Carrie Scoville 415 W. Elberon Avenue San Pedro California 90731

July 15, 2008

Commander, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
Los Angeles District c/o Dr. Spencer D. MacNeil
Post Office Box 532711
Los Angeles, CA 90053-2325

Dr. Ralph Appy, Director Environmental Management Division
Los Angeles Harbor Department
425 South Palos Verdes Street
San Pedro, CA 90731

Re: Public Comment
Recirculated Draft EIR – Berth 97-109 Container Terminal Project, April 2008

Dear Drs. MacNeil and Appy,

Since this project is directly adjacent to several residential neighborhoods special considerations need to be taken to make construction and operations impact compatible with residential needs. There is a big difference between terminal expansion on Terminal Island and outlying locations compared expansion activities which should be allowed in the West Basin.

Having lived in the project vicinity prior to and throughout the duration of this project I have the following comments on this Draft EIR:

I am not in favor of this project or any of its proposed alternatives.

Container shipping in this area would be one of the worst uses of this parcel. Container shipping creates the most traffic, the most congestion, and the most impacts upon neighboring communities. Container terminals require sprawling masses of land, the majority of which is used for container/chassis storage which has little use value at a prime waterfront location. Container terminals require on-dock rail which is infeasible for the West Basin. Rail blocks truck gates, streets, and creates noise in the neighboring community which cannot be mitigated. Rail also requires significantly more land in order to assemble trains. This is a slow process, not essential to moving freight from the dock and would be better performed off site. Container terminals are ugly. There is no way to create an aesthetically pleasing parking lot of containers and chassis. Container terminals create an inordinate amount of truck traffic that congests our streets, highways and bridges which were not built for this purpose. Finally, the toxic emissions from the diesel powered vehicles and equipment required for this type of terminal – ships, trucks, trains, etc. should not be allowed anywhere near residential communities.

In short – container terminals need to be located in close proximity to the Alameda Corridor or on Terminal Island. These are the areas best designed to efficiently handle the throughput from this type of operation.
This industrial sprawl needs to be isolated and contained away from communities. The West Basin would be far better served if it were exclusively dedicated to commercial, environmental, marinas, and other recreational uses.

The closest alternative I can see to what I have in mind would be Alternative 7 – non-shipping use retail/office/industrial. Although I do not support this because, again, I do not believe that would be a good use of prime waterfront property.

My first choice for this parcel would be to relocate China Shipping to be adjacent to the Alameda Corridor or on Terminal Island, and REMOVE THE EXISTING LANDFILL AND RESTORE SOUTHWEST SLIP TO ITS PRE-2001 CONDITION.

Second choice would be to relocate China Shipping to be adjacent to the Alameda Corridor or on Terminal Island, remove the cranes and dirt pile, and convert this site to a cruise terminal. The shore-power system would remain for use by the cruise ships. The site could be shared with the Marine Institute currently proposed for the Main Channel.

Comments on the China Shipping EIR distribution process:

1. The Port would have been much better served to “vet” this EIR prior to release to obtain insight on the main project and alternatives that would be more likely to garner support. This would save everyone’s time and a lot of money.

2. This EIR was originally distributed by CD or on the Port’s website only. This was pointed out to be inadequate and was eventually addressed. All EIRs need to be available in hard copy as well since not everyone has a computer, and many of us who do cannot read a document of this length solely on a screen. While the concern for the environment is applauded, not many readers are able to wade through the 6,000 pages on a computer screen. It is also difficult to navigate when each chapter is in a separate file. The Port must make a limited number of hard copies available upon request.

3. The Port needs to consider the length of these EIRs. The primer on port operations, though well written and useful, is not necessary to include in an EIR. Releasing a document of this length, coupled with the reluctance to provide hard copies, can be seen as being calculated to intimidate and deter public comment.

4. The Port has several months and paid staff to develop, write and discuss EIR documents, the public only has 60 days to read and respond to the EIR on a volunteer basis and with no paid staff assistance. The Port should consider a 90 day standard public comment review period to facilitate learned responses to EIR documents.

The sections that follow are a review of the EIR document and a list of project recommendations.
Proposal Description:

1. The new wharfs are designed to fit “the largest ships in the transpacific fleet that would each carry up to 10,000 TEUs” (page 2-20, sec 2.4.2.1).

   Containership designs, like cruise ship designs, are getting larger. Many ships already in service are now well over 10,000 TEUs. What will the Port’s response be when a shipping line wants to bring their newest, largest ship to their shiny new terminal in the inner harbor? How will it fit under the bridge? Where will it be able to dock? How will it be able to navigate the turning basin?

2. Phase II of this facility is for two ships, but “A total of three vessels could be berthed at the terminal at any one time . . .” (page 2-24, sec 2.4.2.7). How can this possibly handle three ships? What would the impact of that be on the turning basin?

   It is strongly recommended to have the third ship anchor at sea or in the outer harbor until a dock is available.

Aesthetics and Visual Resources:

1. The EIR is deficient in identifying the aesthetic impacts of this project in that it only describes the visual impact of additional cranes at the terminal. However, the entire project is dependent upon the 45 acre fill in Southwest Slip constructed in 2001-2003 (concurrent with this project) as part of the Channel Deepening Project. The aesthetic impacts of that fill are excluded from this EIR. Since this China Shipping project includes developing this same fill site for terminal backlands establishing a “footprint”, and it commenced within the same timeframe (2002), I am including its associated environmental impacts in this comment document. To consider the Southwest Slip fill as a separate project would constitute “piecemealing” or project linkage.

   This aesthetic impact is also referenced under Cumulative Impacts.

   The 45 acre fill was created with channel dredgings and fill dirt placed on top to compact and settle the earth. Residents of Knoll Hill and Black Hill formerly had a panoramic waterfront view of the full Southwest Slip and channel. Now it is of this dirt pile, later it will be an overlook of asphalt, cranes, ships, cargo equipment, and stacks of containers and chassis. The project fill was completed in 2003 with the intent of removal of the top portion of earth after two years. It has now been five years and there is still no movement to remove the ugly, weed growing dirt pile. It cannot be understated the aesthetic impact of filling a waterfront view with this horrendous source of visual blight within full view of surrounding residential communities. “Before” and “after” photos of views from the residential neighborhoods in the immediate vicinity are provided below.
2. It should be noted that the July, 2008 photos included here were taken on a Sunday when no ships were at call. Normally there are containers staked 5-high on the asphalt portion above, within direct view of the residences on Black Hill (MacArthur Ave./Shields Drive). They are visible in other photos in this letter. This container storage is also not depicted in the baseline photos from the Shields Drive/ MacArthur locations in the EIR (photo 4/figure 3.1-3b, and photo 16/figure 3.1-3i). This wall of (China Shipping) containers, and the projected
aesthetic impact of the additional 45 acre parking lot of containers to be developed under Phase II and III of this project, needs to be included in the EIR.

3. The entire section of Harbor Boulevard, Front Street, Pacific Avenue and John S. Gibson St. around the project perimeter should be treated as though it is a scenic highway whether or not it is so designated. That would entail abiding by the Scenic Highway Guidelines identified in Table 3.1-1 (page 3.1-69).

Outdoor advertising limitations should apply to both sides of Pacific Avenue, John S. Gibson Boulevard and Front Street along the perimeter of the project area and all billboards should be removed.

All public utilities should be placed underground along this corridor.

4. Furthermore, the hilltop roads of W. Summerland Ave. (400 block), W. MacArthur Ave. (500 block), Shields Drive (500-600 block), and all roads on Knoll Hill should also be designated scenic highways and vistas as they provide close and unobstructed views of the Port and project site. Any development plans for the bluff sides of these streets should not be permitted due to blocking the view and hillside instability.

Public utilities would need to be placed underground at these sites.

Erosion control plantings need to be established as there are numerous sites along Black Hill and Knoll Hill where slide activity has recently occurred. See further discussion under Geology.

5. See additional discussion and photos of track lines under Air Quality and Meteorology. These track lines have occurred on the terminal since the project began and are clearly visible from adjoining residential neighborhoods.

6. For reasons described above, this project has a much more significant negative aesthetic effect than simply the presence of cranes and should be added to the AES-1 category (page 3.1-88) and AES-5 category (page 3.1-98). The “temporary” placement of a 45 acre dirt pile and extensive expansion of container storage facilities within direct sight of residences and the public require remediation.

7. Knoll Hill is the last remaining original hill of San Pedro and historic landmark that itself deserves attention as an attraction, not just as a viewing point. To surround it with stacks of containers, chassis, ships, trucks, rail and cranes creates negative aesthetic impacts of the view of the hill and should be added to the AES-2 category (page 3.1-69) and AES-5 category (page 3.1-98).

8. MM AES-4 (page 3.1-91) discusses Plaza Park as an aesthetic mitigation measure. Plaza Park is nowhere near the project area and not within the viewshed of this project. Aesthetic mitigation is sorely needed in and around the project site itself and should receive priority opportunity.
Air Quality and Meteorology:

1. The Regional Climate and Meteorology describes the specific climate conditions of the project area (page 3.2-2). What is not mentioned here is the influence of the Southwest Slip on the climate. As discussed under Aesthetics and Visual Resources, the Southwest Slip was filled under the auspices of a prior project, the Channel Deepening Project in 2003. Since this China Shipping project is dependent upon the Channel Deepening landfill project, is in the same location, and is being performed concurrently, I am including its associated environmental impacts in this comment document.

   The hills surrounding the project area keep fresh air from circulating, trap the heat and lower humidity levels forming a “microclimate” atmosphere and wind pattern. The basin used to have a water channel that kept the air cool and fresh. Not only does this contributed to warming the area, but the addition of 150 acres of blacktop container storage lots would highly accelerate this situation.

2. AB 2650 limits truck waiting times to no more than 30 minutes (page 3.2-16). As you can see from the photo below, that is not the practice. This photo of the China Shipping backlands was taken in March, 2008 from the Black Hill (Shields Drive) residential area. Trucks routinely sit idling in long lines waiting to get out of the truck gate at the China Shipping terminal. They also wait in long lines on public property to get in. An appointment system must be instituted to prevent the excess emissions, congestion, noise and aesthetic impacts caused by these truck cues.


   Photo: Tom Politeo. Southern Sierra, Sierra Club Angeles Chapter, Vol 64 No. 4, April 2008.

3. The fugitive dust associated with the uncovered 45 acre dirtpile and adjoining construction sites is not being adequately controlled by simply watering. A mass of earth of this size, with temperatures of the area, would just evaporate normal watering systems. The photos below were taken October 5, 2007 from Knoll Hill and show the fugitive dust being blown off the project area, into the channel, and across the China Shipping terminal towards adjacent passenger terminals and the Vincent Thomas Bridge. At other times fugitive dust was witnessed blowing in the opposite direction carrying dust as far as across the Harbor Freeway. It should be noted that there is an uncovered drainage canal along the north edge of the 45 acre dirtpile which is the watershed for the Palos Verdes, Torrance and Lomita area.
Clearly the Mitigation Measure AQ-6 Additional Fugitive Dust Controls (page 3.2-53) is not meeting the standards being set for this project.

These Air Quality and Meteorology impacts are also referenced under Cumulative Impacts.

**Biological Resources:**

1. Impact BIO-4a discusses dredge and fill operations and disruption of local biological communities. Impact BIO-5 discusses permanent loss of marine habitat due to fill in West Basin. The mitigation for both, BIO-1 (page 3.3-30), will provide credits to mitigation banks for this effort with Bolsa Chica as a potential recipient of these credits.

   It is strongly recommended that a) environmental credits not be considered as a mitigation option, and b) environmental credits for POLA projects never be used towards mitigation projects outside the harbor area. The immediate area must be considered first as this will have the highest negative impact of Port projects.

2. Impact BIO-4 and Impact BIO-5 only account for 2.54 acres of landfill for this project. As stated earlier, there is an additional 45 acres of landfill associated with this project that needs remediation.

**Geology:**

1. Impact GEO-5a (page 3.5-25) discusses landslides and mudslides, and reports that since the project area is flat that will not be an issue. In fact, mudslides occur directly across the street from the project area along Black Hill (MacArthur Ave/Shields Drive). These are mainly due to water erosion but they could be exacerbated by vibrations from construction activity or project operations. One such mudslide recently occurred at 957 N. Pacific Avenue causing Paul’s Bait and Tackle to close and move to the 900 block of S. Pacific Avenue.

   Unlike Knoll Hill, Black Hill was made from channel dredgings and is highly unstable.

**Transportation/Circulation:**

1. See discussion under Air Quality and Meteorology regarding AB 2650 compliance and truck cues at the China Shipping terminal.

2. Section 3.6.13.1.5 discusses anticipated transportation improvements (page 3.6-17), the majority of which pertain to the Harbor Freeway. This freeway was not designed or built with the intention of carrying this level and type of traffic. The city of San Pedro is at the end of this freeway and it is our primary access in and out of the peninsula. It would also impede public access to other port facilities such as Ports ’O Call and the cruise terminals. The impact of this project would cause it to have gridlock similar to the I-710 freeway in Long Beach. It is recommended instead to direct truck traffic by other means to the Alameda Corridor.
3. Black Hill and Barton Hill residents are complaining of vibrations from truck traffic on the Harbor Freeway and SR-47 as causing damage to their homes. Cracks are appearing on patios and walls, residents are being shaken at night in their beds.

4. Impact TRANS-5 identified only the grade crossings at Avalon Boulevard and Henry Ford Avenue as being impacted by this project (page 3.6-46). In fact there are several additional grade crossings which cause vehicle delays and need to be included in the project analysis: Harry Bridges and “C” Street, John Gibson and Channel, and Front Street near the Vincent Thomas Bridge.

**Groundwater and Soils:**

1. Soil and Groundwater Investigations identifies nine pressurized oil pipelines buried in a pipeline corridor along Pacific Avenue and Front Street and continuing to the former Chevron Terminal (page 3.7-4). These pipelines must be removed.

2. Table 3.7-1 identifies an Abandoned Underground Diesel Tank at Berth 105 that cannot be located (page 3.7-5). This tank must be located and removed.

3. The section on the Southwest Slip Fill describes the new 45 acre landfill as being comprised of clean sediment so there are “no contamination problems associated with this new landfill” (page 3.7-6). This is highly improbable since the fill was done with channel dredgings and one of the stated purposed of this project was to relocated toxic dredged materials to a fill site (page 3.14-23).

4. As discussed under Aesthetics and Visual Resources, the Southwest Slip was filled under the auspices of a prior project, the Channel Deepening Project in 2003. Since this China Shipping project is dependent upon the Channel Deepening landfill project, is in the same location, and is being performed concurrently, I am including its associated environmental impacts in this comment document. Impacts and Mitigation for the Construction Impacts (page 3.7-11) should also include assessment of this 45 acre site. Likewise, they should be listed under Significant Unavoidable Impacts (page 3.7-90).

**Land Use:**

1. Other Land Uses in the Project Area (page 3.9-3) describes an area as “West Knoll” or MacArthur Avenue Knoll. This is actually Black Hill, which spans from Pacific Avenue to Gaffey Street. The hill was bisected by construction of the Harbor Freeway in the early 1960’s but the community still considers itself one neighborhood. Black Hill has no connection whatsoever with Knoll Hill.

2. The Redevelopment Area section discusses “blight” and adverse economic conditions (page 3.9-4). It cannot be understated the how Port development and operations contributes to the blight of this community. What was once waterfront property now has a view of an ugly “temporary” dirtpile which has been there for five years already. The climate has changed,
fugitive dust is in the air, particulate matter blankets everything, the noise has increased, lost
tractor-trailers enter the neighborhood, and now this is on a 24 hour basis. This affects
property values, health issues, and quality of life issues in the community. The neighboring
vicinity from Knoll Hill to Bandini Street, and the SR-47/Summerland to Miraflores/Shields
Drive also have no community serving facilities as described in this paragraph. There are no
cafés, grocery stores, churches, mailboxes, etc. There is no public transportation service on
Black Hill. All of these services existed on Black Hill prior to construction of the Harbor
Freeway/SR-47. The streets are paved with cracked and buckled concrete stamped “Griffith
Company 1926”.

3. Figure 3.9-2 Zoning Designations depicts the Black Hill/West Knoll area as “low density
residential” or R-1. In fact there are over 10 multi-unit apartment/condominium/cottage
complexes on the Hill east of the Harbor Freeway. There are over 275 families on Black
Hill, with many residences converted to multi-story units with much higher occupancy
capacity.

4. Impact LU-4 (page 3.9-24) asserts that the project would disrupt, divide, or isolate
neighborhoods, communities or land uses. This is false. This project and the related
increases in traffic on the Harbor Freeway and SR-47 do just that to the Black Hill and
nearby neighborhoods. The noise, lights, aesthetics, air quality, and traffic will push
residences further and further away from the project area and these traffic corridors, and
further the divide in our neighborhoods.

5. Impact LU-5 (page 3.9-25) is also incorrect for this issues cited above. The aesthetic and
environmental impacts of this project have an extremely detrimental effect on the
neighboring residential community causing increased dumping, decrease in property values and an assortment of other blight related issues.

6. Mitigation monitoring is reportedly not needed and no significant unavoidable impacts asserted in this EIR (page 3.9-61). This also is incorrect for the reasons stated in this section and need to be addressed.

7. As stated in the opening paragraphs of this document, container shipping in this area would be one of the worst uses of this parcel. Container terminals need to be located in close proximity to the Alameda Corridor or on Terminal Island. These are the areas best designed to efficiently handle the throughput from this type of operation.

Marine Transportation:

1. Vessel operations does not discuss the height of the Vincent Thomas Bridge. Considering there was a recent collision with a ship passing at high tide this need to be addressed.

2. As discussed in the Proposal Description section of this document what will happen when a shipping line wants to bring their newest, largest ship to their newest terminal in the inner harbor? What is the plan for the Vincent Thomas Bridge? When will it be removed?

Noise:

The baseline noise studies conducted in this EIR were done in 2001 and provided the basis for projection. Since that time PierPass was implemented starting 24 hour gate operations and could not have been anticipated or considered in the model.

Noise relating to the recent realignment of the Pacific Harbor line track and installation of the Yang Ming rail spur which both run across the project area is not included in the noise study or considered a factor in this project study. Consequently, the only rail noise reported in this EIR pertains to the grade crossing at Henry Ford Avenue in Wilmington. This is incorrect.

In addition, container operations were being conducted on the project site at the time in support of the Yang Ming terminal overflow. Noise estimates from this operation were also eliminated from the project estimates.

These were not included in the baseline studies or projections, yet the calculations of current and future project throughput is dependent upon these operations being conducted on this project site.

To conduct noise studies in the neighboring community and filter out the noise associated with the 24 hour rail/truck/cargo handling equipment operations in the immediate vicinity is misleading. More recent PCAC noise studies conducted in 2005 at the same locations show these impacts.
For example, when angry, truckers commonly lean on their horns in unison in what is called a “trucker protest” which can last for several minutes. Now that there are 24 hour gate operations this occurs at 11:00 p.m. or later, and is unacceptable. This needs to be corrected.

The Pacific Harbor line realignment and rail spur created for the Yang Ming intermodal facility follow Harbor Boulevard along the perimeter of the project site. These two right of ways were installed in such a way that they follow several turns that are too tight for normal rail operation and create “wheel squeal” at these turns – which you feel in your bones. Each car, and the trains often have 75 or more cars, creates a metal-on-metal scraping as it hits these turns. This goes on all night long and is unacceptable. It is also due to pitch, so no sound barrier will prevent it. This is also a new phenomenon, it has occurred since this project started. This must be corrected.

The impact of the car coupling on the rail spur also occurs all night long. Each time a train starts or stops every car in line makes a loud noise all the way up the chain.

The studies also do not account for the noise of loading and unloading containers in the ships at the China Shipping terminal. These are 24 hour operations and the boom from dropping containers in the cargo holds creates an unacceptable disturbance throughout the night. This must be corrected.

Some of the loudest, most persistent noise comes from the container handling operations in the backlands. Cargo handling equipment alarms beep continuously, horns are used to signal when a chassis is in position to pick up or load a container, and trucks honk all the time. This is adjacent to a residential neighborhood and needs to be ceased at night.

Since this terminal is adjacent to a residential neighborhood the Port needs to reconsider conducting night time operations if it cannot do so in a quiet manner.

Recreation:

Impact REC-2 (page 3.12-6) discusses loss of recreational facilities. It says there will be no significant impact or loss in recreational areas. Every landfill project takes away public access waterways. 43 + 2.5 acres of landfill displaces public access waterways which are recreational areas. People could sail or boat up the Southwest Slip, now it is filled and leased to a private company.

Public access recreation areas in the Main Channel will also be impacted by the new ships at the terminals and the extra barriers required around them for Port Security purposes.

Utilities and Public Services:

Impact PS-1 reports that the project would not increase the demand for addition law enforcement officers. See discussion in the Noise section about the trucker protests. I have had to continually call the Port Police after 10:00 p.m. when truckers lean on their horns in unison while on this project site. This is annoying to the Port Police but is the only avenue available for action.
Water Quality, Sediments and Oceanography:

1. The Clean Water Act identifies “compensation for loss of waters of the U.S.” (page 3.14-26). How does this apply to the 45 + 2.45 acres of landfill associated with this project?

2. Impacts and Mitigation refers to placing dredged contaminated sediments at the Anchorage Road soil storage site (page 3.14-32). This site is also adjacent a residential community, the Wilmington Marina, and needs to be removed. It should not be considered for this project.

3. Impacts WQ-Ib, WQ-IcWQ-3a and WQ-4a are all incorrect as it pertains to the 45+2.45 acres of landfill associated with this project. The fissures in the photo of the uncovered landfill site show the effects of uncontained water erosion. The watershed canal for the Palos Verdes, Torrance and Lomita area runs along the north edge of this dirt pile:

   ![Water Erosion Impacts](image)

Clearly there is no Storm Water Protection Plan that would have the capability to adequately address fugitive dust and storm water runoff associated with a project of this magnitude. It is recommended that this site be covered and removed immediately, and this method of landfill compression not be used again.

Cumulative Analysis:
There are several adjacent and/or overlapping projects happening at or near the China Shipping project timeline which must be considered in this EIR. The success of the China Shipping project is dependent on these additional projects and cannot be separated:

- Channel Deepening Project – 43 acre Southwest Slip landfill created in 2003. Creates “footprint” for China Shipping project and provides essential backlands development opportunity.
- West Basin Intermodal Terminal Expansion (Yang Ming, Berths 121-131) – improved intermodal capabilities of the adjacent railyard, built rail spur around perimeter of China Shipping project area, provided space at China Shipping terminal backlands for Yang Ming container overflow operations, realigned Pacific Harbor Line rail around perimeter of China Shipping project area. (2001?).

The environmental impacts of these projects have a direct relation to the proposed China Shipping project and need to be included in this review.

Current and future projects would include the SR-46 I-110 projects discussed under Traffic, TraPac container terminal project, and any project planned for the West Basin vicinity as they pertain to traffic, noise, land use, and environmental justice issues.

All projects past and current need to be considered as they pertain to air quality, water quality, land use and environmental justice issues.

All aesthetic, air quality/metrology, biological, geological, transportation/circulation, groundwater/soils, land use, marine transportation, noise, recreation, public utilities and water quality mitigation issues raised in this document need to be considered on a cumulative basis as well as no project is on a planet of its own.
Mitigation Recommendations

Allow night construction lighting only during winter months when sun sets early – and only until assigned construction stops for the day. Lights are to be directed towards North and East (waterline), not the hillsides.

Finish sidewalk installation at Pacific Ave and Front Street intersection (photo below):

![Image of Pacific Avenue and Front Street intersection]

Work with the CRA to establish at Pacific Avenue Corridor Mural Program along the corrugated fences and walls of N. Pacific Avenue between Channel St. and Barton Hill (site potential below):
Remove all Billboards on both sides of the 700-900 blocks of N. Pacific Avenue.

Restore the old Sampaguita Restaurant on Front Street to a community serving café. Remove billboard on site.

Purchase properties on the south side of N. Pacific Avenue between Front Street and Channel (700-900 Blocks) for the purposes of creating a hillside “green belt”. This is commercially zoned land at the base of a geographically unstable hillside. The hillside could be stabilized and cliff gardens could be planted, along with pedestrian paths or trails, benches and much needed stairways to the residential area above. This would also deter further development on this unstable hillside, and reduce noise, blight and air pollution, and separate the project area with the Black Hill neighborhood.

Create pedestrian access harbor viewing areas along the hillsides of Black Hill and Knoll Hill. Connect them with the California Coastal Trail.

Continue California Coastal Trail through Harbor Boulevard, Pacific and Knoll Hill/Black Hill.

Retain historical building status for Paul’s Bait and Tackle, Neptune electronics, and Sylvia’s Bail Bonds along N. Pacific Avenue.
Purchase parcels for sale along the I-110 Harbor Freeway north of Channel Street for use as cruise terminal/San Pedro waterfront parking, green belt, community gardens, or nursery space.

Local youth have no summer job opportunities anymore – traditional jobs now are taken by adults. Create an intensive summer jobs internship program for students of San Pedro High School. That will show them local job opportunities, give them practical skills, lower crime rates, and keep them interested in staying in school.

Underground all utilities along both sides of Front Street, Harbor Blvd., N. Pacific Avenue, N. Gaffey, and John S. Gibson.

Underground utilities on Knoll Hill and at the Black Hill (MacArthur Ave/Shields Dr) viewshed.

Create Federal Quiet Zones throughout San Pedro and Wilmington.

Work with LADOT to bring light rail to San Pedro for public transit.

Perform a seismic analysis of the project site and supporting highways.

Provide hillside stabilization for surrounding communities along project site and supporting highways.

Install air monitoring equipment on the project site and in the community.

Conduct Public Health Campaigns: Door-to-door canvassing for air quality, respiratory illness, noise levels, etc.

Construct a water fountain in the Downtown San Pedro community where the air is trapped and get very hot and dry – for example S. Pacific Avenue between 1st and 4th Streets.

Test soil at Harbor Occupational Center and remediate toxins along the Railroad Right of Way, automotive shop, etc. Harbor Occ is on a former Gas Company facility. Test soil, cap, secure and remove any remaining gas pipelines.

Work with LA Planning department to rezone Knoll Hill, Pacific Avenue corridor parks and open space in perpetuity.

Work with LA Planning Department to rezone Black Hill residential/light commercial in perpetuity and retain the public viewshed along MacArthur Ave/Shields Drive. Improving and retaining open space along MacArthur Ave./Shields Drive improves habitat for shore birds as well as raptors.

Goats could be introduced annually to trim grass on Knoll Hill and Black Hill.

Support, legalize and expand the Skate Park at the Channel Street underpass.
Remove the ugly warehouse/distribution facility on Westmont at the Harbor Freeway. Don’t allow further warehouse/distribution facilities in San Pedro or Wilmington to replace a “buffer” between Port and residences. A warehouse does not constitute a green buffer and increases truck traffic into the community.

Restore natural watershed/creek from Green Hills Mortuary/former Navy property to the drainage channel along N. Gaffey.

Support construction of tertiary water treatment plant from County facility in Carson rather than an additional outfall through San Pedro or the Port:
- Direct the clean water flow from the new facility through Canada de Palos Verdes creek from Carson to Machado Lake to upgrade circulation.
- Restore the drainage channel from Machado Lake through to the China Shipping project site at the Southwest Slip. Remove concrete walls and fence along N. Gaffey and replace with more natural terrain. Restoration of canal facilitates biological resources and creates wildlife habitat.

Strengthen the PCAC:
- Conduct a Public Awareness Campaign for PCAC. Assist with branding, brochures, presentations, posters and other outreach materials.
- Provide better website support for ease of access and publicity.
- Post announcements of PCAC meetings and significant events on main POLA website.
- Prominently announce PCAC funded projects. Hold public events for aesthetic and R&D efforts. Include PCAC credits in requests for proposals, require PCAC credit on all project results, when applicable include PCAC credits on all Port publicity documents and events.

Remove Foreign Trade Zone warehouse and distribution facility at 1020 N. MacFarland Ave. in residential Wilmington district.

Support the East Wilmington Open Space Park proposal being considered by the PCAC.

On-site noise deterrent signage is needed. Citations need to be issued to the vehicle/equipment operator as well as the terminal operator for allowing noise violations.

Cover and remove the Anchorage Road soil storage site. It is causing illness to the Wilmington Marina residential community.

Remove the 45 acres of fill in Southwest Slip and restore it to its pre-2001 condition.

Install on site noise, air and vibration monitoring stations. Install same in neighboring communities and long the SR-47/I-110 Freeways.

Turn lighting away from residential areas, streets and highways during construction. Turn all construction lights off when construction activity ceases at prescribed hour.
Have trucks and cargo handling equipment flash their lights at night to signal each other, not use their horns.

Use electric trucks, cranes and cargo handling equipment.

Cite terminal operators for long truck lines and not abiding by an appointment system.

Create an arboreal or light colored canopy over the backlands areas to reduce effects of climate change in region. A minimum of 10% of the property, including the container storage area, should be devoted to landscaping.

Use light pigment asphalt on the terminal backlands to reflect light and heat.

Permanent air quality monitoring stations are needed immediately in the surrounding communities and should be calibrated and monitored by an outside agency. Public health surveys need to be regularly taken of adjacent neighborhoods, schools and community centers.

Install an historic plaque commemorating the former Todd Shipyards along N. Pacific Avenue at berths 103-109.

Implement the employee version of the Clean Truck program to prevent truck cues on Port property and into neighborhoods.

Harbor Freeway/SR-47 interchange:
- Ground stabilization and seismic/noise vibration monitoring stations.
- Permanent noise monitoring stations.
- Soundwall installation.
- Permanent Air Quality monitoring stations at Harbor Freeway at SR 47 interchange.
- Regular reporting of monitoring station results to community at public meetings and through US mail.
- Host regular public meetings for community input.
- Complete brush clearance and planting of all Caltrans property from the Vincent Thomas Bridge through Channel Street. Include underpasses, park-and-ride lot, etc.
- Extensive public outreach campaign within immediate vicinity, with the Central San Pedro Neighborhood Council, and the PCAC regarding any and all improvements.

Purchase vacant properties adjacent to the Harbor Freeway north of Channel St. in Wilmington for use as remote parking or green buffer zones.

Ban the location of any trucking facilities, including repair, sales/leasing, towing or dispatching within 1.5 miles of the project vicinity. Have them located in designated industrial zones only.

Post “No Trucks” signs at access roads to nearby residential neighborhoods (Summerland, Gaffey Place, Miraflores, etc.).
Posted bilingual English/Spanish directional signs to designate truck routes.

Relocate the Kinder Morgan tank farm at Berths 118-120 to Pier 400. Get it away from the West Basin.

Widen the MacArthur overpass on the Harbor Freeway to create a land bridge/park space and reunite Black Hill. A similar park project is under consideration for the Hollywood Freeway.

Use Port Lobbyists to lobby for stronger environmental laws and Federal compliance with MARPOL international treaties. Pressure DOT, MARAD, and the Department of Commerce in favor of environmental compliance.

Improve Bus Shelters around project perimeter and in immediate vicinity.

Work with LA DOT to bring light rail passenger transit to San Pedro.

Remove and relocate West Bain Intermodal Rail facility. It is incompatible with the West Basin.

Complaint Reporting:
- Post a 24 hour phone number to call for lights, noise, dust, etc. issues.
- Provide a 24 hour Port Ombudsman for community complaints and resolution. The Port Police is inadequate and an improper authority for these matters. The Ombudsman should be tasked to resolve and/or report on conflict resolutions to the complainant within 48 hours.

Thank you again for this opportunity to respond to this EIR.

Regards,

Carrie Scoville