Section 3.14
Utilities and Service Systems

SECTION SUMMARY

This section addresses potential impacts on utilities and service systems (water services, wastewater, storm drains, solid waste, electricity, and natural gas) that could result from increasing container-handling capacities at the proposed project site.

Section 3.14, Utilities and Service Systems, provides the following:

- A description of existing utilities serving the Port;
- A discussion on the methodology used to determine whether the proposed Project or an alternative would result in an impact on utilities;
- An impact analysis of both the proposed Project and alternatives; and
- A description of any mitigation measures proposed to reduce any potential impacts, as applicable.

Key Points of Section 3.14:

There is adequate existing water, wastewater, stormwater, and energy infrastructure to service the proposed Project through 2026. Moreover, there is sufficient water supply, wastewater treatment plant capacity, and landfill capacity to accommodate the proposed Project's water demand, wastewater generation, and solid waste generation. No utility infrastructure expansion or upgrades would be required that would result in a significant impact on the environment.

With the implementation of the mitigation measures identified below, potential impacts would be further reduced and impacts would remain less than significant:

- **MM UT-1: Recycling of Construction Materials.** Demolition and/or excess construction materials will be separated on site for reuse/recycling or proper disposal. During grading and construction, separate bins for recycling of construction materials will be provided on site.
- **MM UT-2: Materials with Recycled Content.** Materials with recycled content will be used in project construction where feasible.

In addition to the mitigation provided as part of the utilities analysis within this section, mitigation measures MM GHG-1 and MM GHG-2 would be implemented to reduce energy demand and MM GHG-3 would be implemented to reduce solid waste. Specifically, MM GHG-1 would require the tenant to

perform regular energy audits[1], MM GHG-2 would require installation of LED light bulbs or technology with similar energy savings in all interior buildings, and MM GHG-3 would ensure a minimum of 75% of all waste generated in all terminal buildings is recycled by 2017 to reduce solid waste generation. These mitigation measures are explained in more detail in Section 3.6, Greenhouse Gas Emissions. For additional information regarding the Port's sustainability initiatives, refer to LAHD's *Sustainability Assessment and Plan Formulation* and *Climate Action Plan – Strategies for Municipally-Controlled Sources* (LAHD 2008 and 2007, respectively).

[1] An energy audit typically involves the installation of innovative power-saving technology approximately every five years, where feasible, such as power factor correction systems and lighting power regulators. Such systems help to maximize usable electric current and eliminate wasted electricity, thereby lowering overall electricity use. See the Port of Los Angeles *Sustainability Assessment and Plan Formulation* for additional information (LAHD 2008).

3.14.1 Introduction

This section addresses potential impacts on utilities and service systems (water conveyance and supply, wastewater conveyance, storm drain infrastructure, solid waste disposal, electricity infrastructure, and natural gas conveyance) that could result from increasing container-handling capacities at the proposed project site.

3.14.2 Environmental Setting

3.14.2.1 Water

The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) provides water service to the proposed project area. LADWP is responsible for supplying, treating, and distributing water for domestic, industrial, agricultural, and firefighting purposes within the City, which includes the Port. Water sources utilized by LADWP include local sources, such as wells and recycled water (for non-potable uses), and imported sources, including the Los Angeles Aqueducts and purchases from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD). MWD imports water from the Colorado River via the Colorado River Aqueduct, from northern California via the State Water Project's California Aqueduct, and from various groundwater sources. Water supply and conveyance structures include a series of 114 tanks and reservoirs and a network of pipelines, including 7,221 miles of distribution mains. In Fiscal Year 2010–2011, LADWP supplied 361,666 acre-feet of water for residential uses and 118,636 acre-feet of water for commercial and industrial uses, for a total of 480,302 acre-feet. Through Fiscal Years 2006 to 2010, the yearly average has been 621,700 acre-feet (LADWP 2011).

In a continuing effort to ensure a reliable water supply for future years, LADWP prepared the Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), which was adopted on April 11, 2011 (LADWP 2011). The UWMP is updated every 5 years, as required by the California Water Code (Section 10621a), and is designed to serve as the City master plan for water supply and resources management. This plan provides the basic policy principles that will guide the LADWP decision-making process to secure an adequate sustainable water supply for the entire City area of 464 square miles, including the Port, through the year 2035.

Specific supply-and-demand management strategies are designed to provide a hedge against droughts and variability of surface water. LADWP's UWMP uses a service-area-wide method in developing City water demand projections. This methodology does not rely on individual development demands to determine area-wide growth. Rather, the growth in water use for the entire service area was considered in developing long-term water projections for the City to 2035, including water use by Port tenants. The driving factors for this growth are demographics, weather, and water conservation. Demographic projections for LADWP's service area are based on the 2008 Regional Transportation Plan forecast generated by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG).[2] Total LADWP demand for water is predicted to be 701,200 acre-feet in 2030 and 710,800 acre-feet in 2035. Nonetheless, the LADWP

[2] Chapter 11.4, Water Supply Assessments, of the UWMP is incorporated by reference and is available at LAHD, Environmental Management Division 222 W. 6th Street, Suite 1080, San Pedro, California, and online at: http://www.ladwp.com/ladwp/cms/ladwp014334.pdf

expects a 15% lower water demand trend than what was projected in the 2005 UWMP. LADWP would be able to meet this demand by increasing local water supplies and water conservation from the current 12% to 43% by 2035, reducing its reliance on the purchased MWD water supply by one-half (LADWP 2011).

LADWP requires consultation with applicants for projects that would be completed after 2015 through a Service Advisory Request (SAR) in order to assess whether the current infrastructure (e.g., water lines) would be able to accommodate the increased water demand based on fire flow requirements. If the SAR determines that current infrastructure would not be adequate, LADWP requires that additional infrastructure be constructed at the applicant's expense. This consultation is done once all design plans are complete and typically takes place after the CEQA process has concluded.

Distribution mains are located throughout the proposed project area. Table 3.14-1 provides an estimate of CEQA and NEPA baseline water use at the terminal.

Table 3.14-1: Water Demand at the Terminal

	CEQA Baseline *(2012)*	NEPA Baseline *(2026)*
Office Uses Factor (gpd/1,000 sf)	150	150
Total Office Area (sf)	21,937	21,937
Office Water Demand (gpd)	*3,290*	*3,290*
Industrial Uses Factor (gpd/1,000 sf)	80	80
Total Industrial Area (sf)	28,184	28,184
Industrial Water Demand (gpd)	*2,255*	*2,255*
Other Water Factor [a]	26.64 gpcd[a]	26.64 gpcd[a]
Total Other Unit (employees)	533	751
Other Water Demand (gpd)	*14,199*	*20,007*
Total Water Demand (gpd)	19,744	25,552
Conversion (gal/acre-feet)	325,851.44	325,851.44
Total Water Demand (acre-feet/day)	**0.061**	**0.078**
Total LADWP Water Demand (afy) [b]	**22.26**	**28.47**
LADWP Demand (acre-feet) [c]	621,458	675,604
% of LADWP Demand	**0.00358**	**0.0042**

Source: LADWP 2011.

[a] The City's Bureau of Sanitation's wastewater generation factor of 24 gallons per capita per day for employees was multiplied by 1.11 to account for evaporation, outdoor use/storm drain conveyance, etc. associated with wastewater generation.

[b] The total LADWP water demand associated with the proposed Project does not account for water efficiency requirement ordinance savings that would be applied by LADWP under water conservation commitments

[c] Fiscal Year 2025 water demand was used for the total "LADWP Demand" row (based on the 2010 UWMP) as this is the closest available forecast to the 2026 project horizon year; does not include active water conservation measures; CEQA baseline uses a 2005–2010 average, which is the most recent data available in the UWMP.

afy	acre-feet per year
gal	gallon
gpcd	gallons per capita per day
gpd	gallons per day
sf	square feet

3.14.2.2 Wastewater

The City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation (BOS) provides wastewater treatment and conveyance service for most of the City and numerous jurisdictions or agencies that contract with the City for wastewater conveyance and treatment. The City thus serves as a regional wastewater provider. The BOS maintains sewer lines, force mains, and pump stations throughout the proposed project area. Wastewater is conveyed from the proposed project area to the Terminal Island Water Reclamation Plant (TIWRP), an advanced water treatment facility at 445 Ferry Street, just south of the proposed project site. The facility treats industrial wastewater generated on Terminal Island in addition to wastewater generated in the communities of Wilmington, San Pedro, and areas of Harbor City. The TIWRP provides pretreatment, primary sedimentation, secondary treatment, tertiary treatment (filtration), advanced treatment (microfiltration and reverse osmosis), sludge digestion, and drying. The TIWRP treats all flow received to at least first-stage tertiary levels. A portion of the wastewater influent is further treated in advanced water treatment facilities for reuse in irrigation and industrial water supplies in the Port area. The remaining treated effluent flows to the Outer Harbor at an outfall approximately 3,000 feet offshore via a 60-inch-diameter pipeline. The TIWRP is designed to treat 30 million gallons per day (mgd) with an advanced treatment system that produces high-quality recycled water at 4.5 mgd. Currently, the plant is processing at approximately 60% capacity. The City of Los Angeles projects that, by 2020, wastewater flows in the TIWRP service area will grow to 19.9 mgd; therefore, approximately 10 mgd in daily capacity at TIWRP would remain unused and available for future years (BOS and LADWP 2006).

Data for wastewater generated at the terminal for the CEQA and NEPA baseline is estimated by dividing the estimated baseline water use by a factor of 1.11 to account for evaporation, outdoor use/storm drain conveyance, and other forms of water loss. Table 3.14-2 shows the amount of wastewater generated and the percentage it represents of the TIWRP's capacity.

Table 3.14-2: Wastewater Generation at the Terminal

	CEQA Baseline *(2012)*	NEPA Baseline *(2026)*
Total Wastewater (gpd)[a]	17,787	23,019
Total Wastewater (mgd)	**0.0197**	**0.0256**
Existing Flow at TIWRP (mgd)	17.5	17.5
% of Existing Flow at TIWRP	**0.11**	**0.15**
TIWRP Capacity (mgd)	30.0	30.0
% of TIWRP Capacity	**0.066**	**0.085**

Note:

[a] Water usage projections from Table 3.14-1 are used as the proxy for wastewater generation, because the amount of wastewater used is a function of the amount of water used. Water demand is divided by 1.11 to account for evaporation, outdoor use/storm drain conveyance, etc.

mgd million gallons per day

3.14.2.3 Storm Drainage

Storm drains are located in the proposed project area and maintained by the LAHD, City, and Los Angeles County. Storm drainage on Terminal Island consists of surface runoff catch basins along Seaside Avenue near Navy Way and a 96-inch-diameter outfall line. This system collects the water and discharges it in the East Basin Channel. An additional system runs parallel to Ferry Street near Seaside Avenue and consists of a 78-inch-diameter outfall line. This outfall also terminates at the East Basin Channel, northeast of the Vincent Thomas Bridge. Other storm drain systems include a 78-inch-diameter line along Earle Street and the 48-inch-diameter Terminal Island storm drain (USACE and LAHD 2007). Storm drains within the proposed project vicinity sufficiently accommodate current demands.

Site runoff on the existing terminal is collected via an on-site storm drain system and is directed to the wharf frontage, where it is discharged to the East Basin Channel.

3.14.2.4 Solid Waste

Existing operations at the YTI terminal generate solid waste consisting of nonhazardous materials, such as food and beverage containers, paper products, and other miscellaneous personal trash disposed of by on-site staff, and hazardous materials including oils and greases, paints, and solvents. Solid waste generated by terminal operations complies with federal, state, and local regulations and codes pertaining to nonhazardous and hazardous solid waste disposal, including Chapter VI, Article 6, *Garbage, Refuse Collection* of the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code, Part 13, Title 42, *Public Health and Welfare* of the California Health and Safety Code, and Chapter 39 of the U.S. Solid Waste Disposal Code.

The BOS, in general, and Browning Ferris Industries (a private waste management service) provide solid waste collection and disposal services for the Port. Port tenants, however, usually contract with private waste haulers for solid waste disposal. YTI uses Asbury Environmental Services of Compton, CA and Safety-Kleen Systems, Inc. of Santa Ana, CA for transporting hazardous and nonhazardous waste from the terminal. In 2012, two additional companies, Siemens Industry, Inc. of Los Angeles, CA and Demenno-Kerdoon of Compton, CA, provided disposal services of hazardous and nonhazardous waste.

Nonhazardous solid waste generated at the proposed project site is disposed of at the Sunshine Canyon Landfill or Chiquita Canyon Sanitary Landfill, depending on daily capacities and hours of operation. Hazardous waste or contaminated soil may be disposed of at the Clean Harbor Buttonwillow Landfill or the Kettleman Hills facility. These and other solid waste disposal facilities that could be used during construction and/or operation of the proposed Project or alternative are described below. Los Angeles County Ordinance 7A prohibits solid waste from the City from being handled by or disposed of in facilities and landfills operated by the Los Angeles County Sanitation District.

Sunshine Canyon Landfill (Sunshine Canyon) is located at 14747 San Fernando Road in Sylmar, CA, approximately 50 miles from the proposed project site. Sunshine Canyon is owned and operated by BFI, and has a maximum permitted throughput of 12,100 tons per day, a remaining capacity of 112,300,000 cubic yards, and an operation cease date of

December 31, 2037 (CalRecycle 2013). The waste types accepted at this facility include construction and demolition debris, green materials, industrial, inert, and mixed municipal.

Chiquita Canyon Sanitary Landfill (Chiquita Canyon) is located at 29201 Henry Mayo Drive in Castaic, CA, approximately 65 miles from the proposed project site. This facility is owned and operated by Chiquita Canyon, Inc., and has a maximum permitted throughput of 6,000 tons per day. The remaining capacity was approximately 8,390,000 cubic yards as of December 2010, and has an estimated closure date of 2019 (LACDPW 2013). The waste types accepted at this facility include mixed municipal, green materials, construction and demolition debris, industrial, and inert.

Clean Harbors Buttonwillow Landfill (Buttonwillow) is located at 2500 West Lokern Road in Buttonwillow, CA, approximately 165 miles from the proposed project site (approximately 36 miles west of Bakersfield). This facility has a maximum permitted throughput of 10,482 tons per day with a maximum capacity of 14,293,760 cy, a current constructed capacity of 950,000 cy, and an estimated closure date of 2040 (CalRecycle 2013; Clean Harbors 2008). The waste types accepted at this facility (classified as Class I) include contaminated soil, industrial, other designated, and other hazardous.

Another Class I facility that could be used for disposal of hazardous waste is the Kettleman Hills facility. Kettleman Hills is a Class I and II facility located at 35251 Old Skyline Roads in Kettleman City, CA, approximately 200 miles from the proposed project site. This facility has a maximum permitted throughput of 10,700,000 cy with 1,500,000 cy of capacity remaining (CIWMB/CalRecycle 2013). The facility does not have an estimated closure date. The waste types accepted at this facility (classified as Class I) include contaminated soils and industrial.

Two transfer stations serve the Port: the Falcon Refuse Center in the Wilmington Community and the Southeast Resource Recovery Facility in the City of Long Beach. The Falcon Refuse Center is operated by Allied Waste Transfer Services of California and receives an average of 1,850 tons per day. The permitted capacity of this facility is 3,500 tons per day. The center accepts solid waste from construction and demolition activities, as well as industrial and mixed municipal sources (CalRecycle 2013). The Southeast Resource Recovery Facility is in the City of Long Beach, west of the Terminal Island Freeway, just north of Ocean Boulevard at 120 Pier S Avenue. The facility is owned by a separate authority created by a joint powers agreement between the Sanitation Districts and the City of Long Beach, but is operated under contract by a private company. The site is not open to the public and only pre-approved and pre-registered licensed waste haulers may use the facility. The facility accepts only nonhazardous municipal solid waste. Currently the maximum daily permitted tonnage is 1,380 tons per day. The average daily tonnage being accepted is 1,290 tons per day (LACSD 2011, 2012). In a recent year, the Port disposed of approximately 12,000 tons of waste and diverted 22,000 tons, achieving a diversion rate of approximately 65%. The waste reduction and recycling assessments from 2009 to 2010 showed that the tenants audited disposed of approximately 23,000 tons and diverted approximately 56,000 tons, for a diversion rate of approximately 71% (Garrett pers. comm. 2012). Currently, the city has a recycle diversion rate of 76.4% and a goal of 90% by 2025 (Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation 2013).

LAHD's Construction and Maintenance Division recycles asphalt and concrete demolition debris by crushing and stockpiling the crushed material to use on other Port projects. Additionally, LAHD recycles and diverts ferrous metals and inert materials. LAHD's diversion rates vary from year to year largely due to fluctuations in construction project waste, which is heavily recycled. Data from a recent year shows that LAHD's diversion rate for construction and development has been as high as 99.1%, or 60,166 tons (Garrett pers. comm. 2012). The combined waste diversion from Port programs and construction is 96.3% (Garrett pers. comm. 2012). The following programs are implemented by LAHD to assist in waste diversion:

- Duplex Printing and Photocopying;
- Wood Waste Diversion Program;
- Green Waste Recycling Program;
- Administrative Office Recycling Program;
- Toner Cartridge Recycling;
- Ferrous Metals Recovery Program;
- Inerts Recycling Program;
- Motor Oil Recycling Program;
- Tire Recycling Program;
- Office Paper Recycling;
- Cardboard Recycling Program;
- Scrap Metal Reuse;
- Beverage Container Recycling;
- Fish Sludge Recovery;
- Wood Waste Collection Program;
- Nonfood Donation; and
- Office Furniture Source Reduction.

Solid waste data generated at the terminal was provided by YTI and represents the total solid waste hauled from the terminal during 2012. The 2026 NEPA baseline is projected based on the projected activity that would occur from increased throughput at the terminal over time associated with the No Federal Action Alternative. Table 3.14-3 shows the amount of waste in 2012 and that projected in 2026 for the NEPA baseline, as well as the relative percentage of Chiquita Canyon's and Sunshine Canyon's permitted throughput.

Table 3.14-3: Solid Waste Generation at the Terminal

	CEQA Baseline *(2012)*	NEPA Baseline *(2026)*
Employees	533[b]	751
Generation Factor (pounds per employee per day) [a]	0.43	0.43
Total Solid Waste (pounds/day)	228[b]	323
Total Solid Waste (tons/day)	**0.114**	**0.1615**
Chiquita Canyon Landfill Permitted Throughput (tons/day)	6,000	6,000
% Chiquita Canyon Landfill Permitted Throughput	0.0019	0.0027
Sunshine Canyon Landfill Permitted Throughput (tons/day)	12,100	12,100
% Sunshine Canyon Landfill Permitted Throughput	0.00094	0.0013

Source: Port of Los Angeles 2010; LACSD 2007; Hansen pers. comm. 2013.

Notes:

[a] Generation factor was determined based on actual employees divided by actual solid waste generated at the proposed project site; the resulting ratio was then applied to the future scenarios.

[b] Data provided by YTI.

The percentages for each landfill represent a worst-case scenario, where all of the waste generated by the proposed Project or alternative would go to a single landfill. However, it is more likely that solid waste would be disposed of at more than one landfill and a portion would be diverted from landfills.

3.14.2.5 Electrical Service

LADWP provides electrical services to the Port and the proposed project area and has adequate generation to serve the current customer load. LADWP has produced its *Integrated Resources Plan* (IRP), which anticipates load growth and includes plans for new generating capacity or demand-side management programs to meet load requirements for future customers. The growth in annual peak demand over the next 20 years is estimated to be about 1.3%, or approximately 100 megawatts (MW) per year. Currently, LADWP has a total generating capacity of about 7,197 MW per day to serve a peak Los Angeles demand of about 6,142 MW (LADWP 2012).

The industrial power station closest to the Port has four main 138-kilovolt (kV) supply lines, two from the Harbor Generating Station and two from North Wilmington. A 34.5-kV line connects with the steam plant generator, and underwater circuits from San Pedro (a 4.8-kV line) and Wilmington (a 34.5-kV line) cross to Terminal Island. Several other electrical power cables are distributed throughout the Harbor area, including power lines within the proposed project area. The proposed project site's facilities are designed to step down the incoming voltage from 34.5 kV (incoming power) to lower voltages for the cranes and general terminal uses, such as lights and buildings. In addition, Alternative Maritime Power (AMP) has been installed on site and is currently in use at Berths 214–216. Additional AMP is currently being installed and will be available for use at Berths 212–213 and 214–216 by the end of calendar year 2013. AMP will be available at Berths 217–220 by the time the berth becomes operational in 2016. Fourteen ship calls used AMP during calendar year 2012.

In 2012, the terminal's electricity use from seven feeds included 3,160 kilowatt-hours (kWh) for area lighting; 3,820,800 kWh for cranes; 9,664,800 kWh for refrigerated storage, buildings, and yard lights; 1,047,680 kWh between 2 feeds for TICTF storage area lighting, loading area lighting, and air; and 1,218,000 kWh for crane maintenance warehouse and the machine shop. In all, the electricity used in 2012 amounted to 15,754,440 kWh.

3.14.2.6 Natural Gas Service

The Southern California Gas Company (SCGC) provides natural gas in the proposed project area. As a public utility, SCGC is under the jurisdiction of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) and can be affected by actions of federal regulatory agencies. The gas demand projections for Southern California are determined in large part by the long-term economic outlook for SCGC's service territory. As of mid-2012, Southern California's economy is slowly climbing out of its most severe slump since the 1930s. Demand is expected to be virtually flat for the next 21 years because of modest economic growth, CPUC mandated demand-side management and renewable electricity goals, decline in commercial and industrial demand, continued increased use of non-utility pipeline systems by enhanced oil recovery customers, and savings linked to advanced metering modules. The 2012 California Gas Report estimates the total annual gas supply taken by SCGC to be 2,673 million cubic feet per day (MMcf/day) in 2012, 2,615 MMcf/day in 2015 and 2,599 MMcf/day in 2025. The report predicts the total capacity available to SCGC to remain constant at 3,875 MMcf/day through 2030 (California Gas and Electric Utilities 2012). The most recent annual data (2012) available for the project site shows that approximately 331 hundred cubic feet[3] of natural gas were consumed on site, which converts to approximately 0.0331 MMcf, or 0.00124% of the gas supplied in 2012.

3.14.3 Applicable Regulations

The only regulations that apply to utilities are state and local regulations. There are no applicable federal regulations.

3.14.3.1 State Regulations

California Urban Water Management Act

The California Urban Water Management Planning Act requires urban water suppliers to initiate planning strategies that make every effort to ensure that the level of reliability in their water services is sufficient to meet the needs of their various categories of customers during normal, dry, and multiple dry-water years. This act also requires water suppliers to develop water management plans every five years. The LADWP would be the water supplier and, as such, the proposed Project or alternative would be under the jurisdiction of the current UWMP, pursuant to the California Urban Water Management Planning Act.

[3] Converted from 3,124 therms; information provided by YTI and represents total natural gas consumed in 2012.

Senate Bill 610 Water Supply Assessment

Senate Bill (SB) 610 (Chapter 643, Statutes of 2001) amended state law, effective January 1, 2002, to improve the link between information on water supply availability and certain land use decisions made by cities and counties. SB 610 seeks to promote more collaborative planning between local water suppliers and cities and counties. The statute requires detailed information regarding water availability to be provided to the city and county decision-makers prior to approval of specified large development projects. The statute also requires this detailed information be included in the administrative record that serves as the evidentiary basis for an approval action by the city or county on such projects. The measure recognizes local control and decision-making regarding the availability of water for projects and the approval of projects.

Under SB 610, water assessments must be furnished to local governments for inclusion in any environmental documentation for certain projects (as defined in Water Code 10912[a]) subject to CEQA. Per California Water Code Section 10912[a], a "project" means any of the following:

- A proposed residential development of more than 500 dwelling units.
- A proposed shopping center or business establishment employing more than 1,000 persons or having more than 500,000 square feet of floor space.
- A proposed commercial office building employing more than 1,000 persons or having more than 250,000 square feet of floor space.
- A proposed hotel or motel, or both, having more than 500 rooms.
- A proposed industrial, manufacturing, or processing plant, or industrial park planned to house more than 1,000 persons, occupying more than 40 acres of land, or having more than 650,000 square feet of floor area.
- A mixed-use project that includes one or more of the projects specified in this subdivision.
- A project that would demand an amount of water equivalent to, or greater than, the amount of water required by a 500-dwelling-unit project (approximately 127,650 gpd[4]).

California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act

The California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991 (AB 1327) was enacted on October 11, 1991 and added Chapter 18 to Part 3 of Division 30 of the Public Resources Code. It required each jurisdiction to adopt an ordinance by September 1, 1994, requiring any "development project" for which an application for a building permit is submitted to provide an adequate storage area for collection and removal of recyclable materials. AB 1327 regulations govern the transfer, receipt, storage, and loading of recyclable materials at the Port.

[4] Based on the wastewater generation rates from the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* for three-bedroom duplex/townhome/single-family residential (230 gallons per day), factored at 111% of the wastewater generation rate.

California Integrated Waste Management Act

The State of California requires that all jurisdictions achieve compliance with AB 939 (Public Resources Code Sections 40000 et seq.), a state mandate that requires reaching 50% diversion of solid waste from landfills by 2000. AB 939 further requires each city to conduct a Solid Waste Generation Study and to annually prepare a Source Reduction and Recycling Element to describe how it will reach its goals. AB 939 was designed to focus on source reduction, recycling and composting, and environmentally safe landfilling and transformation activities. This act required cities and counties to divert 25% of all solid waste from landfills and transformation facilities by 1995, and 50% by 2000. The City of Los Angeles met and exceeded the year 2000 goals; in 2011, the City's diversion rate was 72% (BOS 2013).

California Building Code CCR, Title 24, Part 6

Title 24, Part 6 of the California Building Code describes the California energy efficiently standards for residential and nonresidential buildings. These standards were established in 1978 in response to a legislative mandate to reduce California's energy consumption and have been updated periodically to include new energy efficiency technologies and methods. Title 24 requires building according to energy efficient standards for all new construction, including new buildings, additions, alterations, and, in nonresidential buildings, repairs.

3.14.3.2 Local Regulations

LADWP Urban Water Management Plan

Consistent with the California Urban Water Management Planning Act, LADWP has prepared a UWMP to describe how water resources are used and to present strategies that will be used to meet the City's current and future water needs. To meet the objectives of the California Urban Water Management Planning Act, the LADWP UWMP focuses primarily on water supply reliability and water use efficiency measures. The California Urban Water Management Planning Act requires water suppliers to develop water management plans every five years. LADWP most recently completed this five-year update in 2010. This plan, the *2010 Urban Water Management Plan*, was completed as an update to the previous 2005 UWMP. LADWP also published annual fiscal year updates in the 2010 UWMP. The plan projects water demand and supplies through 2035; total demand for water is predicted to be 675,604 acre-feet in 2025 and 710,760 acre-feet in 2035 with passive water conservation, and 632,275 acre-feet in 2025 and 641,622 acre-feet in 2035 with passive and active water conservation. LADWP expects it will be able meet this demand with a combination of existing supplies, planned supplies, and MWD purchases (existing and planned) (LADWP 2011).

City of Los Angeles Emergency Water Conservation Plan (Ordinance No. 181288)

This ordinance was adopted in August 2010 and amended Chapter XII, Article I of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) to clarify prohibited uses and modify certain water conservation requirements of the City of Los Angeles Emergency Water Conservation Plan (City of Los Angeles 2010). The purpose of the ordinance is to minimize the effect of a water shortage on the customers of the City of Los Angeles and to adopt provisions that will significantly reduce water consumption over an extended

period of time. The revised Water Conservation Ordinance contains five water conservation "phases," which correspond to severity of water shortage, with each increase in phase requiring more stringent conservation measures. Phase II is currently in effect. Water conservation phases define outdoor watering restrictions, as appropriate, including sprinkler use restrictions and other prohibited water uses.

Wastewater Facilities Plan/ Water Integrated Resources Plan

The City prepares a wastewater facilities plan approximately every 10 years to review the existing wastewater treatment system, project future wastewater service demands, and identify various facility improvements to meet future demands. Future wastewater demand projections are based, in part, on SCAG population projections.

The BOS and LADWP prepared the Water Integrated Resources Plan (Water IRP) for the wastewater program. Flows generated in the Port are conveyed to the TIWRP. The Water IRP estimates that by 2020, wastewater flows within the TIWRP service area will grow to 19.9 mgd from their current flows of approximately 17.5 mgd (BOS and LADWP 2006). With the capacity of the TIWRP at 30 mgd, approximately 10 mgd in daily capacity at TIWRP would remain unused by 2020. The projected wastewater flow level increase from 16.2 mgd to 19.9 mgd over a 14-year period (2006 to 2020) is equivalent to an annual increase in wastewater generation in the TIWRP of approximately 0.264 mgd. Applying this growth percentage to estimate future flows in the service area beyond the 2020 planning horizon in the Water IRP shows that, in 2026, service area wastewater flows could reach 21.5 mgd, which is below TIWRP capacity.

City of Los Angeles Low Impact Development Ordinance (Ordinance 181899)

The Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinance became effective in November 2011 and amends and expands on the existing Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan requirements (which have been in effect since 2002) by incorporating LID practices and principles and expanding the applicable development categories. This ordinance requires all development/redevelopment to capture and manage 100% of the first 0.75-inch storm event on site. This may be achieved by implementing on-site infiltration, capture and use, and bio-filtration/bio-treatment BMPs to the maximum extent feasible. The concept of LID is consistent with the recommendations and strategies identified in the IRP, Water Quality Compliance Master Plan, all of the City's watershed-specific total maximum daily load Implementation Plans, LADWP's Water Supply Action Plan, and the Los Angeles River Revitalization Plan. The Ordinance includes off-site mitigation as a potential alternative to achieve compliance. LID requirements became operative in May 2012, 180 days after adoption.

City of Los Angeles Solid Waste Management Policy Plan

The City of Los Angeles Solid Waste Management Policy Plan is a long-term planning document adopted by the City Council in November 1994 containing goals, objectives, and policies for solid waste management for the City. It specifies Citywide diversion goals and disposal capacity needs. The mandate was enacted to encourage reduction, recycling, and reuse of solid waste generated in the state to preserve landfill capacity, conserve water, energy, and other natural resources, and to protect the state's environment (City of Los Angeles 2006).

Recovering Energy, Natural Resources, and Economic Benefit from Waste for Los Angeles Plan

The City has initiated the Recovering Energy, Natural Resources, and Economic Benefit from Waste for Los Angeles Plan (RENEW LA Plan) as a guide for solid waste and resource management in the future (City of Los Angeles 2005). The RENEW LA Plan is a comprehensive plan for the recovery and beneficial use of materials currently being disposed of in landfills. The key goal of the RENEW LA Plan is creation of a new system of resource management based on the concept of "zero waste." The goal of zero waste as defined in the Plan is to reduce, reuse, recycle, or convert the resources now going to disposal to achieve an overall diversion level of 90% or more by 2025 and to leave for disposal only a small amount of inert residual material (City of Los Angeles 2005). The Plan not only puts forth the vision of where the City wants to be in 2025 but also provides a guiding "blueprint" of how to get there. The blueprint highlights milestones, facility development, and key actions to be accomplished during four 5-year time periods: 2005 to 2010, 2010 to 2015, 2015 to 2020, and 2020 to 2025. Actions will be required in technology and programs, policy, and education. The Solid Waste Integrated Resources Plan, currently in its final stages of preparation, builds on the RENEW LA Plan.

Solid Waste Integrated Resources Plan

Consistent with the RENEW LA Plan, the City is developing the Solid Waste Integrated Resources Plan (SWIRP), which will serve as the 20-year master plan for City solid waste and recycling programs (City of Los Angeles 2009). The SWIRP will outline City objectives to provide sustainability, resource conservation, source reduction, recycling, renewable energy, maximum material recovery, and public health and environmental protection for solid waste management planning through 2025—leading Los Angeles toward being a "zero waste" city. Achieving zero waste will require radical changes in three areas: product creation (manufacturing and packaging), product use (use of sustainable and recyclable products), and product disposal (resource recovery or landfilling). Stakeholders will be instrumental in guiding this visionary 20-year solid waste management plan. This plan will seek input from stakeholders representing a broad section of the community, from diverse cultural backgrounds and income levels, and will result in the development and implementation of a 20-year master plan for the City's solid waste and recycling programs.

LADWP Power Integrated Resources Plan

Under the Los Angeles City Charter (Sections 220 and 673), LADWP has the power and duty to construct, operate, maintain, extend, manage, and control water and electric works and property for the benefit of the City and its habitats. As a consequence, LADWP is charged with maintaining sufficient capability to provide its customers with a reliable supply of power. The goal of the Power Integrated Resources Plan (Power IRP) is to identify a portfolio of generation resources and Power System assets that meets the City's future energy needs at the lowest cost and risk consistent with LADWP's environmental priorities and reliability standards (LADWP 2012). LADWP has issued the 2012 Final Draft Power IRP, which provides forecasts and a 20-year framework to ensure that current and future energy needs of the City can be met over the next 20 years (LADWP 2012). This 2012 Power IRP document revises and builds upon last year's 2011 Power IRP. Major changes from 2011 include expanded discussion regarding the Power Reliability Program, more detailed information on transmission planning and

projects, a new subsection on the impacts of climate change on power system operations, and new case options that analyze higher levels of energy efficiency and solar distributed generation.

In 2002, SB 1078 (Public Utilities Code Chapter 2.3 Section 387, 390.1, and 399.25) implemented a Renewable Portfolio Standard, which established a goal that 20% of the energy sold to customers be generated by renewable resources by 2017. The goal was accelerated in 2006 under SB 107 and expanded in 2011 under SB 2, which requires investor-owned utilities, electric service providers, and community choice aggregators to increase procurement from eligible renewable energy resources to 33% of total procurement by 2020. The Power IRP provides objectives and recommendations to reliably supply LADWP customers with power and to meet the 33% renewable energy goal by 2020.

LADWP's Load Forecast incorporates updates to reflect the latest load forecast, fuel price and projected renewable price forecasts, and other numerous modeling assumptions. Compared to the prior 2011 forecast, projected electricity sales in calendar year 2020 decreased by 5.3%, mostly due to increased levels of energy efficiency. Long-term natural gas price forecasts have been revised downwards from last year with prices reaching very low levels over the last year. Compared to last year's 2011 Power IRP, Opal and SCGC expected gas prices are 16% lower on average in the short term (2011 to 2020) and 8% to 9% lower on average in the long term (2021 to 2030). Coal price forecasts are also lower; with Intermountain Power Project coal at 4% lower for the period from 2012 to 2027, and Navajo coal at 14% lower for the period from 2012 to 2019.

Industrial Waste Control Ordinance

The Industrial Waste Management Division of the BOS was established to protect the local receiving waters by regulating industrial wastewater discharge to the City's sewer system and by administering and enforcing the Industrial Waste Control Ordinance (Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 64.30) as well as federal EPA pretreatment regulations.

Industrial facilities and certain commercial facilities that plan to discharge industrial wastewater to the City's sewage collection and treatment system are required to first obtain an industrial wastewater permit. Permits are issued when a determination has been made by the Board of Public Works for the City of Los Angeles that the wastewater to be discharged will not violate any provisions of the ordinance, the Board's Rules and Regulations, the water quality objectives for receiving waters established by the California Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, or applicable federal or state statutes, rules, or regulations.

Port of Los Angeles Sustainability Assessment and Plan Formation

In June 2008, the LAHD published the Sustainability Assessment and Plan Formation in response to the Mayoral Executive Directive No. 10, "Sustainable Practices in the City of Los Angeles," adopted in June 2007. "This directive sets forth his vision to transform Los Angeles into the most sustainable large city in the country and includes goals in the areas of energy and water, procurement, contracting, waste diversion, non-toxic product selection, air quality, training, and public outreach" (LAHD 2008). The 2011 Annual Sustainability Report includes scorecards that provide a qualitative measure of the progress the LAHD has made to address the Port's material issues related to

sustainability and implementation of the various sustainability-related programs and policies. As indicated by the scorecards, the Port is leading the industry in many aspects of sustainability, including health risk reduction, habitat protection, open space and urban greening, and green growth. A more comprehensive approach to Port sustainability planning is currently underway.

Port Leasing Policy

The Port Leasing Policy requires that all new leases include applicable Port environmental requirements including, but not limited to: air emission controls; water, stormwater and sediment quality; trash management and recycling; lighting and noise control and facility appearance; hazardous material management requirements; facility restoration and decommissioning requirements; and CEQA mitigation measures and reporting requirements.

CalGreen

CalGreen is a statewide mandatory green building code all cities in California were required to adopt by January 1, 2011. CalGreen requires new standards in materials reuse, locally sourced materials, water/energy efficiency, and indoor air quality. To meet CalGreen requirements, the City of Los Angeles adopted the Green Building Standards Code (LA Green Code), which establishes mandatory sustainable design standards. All new buildings are required to meet this new code, and additions/expansions valued at over $200,000 are also subject to the LA Green Code.

3.14.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

3.14.4.1 Methodology

Assessment of the proposed Project and each alternative's impacts on utilities (water, wastewater, storm drainage, and solid waste) and energy providers (electricity and natural gas) varies depending on the utility; however, the evaluations generally include a comparison of the project-generated demand against existing and anticipated resource supplies and/or conveyance capacity. Quantifications of demands and generations were included based on factors provided by the applicable agencies.

Water Supply

Water supply or conveyance impacts are typically evaluated by estimating water consumption factors associated with the proposed project, or alternative, site land use(s) or, for nonresidential development, unit demand factors per acre or gross square footage, as established by the City. LADWP maintains water consumption factors of 150 gpd per 1,000 square feet (sf) of office use space and 80 gpd per 1,000 sf of industrial use space (City of Los Angeles 2006). The office and industrial areas were determined using the total square footage of the various buildings described in Chapter 2 (Project Description). Table 3.14-4 shows the water demand and the percentage of water supply this demand represents under baseline, proposed Project, and alternative conditions. The projected demand was determined using the applicable LADWP and Department of Public Works factors and the estimated throughput. As shown in Table 3.14-4 below, it is anticipated that LADWP would be able to meet the demands of the proposed Project or alternatives through 2026.

Wastewater

Assessment of impacts on sewers or wastewater treatment systems generally includes a comparison of the proposed Project/alternative-related land use-based wastewater flow generation to the existing and projected wastewater treatment capacity of the TIWRP, which is 30 mgd. Wastewater generation is a function of water use, which is typically slightly less than or equal to water use because water use in facilities flows from internal devices to internal drains that connect with the sewer system. For purposes of this evaluation, water usage projections from Table 3.14-4 are used as the proxy for wastewater generation, because the amount of wastewater generated is a function of the amount of water used. Water demand is divided by 1.11 to account for evaporation, outdoor use/storm drain conveyance, and other forms of water loss. The impact analysis also projects water use based on the wastewater generation for each alternative, as well as the percentage that the generation amounts would contribute to the existing flow and future flow at the TIWRP (see Table 3.14-5).

Storm Drainage Facilities

Assessment of impacts on the storm drain system is based primarily on the determination of the contribution of the proposed Project or an alternative to stormwater runoff compared to baseline conditions, or the diversion or disruption of surface water flows such that flooding would occur.

Solid Waste

Impacts related to solid waste generally involve the estimation of the Project/alternative-related, land use-based, solid waste generation compared to the capacity of the landfill(s) serving the proposed project area. Quantification of solid waste generation was based on actual terminal solid waste data from 2012 and extrapolated for future years (see Table 3.14-6).

Table 3.14-4: Baseline and Future Water Demand at the Terminal under Proposed Project and Alternative Scenarios

	CEQA Baseline (*2012*)	NEPA Baseline *(2026)*	Proposed Project *(2026)*	Alternative 1 *(2026)*	Alternative 2 *(2026)*	Alternative 3 *(2026)*
Office Uses Factor (gpd/1,000 sf)	150	150	150	150	150	150
Total Office Area (sf)	21,937	21,937	21,937	21,937	21,937	21,937
Office Water Demand (gpd)	*3,290*	*3,290*	*3,290*	*3,290*	*3,290*	*3,290*
Industrial Uses Factor (gpd/1,000 sf)	80	80	80	80	80	80
Total Industrial Area (sf)	28,184	28,184	28,184	28,184	28,184	28,184
Industrial Water Demand (gpd)	*2,255*	*2,255*	*2,255*	*2,255*	*2,255*	*2,255*
Other Water Factor [a]	26.64 gpcd[a]	26.64 gpcd[a]	26.64 gpcd[a]	26.64 gpcd[a]	26.64 gpcd[a]	26.64 gpcd[a]
Total Other Unit (employees)	533	751	845	751	751	845
Other Water Demand (gpd)	*14,199*	*20,007*	*22,511*	*20,007*	*20,007*	*22,511*
Total Water Demand (gpd)	19,744	25,552	28,056	25,552	25,552	28,056
Conversion (gal/acre-feet)	325,851.44	325,851.44	325,851.44	325,851.44	325,851.44	325,851.44
Total Water Demand (acre-feet/day)	**0.061**	**0.078**	**0.086**	**0.078**	**0.078**	**0.086**
Total Water Demand (afy) [b]	**22.26**	**28.47**	**31.39**	**28.47**	**28.47**	**31.39**
Annual LADWP Demand (acre-feet) [c]	621,458	675,604	675,604	675,604	675,604	675,604
% of LADWP Demand	**0.00358**	**0.0042**	**0.0046**	**0.0046**	**0.0042**	**0.0046**

Source: LADWP 2011.

[a] The City's Bureau of Sanitation's wastewater generation factor of 24 gallons per capita per day for employees was multiplied by 1.11 to account for evaporation, outdoor use/storm drain conveyance, etc. associated with wastewater generation.

[b] The total LADWP water demand associated with the proposed Project does not account for water efficiency requirement ordinance savings that would be applied by LADWP under water conservation commitments.

[c] Fiscal Year 2025 water demand and supply projection was used for the total "LADWP Demand" row (based on the 2010 UWMP) as this is the closest available forecast to the 2026 project horizon year. Does not include active water conservation measures. CEQA baseline uses a 2005–2010 average, which is the most recent data available in the UWMP.

afy	acre-feet per year
gal	gallon
gpcd	gallons per capita per day
gpd	gallons per day
sf	square feet

Table 3.14-5: Existing and Future Wastewater Generation at the Terminal under Proposed Project and Alternative Scenarios

	CEQA Baseline (*2012*)	NEPA Baseline *(2026)*	Proposed Project *(2026)*	Alternative 1 *(2026)*	Alternative 2 *(2026)*	Alternative 3 *(2026)*
Total Wastewater (gpd)[a]	17,787	23,019	25,275	23,019	23,019	25,275
Total Wastewater (mgd)	**0.0197**	**0.0256**	**0.028**	**0.0256**	**0.0256**	**0.028**
Existing Flow at TIWRP (mgd)	17.5	17.5	17.5	17.5	17.5	17.5
% of Existing Flow at TIWRP	**0.11**	**0.15**	**0.16**	**0.15**	**0.15**	**0.16**
TIWRP Capacity (mgd)	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0
% of TIWRP Capacity	**0.066**	**0.085**	**0.093**	**0.085**	**0.085**	**0.093**

Note:

[a] Water usage projections from Table 3.14-3 are used as the proxy for wastewater generation because the amount of wastewater used is a function of the amount of water used. Water demand is divided by 1.11 to account for evaporation, outdoor use/storm drain conveyance, etc.

gpd gallons per day
mgd million gallons per day

1

Table 3.14-6: Existing and Future Solid Waste Generation at the Terminal under Proposed Project and Alternative Scenarios

	CEQA Baseline (*2012*)	NEPA Baseline *(2026)*	Proposed Project *(2026)*	Alternative 1 *(2026)*	Alternative 2 *(2026)*	Alternative 3 *(2026)*
Employees	533[b]	751	845	751	751	845
Generation Factor (pounds per employee per day) [a]	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.43
Total Solid Waste (pounds/day)	228[b]	323	363	323	323	363
Total Solid Waste (tons/day)	**0.114**	**0.1615**	**0.1815**	**0.1615**	**0.1615**	**0.1815**
Chiquita Canyon Landfill Permitted Throughput (tons/day)	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
% Chiquita Canyon Landfill Permitted Throughput	**0.0019**	**0.0027**	**0.0030**	**0.0027**	**0.0027**	**0.0030**
Sunshine Canyon Landfill Permitted Throughput (tons/day)	12,100	12,100	12,100	12,100	12,100	12,100
% Sunshine Canyon Landfill Permitted Throughput	**0.00094**	**0.0013**	**0.0015**	**0.0013**	**0.0013**	**0.0015**

Source: Port of Los Angeles 2010; LACSD 2007; Hansen pers. comm.

Notes:

[a] Generation factor was determined based on actual employees divided by actual solid waste generated at the proposed project site; the resulting ratio was then applied to the future scenarios.

[b] Data provided by YTI.

The percentages for each landfill represent a worst-case scenario, where all of the waste generated by the proposed Project or an alternative would go to a single landfill. However, it is more likely that solid waste would be disposed of at more than one landfill and a portion diverted from the landfill.

1

Energy

The determination of impacts on electricity and natural gas supplies depends on an estimation of demand generated by the proposed Project or alternative uses, compared to availability and capacity of existing supplies and the conveyance infrastructure.

Based on existing electrical demand from 2012, it is projected that the proposed Project would require an additional 7,337,742 kWh, for a total of approximately 23,092,182 kWh in 2026.[5] This accounts for additional crane use on site as well as increases in backlands operations.

In terms of natural gas, the proposed Project is projected to demand an amount similar to the existing use of approximately 331 hundred cubic feet[6], which converts to approximately 0.0331 MMcf. This represents approximately 0.00124% of the gas supplied in 2012, 0.00126% of the gas to be supplied in 2015, and 0.00127% of the gas to be supplied in 2025, which is the closest forecasted year to the proposed Project's peak year in 2026. The similar use is a result of no increase in habitable building space, such as office uses, that use natural gas for space and water heating. The 2012 California Gas Report's predicted total capacity available to SCGC is expected to remain constant at 3,875 MMcf/day through 2030, which represents 0.000854% of the total capacity available by 2030.

3.14.4.2 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 normally would constitute the baseline physical conditions by which the CEQA lead agency determines if an impact is significant. The NOP for the proposed Project was published in April 2013. For purposes of this Draft EIS/EIR, the CEQA baseline takes into account the throughput for the 12-month calendar year preceding NOP publication (January through December 2012) in order to provide a representative characterization of activity levels throughout the complete calendar year preceding release of the NOP. In 2012, the YTI Terminal encompassed approximately 185 acres under its long-term lease, supported 14 cranes (10 operating), and handled approximately 996,109 TEUs and 162 vessel calls. The CEQA baseline conditions are also described in Section 2.7.1 and summarized in Table 2-1.

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

[5] Projected electrical needs were provided by YTI based on existing electrical demand extrapolated for additional onsite operations, including use of additional cranes.

[6] Converted from 3,124 therms; information provided by YTI and represents total natural gas consumed in 2012.

3.14.4.3 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 NEPA baseline. The NEPA baseline conditions are described in Section 2.7.2 and summarized in Table 2-1. The NEPA baseline condition for determining significance of impacts includes the full range of construction and operational activities the applicant could implement and is likely to implement absent a federal action, in this case the issuance of a USACE permit.

Unlike the CEQA baseline, which is defined by conditions at a point in time, the NEPA baseline is not bound by statute to a "flat" or "no-growth" scenario. Instead, the NEPA baseline is dynamic and includes increases in operations for each study year (2015, 2016, 2017, 2020, and 2026), which are projected to occur absent a federal permit. Federal permit decisions focus on direct impacts of the proposed Project 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 the alternatives under NEPA is defined by comparing the proposed Project or the alternatives to the NEPA baseline.

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

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

3.14.4.4 Thresholds of Significance

The following significance criteria are based on the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* (City of Los Angeles 2006) and other criteria applicable to Port projects. The proposed Project or an alternative would have a significant impact on public utilities if it would:

UT-1: Result in a substantial increase in wastewater flows that would exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) or the capacity of existing treatment facilities

UT-2: Result in a substantial increase in water demand that would exceed the water supplies available from existing entitlements and resources, and new or expanded facilities or entitlements would be required

UT-3: Generate substantial surface runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing municipal storm drain systems

UT-4: Result in an increase in solid waste generation due to project operations that would exceed the capacity of existing solid waste handling and disposal facilities

UT-5: Require new, off-site energy supply and distribution infrastructure or capacity-enhancing alterations to existing facilities that are not anticipated by adopted plans or programs

The discussion under UT-2 assumes implementation of AB 939, because the City is actively implementing measures to comply with AB 939 requirements, such as recycling programs and other means of complying with the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act to reduce the generation of solid waste and assist the City in maintaining solid waste diversion goals pursuant to AB 939.

3.14.4.5 Impact Determination

Proposed Project

Impact UT-1: The proposed Project would not result in a substantial increase in wastewater flows that would exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB or the capacity of existing treatment facilities.

The proposed project site is currently connected to the sanitary sewer system. During construction, if required, portable temporary facilities would be available for construction workers. Such facilities would be hauled away and the waste disposed of in accordance with RWQCB regulations. Once operational, the proposed Project would be fully connected to the sanitary sewer system, where wastewater would be processed and sanitized at the TIWRP.

With the increase in water demand during proposed project operation, there would be a proportionate increase in wastewater generation. As shown in Table 3.14-5, the increased staff levels associated with 2026 proposed operation would generate an increase of 7,488 gpd (0.0083 mgd) over the CEQA baseline and 2,256 (0.0024 mgd) over the 2026 NEPA baseline. Wastewater generated from the proposed project site would be conveyed to, and treated by, the TIWRP.

The TIWRP has a capacity of 30 mgd and currently operates at approximately 60% capacity. The City projects that by 2020, wastewater flows in the TIWRP service area will grow from the current 17.5 mgd to 19.9 mgd (BOS and LADWP 2006). Therefore, approximately 10 mgd in daily capacity at TIWRP would remain unused and available for future years. The proposed Project's additional 7,488 gpd contribution to the TIWRP's daily wastewater processing capacity would constitute approximately 0.0624% (7,488 ÷ 12,000,000) of the TIWRP's available capacity. The proposed Project would contribute even less over the 2026 NEPA baseline, with its addition above the baseline of only 2,256 gpd to the TIWRP's daily wastewater processing capacity, which would constitute approximately 0.019% (2,256 ÷ 12,000,000) of the TIWRP's available capacity. The negligible proposed Project-related increase over the CEQA baseline and NEPA baseline would not exceed the daily capacity of the TIWRP at the proposed Project's peak operational year in 2026. Furthermore, given the close proximity to the

TIWRP, the conveyance system is adequately sized for the additional flow anticipated over the long term.

Therefore, because the TIWRP operates in compliance with the RWQCB's requirements and has sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed Project's wastewater generation, wastewater discharged into the sewer system would not exceed the system's capacity or the requirements of the RWQCB.

CEQA Impact Determination

Discharge to the sanitary sewer would meet RWQCB requirements, as there is sufficient conveyance capacity to send wastewater to the TIWRP and sufficient capacity at the TIWRP to process the proposed Project's wastewater. Impacts would be less than significant under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Impact Determination

Discharge to the sanitary sewer would meet RWQCB requirements, as there is sufficient conveyance capacity to send wastewater to the TIWRP and sufficient capacity at the TIWRP to process the proposed Project's wastewater. Impacts would be less than significant under NEPA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact UT-2: The proposed Project would not result in a substantial increase in water demand that would exceed the water supplies available from existing entitlements and resources, and would not require new or expanded facilities or entitlements.

During construction, the proposed Project would use water for various purposes, such as dust suppression, mixing and pouring paving materials, and other construction-related activities. Typically, the majority of water use during construction would be associated with dust suppression during grading or trenching, which would be generally performed by water trucks that use non-potable water from off-site sources. The additional water use would not be substantial, and no impact on water supply would occur.

During operation, additional water requirements would be associated with a higher use of restroom and breakroom facilities by a greater number of employees, as well as water used from washing more machinery and containers on site. However, no additional water

supply infrastructure (e.g., on-site water pipelines) would be needed to provide the additional water.

During its peak operational year in 2026, the proposed Project would increase water demand at the proposed project site by approximately 0.025 acre-foot per day, or 8,312 gpd over the CEQA baseline, and approximately 0.008 acre-foot per day, or 2,504 gpd over the 2026 NEPA baseline. To provide context to this amount of water, a "water-demand" project defined by SB 610, as described in Section 3.14.3, is a project that requires water supply assessment because it is often not explicitly accounted in the current UWMP. As noted in Section 3.14.3, a "water-demand" project can include an industrial project that would: (1) employ more than 1,000 persons; (2) occupy more than 40 acres of land; or (3) develop more than 650,000 square feet of floor area. The proposed Project would employ up to an additional 312 employees by 2026, which is 688 fewer than the threshold. No additional land would be developed, as the proposed Project would be contained entirely within the currently developed terminal site; therefore, the 40-acre threshold is not triggered. Finally, no additional building square footage is proposed; thus, the 650,000-square-foot floor area threshold is not reached.

In addition, a project with a water demand equivalent of 500 homes could be considered a "water-demand" project. Using LADWP generation rates, a "water-demand" project requires at least 127,650 gpd.[7] Thus, the proposed Project's anticipated demand is relatively small, amounting to less than 6.5% of the amount of water needed to be considered a "water-demand" project. Consequently, the proposed Project's water demand is substantially below the threshold that requires preparation of a water supply assessment and, given its relatively low water demand, can be accommodated with the anticipated water supplies identified in the UWMP.

Installation of backland improvements would require on-site relocations of four fire hydrants and associated piping. The fire hydrants would be relocated in developed areas. No additional building space is proposed; therefore, no new sinks, toilets, showers, or water-specific would be built. No other water facilities or infrastructure would be relocated or modified.

CEQA Impact Determination

During its peak operational year in 2026, the proposed Project would increase water demand at the proposed project site by approximately 0.025 acre-foot per day, or 8,312 gpd over the CEQA baseline. This amounts to an increase of only 0.0013% of LADWP's anticipated demand of 710,800 acre-feet per year in 2035. Moreover, the proposed Project's anticipated demand of an additional 8,312 gpd in 2026 is relatively small, amounting to less than 6.5% of the water demand needed to constitute a "water-demand" project. This amount of water can be accommodated by LADWP as projected in the 2010 UWMP. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in a substantial increase in water demand that would exceed the water supplies available from existing entitlements and resources.

[7] Based on the wastewater generation rates from the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* for three-bedroom/duplex/townhome/ single-family residential (230 gallons per unit), factored at 111% of the wastewater generation rate.

The proposed Project would relocate up to four fire hydrants within the proposed project site to provide space for the proposed improvements. The relocations would all occur in developed areas on site. No additional building space is proposed; therefore, no new sinks, toilets, showers, or water-specific uses would be built. Therefore, the proposed Project would not require new or expanded facilities or entitlements. Impacts would be less than significant under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Impact Determination

During its peak operational year in 2026, the proposed Project would increase water demand at the proposed project site by approximately 0.008 acre-foot per day, or 2,504 gpd over the NEPA baseline. This amounts to an increase of only 0.00041% of LADWP's anticipated demand in 2035. Moreover, the proposed Project's anticipated demand of an additional 2,504 gpd in 2026 is relatively small, amounting to less than 2.0% of the water demand needed to constitute a "water-demand" project. This amount of water can be accommodated by LADWP as projected in the 2010 UWMP. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in a substantial increase in water demand that would exceed the water supplies available from existing entitlements and resources.

The proposed Project would relocate up to four fire hydrants within the proposed project site to provide space for the proposed improvements and better locate them where they would be required. The relocations would all occur in developed areas onsite. No additional building space is proposed; therefore, no new sinks, toilets, showers, or water-specific uses would be built. Therefore, the proposed Project would not require new or expanded facilities or entitlements. Impacts would be less than significant under NEPA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact UT-3: The proposed Project would not generate substantial surface runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing municipal storm drain systems.

During construction activities, a storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) would be implemented to ensure discharge to the harbor would be minimized and would be treated through BMPs identified in the SWPPP. For more information on water quality during construction, see Section 3.15, "Water Quality, Sediments, and Oceanography." With BMPs to help control stormwater runoff, stormwater volumes would not exceed the stormwater drainage capacity during construction.

Once operational, the proposed Project would not increase runoff associated with the proposed project site, because all improvements would occur on existing impervious (i.e., paved) space. Stormwater infrastructure would be left in its existing state or enhanced where appropriate based on the planned improvements in the backland.

CEQA Impact Determination

Discharge to the harbor during construction would be minimized by the implementation of a SWPPP and stormwater flows would be accommodated by existing infrastructure. During operation, the proposed Project would not increase runoff because all improvements would occur on existing impervious (i.e., paved) space. Impacts would be less than significant under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Impact Determination

As discussed under the CEQA Impact Determination, discharge to the harbor during construction would be minimized by the implementation of a SWPPP. During operation, the proposed Project would not increase runoff because all improvements would occur on existing impervious (i.e., paved) space. Impacts would be less than significant under NEPA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact UT-4: Implementation of the proposed Project would not result in an increase in solid waste generation due to project operations that would exceed the capacity of existing solid waste handling and disposal facilities.

Construction and demolition activities could generate debris that would require disposal in a landfill. Construction debris is one of the greatest individual contributors to solid waste capacity, making up approximately 29% of the State of California's waste disposal demand (CIWMB/CalRecycle 2009). Proposed construction activities would generate some construction and demolition materials including asphalt, concrete, and solids. Due to lower disposal costs or tipping fees, asphalt and concrete are typically recycled for aggregate base or disposed of at inert landfills instead of sanitary landfills. LAHD's Asphalt and Concrete Recycling Program provides for the re-use/recycling of construction debris that otherwise would be disposed of at a landfill. The program is part of the implementation of LAHD's sustainable design and construction policies and practices to recycle and reuse materials to protect the environment. The program consists of crushing salvaged concrete and asphalt concrete rubble into crushed miscellaneous

base for reuse under new asphalt and concrete pavements throughout the harbor. In addition, approximately 27,000 cy of dredged material would be generated during dredging of the East Basin Channel at Berths 214–216 and 217–220. All dredged material would be disposed of at an approved site, such as LA-2, the Berths 243–245 CDF, or another approved location either within the Port or at a landfill outside the Port Complex.

Project operations would result in a small increase in the generation of solid waste. Container terminal operations would primarily consist of container loading and storage activities and no additional administrative facilities would be required to support proposed operations. Additionally, operation of the proposed Project would be required to comply with applicable waste diversion requirements, as well as all existing hazardous waste laws and regulations, including the federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, and CCR Title 22 and Title 26. (See Chapter 3.8, *Groundwater and Soils*, and 3.9, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, for a complete description of these hazardous waste laws.)

Based on the solid waste generation factor derived from 2012 solid waste data provided by YTI, by 2026 the proposed Project would generate an additional 135 pounds per day (0.0675 ton per day) over current levels and would generate an additional 40 pounds per day over the NEPA baseline that would require transportation to Chiquita Canyon or Sunshine Canyon. (A small percentage of this waste would be considered hazardous waste and would be transported to an appropriate facility, such as Buttonwillow or the Kettleman Hills facility.) This amount represents 0.0011% of the permitted daily capacity of 6,000 tons at Chiquita Canyon and 0.0005% of the permitted daily capacity of 12,100 at Sunshine Canyon. The landfills would be able to accommodate the small increase in solid waste generated by project operations through their closure dates, estimated to be approximately 2019 for Chiquita Canyon and 2037 for Sunshine Canyon. Solid waste generated from project operations after closure of Chiquita Canyon (2019) is not expected to result in significant impacts, because adequate capacity would exist through 2037 at Sunshine Canyon. In addition, other landfills that could take the project solid waste include El Sobrante Landfill, which closes in 2045. It should be noted that the City is pursuing zero-waste solutions; if zero waste is achieved, substantial reductions in solid waste could occur over an extended time period. Additionally, mitigation measure MM GHG-3 requires that a minimum of 60% of all waste generated in all terminal buildings is recycled by 2017.

Implementation of the proposed Project has the potential to encounter unidentified contaminated soils at the proposed project site, which could require the treatment, removal, and/or disposal of the material. However, substantial amounts of hazardous materials are not expected to be encountered at the proposed project site due to the limited amount of demolition and excavation anticipated. If contaminated soils are encountered, LAHD would consider the type and extent of contamination and explore the variety of options available for remediation, which could include *in situ*, on-site, and off-site treatment (e.g., incineration, soil vapor extraction, bioremediation) and disposal options. In the event that the material still requires disposal after treatment, Kettleman Hills Landfill, Buttonwillow, or another Class I landfill in the United States would be utilized, based on facility and hazardous material requirements.

Certain forms of on-site or off-site treatment could result in soils that could be reused on site or used as cover in a nonhazardous materials landfill. It would be speculative to

estimate the likelihood, amount, or type of contamination that could be encountered during excavation, and what would be the most likely treatment option selected by the lead agency. These details cannot be known until completion of the relevant hazardous materials investigations prepared immediately before construction activities. However, because there are numerous treatment and disposal options, many of which do not involve Class I landfill disposal, because the Kettleman Hills facility has available capacity (approximately 1,500,000 cy), and numerous hazardous waste disposal facilities are available for off-site disposal in California and other states, significant impacts related to exceeding the capacity of a Class I landfill are not anticipated.

CEQA Impact Determination

Container terminal operations would consist primarily of container loading and storage activities that would not generate substantial amounts of solid waste requiring disposal in a landfill. By 2026, the proposed Project would generate 135 pounds of solid waste per day (0.0675 ton per day) over the 2012 CEQA baseline level. This would represent an increase in the contribution to the permitted daily throughput at Chiquita Canyon from CEQA baseline conditions of 0.0019% to the proposed Project's peak year operations of 0.0030% in 2026. If solid waste is instead brought to Sunshine Canyon, the contribution to the permitted daily throughput at Sunshine Canyon would increase from 0.00094% to 0.0015%. The landfills would be able to accommodate the negligible increase in solid waste generated by project operations through their respective closure dates, estimated to be approximately 2019 for Chiquita Canyon and 2037 for Sunshine Canyon.

A substantial amount of debris during construction is not anticipated to be generated, because the Port recycles up to 99% of construction and demolition debris and most of the construction debris generated by the proposed Project would be old paving and asphalt (Garrett pers. comm. 2012). Although hazardous materials could be encountered and require disposal during construction activities, several contaminated soil treatment and disposal options and Class I landfills are available for off-site disposal. Because of this, impacts related to exceeding the capacity of a Class I landfill would be less than significant. Consequently, significant impacts on hazardous materials landfill capacity would not occur.

Because adequate landfill capacity would be available through the proposed Project's peak operational year in 2026, the proposed Project's implementation would result in a less than significant impact on landfill capacity under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

Although significant impacts on landfill capacity would not occur, mitigation measures MM UT-1 and MM UT-2 have been added to further reduce the amount of solid waste generated. MM UT-1 would be implemented to minimize the amount of solid waste generated during proposed project construction that would require transportation to a landfill. MM UT-2 is provided not to mitigate an identified environmental impact, but rather to support development of recycled material markets, to the extent feasible.

MM UT-1 Recycling of Construction Materials. Demolition and/or excess construction materials will be separated on site for reuse/recycling or proper disposal. During grading and construction, separate bins for recycling of construction materials will be provided on site.

MM UT-2 Materials with Recycled Content. Materials with recycled content will be used in project construction where feasible.

Additionally, GHG mitigation measure MM GHG-3 requires that a minimum of 60% of all waste generated in all terminal buildings is recycled by 2017. This mitigation measure would further reduce solid waste generation.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Impact Determination

The proposed Project would include in-water and over-water construction activities that would not be part of the NEPA baseline. By 2026, operation of the proposed Project associated with the actions covered under NEPA would generate an additional 40 pounds of solid waste per day (0.02 ton per day) over the 2026 NEPA baseline. This would represent an increase in the contribution to the permitted throughput at Chiquita Canyon Landfill from 2026 NEPA baseline conditions of 0.0027% to proposed project operations of 0.003%, and the contribution to permitted throughput at Sunshine Canyon would increase from 0.0013% to 0.0015%. The landfills would be able to accommodate the small increase in solid waste generated by project operations through their respective closure dates, estimated to be approximately 2019 for Chiquita Canyon and 2037 for Sunshine Canyon.

A substantial amount of debris generation during construction is not anticipated because the Port recycles up to 99% of construction and demolition debris (Garrett pers. comm. 2012), and most of the construction debris generated by construction would be old paving materials and asphalt. Although hazardous materials could be encountered and require disposal during construction activities, several contaminated soil treatment and disposal options and Class I landfills are available for off-site disposal. Because of this, impacts related to exceeding the capacity of a Class I landfill would be less than significant. Consequently, significant impacts on hazardous materials landfill capacity would not occur.

Because adequate landfill capacity would be available through the project horizon year of 2026, the proposed Project's implementation would result in a less than significant impact on landfill capacity under NEPA.

Mitigation Measures

Although significant impacts on landfill capacity would not occur, mitigation measures MM UT-1 and MM UT-2 along with mitigation measure MM GHG-3 would be implemented to further reduce the amount of solid waste generated.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact UT-5: Implementation of the proposed Project would not require new, off-site energy supply and distribution infrastructure or capacity-enhancing alterations to existing facilities that are not anticipated by adopted plans or programs.

Energy (diesel fuel and electricity) would be used during construction of the proposed Project. Energy expenditures during construction would be short in duration, occurring periodically during each of the proposed project construction phases. Construction would not result in substantial waste or inefficient use of energy because construction would be competitively bid, which would facilitate efficiency in all construction stages. Current LAHD bid specifications include provisions to reduce energy consumption, such as staging work during nonpeak hours when appropriate.

Development of the backlands would require grading, paving, and striping, as well as relocation of five light poles, a substation, and a transformer. All relocations would occur on site within developed areas, and the relocations are included as part of the environmental analysis in the Draft EIR, including for air quality, greenhouse gases, and cultural resources.

Operational electricity demands at the proposed project site would be related to industrial uses, including additional crane operations, facility and backlands operations (refrigeration units), site and security lighting, general site maintenance, and AMP. No new buildings are proposed as part of the proposed Project. All light fixtures used at the proposed project site would meet the latest efficiency standards and would not waste input energy by producing unusable light in the form of glare.

Current electrical demand is 15,754,440 kWh. Based on this usage and the proposed additional electrical draw, primarily from new cranes, electrical demand in 2026 is estimated to be 23,092,182 kWh based on a throughput of 1,913,000 TEUs.

As described in Section 3.14.3.2, LADWP is charged with maintaining sufficient capability to provide its customers with a reliable supply of power, and will continue to do so with proper planning and development of facilities in accordance with the City Charter using such mechanisms as the Power IRP. Based on the LADWP Power IRP, electricity resources and reserves at LADWP will adequately provide electricity for all of its customers, including the proposed Project, through the current Power IRP planning horizon of 2040 (LADWP 2012). Further, the LADWP is required by the Charter to provide a reliable supply of electricity for its customers; because LADWP is moving toward increasing renewable energy supplies in its resource portfolio, the electricity demand of the proposed Project, by itself, would not result in the need to construct a new off-site power station or facility. For a discussion of cumulative impacts related to electricity demand, see Chapter 4, Cumulative Analysis.

The proposed Project would generate negligible additional demand for natural gas associated with space and water heating because administrative offices would not be expanded and no new buildings are proposed. SCGC's existing supplies via the existing infrastructure adjacent to and within the proposed project site would be adequate to serve the proposed Project during the peak operational year of 2026.

CEQA Impact Determination

Construction of the proposed Project would not result in substantial waste or inefficient use of energy, because construction would be competitively bid, which would facilitate efficiency in all construction stages. Current LAHD bid specifications include provisions to reduce energy consumption, such as staging work during nonpeak hours when appropriate.

Current electrical demand is 15,754,440 kWh. Based on this usage and the proposed additional electrical draw, primarily from new cranes, electrical demand in 2026 is estimated to be 23,092,182 kWh based on a throughput of 1,913,000 TEUs. Based on the LADWP Power IRP, electricity resources and reserves at LADWP will adequately provide electricity for all of its customers, including the proposed Project, through the current Power IRP planning horizon of 2040 (LADWP 2012). Impacts on electrical service would be less than significant under CEQA.

Project-related natural gas demands (space and water heating) would be similar to the CEQA baseline, because no new buildings or building expansions are proposed. No additional gas line infrastructure would be required. Impacts on gas service would be less than significant under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required. However, GHG mitigation measure MM GHG-1 would require the tenant to perform regular energy audits, and MM GHG-2 would require use of LED lighting. These mitigation measures would further reduce energy demand associated with the proposed Project.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Impact Determination

Construction of the proposed Project would not result in substantial waste or inefficient use of energy, because construction would be competitively bid, which would facilitate efficiency in all construction stages. Current LAHD bid specifications include provisions to reduce energy consumption, such as staging work during nonpeak hours when appropriate.

The proposed additional electrical draw by 2026, primarily from new cranes, is estimated to be 23,092,182 kWh based on a throughput of 1,913,000 TEUs. Based on the LADWP Power IRP, electricity resources and reserves at LADWP will adequately provide electricity for all of its customers, including the proposed Project, through the current Power IRP planning horizon of 2040 (LADWP 2012). Impacts on electrical service would be less than significant under NEPA.

Project-related natural gas demands (space and water heating) would be similar to the NEPA baseline, because no new buildings or building expansions are proposed. No additional gas line infrastructure would be required. Impacts on gas service would be less than significant under NEPA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required. However, GHG mitigation measure MM GHG-1 would require the tenant to perform regular energy audits, and MM GHG-2 would require use of LED lighting. These mitigation measures would further reduce energy demand associated with the proposed Project.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

Alternative 1 – No Project

Under Alternative 1, none of the proposed construction activities would occur in water or in waterside or backland areas. LAHD would not implement any terminal improvements. No new cranes would be added, and no dredging would occur. The No Project Alternative would not include the 100-foot gauge crane rail extension, expansion of the TICTF on-dock rail yard, or backland repairs.

Under the No Project Alternative, the existing YTI Terminal would continue to operate as an approximately 185-acre container terminal. Based on LAHD's throughput projections, the YTI Terminal is expected to reach its operating capacity of approximately 1,692,000 TEUs with 206 ship calls by 2026.

Impact UT-1: Alternative 1 would not result in a substantial increase in wastewater flows that would exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB or the capacity of existing treatment facilities.

The Alternative 1 site is currently connected to the sanitary sewer system. No construction would occur with the No Project Alternative; consequently, no construction-related impacts would occur.

With the increase in water demand during operations related to the continued increase in throughput and ship calls to 2026, there would be a proportionate increase in wastewater generation. Wastewater generated from the proposed project site would be conveyed to, and treated by, the TIWRP.

CEQA Impact Determination

Increased staff levels associated with proposed operation would generate an increase of 0.0017 mgd (5,232 gpd) over the CEQA baseline. The negligible proposed project-related increase over the CEQA baseline would not exceed the daily capacity of the TIWRP at Alternative 1's peak operational year in 2026. Furthermore, given the proximity to the TIWRP, the conveyance system is adequately sized for the additional flow anticipated over the long term.

Discharge to the sanitary sewer would meet RWQCB requirements, as there is sufficient conveyance capacity to send wastewater to the TIWRP and sufficient capacity at the TIWRP to process Alternative 1's wastewater. Impacts would be less than significant under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Impact Determination

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

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures are not applicable.

Residual Impacts

An impact determination is not applicable.

Impact UT-2: Alternative 1 would not result in a substantial increase in water demand that would exceed the water supplies available from existing entitlements and resources, and would not require new or expanded facilities or entitlements.

No construction would occur with Alternative 1; consequently, no construction-related impacts would occur. Alternative 1 would increase water demand at the proposed project site above existing conditions as a result of increased throughput that would occur at the terminal.

CEQA Impact Determination

Alternative 1 would increase water demand at the Alternative 1 site by approximately 0.017 acre-feet per day (5,808 gpd) over the CEQA baseline. This amounts to an increase of only 0.00087% of LADWP's anticipated demand of 710,800 annual acre-feet demand in 2035. Moreover, Alternative 1's anticipated demand of an additional 5,808 gpd in 2026 is relatively small, amounting to less than 4.5% of the water demand needed to constitute a "water-demand" project. This amount of water could be accommodated by LADWP as projected in the 2010 UWMP. Thus, Alternative 1 would not result in a substantial increase in water demand that would exceed the water supplies available from existing entitlements and resources. Impacts would be less than significant under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Impact Determination

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

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures are not applicable.

Residual Impacts

An impact determination is not applicable.

Impact UT-3: Alternative 1 would not generate substantial surface runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing municipal storm drain systems.

No construction would occur with the No Project Alternative; consequently, no construction-related impacts would occur. Once operational, Alternative 1 would not increase runoff associated with the proposed project site because the site is largely already impervious (i.e., paved), and Alternative 1 does not propose any new structures or impervious surfaces.

CEQA Impact Determination

Because no construction would occur with the No Project Alternative, this alternative would not increase runoff, as the site is largely already impervious (i.e., paved). Impacts would be less than significant under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Impact Determination

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

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures are not applicable.

Residual Impacts

An impact determination is not applicable.

Impact UT-4: Implementation of Alternative 1 would not result in an increase in solid waste generation due to project operations that would exceed the capacity of existing solid waste handling and disposal facilities.

No construction would occur with the No Project Alternative; consequently, no construction-related impacts would occur.

Project operations would result in a small increase in the generation of solid waste from the growth in terminal operations up to its existing throughput capacity.

CEQA Impact Determination

No construction would occur with the No Project Alternative; consequently, no construction-related impacts would occur. As shown in Table 3.14-6, by 2026, Alternative 1 would generate an additional 95 pounds per day over the CEQA baseline. (A small percentage of this waste would be considered hazardous waste and would be transported to an appropriate facility such as Buttonwillow or the Kettleman Hills facility.) This amount represents 0.0008% of the permitted daily capacity of 6,000 tons at Chiquita Canyon and 0.00036% of the permitted daily capacity of 12,100 at Sunshine Canyon. Moreover, the landfills would be able to accommodate the small increase in solid waste generated by project operations through their closure dates. Implementation of Alternative 1 would result in a less than significant impact on landfill capacity under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Impact Determination

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

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures are not applicable.

Residual Impacts

An impact determination is not applicable.

Impact UT-5: Implementation of Alternative 1 would not require new, off-site energy supply and distribution infrastructure or capacity-enhancing alterations to existing facilities that are not anticipated by adopted plans or programs.

No construction would occur with the No Project Alternative; consequently, no construction-related energy impacts would occur. During operation, Alternative 1's

electrical demand in 2026 would be 20,074,292 kWh, as it would only reach a throughput of 1,692,000 TEUs. As described in Section 3.14.3.2, LADWP is charged with maintaining sufficient capability to provide its customers with a reliable supply of power, and will continue to do so with proper planning and development of facilities in accordance with the City Charter using such mechanisms as the Power IRP. Based on the LADWP Power IRP, electricity resources and reserves at LADWP will adequately provide electricity for all of its customers, including YTI under Alternative 1, through the current Power IRP planning horizon of 2040 (LADWP 2012). Further, LADWP is required by the Charter to provide a reliable supply of electricity for its customers; because LADWP is moving toward increasing renewable energy supplies in its resource portfolio, the electricity demand of Alternative 1, by itself, would not result in the need to construct a new off-site power station or facility.

Alternative 1 would generate negligible additional demand for natural gas associated with space and water heating because administrative offices would not be expanded and no new buildings are proposed. SCGC's existing supplies via the existing infrastructure adjacent to and within the proposed project site would be adequate to serve Alternative 1 during the peak operational year of 2026.

CEQA Impact Determination

No construction would occur with the No Project Alternative; consequently, no construction-related energy impacts would occur. During operation, Alternative 1's electrical demand in 2026 would be 20,074,292 kWh, which is approximately 4,319,852 kWh more than the CEQA baseline. However, as with the proposed Project, LADWP will adequately provide electricity based on the LADWP Power IRP. Therefore, Alternative 1's impact related to energy supply would be less than significant under CEQA.

Alternative 1-related natural gas demands (space and water heating) would be similar to the CEQA baseline. Impacts on gas service would be less than significant under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Impact Determination

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

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures are not applicable.

Residual Impacts

An impact determination is not applicable.

Alternative 2 – No Federal Action

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

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

Impact UT-1: Alternative 2 would not result in a substantial increase in wastewater flows that would exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB or the capacity of existing treatment facilities.

Construction would be limited to backlands improvements only consisting of slurry sealing; deep cold planing; asphalt concrete overlay; restriping; and removal, relocation, or modification of any underground conduits and pipes necessary to complete repairs. All construction wastewater would be disposed of using portable temporary facilities, as needed. Such facilities would be hauled away and the waste disposed of in accordance with RWQCB regulations. Once operational, Alternative 2 would be fully connected to the sanitary sewer system where wastewater would be processed and sanitized at the TIWRP.

With the increase in water demand during operations related to the continued increase in throughput and ship calls to 2026, there would be a proportionate increase in wastewater generation. Wastewater generated from the proposed project site would be conveyed to, and treated by, the TIWRP, which has capacity to accommodate Alternative 2's wastewater generation.

CEQA Impact Determination

By 2026, increased staff levels associated with proposed operation would generate an increase of 5,232 gpd over the CEQA baseline. Discharge to the sanitary sewer would meet RWQCB requirements, as there is sufficient conveyance capacity to send wastewater to the TIWRP and sufficient capacity at the TIWRP to process Alternative 2's wastewater. Impacts would be less than significant under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Impact Determination

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

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

No impacts would occur.

Impact UT-2: Alternative 2 would not result in a substantial increase in water demand that would exceed the water supplies available from existing entitlements and resources, and would not require new or expanded facilities or entitlements.

Construction would be limited to backlands improvements. Typically, the majority of water use during construction is associated with dust suppression during grading or trenching, which is generally performed by water trucks that use non-potable water from off-site sources.

Alternative 2 would increase water demand at the proposed project site above existing conditions as a result of increased throughput that would occur at the terminal.

The No Federal Action Alternative would involve the same construction and operational activities as would occur under the NEPA baseline. Therefore, there would be no incremental difference between Alternative 2 and the NEPA baseline.

CEQA Impact Determination

By the year 2026, Alternative 2 would increase water demand at the Alternative 2 site by approximately 0.017 acre-feet per day (5,808 gpd) over the CEQA baseline. This amounts to an increase of only 0.00087% of LADWP's anticipated demand of 710,800 annual acre-feet demand in 2035. Moreover, Alternative 2's anticipated demand of an additional 5,808 gpd in 2026 is relatively small, amounting to less than 4.5% of the water demand needed to constitute a "water-demand" project. This amount of water can be accommodated by LADWP as projected in the 2010 UWMP. Alternative 2 would not result in a substantial increase in water demand that would exceed the water supplies available from existing entitlements and resources. Impacts would be less than significant under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Impact Determination

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

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

No impacts would occur.

Impact UT-3: Alternative 2 would not generate substantial surface runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing municipal storm drain systems.

Alternative 2 would include only backlands improvements consisting of slurry sealing; deep cold planing; asphalt concrete overlay; restriping; and removal, relocation, or modification of any underground conduits and pipes necessary to complete repairs. No construction of in-water or over-water features would occur under Alternative 2. Under Alternative 2, discharge to the harbor during construction would be minimized by the implementation of a SWPPP, and stormwater flows would be accommodated by the existing infrastructure. During operation, Alternative 2 would not increase runoff at the proposed project site because all improvements would occur on existing impervious (i.e., paved) space.

CEQA Impact Determination

With implementation of a SWPPP and sufficient stormwater infrastructure during construction, along with a similar impervious area after project construction and during Alternative 2 operation compared to baseline conditions, impacts would be less than significant under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Impact Determination

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

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

No impacts would occur.

Impact UT-4: Implementation of Alternative 2 would not result in an increase in solid waste generation due to project operations that would exceed the capacity of existing solid waste handling and disposal facilities.

Proposed project operations would result in a small increase in the generation of solid waste from the growth in terminal operations up to its existing throughput capacity.

CEQA Impact Determination

As shown in Table 3.14-6, by 2026 Alternative 2 would generate 95 pounds per day over the CEQA baseline level. (A small percentage of this waste would be considered hazardous waste and would be transported to an appropriate facility such as Buttonwillow or the Kettleman Hills facility.) This amount represents 0.0008% of the permitted daily capacity of 6,000 tons at Chiquita Canyon and 0.00036% of the permitted daily capacity of 12,100 at Sunshine Canyon. The landfills would be able to accommodate the small increase in solid waste generated by proposed project operations through their closure dates. Construction and demolition debris would be recycled, and very little would be sent to the landfills. Because adequate landfill capacity would be available through the project horizon year of 2026, Alternative 2's implementation would result in a less than significant impact on landfill capacity under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

Although significant impacts on landfill capacity would not occur, mitigation measures MM UT-1, MM UT-2, and MM GHG-3 would be implemented to further reduce the amount of solid waste generated.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Impact Determination

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

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

No impacts would occur.

Impact UT-5: Implementation of Alternative 2 would not require new, off-site energy supply and distribution infrastructure or capacity-enhancing alterations to existing facilities that are not anticipated by adopted plans or programs.

Energy (diesel fuel and electricity) would be used during construction of Alternative 2. Energy expenditures during construction would be short in duration, occurring periodically during each of the Alternative 2 construction phases. Construction would not result in substantial waste or inefficient use of energy because construction would be competitively bid, which would facilitate efficiency in all construction stages.

During operation, Alternative 2's electrical demand in 2026 would be 20,074,292 kWh as it would reach a throughput of 1,692,000 TEUs. As described in Section 3.14.3.2, LADWP is charged with maintaining sufficient capability to provide its customers with a reliable supply of power, and will continue to do so with proper planning and development of facilities in accordance with the City Charter using such mechanisms as the Power IRP. Based on the LADWP Power IRP, electricity resources and reserves at LADWP will adequately provide electricity for all of its customers, including Alternative 2, through the current Power IRP planning horizon of 2040 (LADWP 2012). Further, LADWP is required by the Charter to provide a reliable supply of electricity for its customers; because LADWP is moving toward increasing renewable energy supplies in its resource portfolio, the electricity demand of Alternative 2, by itself, would not result in the need to construct a new off-site power station or facility.

Alternative 2 would generate negligible additional demand for natural gas associated with space and water heating because administrative offices would not be expanded and no new buildings are proposed. SCGC's existing supplies via the existing infrastructure adjacent to and within the proposed project site would be adequate to serve Alternative 2 during the peak operational year of 2026.

CEQA Impact Determination

Construction of Alternative 2 would not result in substantial waste or inefficient use of energy, because construction would be competitively bid, which would facilitate

efficiency in all construction stages. Moreover, based on the LADWP Power IRP, electricity resources and reserves at LADWP will adequately provide electricity for all of its customers, including Alternative 2, through the current Power IRP planning horizon of 2040 (LADWP 2012). Impacts on electrical service would be less than significant under CEQA.

Alternative 2-related natural gas demands (space and water heating) would be similar to the CEQA baseline. Impacts on gas service would be less than significant under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required. However, GHG mitigation measure **MM GHG-1** would require the tenant to perform regular energy audits, and **MM GHG-2** would require use of LED lighting. These mitigation measures would further reduce energy demand associated with Alternative 2.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Impact Determination

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

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

No impacts would occur.

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

Alternative 3 would not include conducting the proposed dredging and pile driving at Berths 214–216. The following components of the proposed Project would be unchanged under the Reduced Project Alternative:

- modifying up to six existing cranes;
- replacing up to four existing non-operating cranes;
- 6,000 cy of dredging from a depth of -45 to -47 feet mean lower low water (MLLW) (with an additional 2 feet of overdredge depth, for a total depth of -49 feet MLLW), and installing 1,200 linear feet of sheet piles and king piles to support and stabilize the existing wharf structure at Berths 217–220;
- disposing of dredged material at LA-2, the Berths 243–245 CDF, or another approved upland location;

- extending the existing 100-foot gauge landside crane rail through Berths 217–220;
- performing ground repairs and maintenance activities in the backlands area; and
- expanding the TICTF on-dock rail by adding a single rail loading track.

Under this alternative, there would be three operating berths after construction, similar to the proposed Project, but Berths 214–216 would remain at their existing depth. This alternative would require less dredging (by approximately 21,000 cy) and pile driving and a shorter construction period than the proposed Project. Based on the throughput projections, this alternative is expected to operate at its capacity of approximately 1,913,000 TEUs by 2026, similar to the proposed Project. However, while the terminal could handle similar levels of cargo, the reduced project alternative would not achieve the same level of efficient operations as achieved by the proposed Project. This alternative would not accommodate the largest vessels (13,000 TEUs). The depth achieved at Berths 217–220 would only be capable of handling vessels up to 11,000 TEUs, requiring additional vessels to call on the terminal to meet future growth projections up to the capacity of the terminal. Therefore, under this alternative, 232 vessels would call on the terminal in 2020 and 2026, compared to 206 vessels for the proposed Project. Additionally, because of the higher number of annual vessel calls, this alternative would result in a maximum of five peak day ship calls (over a 24-hour period) compared to four for the proposed Project.

Impact UT-1: Alternative 3 would not result in a substantial increase in wastewater flows that would exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB or the capacity of existing treatment facilities.

Under Alternative 3, construction would include many of the elements of the proposed Project. All construction wastewater would be disposed of using portable temporary facilities, as needed. Such facilities would be hauled away and the waste disposed of in accordance with RWQCB regulations. Once operational, Alternative 3 would be fully connected to the sanitary sewer system where wastewater would be processed and sanitized at the TIWRP.

With the increase in water demand during operations related to the continued increase in ship calls to 2026, there would be a proportionate increase in wastewater generation. Wastewater generated from the proposed project site would be conveyed to, and treated by, the TIWRP, which has capacity to accommodate Alternative 3's wastewater generation.

CEQA Impact Determination

By 2026, increased staff levels associated with Alternative 3 operations would generate a wastewater increase of 7,488 gpd (0.0083 mgd) over the CEQA baseline based on a throughput of 1,913,000 TEUs by 2026. Discharge to the sanitary sewer would meet RWQCB requirements, as there is sufficient conveyance capacity to send wastewater to the TIWRP and sufficient capacity at the TIWRP to process Alternative 3's wastewater. Impacts would be less than significant under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Impact Determination

By 2026, increased staff levels associated with Alternative 3 operations would generate a wastewater increase of 2,256 gpd (0.0024 mgd) over the 2026 NEPA baseline based on a throughput of 1,913,000 TEUs by 2026. Discharge to the sanitary sewer would meet RWQCB requirements, as there is sufficient conveyance capacity to send wastewater to the TIWRP and sufficient capacity at the TIWRP to process Alternative 3's wastewater. Impacts would be less than significant under NEPA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact UT-2: Alternative 3 would not result in a substantial increase in water demand that would exceed the water supplies available from existing entitlements and resources, and would not require new or expanded facilities or entitlements.

Construction under Alternative 3 would include the same components as the proposed Project except it would not include conducting the proposed dredging and pile driving at Berths 214–216. Water may be used for various purposes, such as dust suppression, mixing and pouring paving materials, and other construction-related activities. Typically, the majority of water use during construction is associated with dust suppression during grading or trenching, which is generally performed by water trucks that use non-potable water from off-site sources. The additional water use would not be substantial, and no impact on water supply would occur.

During the peak year of operation in 2026, Alternative 3 would increase water demand at the proposed project site above existing conditions.

CEQA Impact Determination

During the peak year of operation in 2026, Alternative 3 would increase water demand at the proposed project site by approximately 0.025 acre-foot per day (8,312 gpd) over the CEQA baseline. The approximately 0.025 acre-foot per day amounts to an increase of only 0.0013% of LADWP's anticipated demand of 710,800 in 2035. Moreover, Alternative 3's anticipated demand of an additional 8,312 gpd in 2026 is relatively small, amounting to less than 4.5% of the water demand needed to constitute a "water-demand" project. This amount of water can be accommodated by LADWP as projected in the 2010 UWMP. Therefore, Alternative 3 would not result in a substantial increase in water demand that would exceed the water supplies available from existing entitlements and resources. Impacts would be less than significant under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Impact Determination

During the peak year of operation in 2026, Alternative 3 would increase water demand at the proposed project site by approximately 0.008 acre-foot per day, or 2,504 gpd over the 2026 NEPA baseline. The approximately 0.008 acre-foot per day amounts to an increase of only 0.00041% of LADWP's 2035 anticipated demand. Moreover, Alternative 3's anticipated demand of an additional 2,504 gpd in 2026 is relatively small, amounting to less than 2.0% of the water demand needed to constitute a "water-demand" project. This amount of water can be accommodated by LADWP as projected in the 2010 UWMP. Therefore, Alternative 3 would not result in a substantial increase in water demand that would exceed the water supplies available from existing entitlements and resources. Impacts would be less than significant under NEPA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact UT-3: Alternative 3 would not generate substantial surface runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing municipal storm drain systems.

During Alternative 3 construction activities, a storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) would be implemented to ensure discharge to the harbor would be minimized and would be treated through BMPs identified in the SWPPP. With BMPs to help control stormwater runoff, stormwater volumes would not exceed the stormwater drainage capacity during construction.

Once operational, Alternative 3 would not increase runoff associated with the Alternative 3 site, because all improvements would occur on existing impervious (i.e., paved) space. Stormwater infrastructure would be left in its existing state or enhanced where appropriate based on the planned improvements in the backland.

CEQA Impact Determination

Under Alternative 3, discharge to the harbor during construction would be minimized by the implementation of a SWPPP, and stormwater flows would be accommodated by existing infrastructure. During operation, Alternative 3 would not increase runoff associated with the Alternative 3 site because all improvements would occur on existing impervious (i.e., paved) space. Impacts would be less than significant under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Impact Determination

For the same reasons discussed under the CEQA Impact Determination, impacts on existing municipal storm drain systems would be less than significant under NEPA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact UT-4: Implementation of Alternative 3 would not result in an increase in solid waste generation due to project operations that would exceed the capacity of existing solid waste handling and disposal facilities.

Under Alternative 3, construction and demolition activities would generate debris that would be recycled for aggregate base or disposed of at inert landfills instead of sanitary landfills. In addition, approximately 6,000 cy of dredged material would be generated during dredging of the East Basin Channel at Berths 217–220. All dredged material would be disposed of at an approved site, such as LA-2, the Berths 243–245 CDF, or another approved location either within the Port or at a landfill outside the Port Complex.

Proposed project operations would result in a small increase in the generation of solid waste from the growth in terminal operations up to its existing throughput capacity.

CEQA Impact Determination

As shown in Table 3.14-6, by 2026 Alternative 3 would generate 135 pounds of solid waste per day over the CEQA baseline level, similar to the proposed Project. (A small percentage of this waste would be considered hazardous waste and would be transported to an appropriate facility, such as Buttonwillow or the Kettleman Hills facility.) This amount represents 0.0011% of the permitted daily capacity of 6,000 tons at Chiquita Canyon and 0.0005% of the permitted daily capacity of 12,100 at Sunshine Canyon. The landfills would be able to accommodate the small increase in solid waste generated by proposed project operations through their closure dates. Because adequate landfill capacity would be available through the project horizon year of 2026, Alternative 3's implementation would result in a less than significant impact on landfill capacity under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

Although significant impacts on landfill capacity would not occur, mitigation measures MM UT-1, MM UT-2, and MM GHG-3 would be implemented to further reduce the amount of solid waste generated.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Impact Determination

By 2026, operation of Alternative 3 would generate an additional 40 pounds of solid waste per day above the NEPA baseline. This would represent an increase in the contribution to the permitted throughput at Chiquita Canyon from NEPA baseline conditions of 0.0027% to Alternative 3 operations of 0.003%, and the contribution to the permitted throughput at Sunshine Canyon would increase from 0.0013% to 0.0015%. The landfills would be able to accommodate the small increase in solid waste generated by proposed project operations through their respective closure dates, estimated to be approximately 2019 for Chiquita Canyon and 2037 for Sunshine Canyon. Because adequate landfill capacity would be available through the project horizon year of 2026, Alternative 3's implementation would result in a less than significant impact on landfill capacity under NEPA.

Mitigation Measures

Although significant impacts on landfill capacity would not occur, mitigation measures MM UT-1, MM UT-2, and MM GHG-3 would be implemented to further reduce the amount of solid waste generated.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact UT-5: Implementation of Alternative 3 would not require new, off-site energy supply and distribution infrastructure or capacity-enhancing alterations to existing facilities that are not anticipated by adopted plans or programs.

Construction under Alternative 3 would include the same components as the proposed Project except it would not include conducting the proposed dredging and pile driving at Berths 214–216. As with the previous alternatives, energy (diesel fuel and electricity) would be used during construction of Alternative 3. Energy expenditures during construction would be short in duration, occurring periodically during each of the Alternative 3 construction phases. Construction would not result in substantial waste or inefficient use of energy because construction would be competitively bid, which would facilitate efficiency in all construction stages.

During operation, Alternative 3's electrical demand in 2026 would be 23,092,182 kWh, as it would reach a throughput of 1,913,000 TEUs. As described in Section 3.14.3.2, LADWP is charged with maintaining sufficient capability to provide its customers with a reliable supply of power, and will continue to do so with proper planning and development of facilities in accordance with the City Charter using such mechanisms as the Power IRP. Based on the LADWP Power IRP, electricity resources and reserves at LADWP will adequately provide electricity for all of its customers, including Alternative 3, through the current Power IRP planning horizon of 2040 (LADWP 2012). Further, LADWP is required by the Charter to provide a reliable supply of electricity for its customers; because LADWP is moving toward increasing renewable energy supplies in its resource portfolio, the electricity demand of Alternative 3, by itself, would not result in the need to construct a new off-site power station or facility.

Alternative 3 would generate negligible additional demand for natural gas associated with space and water heating because administrative offices would not be expanded and no new buildings are proposed. SCGC's existing supplies via the existing infrastructure adjacent to and within the Alternative 3 site would be adequate to serve Alternative 3 during the peak operational year of 2026.

CEQA Impact Determination

Construction of Alternative 3 would not result in substantial waste or inefficient use of energy, because construction would be competitively bid, which would facilitate efficiency in all construction stages. During operation, Alternative 3's electrical demand in 2026 would be 23,092,182 kWh, as it would reach a throughput of 1,913,000 TEUs, which is approximately 7,337,742 kWh more than the 2012 CEQA baseline. However, as with the proposed Project, LADWP will adequately provide electricity based on the LADWP Power IRP. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact on electrical service would be less than significant under CEQA.

Alternative 3-related natural gas demands (space and water heating) would be similar to the CEQA baseline, because no new buildings or building expansions are proposed. No additional gas line infrastructure would be required. Impacts on gas service would be less than significant under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required. However, GHG mitigation measure MM GHG-1 would require the tenant to perform regular energy audits, and MM GHG-2 would require use of LED lighting. These mitigation measures would further reduce energy demand associated with Alternative 3.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Impact Determination

During operation, Alternative 3's electrical demand in 2026 would be 23,092,182 kWh, as it would reach a throughput of 1,913,000 TEUs, which is approximately 4,319,852 kWh more than the 2026 NEPA baseline. However, as with the proposed Project, LADWP will adequately provide electricity based on the LADWP Power IRP. Therefore, for the same reasons discussed under the CEQA Impact Determination, impacts on electrical and natural gas services would be less than significant under NEPA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required. However, GHG mitigation measure MM GHG-1 would require the tenant to perform regular energy audits, and MM GHG-2 would require use of LED lighting. These mitigation measures would further reduce energy demand associated with Alternative 3.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

3.14.4.6 Summary of Impact Determinations

Table 3.14-7 summarizes the CEQA and NEPA impact determinations of the proposed Project and alternatives related to utilities and service systems, as described in the detailed discussion above. This table is meant to allow easy comparison between the potential impacts of the proposed Project and 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 impact threshold, 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.

Table 3.14-7: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Utilities Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Impacts after Mitigation
Proposed Project	**UT-1:** The proposed Project would not result in a substantial increase in wastewater flows that would exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB or the capacity of existing treatment facilities.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant
	UT-2: The proposed Project would not result in a substantial increase in water demand that would exceed the water supplies available from existing entitlements and resources, and would not require new or expanded facilities or entitlements.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant
	UT-3: The proposed Project would not generate substantial surface runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing municipal storm drain systems.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant
	UT-4: Implementation of the proposed Project would not result in an increase in solid waste generation due to project operations that would exceed the capacity of existing solid waste handling and disposal facilities.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required; however, **MM UT-1:** Recycling Construction Materials, **MM UT-2:** Using materials with recycling content, and **MM GHG-3:** Recycling would further reduce any potential impact.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant
	UT-5: Implementation of the proposed Project would not require new, off-site energy supply and distribution infrastructure or capacity-enhancing alterations to existing facilities that are not anticipated by adopted plans or programs.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required; however, **MM GHG-1:** Energy Audit and **MM GHG-2:** LED Lighting would further reduce any potential impact.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant

Table 3.14-7: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Utilities Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Impacts after Mitigation
Alternative 1 – No Project	**UT-1:** Alternative 1 would not result in a substantial increase in wastewater flows that would exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB or the capacity of existing treatment facilities.	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	NEPA: Not applicable
	UT-2: Alternative 1 would not result in a substantial increase in water demand that would exceed the water supplies available from existing entitlements and resources, and would not require new or expanded facilities or entitlements.	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	NEPA: Not applicable
	UT-3: Alternative 1 would not generate substantial surface runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing municipal storm drain systems.	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	NEPA: Not applicable
	UT-4: Implementation of Alternative 1 would not result in an increase in solid waste generation due to project operations that would exceed the capacity of existing solid waste handling and disposal facilities.	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	NEPA: Not applicable
	UT-5: Implementation of Alternative 1 would not require new, off-site energy supply and distribution infrastructure or capacity-enhancing alterations to existing facilities that are not anticipated by adopted plans or programs.	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	NEPA: Not applicable

Table 3.14-7: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Utilities Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Impacts after Mitigation
Alternative 2 – No Federal Action	**UT-1:** Alternative 2 would not result in a substantial increase in wastewater flows that would exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB or the capacity of existing treatment facilities.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: No impact
	UT-2: Alternative 2 would not result in a substantial increase in water demand that would exceed the water supplies available from existing entitlements and resources, and would not require new or expanded facilities or entitlements.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: No impact
	UT-3: Alternative 2 would not generate substantial surface runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing municipal storm drain systems.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: No impact
	UT-4: Implementation of Alternative 2 would not result in an increase in solid waste generation due to project operations that would exceed the capacity of existing solid waste handling and disposal facilities.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: No impact	**MM UT-1:** Recycling of Construction Materials, **MM UT-2:** Materials with Recycled Content, and **MM GHG-3:** Recycling would further reduce any potential impact.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: No impact
	UT-5: Implementation of Alternative 2 would not require new, off-site energy supply and distribution infrastructure or capacity-enhancing alterations to existing facilities that are not anticipated by adopted plans or programs.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: No impact	**MM UT-1:** Recycling of Construction Materials, **MM UT-2:** Materials with Recycled Content, and **MM GHG-1:** Energy Audit would further reduce any potential impact.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: No impact

Table 3.14-7: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Utilities Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Impacts after Mitigation
Alternative 3 – Reduced Project: Improve Berths 217–220 Only	**UT-1:** Alternative 3 would not result in a substantial increase in wastewater flows that would exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB or the capacity of existing treatment facilities.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant
	UT-2: Alternative 3 would not result in a substantial increase in water demand that would exceed the water supplies available from existing entitlements and resources, and would not require new or expanded facilities or entitlements.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant
	UT-3: Alternative 3 would not generate substantial surface runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing municipal storm drain systems.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant
	UT-4: Implementation of Alternative 3 would not result in an increase in solid waste generation due to project operations that would exceed the capacity of existing solid waste handling and disposal facilities.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant	**MM UT-1:** Recycling of Construction Materials, **MM UT-2:** Materials with Recycled Content, and **MM GHG-3:** Recycling would further reduce any potential impact.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant
	UT-5: Implementation of Alternative 3 would not require new, off-site energy supply and distribution infrastructure or capacity-enhancing alterations to existing facilities that are not anticipated by adopted plans or programs**.**	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required; however, GHG mitigation measure **MM GHG-1:** Energy Audit would require the tenant to perform regular energy audits, further reducing energy demand associated with the proposed Project.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant

3.14.4.7 Mitigation Monitoring

The mitigation monitoring program below is applicable to the proposed Project and Alternatives 2 and 3 under CEQA and NEPA.

Impact UT-4: Implementation of Alternative 3 would not result in an increase in solid waste generation due to project operations that would exceed the capacity of existing solid waste handling and disposal facilities.	
Mitigation Measure	**MM UT-1: Recycling of Construction Materials.** Demolition and/or excess construction materials will be separated on site for reuse/recycling or proper disposal. During grading and construction, separate bins for recycling of construction materials will be provided on site.
Timing	During demolition and construction activities
Methodology	Demolition and construction waste will be separated on site into piles identified for reuse, recycling, or disposal. Materials will be taken to the appropriate facilities.
Responsible Parties	Construction contractor; LAHD to verify
Residual Impacts	Less than significant
Mitigation Measure	**MM UT-2: Materials with Recycled Content**. Materials with recycled content will be used in project construction where feasible.
Timing	Pre-construction material planning and during construction
Methodology	Construction materials, where feasible, will have content that has been recycled from a previous function.
Responsible Parties	Construction contractor; LAHD to verify
Residual Impacts	Less than significant

Mitigation measures for greenhouse gases (MM GHG-1 through MM GHG-3) are also applicable to the proposed Project and Alternatives 2 and 3 to further reduce energy use (MM GHG-1 and MM GHG-2) and solid waste generation (MM GHG-3). The monitoring program for mitigation measures MM GHG-1 through MM GHG-3 can be found in Section 3.6, Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

3.14.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts

No significant unavoidable impacts on utilities or service systems would occur during construction or operation of the proposed Project or an alternative.