an additional focus on the San Pedro area. However, the data did not identify whether trucks were Port-related. Field data were collected on commercial vehicles (i.e., trucks with two axles, three or more axles, and trailers parked without tractors). Both truck traffic and truck parking in neighborhoods adjacent to the Port were addressed. Field staff observed the locations of parked commercial vehicles during several different daytime and evening hours on a weekday in September, 2005, and collected both visual and mechanical (hose) counts of truck movements at selected intersections.
City of Los Angeles planning and traffic engineering staff were contacted to identify locations where residents have reported excessive truck traffic and/or truck parking. Most of these are located near major roadways or major truck trip generators (e.g., container storage facilities). In addition, applicable City of Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) regulations and locations of local signs designating truck routes and prohibiting truck traffic and truck parking were identified. Currently, there are many truck prohibition signs located throughout the Wilmington Community providing “barriers” around the community; however, there are virtually no signs directing operators to designated truck routes. Results from the field work indicate that some trucks continue to drive through the area in violation of posted prohibition signs. One reason for this may be a lack of posted truck route and alternative truck route signs. Also, the quality of the Lomita Boulevard street surface deteriorates dramatically just east of Eubank Avenue (i.e., an unpaved segment) and does not connect to Alameda Street. This could explain the amount of truck traffic on nearby residential streets.

The data results for truck traffic volumes and truck parking generally support resident complaints about excessive traffic and parking in proximity to large truck traffic generators and other limited areas. Truck parking, however, does not appear to be a widespread problem in residential areas of Wilmington but is more limited to specific areas. Some late night parking may result from truck drivers living in Wilmington who might therefore park in residential areas.

Within the City of Los Angeles, the Community Redevelopment Agency’s Board and City Council are jointly responsible for making the determination that an area meets a blighted condition. Once a determination of blight has been made and a redevelopment plan is approved by the City Council, redevelopment under the Community Redevelopment Law can occur. Redevelopment is also the responsibility of the Community Redevelopment Agency.

There are three redevelopment areas in the vicinity surrounding the proposed Project site: the Los Angeles Harbor Industrial Center Redevelopment Project area, the Pacific Corridor Redevelopment Project area, and the Beacon Street Redevelopment Project area.

The Los Angeles Harbor Industrial Center Redevelopment Project is a 232-acre area located to the north of the project site and is roughly bordered by Anaheim Street on the north, Broad Street on the west, and Harry Bridges Boulevard/Alameda Street on the south and east. The Los Angeles Harbor Industrial Center Redevelopment Project was established in 1974 and was last amended in 1994. The area it encompasses was characterized by physical and economic blight due to a variety of factors: oil extraction activities; unimproved streets and alleys; junk strewn over vacant land; and an incompatible and unhealthy mix of industrial buildings, residential dwellings, oil extraction equipment, rusting oil storage tanks, automobiles, junk-yards, boat construction and storage yards. Hindering development were the small, residential-sized parcels held in scattered ownership coupled with a complicated overlay of multiple petroleum rights; environmental deficiencies, such as soil toxins; railroad rights-of-way; and obsolete utility and public improvement systems (CRA/LA 2005a).

The 693-acre Pacific Corridor Redevelopment Project Area, established in 2002, extends from the south side of Knoll Hill and is generally bordered by Capital Drive on the north,
Gaffey Drive on the west, 22nd Street on the south, and Harbor Boulevard on the east. The project includes development/rehabilitation of commercial/retail uses, a “welcome park”, a transit center, additional parking, and residential uses, formation of an Arts District, and provision of business incentives and other strategies. Historically, Pacific Avenue served as the main commercial street for the San Pedro community in the downtown area. More recently, however, it became an economically stagnant area with many empty storefronts and high incidents of crime and graffiti. Construction of the Gaffey Street off ramp from the 110 Freeway further exacerbated the decline by redirecting customers elsewhere (CRA/LA 2002).

The Beacon Street Redevelopment Project Area, established in 1969, comprises 60 acres and is roughly bordered by 3rd Street on the north, Mesa Street on the west, 7th Street on the south, and Harbor Street on the north. “The Beacon Street Redevelopment Project has transformed a once seedy waterfront area into a modern downtown community, with new commercial residential, cultural, and institutional uses replacing the pawn shops, bars, missions and pool halls that had previously dominated the area. Major recent undertakings are acquisition and rehabilitation of the historic Warner Grand Theatre and development of a 14-screen movie theater complex” (CRA/LA 2005b).

### 3.8.3 Applicable Regulations

Land use and development within the West Basin are governed by several state and local plans and policies, as described below. These also include City of Los Angeles ordinances related to cargo container and open storage.

#### 3.8.3.1 State Lands Commission

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

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

#### 3.8.3.2 California Coastal Commission

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

- Provide for maximum public access to and recreational use of the coast, consistent with private rights and environmental protection;
- Protect marine and land resources—including wetlands, rare and endangered habitat areas, environmentally sensitive areas, tide pools, and stream channels;
- Maintain productive coastal agricultural lands;
- Direct new housing and other development to urbanized areas with adequate services rather than allowing a scattered, sprawling, wasteful pattern of subdivision;
- Protect the scenic beauty of the coastal landscape; and
- Locate any needed coastal energy and industrial facilities where they will have the least adverse impact.

The California Coastal Act of 1976 also influences Port operations. The Act established the California Coastal Commission as the coastal management and regulatory agency over the Coastal Zone (Public Resources Code 30103), within which the Port of Los Angeles is included. The California Coastal Commission is responsible for assisting in the preparation, review and certification of Local Coastal Programs/Local Coastal Plans (LCPs). The LCPs are developed by municipalities for that portion of their jurisdiction that falls within the coastal zone. Following certification of the LCP, regulatory responsibility is then delegated to the local jurisdiction, although the Coastal Commission retains jurisdiction over the immediate shoreline. The Port Master Plan acts as the LCP for the Port of Los Angeles, as described in Section 3.8.3.5.

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

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

### 3.8.3.3 City of Los Angeles General Plan

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

The City of Los Angeles General Plan Land Use Element includes 35 local area plans, known as Community Plans, as well as plans for the Port of Los Angeles and Los Angeles International Airport. The Port of Los Angeles Plan (1982 plus subsequent amendments), part of the City of Los Angeles General Plan Land Use Element, is intended to serve as the official 20-year guide to the continued development and operation of the Port, and is consistent with the Port Master Plan. The Port of Los Angeles Plan’s primary purposes are:

- The promotion of an arrangement of land and water uses, circulation and services that contribute to the economic, social and physical health, safety, welfare and convenience of the Port, within the larger context of the City
- Guidance of development, betterment and change within the Port to meet existing and anticipated needs
- To contribute to a safe and healthful environment
- To balance growth and stability
- To reflect economic potentialities and limitations, and water developments and other trends
- To protect investment to the extent reasonable and feasible

The Port of Los Angeles Plan designates the northern and western portions of the Port, including the West Basin, as Commercial/Industrial land uses, which are further classified as General/Bulk Cargo and Commercial/Industrial Uses/Non-Hazardous uses. General Cargo includes container, break-bulk, neo-bulk, and passenger facilities. Commercial uses include restaurants and tourist attractions, offices, retail facilities, and related uses. Industrial uses include light manufacturing/maritime-related industrial activities, ocean-resource industries, and related uses.

The remainder of the Port to the southeast is similarly designated and classified, differentiated only by a Hazardous Uses classification (City of Los Angeles 1982a). Figure 3.8-1 illustrates General Plan land use designations for the proposed Project area.

The Port of Los Angeles Plan contains the following objectives and policies applicable to the West Basin.
Figure 3.8-1. Land Use Designations for the West Basin and Project Area

3.8.3.3.1 Port of Los Angeles Plan Objectives

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

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

Objective 3. To coordinate the development of the Port of Los Angeles and the development of adjacent communities as set forth in the community plans for San Pedro and Wilmington-Harbor City.

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

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

a. Changing technologies in the ocean and land movement of waterborne commerce
b. Changing patterns in the commodity mix and form of waterborne commerce
c. Changing developments in the Port of Long Beach and the surrounding residential and industrial areas adjacent to and affected by the Port
d. Changes in law and regulations affecting the environmental and economic uses of the Port
e. Changes in other U.S. ports affecting the Port’s competitive position

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

Objective 7. To upgrade the existing rail transportation system to keep pace with Port development and to abolish redundant trackage so that valuable land may be better utilized and operations improved.

Objective 8. To minimize conflicts between vehicular, pedestrian, railroad and harbor-oriented industrial traffic, tourist and recreational traffic and commuter traffic patterns within the Port.
3.8.3.3.2 Port of Los Angeles Plan Policies

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

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

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

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

Policy 14. Programs designed to improve or modify roadway circulation in the Port shall be developed, in part, to eliminate: hazardous situations caused by inadequately protected rail/highway crossings; dual use of streets (by rails in the pavement); service and other roads crisscrossing the tracks; and random use of land areas by both highway and rail movement.

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

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

Policy 19. The following long-range preferred water and land uses shall guide future Port development:

- **Area 3 West Turning Basin**: Non-hazardous general cargo operations, commercial shipping and other heavy commercial and industrial uses.
- **Area 4 The West Basin**: Non-hazardous general cargo operations and Port-related industrial uses.
- **Area 5 Wilmington District**: Non-hazardous liquid and non-hazardous dry bulk cargo, general cargo, commercial fishing operations, and Port-related commercial and industrial uses.
3.8.3.4 Zoning Designations

Zoning designations for the proposed Project area are shown in Figure 3.8-2. The western portion of the West Basin is designated as [Q]M3-1VL (Heavy Industrial Zone) in the City of Los Angeles Planning and Zoning Code (City of Los Angeles 2000a). The heavy industrial designation includes a permanent qualified classification, as indicated by the bracketed [Q] symbol in the zoning designation. The qualified classification typically indicates that a property may not be suitable for all uses ordinarily permitted in a particular zone classification, or that development is required to conform to certain standards, as necessary to: (1) ensure compatibility with the surrounding properties or neighborhood; (2) ensure compliance with General Plan objectives; or (3) prevent or mitigate potential adverse environmental effects associated with the zoning designation. Accordingly, the qualified classification signifies specific allowances or limitations on permitted uses or height restrictions for a given parcel. Proposed development authorized by the qualified zone classification is required to demonstrate compliance with all applicable terms of the zoning ordinance otherwise implied by the zoning designation (City of Los Angeles 2000b).

The western portion of the West Basin is additionally designated as Very Limited Height District 1, as indicated by the “1” and the “VL” in the zoning designation. This designation allows a floor area ratio (FAR) of not more than 1.5 times the buildable area of the site and a maximum building or structure height of three stories, or 45 feet, above grade. Exceptions to the height limitation are permitted for equipment necessary to operate a structure in the height zone, provided such structures are not constructed solely for creating additional floor area (City of Los Angeles 2000c).

The remainder of the West Basin is zoned [Q]M3-1 (Heavy Industrial Zone with qualified classifications), but without the VL height district classification. Lacking the VL classification, allowable building and structure heights are dependent upon the zoning classification of adjacent properties, project site distance from those properties, and surrounding topography. Accordingly, building and structure FAR and height limitations vary throughout the remainder of the West Basin (City of Los Angeles 2000d).

North of the West Basin, the blocks between Harry Bridges Boulevard and “C” Street are zoned M2-1VL-O (Light Industrial); the “O” symbol indicates the area is a designated Oil-Drilling District. The neighborhood north of “C” Street is predominantly zoned R1 (One-Family Residential), R2 (Two-Family Residential), and R3 (Multiple Dwelling), with the Figueroa Street and Wilmington Boulevard intersections zoned for General and Neighborhood Commercial uses, and an Open Space designation for the Wilmington Recreational Center and Park.

Properties northwest and west of the West Basin are designated PF (Public Facility, including the Harbor Freeway), M1 (Limited Industrial), M2 (Light Industrial), and CM (Commercial Manufacturing). Properties to the southwest, including Knoll Hill and the MacArthur Avenue residential neighborhood, are designated PF (Terminal Island Freeway), M1, R1 (One-Family Zone), and, south of the Terminal Island Freeway, R2 (Two-Family Residential).

The West Basin is bordered to the south and east by additional Port and Port-related facilities zoned for industrial uses (M3) and, to the north of Slips 1 and 5, PF.
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3.8.3.5 Port Master Plan

The proposed Project is located mostly in the California Coastal Zone, which was established pursuant to the federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 and the California Coastal Act of 1976. These Acts require that planning and development within the Coastal Zone be compatible with coastal resources. The California Coastal Act established the California Coastal Commission as the coastal management and regulatory agency responsible for governing coastal resources.

Chapter 8 of the Coastal Act contains policies applicable to the portions of California ports within the coastal zone. Chapter 8, Article 3 of the Coastal Act stipulates that ports shall prepare and adopt master plans containing provisions within that chapter (California PRC §30710-30721). Port master plans are then certified by the Coastal Commission, and development projects authorized or approved pursuant to an adopted and certified master plan are deemed to be in conformity with the coastal zone management program.

The Port of Los Angeles Master Plan (LAHD 1980) provides for the short- and long-term development, expansion, and alteration of the Port. The Port Master Plan has been certified by the California Coastal Commission and is consistent with the Port of Los Angeles Plan, an Element of the City’s General Plan. The Port Master Plan divides the Port into a series of master planning areas, for which it identifies short-term plans and preferred long-range uses. Master Plan Areas 3, 4, and 5 are located in the vicinity of the proposed Project site.

Master Plan Area 3, the West Turning Basin south of the Project site, is oriented toward cargo handling, heavy industry, and commercial land uses (Figure 3.8-1). Long-range preferred uses for this area include commercial shipping.

Master Plan Area 4, the West Basin, is dedicated to container, and liquid bulk operations (Figure 3.8-1). Short-term plans for the area identify container operations as the primary use, accompanied by liquid bulk facilities. Preferred long-range plans include relocation of existing liquefied petroleum gas facilities and replacement with a major cargo container complex.

Master Plan Area 5, the Wilmington District, which includes the proposed Project site, is characterized in the Port Master Plan as the oldest part of the Harbor. It supports a range of diverse activities, including petroleum and petrochemical storage tank farms on Mormon Island, general cargo, liquid bulk, dry bulk, commercial fishing, industrial, and institutional uses (Figure 3.8-1). Short-term plans include waterfront general cargo and marine oil terminals. The Pier A rail yard, currently located north of the Consolidated Slip area and extending to Anaheim Street and the Henry Ford Bridge, would be relocated within Master Plan Area 5. Inland areas are recommended for Port-related industrial and commercial development. Long-range preferred uses are the same as short-term uses, except for possible relocation of existing dry and liquid bulk terminals to Master Plan Area 9 (Terminal Island and adjacent areas to the south).
Figure 3.8-2. Zoning Designations for the West Basin and Project Area
3.8.3.6 Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan

The proposed Harry Bridges Buffer Area is located within the Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan area. Accordingly, objectives, policies, and associated implementing programs of the Community Plan addressing Port land uses and operations are included in the Port of Los Angeles Plan.

Relevant policies and objectives in the Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan are as follows:

- Cargo container storage facilities shall have direct access from major or secondary highways or through industrial areas with no access to such facilities through residential areas. Container storage areas shall provide landscaped buffering, height limitations, and noise and view mitigation measures protecting nearby residential areas, and no container storage shall be permitted within 300 feet of any residential zone. Even though irrigation in some areas may not be feasible or permitted, it is the policy to encourage landscaping with xeriscape sensitive plants.

- [Q] conditions prohibit cargo container storage within 300 feet of any residential zone in most areas and, where such facilities are permitted in sensitive areas, mitigation measures such as fences or walls, landscaped buffers, and height or stacking limitations are imposed, effectuated by zone changes, with enforcement being the responsibility of the Department of Building and Safety.

- Coordinate the development of the Port of Los Angeles with surrounding communities to improve the efficiency and operational capabilities of the Port to better serve the economic needs of Los Angeles and the region, while minimizing adverse impacts to neighboring communities from Port-related activities.

- Assure that Port programs for land acquisition and circulation improvements will be compatible with and beneficial in reducing environmental impacts to surrounding areas caused by Port-related activities, as well as beneficial to the Port.

- The Port’s Wilmington land acquisition program should develop adequate buffers, landscaping and transitional uses between the Port and the Community.

- Upgrade the circulation system, both internal and external to the Port, to promote efficient transportation routes to employment, waterborne commerce, and commercial and recreational areas, and to divert Port-related traffic away from adjacent residential and commercial areas.

- Port land acquisitions and development in Wilmington should bring about the timely removal of blighting activities and their replacement with uses consistent with Port development activities and which enhance the physical, visual, and economic environment of the community.
3.8.3.7 San Pedro Community Plan

Although the West Basin is entirely located within the Port of Los Angeles Plan area, it abuts the San Pedro Community Plan area along its western edge (John S. Gibson Boulevard divides the two plan areas). Accordingly, goals, objectives, policies, and associated implementing programs of the Community Plan addressing Port land uses and operations are considered in the Port of Los Angeles Plan.

Relevant policies and objectives in the San Pedro Community Plan are as follows:

- Coordinate the development of the Port of Los Angeles with surrounding communities to improve the efficiency and operational capabilities of the Port to better serve the economic needs of Los Angeles and the region, while minimizing adverse environmental impacts to neighboring communities from port-related activities.

- Coordinate the future development of the Port with the San Pedro Community Plan, the Beacon Street Redevelopment Project, and development of the Central Business District of San Pedro.

- The underutilized railroad lines in the West Channel/Cabrillo Beach and West Bank areas of the Port should be phased out upon relocation of the dry and liquid bulk transfer and storage facilities. Any rapid transit terminal serving the adjacent San Pedro Community should be located in a convenient location near the Beacon Street Redevelopment area and Ports O’Call Village, utilizing the railroad right-of-way adjacent to Harbor Boulevard.

- Seek the relocation of potentially hazardous and/or incompatible land uses away from the adjacent commercial and residential areas of San Pedro.

- Facilities used for the storage, processing, or distribution of potentially hazardous petroleum or chemical compounds, located in the Cabrillo Beach, East and West Channels or West Bank portions of the main Channel should be phased out and relocated at Terminal Island or its proposed southerly extension, with no further expansion of existing facilities or the development of new facilities permitted.

3.8.3.8 Wilmington Open Storage Interim Control Ordinance

Ordinance No. 175384 imposed interim regulations on the issuance of any building or use of land permits for “Open Storage” as a primary use on all commercial and industrial properties within the Wilmington-Harbor City Plan Area. It was adopted by the City Council and subsequently became effective on August 15, 2003. The interim ordinance was replaced by a permanent ordinance in 2005. The interim ordinance listed a number of issues related to container storage in Wilmington, some of which are listed below. The enumerated conditions were identified by the City of Los Angeles:

- Prior to adoption of the ordinance, a City of Los Angeles task force was formed to study the land use issues in Wilmington pertinent to container storage. The task force surveyed 245 open storage uses in the Wilmington area and found that
107 of these uses had permits and certificates of occupancy and 138 of these uses were operating without permits.

- Residential areas located near the open storage yards may be subjected to adverse impacts such as blight, noise, dust, odors, rodents and vermin, or blockage of light and air circulation, and they therefore require protection from the impacts generated by these uses.

- The lack of proper screening controls and enforcement of open storage and salvage operations and the substandard maintenance of various industrial sites and structures have been largely responsible for eroding the area’s image and generating nuisance complaints from nearby residents.

- Existing zoning and building regulations provide minimal development restrictions to oversee the usage and operation of various open storage yards, and are largely inadequate to address the adverse impacts created by these uses.

**New Cargo Container and Open Storage Regulations — Changes Affecting Wilmington**

In the summer of 2005, the City of Los Angeles Planning Department adopted a number of changes to further regulate existing and future cargo container and open storage uses in Wilmington. The changes include zone changes and related actions defining new conditions applicable to existing cargo container storage and open storage areas, and changes in the zoning code to limit and identify the location of new Cargo Container Storage Yards. The former changes apply to industrial zones, placing additional controls on existing storage uses such as setbacks, landscaped buffers, storage and stacking height, and fencing/screening, and in some cases, adding conditions specifically prohibiting automobile dismantling yards, junkyards and building materials salvage yards. The latter changes allow new Cargo Container Storage subject to certain conditions in multiple specified locations zoned as Heavy Industrial/General Bulk Cargo, primarily areas east of Alameda Street, including areas south of Lomita Boulevard between Eubank Avenue and Alameda Street. However, these changes also prohibit new Cargo Container Storage Yards in six other areas zoned Light Industrial or Limited Industrial.

**3.8.3.9 Southern California Association of Governments Regional Comprehensive Plan**

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) integrates SCAG’s planning policy for Land Use and Housing, Solid Waste, Energy, Air Quality, Open Space and Habitat, Economy and Education, Water, Transportation, Security and Emergency Preparedness, and Finance. The RCP is built around the Compass Growth Vision and 2% Strategy adopted by the Regional Council in April 2004 which is based on four key principles: Mobility, getting where we want to go; Livability, creating positive communities; Prosperity, long-term health for the region; and Sustainability, preserving natural surroundings.
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The RCP transportation policies are based on the adopted 2004 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RTP includes an action plan for implementation of strategies in support of the policies adopted by the SCAG Regional Council. The 2004 RTP establishes a transportation vision for an area that includes Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, Ventura and Imperial Counties. RTP is a Multimodal Plan representing a vision for a better transportation system, integrated with the best possible growth pattern for the Region over the Plan horizon of 2030. The 2004 RTP goals and policies include the following:

- Maximize mobility and accessibility for all people and goods in the region;
- Ensure travel safety and reliability for all people and goods in the region;
- Preserve and ensure a sustainable regional transportation system;
- Maximize the productivity of our transportation system;
- Protect the environment, improve air quality and promote energy efficiency; and
- Encourage land use and growth patterns that complement our transportation investments.

3.8.3.10 San Pedro Bay Ports Clean Air Action Plan

The Port, in conjunction with the Port of Long Beach and with guidance from AQMD, CARB and USEPA, has developed the San Pedro Bay Ports Clean Air Action Plan (CAAP), which was approved by the Los Angeles and Long Beach Boards of Harbor Commissioners on November 20, 2006. The CAAP focuses on reducing diesel particulate matter (DPM), NOX, and SOX, with two main goals: (1) to reduce Port-related air emissions in the interest of public health, and (2) to disconnect cargo growth from emissions increases. The Plan includes near-term measures implemented largely through the CEQA/NEPA process and new leases at both ports.

The CAAP consists of the following standards:

1. San Pedro Bay Standards
   - Reduce public health risk from toxic air contaminants associated with port-related mobile sources to acceptable levels.
   - Prevent port-related violations of the state and federal ambient air quality standards at air quality monitoring stations at both ports.
   - Reduce criteria pollutant emissions to the levels that will assure that port-related sources contribute their “fair share” to enable the South Coast Air Basin to attain state and federal ambient air quality standards.

2. Project-Specific Standards
   - Projects must meet the 10 in 1,000,000 excess cancer risk threshold, as determined by health risk assessments conducted during CEQA review and implemented through required NEPA/CEQA mitigations associated with lease negotiations. Projects that exceed the AQMD CEQA significance
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thresholds for criteria pollutants must implement the maximum available controls and feasible mitigations for any emissions increases.

3. Source Specific Performance Standards

- These standards include a series of measures that will be implemented through port lease requirements, tariffs, incentives, and the NEPA/CEQA environmental review process.
- Compliance with the Project Specific Standards may require that an individual terminal go beyond the Source Specific Performance Standards or advance the date of compliance with those performance standards.
- The Source Specific Performance Standards are targeted at the following five source categories of mobile equipment and vessels that are part of port-related goods movement: 1) heavy-duty vehicles/trucks; 2) ocean-going vessels; 3) cargo handling equipment; 4) harbor craft; and 5) railroad locomotives.

The proposed Project includes air quality control measures outlined in the CAAP, both as mitigation that will be imposed via permits and lease provisions and as standard measures that will be implemented through lease agreements with other agencies and business entities, and Port contracting policies.

3.8.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

3.8.4.1 Methodology

This analysis evaluates consistency or compliance for the proposed marine terminal, waterside, and transportation improvement projects with adopted plans and policies governing land use and development at the Port. All plans with policies applicable to Port development were evaluated, including the City of Los Angeles General Plan and its Elements, the City’s Planning and Zoning Code, Port of Los Angeles Master Plan, and plans prepared by other agencies with jurisdiction over potentially affected resources.

The Land Use analysis addresses the potential for the creation of physical incompatibilities between the proposed Project and adjacent land uses or activities, through the evaluation of the extent to which off-site land uses may be affected by physical interruption or disruption, or the extent to which other environmental impacts are also land use impacts. Additionally, this analysis evaluates the potential for proposed Project activities to affect conditions in surrounding communities, including truck and rail operations, container storage activities, and potential impacts on existing property value trends.

3.8.4.1.1 CEQA Baseline

Section 15125 of the CEQA Guidelines requires EIRs to include a description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of a project that exist at the time of the NOP. These environmental conditions would normally constitute the baseline
physical conditions by which the CEQA lead agency determines whether an impact is significant. For purposes of this Draft EIS/EIR, the CEQA Baseline for determining the significance of potential impacts under CEQA is December 2003. CEQA Baseline conditions are described in Table 2-2 of Section 2.4.

The CEQA Baseline represents the setting at a fixed point in time, with no project growth over time, and differs from the “No Project” Alternative (discussed in Section 2.5.1) in that the No Project Alternative addresses what is likely to happen at the site over time, starting from the baseline conditions. The No Project Alternative allows for growth at the proposed Project site that would occur without any required additional approvals.

### 3.8.4.1.2 No Federal Action/NEPA Baseline

For purposes of this Draft EIS/EIR, the evaluation of significance under NEPA is defined by comparing the proposed Project or other alternative to the No Federal Action scenario. The No Federal Action/NEPA Baseline condition for determining significance of impacts coincides with the “No Federal Action” condition, which is defined by examining the full range of construction and operational activities the applicant could implement and is likely to implement absent permits from the USACE. Therefore, the No Federal Action/NEPA Baseline would not include any dredging, filling of the Northwest Slip, wharf construction or upgrades, or crane replacement. The No Federal Action/NEPA Baseline would include construction and operation of all upland elements (existing lands) for backlands or other purposes. The upland elements are assumed to include:

- Adding 57 acres or existing land for backland area and an on-dock rail yard;
- Constructing a 500-space parking lot for union workers;
- Demolishing the existing administration building and constructing a new LEED certified administration building and other terminal buildings;
- Adding new lighting and replacing existing lighting, fencing, paving, and utilities on the backlands;
- Relocating the Pier A rail yard and constructing the new on-dock rail yard;
- Widening and realigning Harry Bridges Boulevard; and
- Developing the Harry Bridges Buffer Area.

Unlike the CEQA Baseline, which is defined by conditions at a point in time, the No Federal Action/NEPA Baseline is not bound by statute to a “flat” or “no growth” scenario; therefore, the USACE may project increases in operations over the life of a project to properly analyze the No Federal Action/NEPA Baseline condition. Normally, any ultimate permit decision would focus on direct impacts to the aquatic environment, as well as indirect and cumulative impacts in the uplands determined to be within the scope of federal control and responsibility. Significance of the proposed Project or alternative is defined by comparing the proposed Project or alternative to the No Federal Action/NEPA Baseline (i.e., the increment). The No Federal Action/NEPA Baseline conditions are described in Table 2-2 of Section 2.4.
The No Federal Action/NEPA Baseline also differs from the “No Project” Alternative, where the Port would take no further action to construct and develop additional backlands (other than the 176 acres that currently exist). Under this alternative, no construction impacts would occur. However, forecasted increases in cargo throughput would still occur as greater operational efficiencies are made.

### 3.8.4.2 Thresholds of Significance

The following criteria are based on the *Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide* (City of Los Angeles 2006) and are the basis for determining the significance of impacts associated with land use consistency and compatibility resulting from proposed Project development. The following factors are used to determine significance for land use consistency and compatibility.

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

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

**LU-3:** The proposed Project would disrupt, divide, or isolate neighborhoods, communities, or land uses.

**LU-4:** The proposed Project would cause a secondary impact to the surrounding land uses.

### 3.8.4.3 Impacts and Mitigation

#### 3.8.4.3.1 Proposed Project

##### 3.8.4.3.1.1 Land Use Consistency

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

The proposed Project site is not located within redevelopment or specific plan areas and therefore, would not affect implementation of these plans. In addition, because terminal activities would be confined to the proposed Project site, the proposed Project would not affect blighted conditions in surrounding redevelopment project areas.

The majority of the proposed Project site is located within the Port of Los Angeles Plan and Port Master Plan (PMP) areas; however, construction of the Harry Bridges Buffer Area and roadway improvements would occur within the Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan area. The Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan designates land use adjacent to the proposed Project area as industrial.
The proposed Project is located within areas designated for Commercial/Industrial uses in the Port of Los Angeles Plan; proposed construction activities and container terminal activities would be consistent with the General/Bulk Cargo (i.e., container, break-bulk, neo-bulk, and passenger facilities) and Commercial/Industrial Uses/Non-Hazardous land use designations. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with the land use/density designations delineated in the City-approved Port of Los Angeles Plan that regulates the continued development and operation of the Port.

The proposed Project site is located within PMP Master Plan Area 5. This area is designated for general cargo uses in the Port Master Plan and proposed container terminal operations would be consistent with the overall general cargo uses identified in the PMP for Master Plan Area 5. The proposed Project would convert the 10 acres of fill in the Northwest Slip to backlands (i.e., container storage area). As the PMP requires plan amendments for the construction of new land, an amendment to the PMP Master Plan Area 5 would be required to create additional backlands within the Northwest Slip.

The proposed Project would include a PMP Amendment, General Plan Amendment (GPA) (i.e., roadway downgrades, zoning designation restrictions, height variance), and a zone change for the proposed 30-acre Harry Bridges Buffer Area between Harry Bridges Boulevard and “C” Street, from Figueroa Street to Lagoon Avenue. These amendments would be required to change the zoning of the buffer area and modify the PMP 5 to include the buffer; the Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan boundary would be adjusted accordingly. Consistent with Tidelands Grants guidelines, the proposed PMP Amendment, GPA, and zone change would add [Q] conditions to the site’s zoning designation, thereby restricting the buffer area to open space and recreational uses, such as:

- Open Space
- Maritime Related Museums and Cultural Facility
- Community Buildings
- Restrooms
- Parking areas

The GPA would also allow the following roadway modifications associated with the Harry Bridges Buffer Area:

- Vacation and removal of six roadway segments between Harry Bridges Boulevard and “C” Street: Mar Vista Avenue; Wilmington Boulevard; Gulf Avenue; McDonald Avenue; Bayview Avenue; and Neptune Avenue.
- Downgrading of two streets: Wilmington Boulevard (secondary arterial) and Neptune Avenue (collector).

As the VL1 zoning designation restricts structures to a maximum allowable height of 45 feet, the PMP Amendment, GPA, and zone change would also include provisions for a height variance for the proposed pedestrian iconic bridge that would be built up to a peak height of 120 feet.
Construction of the Harry Bridges Buffer Area would occur on lands within the Wilmington Harbor City Community area; however, this improvement would occur on undeveloped, vacant land owned by the Port. Proposed roadway improvements (i.e., roadway closures/street downgrades; widening Harry Bridges Boulevard) would potentially require the acquisition and/or use of adjacent land parcels. However, the conversion of these parcels to open space/recreational uses and to roadway uses would not result in significant impacts related to inconsistencies with plans and policies, as the Harry Bridges Buffer Area is a regional community improvement identified in the Wilmington Harbor City Community.

**CEQA Impact Determination**

The proposed Project would be consistent with the Port of Los Angeles Plan and site zoning. As the proposed Project would require amendments to the PMP to create 10 acres of additional backlands/container storage areas within the Northwest Slip, inconsistencies with the PMP would not occur. Construction of the Harry Bridges Buffer Area and proposed roadways improvements would convert land designated in the Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan for industrial uses to open space/recreational and roadway uses; however, these activities would occur on vacant parcels owned by the Port and are adjacent to existing roadways. Furthermore, the proposed GPA (i.e., roadway downgrades, zoning designation restrictions, height variance) would ensure consistency with the land use/density designations identified in the Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan. In addition, because terminal activities would be confined to the proposed Project site, project operations would not affect blighted conditions in surrounding redevelopment project areas. As the proposed Project would be consistent with all applicable land use/zoning designations (after amendments) and includes a physical separation of terminal facilities from residential areas, impacts on land use would be less than significant under CEQA.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation required.

**Residual Impacts**

Less than significant impact.

**NEPA Impact Determination**

The proposed Project would include in-water construction activities (i.e., dredging, filling of the Northwest Slip, new wharf/dike construction, and upgrades to existing wharves), which would not be part of the No Federal Action/NEPA Baseline. These in-water activities would occur within the Port of Los Angeles Plan Area. Deepening berths, new wharf construction, and wharf seismic improvements would not result in features that would be inconsistent with adopted land use designations and plans; the proposed Project includes provisions for an amendment to the PMP to create additional backlands within the Northwest Slip. Therefore, the proposed Project would have less than significant impact under NEPA.
### Mitigation Measures

No mitigation required.

### Residual Impacts

Less than significant impact.

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

The proposed Project would be consistent with the adopted objectives and policies identified in the Port of Los Angeles Plan and Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan (see **Impact LU-1**). Port of Los Angeles Plan Objective 1 gives priority to water-dependent developments to ensure the Port is maintained as an important local, regional and national resource, as well as to accommodate the orderly development of the Port to meet the needs of foreign and domestic waterborne commerce. Objective 4 gives priority to water and coastal-dependent development within the Port to preclude the need for additional ports elsewhere in the state. Proposed redevelopment of the project site as a consolidated container terminal would be consistent with Objectives 1 and 4 of the Port of Los Angeles Plan. Additionally, the proposed GPA required for construction of the Harry Bridges Buffer Area and roadway improvements would ensure consistency with the recreational/park facilities and transportation policies stipulated in the Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan.

The proposed Project would be consistent with the land use goals/objectives identified in the PMP (see **Impact LU-1**). The proposed Project would also be consistent with the container operations short-term and long-range preferred uses delineated in the PMP for Master Plan Area 5, which encompasses the proposed Project site. The PMP serves as the Local Coastal Program/Local Coastal Plan (LCP) for the California Coastal Commission; therefore, the proposed Project would also be consistent with the California Coastal Act of 1976.

The proposed Project would include construction of on-dock rail facilities which would reduce the percentage of inland transport that would occur via truck. Accordingly, the proposed Project would be consistent with the SCAG RCP and RTP policies associated with improving the efficiency of rail transportation and reducing the impacts of truck traffic.

As stated in Section 3.2.4.7 (Table 3.2-67), the proposed Project includes air quality mitigation measures outlined in the CAAP that would be implemented through the NEPA/CEQA review process for the proposed Project. Implementation of mitigation measures **MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-18** would ensure consistency with San Pedro Bay CAAP policies requiring implementation of Project Specific and Source Specific Performance Standards to reduce air pollution from Port operations to acceptable regulatory health risk thresholds.
**CEQA Impact Determination**

As discussed above, the proposed Project would be consistent with the Port of Los Angeles Plan, the Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan, the PMP/Coastal Act, SCAG policies, including the RCP and RTP, and the San Pedro Bay Ports CAAP.

Proposed roadway improvements associated with widening Harry Bridges Boulevard and the buffer area would not conflict with adopted Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan policies. The proposed Project would modify Harry Bridges Boulevard from to straighten it, provide a median and shoulders, which would widen it from 50 feet to 84 feet, which would bring the edge of the roadway up to 20 feet closer to “C” Street. Additionally, construction of the buffer area between Harry Bridges Boulevard and “C” Street, from Figueroa Street to Lagoon Avenue, would require removal of six north-south access streets within this area. Most of these roadways would be vacated; the proposed GPA would be required to downgrade Wilmington Boulevard and Neptune Avenue. However, this would result in isolating Port-related truck traffic away from the residential neighborhood north of “C” Street; consequently, the combination of widening Harry Bridges Boulevard and creating the Harry Bridges Buffer Area would not conflict with Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan policies, which recommend that Port-related traffic be diverted away from adjacent residential areas when the circulation system is upgraded, and that circulation improvements be compatible with, and beneficial in, reducing environmental impacts to surrounding areas caused by Port-related activities. As the proposed Project would be consistent with the General Plan and adopted environmental goals or policies contained in other applicable plans, impacts would be less than significant under CEQA.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation required.

**Residual Impacts**

Less than significant impact.

**NEPA Impact Determination**

The proposed Project would result in dredging, filling of the Northwest Slip, and new wharf construction, which would not be part of the No Federal Action/NEPA Baseline. These would occur within the Port of Los Angeles Plan Area. The proposed Project includes provisions for an amendment to the Port Master Plan in order to create additional backlands within the Northwest Slip. Therefore, these improvements would be consistent with the City of Los Angeles General Plan and associated Port of Los Angeles Plan as well as the Port Master Plan, and would result in less than significant impact under NEPA.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation required.
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Residual Impacts

Less than significant impact.

3.8.4.3.1.2 Land Use Compatibility

Impact LU-3: The proposed Project would not disrupt, divide, or isolate existing neighborhoods, communities, or land uses.

Truck/Rail Activities

The proposed Project would include construction of on-dock rail facilities which would reduce the percentage of inland transport that would occur via truck. The proposed Project also includes transportation improvements that would reduce congestion and improve traffic safety in areas of Wilmington. These improvements would consolidate the north-south movement of trucks serving the terminal and would reduce truck movements through Wilmington neighborhoods. Harry Bridges Boulevard would be widened and realigned from 50 feet to 84 feet. Harry Bridges Boulevard is currently too narrow in areas and would be widen and straightened to improve traffic flow. Harry Bridges Boulevard would remain 2 lanes in either direction with a new landscaped median in the center.

Although the proposed widening of Harry Bridges Boulevard would bring the edge of the roadway up to 20 feet closer to “C” Street and adjacent residential neighborhoods, the proposed Project would construct a buffer area between Harry Bridges Boulevard and “C” Street and would remove the north-south access streets within this area. This would result in isolating Port-related truck traffic away from the residential neighborhood north of “C” Street. Roadway improvements associated with the Harry Bridges Buffer Area would result in closure of all minor north-south streets through the Buffer area except King Avenue and would divert local traffic onto the adjacent parallel routes (i.e., Figueroa Street, King Avenue, Fries Avenue, Marine Avenue, and Avalon Boulevard). The removal of north-south streets (e.g., Wilmington Boulevard) between “C” Street and Harry Bridges Boulevard would reduce truck travel on neighborhood streets, focusing truck movements onto Harry Bridges Boulevard, Alameda Street, and the 110 Freeway. These improvements would reduce the occurrences of truck parking in residential neighborhoods. However, as some trucks continue to drive through residential areas in violation of posted prohibition signs, the proposed Project would further exacerbate existing illegal truck use within the Wilmington community. Therefore, the Project’s contribution to existing violations of unauthorized truck use in Wilmington would be potentially significant.

Proposed Project operations would increase rail trips; however the proposed Project would not result in the construction of new rail lines or yards outside Port boundaries. The new location for the Pier A rail yard is currently used for automobile storage for import/export, and is surrounded by heavy and light industrial uses (primarily the Los Angeles Harbor Industrial Center Redevelopment Project Area). Although the new Pier A rail yard would be adjacent to the Consolidated Slip, which contains approximately 10 to 15 (i.e., 5 percent of the 224 boats) live-aboard residents, this relatively small
number of residents does not represent an existing neighborhood or community within this industrially zoned area. Therefore, as relocation of the Pier A rail yard would be located within an existing industrial area adjacent to industrial uses, and would not result in the construction of new rail lines, the proposed Project would have a less than significant land use impact on neighborhoods from increased/relocated rail facilities.

**Container Storage**

The proposed Project would add approximately 38 percent new terminal area (i.e., backlands available for container storage and other functions that would increase cargo handling efficiency). The increased terminal acreage includes the redevelopment of vacant and underutilized land and development of a 10-acre landfill in the Northwest Slip. The increase in acreage, related increased efficiencies in handling of cargo on-site (e.g., new and better cranes), and construction of the new on-dock rail would reduce the amount of time needed to move containers through the TraPac Terminal. Therefore, container storage associated with the proposed Project would not have direct impacts on surrounding communities.

Although TraPac does not operate any satellite container storage facilities, some shippers utilize off-site container storage facilities and warehouses. These offsite facilities vary in size and are sometimes located in close proximity to residential areas due to the proximity of industrial and residential zoning and land uses in Wilmington. The Port contributes indirectly to the proliferation and use of offsite container storage facilities. LAHD has no authority to regulate the locations of these facilities; however, recent controls and limitations implemented by the City of Los Angeles on container storage in Wilmington apply to these offsite facilities. As stated in Section 3.8.3.8, these regulations place additional controls on existing storage facilities such as setbacks, landscaped buffers, storage and stacking height, and fencing and screening requirements, and also prohibit new container storage yards in some areas zoned Light Industrial or Limited Industrial.

As the proposed Project is consistent with existing and projected future trends of increased goods movement and trade and because the proposed expansion of backlands for container storage would increase efficiency of container handling, proposed backland expansion would not contribute to the disruption, division, and/or isolation to existing residential neighborhoods or communities.

**CEQA Impact Determination**

As discussed above, the proposed Project would not disrupt, divide or isolate existing neighborhoods, communities or land uses within the existing proposed Project area. However, the Project’s contribution to existing violations of unauthorized truck use in Wilmington would be potentially significant.
Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would be required to reduce the proposed Project’s contribution to the ongoing violation of truck use within Wilmington,

MM LU-1: Install Truck Route Signage. Fixed signs directing truck drivers to designated and alternative truck routes shall be installed throughout Wilmington.

MM LU-2: Truck Traffic Enforcement. Port Police shall increase enforcement of prohibition against truck traffic within Wilmington.

Residual Impacts

Implementation of Mitigation Measures LU-1 and LU-2 would reduce the Project’s contribution to existing violations of unauthorized truck use in Wilmington, such that less than significant impacts would occur under CEQA. In addition, live-aboard residents in the Consolidated Slip area could be disturbed by Project-related construction and operation activities. However, the current and proposed future land uses are consistent with property zoning and land use designations. Impacts would be less than significant. The specific impacts associated with proximity of residents to the Pier A rail yard relocation, are also discussed in Section 3.9, Noise.

NEPA Impact Determination

The proposed Project would include in-water construction activities, which would not be part of the No Federal Action/NEPA Baseline. In-water construction activities would not result in land use changes that would disrupt, divide or isolate an established community. In-water construction and operation activities would be consistent with the current and zoned land uses in the area. Therefore, impacts under NEPA would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation required.

Residual Impacts

Less than significant impact.

Impact LU-4: The proposed Project would not cause secondary impacts to surrounding land uses.

Proposed Project activities associated with truck/rail operations and container storage activities would not significantly impact surrounding communities (see Impact LU-3).

Proposed Project construction activities would require removal of rock material from Catalina Island. However, as removal of rock material would occur at a permitted quarry facility on Catalina Island, impacts on resources at this site associated with removal activities have been evaluated previously in the site designation environmental documentation and/or permit applications. Because this facility is an existing
designated/permitted quarry, use of this site for providing rock material for the
proposed Project would comply with the site use and other permit conditions.

**Property Value Trends**

Historically, the proximity of the Port to surrounding residential neighborhoods may
have resulted in generally lower residential property values in adjacent communities.
However, residential property values in communities adjacent to the Port have
increased in recent years and do not exhibit depreciated or stagnant values (LAEDC
2002). The proposed Project would not change residential property trends in the
areas immediately adjacent to the Port.

The proposed Project would increase the number of direct, indirect, and induced jobs and
income in the region and result in other economic benefits. While the economic impacts
are beneficial, the increase in jobs attributable to the proposed Project would be spread
over the larger economic region (refer to Section 7.3.1). In addition, changes in property
value are dependent on other unrelated factors including interest rates, ease of access as a
bedroom community to employment centers, availability of quality education and historic
and existing zoning practices. Therefore, the proposed Project would not significantly
contribute to increased property values due to its direct or indirect economic impacts

**CEQA Impact Determination**

As discussed above, the proposed Project would generate substantial employment
opportunities that would not result in significant secondary impacts on land use,
including indirect impacts on residential property values in surrounding communities.
Therefore, impacts on land use under CEQA would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation required.

**Residual Impacts**

Less than significant impact.

**NEPA Impact Determination**

The proposed Project would result in a slightly higher employment level compared to
the No Federal Action/NEPA Baseline due to in-water construction activities and
increased throughput operations, but as discussed above, employment would be
drawn from local sources, so no secondary land use impacts are expected to occur.
Less than significant impacts under NEPA would occur.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation required.
Residual Impacts

There would be less than significant impact.

3.8.4.3.2 Alternatives

3.8.4.3.2.1 Alternative 1 – No Project Alternative

Alt 1 – Impact LU-1: Alternative 1 would be consistent with the adopted land use/density designation in the Port of Los Angeles Plan, Port of Los Angeles Master Plan, and Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan.

CEQA Impact Determination

Under the No Project Alternative (Alternative 1), no development would occur within the proposed Project area. Therefore, Alternative 1 would not conflict with a community plan and/or redevelopment plan area designations. However, Alternative 1 would violate the Port of Los Angeles Plan and Port Master Plan objectives of accommodating the orderly and continued development of the Port so as to meet the foreign and domestic waterborne commerce, navigation, the commercial fishing industry, and public recreational needs. Furthermore, Alternative 1 would not provide the Port with sufficient ability to accommodate forecasted growth. Therefore, Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

No feasible mitigation exists to reduce impacts.

Residual Impacts

There would be significant residual impacts.

NEPA Impact Determination

Under this alternative, no development would occur within the in-water proposed Project area (i.e., no dredging, filling of the Northwest Slip or new wharf construction). Therefore, potential impacts are not applicable under NEPA since there would be no federal action under this alternative.

Mitigation Measures

Due to No Federal Action, mitigation is not applicable. No mitigation required.

Residual Impacts

No impact.
Alt 1 – Impact LU-2: Alternative 1 would be consistent with the General Plan or adopted environmental goals or policies contained in other applicable plans.

CEQA Impact Determination
As no new developments would occur within the proposed Project area under this alternative, buildout would not attain the goals identified in the Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan related to creating a buffer zone between the Port industrial activities and the Wilmington Community. In addition, Alternative 1 would not ensure consistency with the Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan policies, which recommend that Port-related traffic be diverted away from adjacent residential areas. Impacts on land use would be less than significant under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures
No mitigation required.

Residual Impacts
Less than significant impact.

NEPA Impact Determination
Under this alternative, no development would occur within the in-water proposed Project area (i.e., no dredging, filling of the Northwest Slip or new wharf construction). Therefore, potential impacts are not applicable under NEPA since there would be no federal action under this alternative.

Mitigation Measures
Due to No Federal Action, mitigation is not applicable. No mitigation required.

Residual Impacts
No impact.

Alt 1 – Impact LU-3: Alternative 1 would not disrupt, divide, or isolate existing neighborhoods, communities, or land uses.

CEQA Impact Determination
Alternative 1 would not expand, consolidate or improve existing operations of commercial containerized shipping within the Port area. Therefore, Alternative 1 would not disrupt, divide or isolate existing neighborhoods, communities or land uses within the existing proposed Project area. No impacts would occur under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures
No mitigation required.
Residual Impacts

No impact.

NEPA Impact Determination

Under this alternative, no development would occur within the in-water proposed Project area (i.e., no dredging, filling of the Northwest Slip or new wharf construction). Therefore, potential impacts are not applicable under NEPA since there would be no federal action under this alternative.

Mitigation Measures

Due to No Federal Action, mitigation is not applicable. No mitigation required.

Residual Impacts

No impact.

Alt 1 – Impact LU-4: Alternative 1 would not cause a secondary impact to surrounding land uses.

CEQA Impact Determination

Under this alternative, no development would occur within the proposed Project area; therefore, secondary impacts on the proposed Project area or surrounding land uses would not occur. Alternative 1 would result in less than significant impacts under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation required.

Residual Impacts

Less than significant impact.

NEPA Impact Determination

Under this alternative, no development would occur within the in-water proposed Project area (i.e., no dredging, filling of the Northwest Slip or new wharf construction). Therefore, potential impacts are not applicable under NEPA since there would be no federal action under this alternative.

Mitigation Measures

Due to No Federal Action, mitigation is not applicable. No mitigation required.
Residual Impacts

No impact.

3.8.4.3.2.2 Alternative 2 – Reduced Project: Proposed Project Without the 10-Acre Fill

Under the Reduced Project Alternative (Alternative 2), the proposed 10-acre Northwest Slip would not be filled and the 400-foot wharf adjacent to it would not be constructed.

Alt 2 – Impact LU-1: Alternative 2 would be consistent with the adopted land use/density designation in the Port of Los Angeles Plan, Port of Los Angeles Master Plan, and the Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan.

CEQA Impact Determination

This alternative is similar to the proposed Project except it would not include filling the 10-acre Northwest Slip to create an additional storage area and the 400-foot wharf would not be built adjacent to the Northwest Slip. Eliminating these features would result in decreased container movement efficiency compared to the proposed Project, but would not affect land uses/density designations within the proposed Project area or other adjacent areas. Alternative 2 would result in less than significant impacts under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation required.

Residual Impacts

Less than significant impact.

NEPA Impact Determination

Alternative 2 would include in-water construction activities (i.e., dredging, new Berths 146-147 wharf/dike construction, and upgrades to existing wharves), which would not be part of the No Federal Action/NEPA Baseline. These activities would occur within the Port of Los Angeles Plan Area. These improvements would not result in features that are inconsistent with adopted land use and/or density designations, and would result in less than significant impact under NEPA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation required.

Residual Impacts

Less than significant impact.
Alt 2 – Impact LU-2: Alternative 2 would be consistent with the General Plan or adopted environmental goals or policies contained in other applicable plans.

**CEQA Impact Determination**

Under Alternative 2, proposed roadway improvements associated with widening Harry Bridges Boulevard and the buffer area would not conflict with the adopted Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan policies. However, the proposed PMP Amendment, GPA, and zone change would ensure compliance with Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan policies. Implementation of mitigation measures MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-18 would ensure consistency with San Pedro Bay CAAP policies requiring adherence to Project Specific and Source Specific Performance Standards to reduce air pollution from Port operations to acceptable regulatory health risk thresholds. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in less than significant impacts under CEQA.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation required.

**Residual Impacts**

Less than significant impact.

**NEPA Impact Determination**

Alternative 2 would include in-water construction activities (i.e., dredging, new Berths 146-147 wharf/dike construction, and upgrades to existing wharves), which would not be part of the No Federal Action/NEPA Baseline. Although elimination of filling the 10-acre Northwest Slip would preclude the need for a PMP amendment, the in-water construction activities would be consistent with the City of Los Angeles General Plan and associated Port of Los Angeles Plan and PMP policies, and would result in less than significant impacts under NEPA.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation required.

**Residual Impacts**

Less than significant impact.

Alt 2 – Impact LU-3: Alternative 2 would not disrupt, divide, or isolate existing neighborhoods, communities, or land uses.

**Truck/Rail Activities**

Alternative 2 would include construction of on-dock rail facilities which would reduce the percentage of inland transport that would occur via truck. The proposed
Project also includes transportation improvements that would reduce congestion and improve traffic safety in areas of Wilmington. These improvements would consolidate the north-south movement of trucks serving the terminal and would reduce truck movements through Wilmington neighborhoods. Harry Bridges Boulevard would be widened and realigned from 50 feet to 84 feet. Harry Bridges Boulevard is currently too narrow in areas and would be widen and straightened to improve traffic flow. Harry Bridges Boulevard would remain 2 lanes in either direction with a new landscaped median in the center.

Although the proposed widening of Harry Bridges Boulevard would bring the edge of the roadway up to 20 feet closer to “C” Street and adjacent residential neighborhoods, the proposed Project would construct a buffer area between Harry Bridges Boulevard and “C” Street and would remove the north-south access streets within this area. This would result in isolating Port-related truck traffic away from the residential neighborhood north of “C” Street. Roadway improvements associated with the Harry Bridges Buffer Area would result in closure of all minor north-south streets through the Buffer area except King Avenue and would divert local traffic onto the adjacent parallel routes (i.e., Figueroa Street, King Avenue, Fries Avenue, Marine Avenue, and Avalon Boulevard). The removal of north-south streets (e.g., Wilmington Boulevard) between “C” Street and Harry Bridges Boulevard would reduce truck travel on neighborhood streets, focusing truck movements onto Harry Bridges Boulevard, Alameda Street, and the 110 Freeway. These improvements would reduce the occurrences of truck parking in residential neighborhoods. However, as some trucks continue to drive through residential areas in violation of posted prohibition signs, the proposed Project would further exacerbate existing illegal truck use within the Wilmington community. Therefore, this alternative’s contribution to existing violations of unauthorized truck use in Wilmington would be potentially significant.

Alternative 2 operations would increase rail trips; however this alternative would not result in the construction of new rail lines or yards outside Port boundaries. The new location for the Pier A rail yard is currently used for automobile storage for import/export, and is surrounded by heavy and light industrial uses (primarily the Los Angeles Harbor Industrial Center Redevelopment Project Area). Although the new Pier A rail yard would be adjacent to the Consolidated Slip, which contains approximately 10 to 15 (i.e., 5 percent of the 224 boats) live-aboard residents, this relatively small number of residents does not represent an existing neighborhood or community within this industrially zoned area. Therefore, as relocation of the Pier A rail yard would be located within an existing industrial area adjacent to industrial uses, and would not result in the construction of new rail lines, Alternative 2 would have a less than significant land use impact on neighborhoods from increased/relocated rail facilities.

**Container Storage**

Alternative 2 would add approximately 32 percent new terminal area (i.e., backlands available for container storage and other functions that would increase cargo handling efficiency). The increased terminal acreage includes the redevelopment of vacant and underutilized land. The proposed additional container storage areas are consistent with recent controls and limitations implemented by the City of Los Angeles on open storage, including container storage in Wilmington. The increase in acreage, related increased
efficiencies in handling of cargo on-site (e.g., new and better cranes), and construction of the new on-dock rail would reduce the amount of time needed to move containers through the TraPac Terminal. Therefore, container storage associated with Alternative 2 would not have direct impacts on surrounding communities.

Although TraPac does not operate any satellite container storage facilities, some shippers utilize off-site container storage facilities and warehouses. These offsite facilities vary in size and are sometimes located in close proximity to residential areas due to the proximity of industrial and residential zoning and land uses in Wilmington. The Port contributes indirectly to the proliferation and use of offsite container storage facilities. LAHD has no authority to regulate the locations of these facilities; however, recent controls and limitations implemented by the City of Los Angeles on container storage in Wilmington apply to these offsite facilities. As stated in Section 3.8.3.8, these regulations place additional controls on existing storage facilities such as setbacks, landscaped buffers, storage and stacking height, and fencing and screening requirements, and also prohibit new container storage yards in some areas zoned Light Industrial or Limited Industrial.

As Alternative 2 is consistent with existing and projected future trends of increased goods movement and trade and because the proposed expansion of backlands for container storage would increase efficiency of container handling, proposed backland expansion would not contribute to the disruption, division, and/or isolation to existing residential neighborhoods or communities.

**CEQA Impact Determination**

As discussed above, Alternative 2 would not disrupt, divide or isolate existing neighborhoods, communities or land uses within the existing Project area. However, this alternative’s contribution to existing violations of unauthorized truck use in Wilmington would be potentially significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

The following mitigation measures would be required to reduce this alternative’s contribution to the ongoing violation of truck use within Wilmington,

**MM LU-1: Install Truck Route Signage.** Fixed signs directing truck drivers to designated and alternative truck routes shall be installed throughout Wilmington.

**MM LU-2: Truck Traffic Enforcement.** Port Police shall increase enforcement of prohibition against truck traffic within Wilmington.

**Residual Impacts**

Implementation of Mitigation Measures LU-1 and LU-2 would reduce the potential contribution to existing violations of unauthorized truck use in Wilmington, such that less than significant impacts would occur under CEQA. Live-aboard residents in the Consolidated Slip area could be disturbed by Project-related construction and operation activities. However, the current and proposed future land uses are consistent with property zoning and land use designations. Impacts would be less
than significant. The specific impacts associated with proximity of residents to the Pier A rail yard relocation are also discussed in Section 3.9, Noise.

**NEPA Impact Determination**

Alternative 2 would include in-water construction activities, which would not be part of the No Federal Action/NEPA Baseline. In-water construction activities would not result in land use changes that would disrupt, divide or isolate an established community. In-water construction and operation activities would be consistent with the current and zoned land uses in the area. Therefore, impacts under NEPA would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation required.

**Residual Impacts**

Less than significant impact.

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

Alternative 2 activities associated with truck/rail operations and container storage activities would not significantly impact surrounding communities (see Impact LU-3).

Alternative 2 construction activities would require removal of rock material from Catalina Island. However, as removal of rock material would occur at a permitted quarry facility on Catalina Island, impacts on resources at this site associated with removal activities have been evaluated previously in the site designation environmental documentation and/or permit applications. Because this facility is an existing designated/permited quarry, use of this site for providing rock material for Alternative 2 would comply with the site use and other permit conditions.

**Property Value Trends**

Alternative 2 would increase the number of direct, indirect, and induced jobs; increase income in the region; and result in other economic benefits. While the economic impacts are beneficial, the increase in jobs attributable to Alternative 2 would be spread over the larger economic region (refer to Section 7.3.1). In addition, changes in property value are dependent on other unrelated factors including interest rates, ease of access as a bedroom community to employment centers, availability of quality education and historic and existing zoning practices. Therefore, Alternative 2 would not significantly contribute to increased property values due to its direct or indirect economic impacts.

**CEQA Impact Determination**

As discussed above, Alternative 2 would generate substantial employment opportunities that would not result in significant secondary impacts on land use, including indirect
impacts on residential property values in surrounding communities. Therefore, impacts on land use under CEQA would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation required.

Residual Impacts

Less than significant impact.

NEPA Impact Determination

Alternative 2 would result in a slightly higher employment level compared to the No Federal Action/NEPA Baseline due to in-water construction activities and increased throughput operations. However, as employment would be drawn from local sources no secondary land use impacts are expected to occur. Less than significant impacts under NEPA would occur.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation required.

Residual Impacts

Less than significant impact.

3.8.4.3.2.3 Alternative 3 – Reduced Wharf

The Reduced Wharf Alternative (Alternative 3) would not include construction of the 705-foot wharf along Berths 145-147, fill of the 10-acre Northwest Slip, or construction of the 400-foot wharf adjacent to the Northwest Slip.

Alt 3 – Impact LU-1: Alternative 3 would be consistent with the adopted land use/density designation in the Port of Los Angeles Plan, Port of Los Angeles Master Plan, and the Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan.

CEQA Impact Determination

This alternative is similar to the proposed Project except it would not include the proposed new 705-foot wharf along Berths 145-147, the 10-acre Northwest Slip would not be filled, and the 400-foot wharf would not be constructed adjacent to the Northwest Slip. Under Alternative 3, proposed improvements would occur within the Port of Los Angeles Plan area and would be consistent with designated land use. Roadway improvements, such as the Harry Bridges Boulevard widening, would occur within the Wilmington-Harbor City and San Pedro Community Plan areas. The Wilmington-Harbor City Area Plan designates land use abutted to the proposed Project area as industrial, commercial, and public facilities. As Alternative 3 would
not conflict with these land use designations, this alternative would result in less than
significant impacts under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation required.

Residual Impacts

Less than significant impact.

NEPA Impact Determination

Alternative 3 would include minimal in-water construction (i.e., deepening
navigation channels and wharf seismic improvements), which would not be part of
the No Federal Action/NEPA Baseline. These activities would occur within the Port
of Los Angeles Plan Area, and would be consistent with the site’s General/Bulk
Cargo and Commercial/Industrial Uses/Non-Hazardous land use designations. These
improvements would not result in features that are inconsistent with adopted land use
and/or density designations, and would result in less than significant impacts under
NEPA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation required.

Residual Impacts

Less than significant impact.

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

CEQA Impact Determination

Under Alternative 3, proposed roadway improvements associated with widening
Harry Bridges Boulevard and the buffer area would ensure consistency with adopted
Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan policies. Implementation of mitigation
measures MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-18 would ensure consistency with San Pedro
Bay CAAP policies requiring adherence to Project Specific and Source Specific
Performance Standards to reduce air pollution from Port operations to acceptable
regulatory health risk thresholds. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in less than
significant impacts under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation required.
3.8 Land Use

Residual Impacts

Less than significant impact.

NEPA Impact Determination

Alternative 3 would include minimal in-water construction (i.e., deepening navigation channels and wharf seismic improvements), which would not be part of the No Federal Action/NEPA Baseline. Although elimination of filling the 10-acre Northwest Slip would preclude the need for a PMP amendment, the in-water construction activities would be consistent with the City of Los Angeles General Plan and associated Port of Los Angeles Plan and PMP policies, and would result in less than significant impacts under NEPA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation required.

Residual Impacts

Less than significant impact.

Alt 3 – Impact LU-3: Alternative 3 would not disrupt, divide, or isolate existing neighborhoods, communities, or land uses.

Truck/Rail Activities

Alternative 3 would include construction of on-dock rail facilities which would reduce the percentage of inland transport that would occur via truck. The proposed Project also includes transportation improvements that would reduce congestion and improve traffic safety in areas of Wilmington. Under Alternative 3, Harry Bridges Boulevard would be modified to straighten it, provide a median and shoulders, which would widen it from 50 feet to 84 feet, which would bring the edge of the roadway up to 20 feet closer to “C” Street and adjacent residential neighborhoods. However, this alternative would also create a buffer area between Harry Bridges Boulevard and “C” Street, and would remove the north-south access streets within this area. This would result in isolating Port-related truck traffic away from the residential neighborhood north of “C” Street. Any potential disruption to a neighborhood or community from widening Harry Bridges Boulevard would be reduced by the construction of the new buffer area and removal of the north-south access streets. Roadway improvements associated the buffer area would reduce the occurrences of truck parking in residential neighborhoods. However, as some trucks continue to drive through residential areas in violation of posted prohibition signs, the proposed Project would further exacerbate existing illegal truck use within the Wilmington community. Therefore, this alternative’s contribution to existing violations of unauthorized truck use in Wilmington would be potentially significant.

Alternative 3 operations would increase rail trips; however this alternative would not result in the construction of new rail lines or yards outside Port boundaries. The new location for the Pier A rail yard is currently used for automobile storage for
import/export, and is surrounded by heavy and light industrial uses (primarily the Los Angeles Harbor Industrial Center Redevelopment Project Area). Although the new Pier A rail yard would be adjacent to the Consolidated Slip, which contains approximately 10 to 15 (i.e., 5 percent of the 224 boats) live-aboard residents, this relatively small number of residents does not represent an existing neighborhood or community within this industrially zoned area. Therefore, as relocation of the Pier A rail yard would be located within an existing industrial area adjacent to industrial uses, and would not result in the construction of new rail lines, Alternative 3 would have a less than significant land use impact on neighborhoods from increased/relocated rail facilities.

**Container Storage**

Alternative 3 would add approximately 32 percent new terminal area (i.e., backlands available for container storage and other functions that would increase cargo handling efficiency). The increased terminal acreage includes the redevelopment of vacant and underutilized land. The proposed additional container storage areas are consistent with recent controls and limitations implemented by the City of Los Angeles on open storage, including container storage in Wilmington. The increase in acreage, related increased efficiencies in handling of cargo on-site (e.g., new and better cranes), and construction of the new on-dock rail would reduce the amount of time needed to move containers through the TraPac Terminal. Therefore, container storage associated with Alternative 3 would not have direct impacts on surrounding communities.

Although TraPac does not operate any satellite container storage facilities, some shippers utilize off-site container storage facilities and warehouses. These offsite facilities vary in size and are sometimes located in close proximity to residential areas due to the proximity of industrial and residential zoning and land uses in Wilmington. The Port contributes indirectly to the proliferation and use of offsite container storage facilities. LAHD has no authority to regulate the locations of these facilities; however, recent controls and limitations implemented by the City of Los Angeles on container storage in Wilmington apply to these offsite facilities. As stated in Section 3.8.3.8, these regulations place additional controls on existing storage facilities such as setbacks, landscaped buffers, storage and stacking height, and fencing and screening requirements, and also prohibit new container storage yards in some areas zoned Light Industrial or Limited Industrial.

As Alternative 3 is consistent with existing and projected future trends of increased goods movement and trade and because the proposed expansion of backlands for container storage would increase efficiency of container handling, proposed backland expansion would not contribute to the disruption, division, and/or isolation to existing residential neighborhoods or communities.

**CEQA Impact Determination**

As discussed above, Alternative 3 would not disrupt, divide or isolate existing neighborhoods, communities or land uses within the existing proposed Project area. However, this alternative’s contribution to existing violations of unauthorized truck use in Wilmington would be potentially significant.
Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would be required to reduce this alternative’s contribution to the ongoing violation of truck use within Wilmington,

**MM LU-1: Install Truck Route Signage.** Fixed signs directing truck drivers to designated and alternative truck routes shall be installed throughout Wilmington.

**MM LU-2: Truck Traffic Enforcement.** Port Police shall increase enforcement of prohibition against truck traffic within Wilmington.

Residual Impacts

Implementation of Mitigation Measures LU-1 and LU-2 would reduce the potential contribution to existing violations of unauthorized truck use in Wilmington, such that less than significant impacts would occur under CEQA. In addition, live-aboard residents in the Consolidated Slip area could be disturbed by Project-related construction and operation activities. However, the current and proposed future land uses are consistent with property zoning and land use designations. Impacts would be less than significant. The specific impacts associated with proximity of residents to the Pier A rail yard relocation, are also discussed in Section 3.9, Noise.

NEPA Impact Determination

Alternative 3 would include in-water construction activities, which would not be part of the No Federal Action/NEPA Baseline. In-water construction activities would not result in land use changes that would disrupt, divide or isolate an established community. In-water construction and operation activities would be consistent with the current and zoned land uses in the area, and less than significant impacts under NEPA would occur.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation required.

Residual Impacts

Less than significant impact.

Alt 3 – Impact LU-4: Alternative 3 would not cause a secondary impact to surrounding land uses.

Alternative 3 activities associated with truck/rail operations and container storage activities would not significantly impact surrounding communities (see Impact LU-3).

Property Value Trends

Alternative 3 would increase the number of direct, indirect, and induced jobs and income in the region and result in other economic benefits. While the economic impacts are beneficial, the increase in jobs attributable to Alternative 3 would be spread over the
larger economic region (refer to Section 7.3.1). In addition, changes in property value are
dependent on other unrelated factors including interest rates, ease of access as a bedroom
community to employment centers, availability of quality education and historic and
existing zoning practices. Therefore, Alternative 3 would not significantly contribute to
increased property values due to its direct or indirect economic impacts

**CEQA Impact Determination**

As discussed above, Alternative 3 would generate substantial employment opportunities
that would not result in significant secondary impacts on land use, including indirect
impacts on residential property values in surrounding communities. Therefore, impacts
on land use under CEQA would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation required.

**Residual Impacts**

Less than significant impact.

**NEPA Impact Determination**

Alternative 3 would result in a slightly higher employment level compared to the No
Federal Action/NEPA Baseline due to in-water construction activities and increased
throughput operations. However, as employment would be drawn from local sources, no
secondary land use impacts are expected to occur. Less than significant impacts under
NEPA would occur.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation required.

**Residual Impacts**

Less than significant impact.

**3.8.4.3.2.4 Alternative 4 - Omni Terminal**

Alt 4 – Impact LU-1: Alternative 4 would be consistent with the adopted
land use/density designation in the Community Plan, redevelopment
plan or specific plan for the site.

**CEQA Impact Determination**

The Omni Terminal Alternative (Alternative 4) would convert the existing TraPac
Terminal into an omni cargo handling terminal, which is a permitted use within the site’s
existing land use/density designations. Under Alternative 4, roadway improvements,
such as the Harry Bridges Boulevard widening, would occur within the Wilmington-
Harbor City Community Plan area. The Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan designates land use abutted to the proposed Project area as industrial, commercial, and public facilities. Alternative 4 would not conflict with these land use/density designations and would, therefore, result in less than significant impacts under CEQA.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation required.

**Residual Impacts**

Less than significant impact.

**NEPA Impact Determination**

Under this alternative, no development would occur within the in-water proposed Project area (i.e., no dredging, filling of the Northwest Slip or new wharf construction). Therefore, potential impacts are not applicable under NEPA since there would be no federal action under this alternative.

**Mitigation Measures**

Due to No Federal Action, mitigation is not applicable. No mitigation required.

**Residual Impacts**

No impacts.

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

**CEQA Impact Determination**

Under Alternative 4, proposed roadway improvements associated with widening Harry Bridges Boulevard and the buffer area would be consistent with adopted Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan policies. Implementation of mitigation measures **MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-18** would ensure consistency with San Pedro Bay CAAP policies requiring adherence to Project Specific and Source Specific Performance Standards to reduce air pollution from Port operations to acceptable regulatory health risk thresholds. Therefore, Alternative 4 would result in less than significant impacts under CEQA.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation required.

**Residual Impacts**

Less than significant impact.
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**NEPA Impact Determination**

Under this alternative, no development would occur within the in-water proposed Project area (i.e., no dredging, filling of the Northwest Slip or new wharf construction). Therefore, potential impacts are not applicable under NEPA since there would be no federal action under this alternative.

**Mitigation Measures**

Due to No Federal Action, mitigation is not applicable. No mitigation required.

**Residual Impacts**

No impact.

**Alt 4 – Impact LU-3: Alternative 4 would not disrupt, divide, or isolate existing neighborhoods, communities, or land uses.**

**CEQA Impact Determination**

Alternative 4 would construct an omni-terminal at the existing proposed Project site. As this alternative would not construct the new Pier A rail yard, the potential for impacts on live-aboard residents would not occur.

Under Alternative 4, Harry Bridges Boulevard would be modified to straighten it, provide a median and shoulders, which would widen it from 50 feet to 84 feet, which would bring the edge of the roadway up to 20 feet closer to “C” Street and adjacent residential neighborhoods. However, this alternative would also create a buffer area between Harry Bridges Boulevard and “C” Street and would remove the north-south access streets within this area. This would result in isolating Port-related truck traffic away from the residential neighborhood north of “C” Street. Any potential disruption to a neighborhood or community from widening Harry Bridges Boulevard would be reduced by the construction of the new buffer area and removal of the north-south access streets. Roadway improvements associated the buffer area would reduce the occurrences of truck parking in residential neighborhoods. However, as some trucks continue to drive through residential areas in violation of posted prohibition signs, the proposed Project would further exacerbate existing illegal truck use within the Wilmington community. Therefore, the Project’s contribution to existing violations of unauthorized truck use in Wilmington would be potentially significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

The following mitigation measures would be required to reduce the proposed Project’s contribution to the ongoing violation of truck use within Wilmington,

**MM LU-1: Install Truck Route Signage.** Fixed signs directing truck drivers to designated and alternative truck routes shall be installed throughout Wilmington.

**MM LU-2: Truck Traffic Enforcement.** Port Police shall increase enforcement of prohibition against truck traffic within Wilmington.
Residual Impacts

Implementation of Mitigation Measures LU-1 and LU-2 would reduce the potential contribution to existing violations of unauthorized truck use in Wilmington, such that less than significant impacts would occur under CEQA.

NEPA Impact Determination

Under this alternative, no development would occur within the in-water proposed Project area (i.e., no dredging, filling of the Northwest Slip or new wharf construction). Therefore, potential impacts are not applicable under NEPA since there would be no federal action under this alternative.

Mitigation Measures

Due to No Federal Action, mitigation is not applicable. No mitigation required.

Residual Impacts

No impact.

Alt 4 – Impact LU-4: Alternative 4 would not cause a secondary impact to surrounding land uses.

CEQA Impact Determination

Alternative 4 would increase the number of direct, indirect, and induced jobs and income in the region and result in other economic benefits. While the economic impacts are beneficial, the increase in jobs attributable to Alternative 4 would be spread over the larger economic region (refer to Section 7.3.1). In addition, changes in property value are dependent on other unrelated factors including interest rates, ease of access as a bedroom community to employment centers, availability of quality education and historic and existing zoning practices. Therefore, Alternative 4 would not significantly contribute to increased property values due to its direct or indirect economic impacts. Alternative 4 would result in less than significant impacts under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation required.

Residual Impacts

Less than significant impact.

NEPA Impact Determination

Under this alternative, no development would occur within the in-water proposed Project area (i.e., no dredging, filling of the Northwest Slip or new wharf construction). Therefore, potential impacts are not applicable under NEPA since there would be no federal action under this alternative.
Mitigation Measures

Due to No Federal Action, mitigation is not applicable. No mitigation required.

Residual Impacts

No impact.

3.8.4.3.2.4 Alternative 5 – Landside Terminal Improvements

Under the Landside Terminal Improvements Alternative (Alternative 5), no new developments in Harbor waters would occur (e.g., dredging, filling, and wharf reconstruction/upgrades). Backland infrastructure improvements, however would take place, including the Harry Bridges Boulevard widening and buffer area as well as the rail yard relocation. Terminal acreage would increase from 176 acres in 2003 to 190 acres in 2015 and remain at that level through 2038. The increased acreage for infrastructure improvements would be located entirely within Port boundaries and would be well within industrial areas at the Port. The extent of on-land ground disturbances would be somewhat less than the proposed Project. All mitigation measures of the proposed Project, except for mitigations relating to dredging and new cranes, would apply. Because no federal action would occur, NEPA would not apply and no impacts would occur.

Alt 5 – Impact LU-1: Alternative 5 would be consistent with the adopted land use/density designation in the Community Plan, redevelopment plan or specific plan for the site.

CEQA Impact Determination

Alternative 5 would only include the following landside improvements: PHL relocation; new terminal building; gate upgrades/relocation; and construction of the Harry Bridges Buffer Area and associated roadway modifications. As in-water construction activities (i.e., dredging, seismic wharf upgrades, filling the 10-acre Northwest Slip to create additional storage area, or construction of the 400-foot wharf adjacent to the Northwest Slip), Eliminating these features would result in decreased container movement efficiency compared to the proposed Project, but would not affect land uses within the proposed Project area or other adjacent areas. Land use impacts associated with this alternative would be the same as those identified under Impacts LU-1 through LU- 4 for the proposed Project. Alternative 5 would be consistent with the adopted land use/density designation in the Community Plan, redevelopment plan or specific plan for the site.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation required.

Residual Impacts

Less than significant impact.
**NEPA Impact Determination**

Under this alternative, no development would occur within the in-water proposed Project area (i.e., no dredging, filling of the Northwest Slip or new wharf construction). Therefore, potential impacts are not applicable under NEPA since there would be no federal action under this alternative.

**Mitigation Measures**

Due to No Federal Action, mitigation is not applicable. No mitigation required.

**Residual Impacts**

No impact.

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

**CEQA Impact Determination**

Under Alternative 5, proposed roadway improvements associated with widening Harry Bridges Boulevard and the buffer area would be consistent with adopted Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan policies. Implementation of mitigation measures MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-18 would ensure consistency with San Pedro Bay CAAP policies requiring adherence to Project Specific and Source Specific Performance Standards to reduce air pollution from Port operations to acceptable regulatory health risk thresholds. Therefore, Alternative 5 would result in less than significant impacts under CEQA.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation required.

**Residual Impacts**

Less than significant impact.

**NEPA Impact Determination**

Under this alternative, no development would occur within the in-water proposed Project area (i.e., no dredging, filling of the Northwest Slip or new wharf construction). Therefore, potential impacts are not applicable under NEPA since there would be no federal action under this alternative.

**Mitigation Measures**

Due to No Federal Action, mitigation is not applicable. No mitigation required.
Residual Impacts

No impact.

Alt 5 – Impact LU-3: Alternative 5 would not disrupt, divide, or isolate existing neighborhoods, communities, or land uses.

CEQA Impact Determination

Under Alternative 5, Harry Bridges Boulevard would be modified to straighten it, provide a median and shoulders, which would widen it from 50 feet to 84 feet, which would bring the edge of the roadway up to 20 feet closer to “C” Street and adjacent residential neighborhoods. However, this alternative would also create a buffer area between Harry Bridges Boulevard and “C” Street and would remove the north-south access streets within this area. This would result in isolating Port-related truck traffic away from the residential neighborhood north of “C” Street. Any potential disruption to a neighborhood or community from widening Harry Bridges Boulevard would be reduced by the construction of the new buffer area and removal of the north-south access streets. Roadway improvements associated the buffer area would reduce the occurrences of truck parking in residential neighborhoods. However, as some trucks continue to drive through residential areas in violation of posted prohibition signs, the proposed Project would further exacerbate existing illegal truck use within the Wilmington community. Therefore, contribution of Alternative 5 to existing violations of unauthorized truck use in Wilmington would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would be required to reduce the proposed Project’s contribution to the ongoing violation of truck use within Wilmington,

MM LU-1: Install Truck Route Signage. Fixed signs directing truck drivers to designated and alternative truck routes shall be installed throughout Wilmington.

MM LU-2: Truck Traffic Enforcement. Port Police shall increase enforcement of prohibition against truck traffic within Wilmington.

Residual Impacts

Implementation of Mitigation Measures LU-1 and LU-2 would reduce the potential contribution to existing violations of unauthorized truck use in Wilmington, such that less than significant impacts would occur under CEQA.

NEPA Impact Determination

Under this alternative, no development would occur within the in-water proposed Project area (i.e., no dredging, filling of the Northwest Slip or new wharf construction). Therefore, potential impacts are not applicable under NEPA since there would be no federal action under this alternative.
Mitigation Measures
Due to No Federal Action, mitigation is not applicable. No mitigation required.

Residual Impacts
No impact.

Alt 5 – Impact LU-4: Alternative 5 would not cause a secondary impact to surrounding land uses.

CEQA Impact Determination
Alternative 5 would increase the number of direct, indirect, and induced jobs and income in the region and result in other economic benefits. While the economic impacts are beneficial, the increase in jobs attributable to Alternative 5 would be spread over the larger economic region (refer to Section 7.3.1). In addition, changes in property value are dependent on other unrelated factors including interest rates, ease of access as a bedroom community to employment centers, availability of quality education and historic and existing zoning practices. Therefore, Alternative 5 would not significantly contribute to increased property values due to its direct or indirect economic impacts. Impacts would be less than significant impacts under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures
No mitigation required.

Residual Impacts
Less than significant impact.

NEPA Impact Determination
Under this alternative, no development would occur within the in-water proposed Project area (i.e., no dredging, filling of the Northwest Slip or new wharf construction). Therefore, potential impacts are not applicable under NEPA since there would be no federal action under this alternative.

Mitigation Measures
Due to No Federal Action, mitigation is not applicable. No mitigation required.

Residual Impacts
No impact.
3.8.4.3.3 Summary of Impact determinations

The following Table 3.8-1 summarizes the CEQA and NEPA impact determinations of the proposed Project and its Alternatives related to Land Use, as described in the detailed discussion in Sections 3.8.4.3.1 and 3.8.4.3.2. This table is meant to allow easy comparison between the potential impacts of the proposed Project and its Alternatives with respect to this resource. Identified potential impacts may be based on Federal, State, or City of Los Angeles significance criteria, Port criteria, and the scientific judgment of the report preparers.

For each type of potential impact, the table describes the impact, notes the CEQA and NEPA impact determinations, describes any applicable mitigation measures, and notes the residual impacts (i.e.: the impact remaining after mitigation). All impacts, whether significant or not, are included in this table. Note that impact descriptions for each of the Alternatives are the same as for the proposed Project, unless otherwise noted.

3.8.4.4 Mitigation Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>LU-1: Install Truck Route Signage. Fixed signs directing truck drivers to designated and alternative truck routes shall be installed throughout Wilmington.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LU-2: Truck Traffic Enforcement. Port Police shall increase enforcement of prohibition against truck traffic within Wilmington.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Prior to and concurrent with proposed Project construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>The LAHD shall include MM LU-1 and MM LU-2 in the contract specifications for construction. LAHD shall monitor implementation of mitigation measures during construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Parties</td>
<td>LAHD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual Impacts</td>
<td>Less than significant after mitigation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts

All of the proposed alternatives except the No Project Alternative would be consistent with current land uses and designated zoning within the proposed Project area and other adjacent areas. No significant unavoidable impacts to land use from Project-related construction or operation would occur.
### Table 3.8-1: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Land Use Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts*</th>
<th>Impact Determination</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Impacts after Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Project</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU-1: The proposed Project would be consistent with the adopted land use/density designation in the Community Plan, redevelopment plan or specific plan for the site.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant impact  NEPA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td>Mitigation not required</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant impact  NEPA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU-2: The proposed Project would be consistent with the General Plan or adopted environmental goals or policies contained in other applicable plans.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant impact  NEPA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td>Mitigation not required</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant impact  NEPA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU-3: The proposed Project would not disrupt, divide, or isolate existing neighborhoods, communities, or land uses.</td>
<td>CEQA: <strong>Significant</strong> impact  NEPA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td>Mitigation measures LU-1 and LU-2  Mitigation not required</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant impact  NEPA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU-4: The proposed Project would not cause a secondary impact to surrounding land uses.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant impact  NEPA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td>Mitigation not required</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant impact  NEPA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU-1</td>
<td>CEQA: <strong>Significant</strong> impact  NEPA: Not applicable</td>
<td>No feasible mitigation is available.  Mitigation not required</td>
<td>CEQA: <strong>Significant</strong> impact  NEPA: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU-2</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant impact  NEPA: Not applicable</td>
<td>Mitigation not required</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant impact  NEPA: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU-3</td>
<td>CEQA: No impact  NEPA: Not applicable</td>
<td>Mitigation not required</td>
<td>CEQA: No impact  NEPA: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU-4</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant impact  NEPA: Not applicable</td>
<td>Mitigation not required</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant impact  NEPA: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.8-1: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Land Use
Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts*</th>
<th>Impact Determination</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Impacts after Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.8 Land Use (continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU-1</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td>Mitigation not required</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td>Mitigation not required</td>
<td>NEPA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU-2</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td>Mitigation not required</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td>Mitigation not required</td>
<td>NEPA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU-3</td>
<td><strong>CEQA: Significant impact</strong></td>
<td>Mitigation measures LU-1 and LU-2</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td>Mitigation not required</td>
<td>NEPA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU-4</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td>Mitigation not required</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td>Mitigation not required</td>
<td>NEPA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU-1</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td>Mitigation not required</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td>Mitigation not required</td>
<td>NEPA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU-2</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td>Mitigation not required</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td>Mitigation not required</td>
<td>NEPA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU-3</td>
<td><strong>CEQA: Significant impact</strong></td>
<td>Mitigation measures LU-1 and LU-2</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td>Mitigation not required</td>
<td>NEPA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU-4</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td>Mitigation not required</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td>Mitigation not required</td>
<td>NEPA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU-1</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td>Mitigation not required</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA: Not applicable</td>
<td>Mitigation not required</td>
<td>NEPA: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU-2</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td>Mitigation not required</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA: Not applicable</td>
<td>Mitigation not required</td>
<td>NEPA: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.8-1: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Land Use Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts*</th>
<th>Impact Determination</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Impacts after Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.8 Land Use (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4 (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| LU-3        | CEQA: Significant impact  
NEPA: Not applicable | Mitigation measures  
LU-1 and LU-2  
Mitigation not required | CEQA: Less than significant impact  
NEPA: Not applicable |
| LU-4        | CEQA: Less than significant impact  
NEPA: Not applicable | Mitigation not required  
Mitigation not required | CEQA: Less than significant impact  
NEPA: Not applicable |
| Alternative 5 |                         |                      |                     |                         |
| LU-1        | CEQA: Less than significant impact  
NEPA: Not applicable | Mitigation not required  
Mitigation not required | CEQA: Less than significant impact  
NEPA: Not applicable |
| LU-2        | CEQA: Less than significant impact  
NEPA: Not applicable | Mitigation not required  
Mitigation not required | CEQA: Less than significant impact  
NEPA: Not applicable |
| LU-3        | CEQA: Significant impact  
NEPA: Not applicable | Mitigation Measures  
LU-1 and LU-2  
Mitigation not required | CEQA: Less than significant impact  
NEPA: Not applicable |
| LU-4        | CEQA: Less than significant impact  
NEPA: Not applicable | Mitigation not required  
Mitigation not required | CEQA: Less than significant impact  
NEPA: Not applicable |

* Unless otherwise noted, all impact descriptions for each of the Alternatives are the same as those described for the proposed Project.