



SPECIAL PUBLIC NOTICE

Notice of Intent (NOI) / Notice of Preparation (NOP) of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report and Public Scoping Meeting for the Berths 121-131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project

NOTICE OF INTENT/NOTICE OF PREPARATION (NOI/NOP)

This Notice of Intent/Notice of Preparation (NOI/NOP) is to inform responsible and trustee agencies, public agencies, and the public that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the City of Los Angeles Harbor Department (LAHD) will be preparing a joint Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) for the proposed Berths 121-131 Yang Ming Container Terminal Redevelopment Project (proposed Project) and alternatives. The USACE and the LAHD have agreed to jointly prepare a Draft EIS/EIR in order to optimize efficiency and avoid duplication of effort. The Draft EIS/EIR is intended to be sufficient in scope to address the federal, state, and local requirements and the environmental issues concerning the proposed activities and permit approvals.

Notice of Intent

Interested parties are hereby notified that an application has been received for a USACE permit for the jurisdictional activities described herein. The USACE is considering the LAHD's application for a permit under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 United States Code [U.S.C.] 403 et seq.), Section 404 of the Clean Water Act of 1972 (33 U.S.C. 1344 et seq.), as amended, and Section 103 of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (MPRSA) (33 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.), as amended, to perform dredging and disposal, including potential ocean disposal of dredged material; cut back existing land by 3.7 acres and place fill material and quarry rock to create 2.1 acres of new land (for a net creation of 1.6 acres of water area); construct new wharves, including placement of piles and construction of shoreside electrical infrastructure; install, replace, and/or modify container loading apparatus including new, larger wharf cranes and associated infrastructure); and perform other ancillary improvements within 100 feet of the waters' edge. These actions are proposed in association with improvements to an existing container terminal at Berths 121-131, located in the West Basin of the Port of Los Angeles (Port, POLA; see Figure 1); additional detail of the proposed Project is provided below in Section 4. Interested parties are invited to provide their views on the scope of the Draft EIS/EIR, which will become a part of the public record and will be considered

Berths 121-131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project	1	April 2014
---	---	------------

in the development of the EIS/EIR. The EIS/EIR will be used as part of a USACE permit decision pursuant to the aforementioned statutes. The USACE is the federal lead agency for preparing the EIS under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The primary federal concerns are the potentially significant project-related and cumulative impacts that may result from dredging activities, potential discharges of fill material into waters of the United States, potential transport and disposal of dredged material at an ocean disposal site, installation of pilings, and installation of over-water gantry cranes. Therefore, in accordance with NEPA, the USACE is requiring the preparation of an EIS prior to making a permit decision. The USACE may ultimately make a determination to permit or deny the proposed Project, or permit a modified version of the proposed Project or a project alternative. The USACE has prepared and published a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS for the proposed Project in the Federal Register dated April 11, 2014.

Notice of Preparation

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the LAHD will serve as the lead agency for the preparation of an EIR for its consideration of development within its jurisdiction. The LAHD has prepared, as part of this Notice of Preparation (NOP), an Environmental Checklist in support of the EIR documentation, in accordance with the current City of Los Angeles Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, (Article I); the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, California Code of Regulations); and the California Public Resources Code (Section 21000, et seq.).

The CEQA Environmental Checklist is attached to this NOP for public review and comment. Public comments on the NOI/NOP should be submitted to the USACE and the LAHD by May 25, 2014.

Berths 121–131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project	2	April 2014
---	---	------------




Figure 1
Scoping Meeting Location
Berths 121-131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal
Redevelopment Project

Scoping Meeting

Berths 121-131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project	3	April 2014
---	---	------------

The USACE Los Angeles District, Regulatory Division, and the LAHD will jointly conduct a public scoping meeting for the proposed Project. The purpose of the scoping meeting is to solicit and receive public comment and assess public concerns regarding the appropriate scope and content in the preparation of the Draft EIS/EIR. Participation in the public meeting by federal, state, and local agencies and other interested organizations and persons is encouraged. This meeting will be conducted in both English and Spanish. Members of the public who wish to communicate and listen entirely in Spanish are encouraged to attend this meeting. The meeting time and location is as follows:

May 8th, 2014
 6:00 p.m.–8:00 p.m.
 at the
 Board Room
 Harbor Administration Building
 425 S. Palos Verdes St
 San Pedro, CA 90731

See Figure 1 for a map of the meeting location. The scoping process is intended to provide the USACE and LAHD with information the public feels is necessary to establish the appropriate scope for preparing the environmental analysis in the Draft EIS/EIR. Please submit your comments, concerns, suggestions for project alternatives, and any other pertinent information that may enable us to prepare a comprehensive and meaningful EIS/EIR for the proposed Project.

Public Comment at the Scoping Meeting:

During the public scoping meeting, anyone wishing to make a statement will be allocated a certain amount of time to provide information on the proposed Project. The amount of time each person is allowed will depend on the number of people who sign up to speak at the public hearing. At this time, we estimate that individuals will be given three (3) minutes to provide their comments verbally. We would like to encourage interest groups to designate an official spokesperson to present the group’s views. We will allocate a larger amount of time to official representatives of such groups upon request.

Groups wishing to designate an official representative must notify the USACE in writing prior to, but no later than, May 1, 2014. The determination of this extended speaking time will be based on the number of responses received by the USACE. This rule will be strictly enforced at the discretion of the USACE’s hearing officer.

Berths 121–131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project	4	April 2014
---	---	------------

Written Comments:

Written and email comments to the USACE and LAHD will be received through May 25, 2014.

Written comments: Please send written comments to **both** addresses below:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Los Angeles District, Regulatory Division
Ventura Field Office
c/o Theresa Stevens, Ph.D.
2151 Alessandro Drive, Suite 110
Ventura, CA 93001

Christopher Cannon, Director
Environmental Management Division
Los Angeles Harbor Department
425 S. Palos Verdes Street
San Pedro, CA 90731

Email Comments: Please send email comments to **both** email addresses below:

ceqacomment@portla.org and Theresa.Stevens@usace.army.mil

Comment letters sent via email should include the commenter’s mailing address in the body of the email, and the project title “Berths 121-131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project” in the email subject line.

Parties interested in being added to USACE’s electronic mail notification list for the proposed Project can register at: http://www.spl.usace.army.mil/Portals/17/docs/regulatory/mailling_registration.pdf. This list will be used in the future to notify the public about scheduled hearings and availability of future public notices for proposed Project. Project information provided by LAHD can be found at the following website: http://www.portoflosangeles.org/environment/public_notices.asp.

Contacts:

USACE Project Manager: Theresa Stevens, Ph.D. (805) 585-2146,
Theresa.Stevens@usace.army.mil

LAHD Project Manager: Kevin Grant, (310) 732-7693, kgrant@portla.org

Berths 121–131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project	5	April 2014
---	---	------------

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1.0 Project Overview and Background

1.1 Project Overview

The LAHD administers the Port under the California Tidelands Trust Act of 1911 and the Los Angeles City Charter. The LAHD develops and leases Port property to tenants who operate the facilities. The Port encompasses 7,500 acres and 43 miles of waterfront and provides a major gateway for international goods and services. With 23 major cargo terminals, including dry and liquid bulk, container, breakbulk, automobile, and passenger facilities, the Port handled about 165 million metric revenue tons of cargo in fiscal year 2012/2013 (July 2012–June 2013) (POLA 2013a). In addition to cargo business operations, the Port is home to commercial fishing vessels, shipyards, boat repair facilities, as well as recreational, community, and educational facilities.

The EIS/EIR will evaluate the potential impact of the construction and operation of the proposed Project, which is described in more detail in Section 4 below, as well as alternatives. The proposed Project is divided into two phases; Phase I would be constructed in 2016 – 2018, and Phase II would be initiated in 2018, immediately following the completion of Phase I, with construction lasting until 2023.

Phase I would consist of deepening Berths 126-129 to 53 feet below Mean Lower Low Water (MLLW), constructing a new, 1,260-foot concrete wharf with provision for Alternative Maritime Power (AMP)¹, replacing eight existing wharf cranes with ten new cranes with 100- or 120-foot-gauge crane rails² (the new cranes would be approximately 60 feet higher than the cranes currently at the site), and expanding the on-dock rail yard known as the West Basin Intermodal Container Transfer Facility (WBICTF) by adding two loading tracks. Phase I of the proposed Project would also extend the current lease by nine years, from 2021 to 2030. Phase I construction would take approximately 18 months to complete, with construction expected to begin in 2016. Operations would continue during the construction period.

Phase II would consist of realigning the pierhead line by demolishing the existing wharf and constructing a new, 1,400-foot wharf with 100-foot- or 120-foot-gauge crane rails and provisions for AMP at Berths 121-126. Realignment of the pierhead line would require cutting back the existing land by 3.7 acres and creating 2.1 acres of new land by filling, for a net gain of 1.6 acres of water area. The new wharf would accommodate 10 new cranes, for a total of 20 on the terminal at full build-out. Phase II would also include deepening the berth to -53 feet MLLW by dredging, expanding the WBICTF by lengthening the loading tracks, demolishing existing buildings and constructing a new maintenance/administration building, and converting the terminal to automated operations by installing electric-powered rail-mounted gantry cranes (RMGs) in place of the existing diesel-powered rubber-tired gantry

¹ AMP technology is often referred to as “cold ironing” and allows container vessels docked at berth to “plug in” to shore side electrical power instead of running on diesel power for auxiliary power needs while berthed.

² The rail gauge refers to the spacing of the rails on the wharf.

Berths 121–131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project	6	April 2014
---	---	------------

cranes (RTGs). Deepening the berth would require dredging and disposing of sediments; some of the material would be re-used to create the new land. .

1.2 Project Background

The existing container terminal at the proposed project site (Berths 121-131) is operated by Yang Ming Marine Transport Corporation (YM) under a lease agreement (Permit No. 787) between LAHD and YM. The lease agreement governs approximately 186 acres in the West Basin area, and YM has an option to extend the lease through 2030. YM operates two berths and a container yard, and shares the WBICTF on-dock rail facility with the adjacent China Shipping terminal at Berths 97-102.

The proposed project site is located at 2001 John S. Gibson Boulevard in the Port (Figure 2). The site is within the Port of Los Angeles Community Plan area in the City and County of Los Angeles, California. The proposed project site is near the communities of San Pedro and Wilmington and is approximately 20 miles south of downtown Los Angeles (Figure 3). The site is generally bounded on the north by the TraPac container terminal, the I-110 freeway, the Conoco-Phillips refinery, and the community of Wilmington; on the east by the West Basin, the TraPac container terminal, and the Conoco-Phillips marine terminal; on the south by the China Shipping container terminal, Pacific Avenues, Front Street, and the San Pedro community; and on the west by the I-110 Freeway, the Port Los Angeles Distribution Center, and the community of San Pedro. Land uses in the proposed project site vicinity support a variety of cargo handling operations, including container, liquid bulk, and dry bulk; commercial fishing and seafood processing; a power plant (Harbor Generating Station); Port administration and maintenance facilities; maritime support uses; and recreational and residential uses.

Berths 121–131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project	7	April 2014
---	---	------------



Figure 3
Project Vicinity Map
Berths 121-131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal
Redevelopment Project



2.0 Project Purpose and Need/Project Objectives

The purpose of the proposed Project is to improve marine shipping and commerce by upgrading container terminal infrastructure in, over, and under water and on terminal backlands. The improvements are needed to accommodate the increased volumes of cargo that the economic forecasts predict and to accommodate the larger container ships (14,000 twenty-foot equivalent units [TEU³ or larger) that are anticipated to call at the terminal in the future. The proposed Project is needed because the existing berth at the terminal is not deep enough to accommodate the projected fleet mix; the wharf and cranes at the existing berth are not large enough to load and unload the larger container ships efficiently; and the WBICTF on-dock rail yard does not have the capacity to efficiently accommodate the projected increase in the volumes of containers that would be transported by rail.

The overall project objective is to optimize the container-handling efficiency and capacity of the Port to accommodate the projected fleet mix of larger container vessels that are anticipated to call at the Yang Ming Terminal. To meet the project objective, the following detailed objectives need to be met:

- optimize the use of existing land at the Yang Ming Terminal and associated waterways in a manner that is consistent with the LAHD's public trust obligations;
- provide sufficient depth to ensure the terminal's ability to accommodate the number and size of container ships anticipated to call at the terminal in the foreseeable future;
- improve the wharf facilities at the Yang Ming Terminal to accommodate berthing and loading/unloading of those larger ships; and
- increase on-dock rail facilities to accommodate projected increases in the volume of containers through the Yang Ming Terminal as a result of the larger ships; and
- facilitate more efficient operations by providing infrastructure that will support in terminal automation.

3.0 Existing Conditions

The Yang Ming (YM) Terminal consists of wharves for loading and unloading cargo ships, a large chassis parking/container storage yard, an on-dock intermodal rail yard (the WBICTF), container and equipment maintenance and repair facilities, an entry/exit gate complex, a marine operations building, and an administration building area (Figure 4). Most of the terminal is paved with asphalt, but some areas in the yard, around buildings, and on the wharf are paved with concrete.

³ A TEU is a standard measurement used in the maritime industry for measuring containers of varying lengths. It is based on the volume of a 20-foot-long intermodal container, a standard-sized metal box that is transferred between different modes of transportation, such as ships, trains, and trucks. Because the dimensions of containers vary, TEU is used to standardize capacity and applies conversion factors to account for the varied sizes of containers being handled on vessels and at the terminals.

Berths 121–131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project	10	April 2014
---	----	------------



Figure 4
Existing Terminal Site Map
Berths 121-131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal
Redevelopment Project



There are two operational vessel berths at the terminal, Berths 121 – 126 and Berths 126-129. There are currently eight large gantry cranes on the wharves, three owned by the Port and five by Yang Ming, (YM) but only the five YM-owned cranes are in operation. All eight existing cranes are 50-foot gauge and are 209 feet high at the apex with an outreach of 145 feet. The three non-operating cranes are parked at Berth 131. The water depth at Berths 121-131 is approximately 45 feet below MLLW.

In 2013, the Yang Ming Terminal moved 660,385 TEUs, which was accomplished with 106 vessel calls. The majority of vessels calling at the Yang Ming Terminal included 6,500-TEU-capacity vessels and 4,000-TEU-capacity vessels; no vessels of 8,000-TEU capacity or greater called at the Yang Ming Terminal in 2013. The terminal typically operated 16 hours per day, 6 to 7 days per week, and approximately 305 days of the year. Yang Ming currently operates three rail loading tracks within the adjacent WBICTF on-dock rail yard; in 2013 the rail yard handled approximately 184,842 TEU of YM cargo. The terminal’s cargo destined for the local region and for rail yards other than the WBICTF was conveyed by trucks.

4.0 Description of the Proposed Project

The proposed Project involves the construction and operation of terminal improvements within the Yang Ming Terminal. Phase I construction would consist of dredging and disposing of sediments to deepen the berth; installing new piles; demolishing the existing wharf and constructing a new wharf; removing three existing wharf cranes, adding up to ten new, larger cranes and relocating the remaining five existing cranes to Berths 121-126; and expanding the WBICTF on-dock rail yard by adding two loading tracks (Figure 5). Each of these is described in additional detail in Section 4.1.1. Operation of the proposed Phase I Project is described in Section 4.1.2.

Phase II construction would consist of dredging to deepen Berths 121-126 and disposing of the dredged material; realigning the pierhead line by excavating 3.7 acres of existing shoreline and backlands and filling 2.1 acres of existing water area; constructing a new pile-supported wharf and a rock dike; demolishing existing buildings and constructing new buildings for administration/maintenance and marine operations; installing up to ten new container cranes on the new wharf; expanding the existing WBICTF to the southwest; and constructing various backlands improvements to support increased automated operations. These improvements are depicted in Figure 6 and described in more detail in Section 4.2.1. Operation of Phase II is described in Section 4.2.2.

4.1 Phase I Construction and Operation

4.1.1 Construction

Dredging

The proposed improvements to Berths 126-129 include dredging approximately 400,000 cubic yards of sediments to increase the depth from -45 to -53 feet MLLW (with an additional two feet of overdredge depth, for a total depth of -55 feet MLLW). All dredged material would either be re-used beneficially as construction fill (either in Phase II or in other Port projects) or be disposed of at an approved site; potential sites include an existing ocean disposal site such as the LA-2 site; the Berths 243–245 confined disposal facility (CDF); or another approved location. A sampling and analysis program would be implemented to determine suitability of the dredge material for beneficial re-use and/or disposal.

Berths 121–131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project	12	April 2014
---	----	------------

Wharf and Wharf Cranes

The existing wharf cannot support the number and size of cranes needed to load and unload modern container ships, including the 14,000 TEU vessels currently entering the world fleet and any larger ships that may be deployed in the future. Accordingly, a new, 1260-foot, pile-supported wharf capable of handling super-post-Panamax cranes would be constructed at Berths 126-129. Construction would include installing several thousand concrete piles, constructing a poured-concrete wharf deck, and installing crane rails, electrical infrastructure (including provisions for AMP), and mooring infrastructure.

Under the proposed Project up to ten new, 100-foot- to 120-foot-gauge, single- or dual-hoist, super-post-Panamax cranes, with their supporting crane rails and electrical infrastructure, would be installed at the terminal. These cranes would be approximately 270 feet high at the apex and would have a 200-foot outreach in order to accommodate loading and unloading the largest cargo vessels. The new cranes would be delivered by ship to the new wharf, fully assembled.

The five existing 50-foot-gauge cranes currently in regular use would remain on the terminal, likely for use at Berths 121-126. The three Port-owned, non-operational cranes would be removed during project construction, resulting in up to 15 cranes on the terminal at Phase I full buildout (five 50-foot-gauge cranes and ten 100-foot- or 120-foot-gauge cranes).

WBICTF Rail Yard Improvements

Expansion of the WBICTF on-dock rail would include the addition of two 3,000-linear-foot rail loading tracks, including four turnouts, and reconstruction of a portion of the backlands to accommodate the rail expansion. These improvements would involve grading, paving, striping, lighting, drainage, and utility relocation/modifications as needed.

Construction Schedule

The various elements of Phase I would be constructed concurrently in a single phase. Construction of the proposed Project is anticipated to begin in late 2016 and last for approximately 18 months. The Yang Ming terminal would continue to operate, receiving and loading cargo, throughout the entire construction period, although some vessels would likely be diverted to other marine terminals in the port complex during portions of the construction.

4.1.2 Proposed Operations

The proposed Project includes extending the current lease by nine years, from 2021 to 2030. Implementation of Phase I of the proposed Project would result in a backland-constrained⁴ terminal with maximum capacity of approximately 2,000,000 TEU in the horizon year (2030). Without Phase I of the proposed Project, the terminal would have a maximum physical capacity of approximately 1,638,000 TEU and would be berth-constrained.⁵ Therefore, Phase I of the proposed Project would increase the capacity of the terminal by approximately 362,000 TEU.

⁴ Capacity is limited by the backland area to store and move containers on and off the terminal.

⁵ Capacity is limited by the number of berths and number of vessels that could call upon the terminal to move containers.

Berths 121–131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project	13	April 2014
---	----	------------



Figure 5
Phase I: Proposed Project Site Map
Berths 121-131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal
Redevelopment Project



4.2 Phase II Construction and Operation

4.2.1 Construction

Dredging and Filling

The proposed improvements to Berths 121-126 include dredging to increase depth from -45 to -53 feet MLLW (with an additional two feet of overdredge depth, for a total depth of up to -55 feet MLLW). All dredged material would either be re-used beneficially as construction fill (either in the Phase II project or in other Port projects) or be disposed of at an approved site, using the same re-use and disposal options described for Phase I.

The existing wharf at Berths 121-126 would be demolished, and the shoreline and adjacent backlands excavated as shown in Figure 6 in order to realign the pierhead line. Approximately 3.7 acres of backlands would be excavated to below 0 feet MLLW, thereby creating new water area. Excavated material not re-used on site would be stockpiled elsewhere in the Port for future re-use in other Port projects. To support the new wharf, approximately 2.1 acres of existing water area would be filled to above 0 feet MLLW, most likely using the material excavated to create water area. Construction would, therefore, result in the creation of approximately 1.6 acres of new water area at the Project site. Quarry rock would be placed on the new shoreline slope as protection and stabilization. The rock would come partly from re-use of the existing rock dike and partly as imported rock from sources outside the Port.

Wharf and Wharf Cranes

A new, pile-supported concrete wharf capable of handling super-post-Panamax cranes would be constructed at Berths 121-126. Construction would include driving several thousand concrete piles, constructing a poured-concrete wharf deck, and installing crane rails, electrical infrastructure, and mooring infrastructure. The new wharf would include infrastructure for providing AMP to vessels at berth. .

Up to ten new, 100- or 120-foot-gauge, single-hoist, super-post-Panamax cranes, with their supporting crane rails and electrical infrastructure would be installed on the new wharf. These cranes would be approximately 270 feet high at the apex and would have a 200-foot outreach in order to accommodate loading and unloading the largest cargo vessels. The new cranes would be delivered fully assembled to the new wharf, by ship.

The five existing 50-foot-gauge cranes at Berth 121 in Phase I would be removed during construction. Accordingly, at full buildout of Phase II the YM Terminal would have up to 20 new 100-foot- or 120-foot-gauge cranes and no older cranes.

Buildings

The existing maintenance and repair, marine operations, and gate office buildings would be demolished. New buildings to support administration and maintenance functions would be constructed in the southwestern portion of the Yang Ming terminal, a new gate complex would be constructed near the existing complex, and a new marine operations building would be constructed at the north end of the new wharf.

In accordance with the Port of Los Angeles' Green Building policy (POLA 2007), the new administration/maintenance building would be constructed at a minimum to meet the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver standards. These

Berths 121–131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project	15	April 2014
---	----	------------

standards include, among other things, sustainable site planning, energy efficiency, water conservation, and conserving materials and resources.

WBICTF Rail Yard Improvements

Phase II expansion of the WBICTF on-dock rail would involve extending the existing rail loading tracks into the area currently occupied by the maintenance and repair building. Construction would include laying new track and turnouts; grading, paving, striping; and installing lighting, drainage, and utility relocation/modifications as needed. In addition, crane rails and electrical infrastructure would be installed along the tracks to support RMGs.

Backlands Improvements

In order to support automated operations, the container yard would be reconfigured and reconstructed to accommodate RMGs and other infrastructure. Although the type of automated container terminal equipment is unknown at this time, such a system can include automated shuttle carriers, other types of horizontal transport such as automated guided vehicles (AGVs), or manual shuttles; tractors and terminal chassis can also be used within the same operational footprint. It is anticipated that construction would include reinforcing the pavement in selected areas, installing crane rails and electrical and other infrastructure, and installing striping, signage, fencing, lighting, and utilities.

Construction Schedule

The various elements of Phase II would be constructed in 2018 to 2023. The Yang Ming terminal would continue to operate, receiving and loading cargo, throughout the entire construction period. However, some vessels would likely be diverted to other marine terminals in the port complex during portions of the construction.

4.2.2 Proposed Operations

Implementation of Phase II of the proposed Project would result in a maximum capacity of between 2,000,000 and 3,000,000 TEU. The upper limit is defined by the berth capacity associated with the proposed Phase II wharf improvements. A detailed terminal capacity analysis will be conducted in the Draft EIR/EIS to determine if, and by how much, automation could increase the container yard capacity, which could be the limiting capacity associated with Phase II.

Without Phase II of the proposed Project but assuming operation of Phase I, the terminal would have a maximum physical capacity of approximately 2,000,000 TEU and would be backlands-constrained.

Yang Ming has expressed interest in terminal automation as part of Phase II development of the proposed Project. Automation is one strategy that a terminal operator can pursue to reduce costs and improve efficiency, whether operating at capacity or less. Terminal operators choose their mode of operation (amount of labor employed per vessel, terminal operating hours, degree of automation) based upon their own internal business models, which balance the level of service they can provide to their shipping line and cargo-owning customers against the costs of providing that level of service. With the trend towards larger vessels likely to continue, the need for increased efficiency will continue to grow. Automation can improve the efficiency of cargo handling and speed the velocity of cargo movement through the terminal, especially as volumes increase.

Berths 121–131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project	16	April 2014
---	----	------------




Figure 6
Phase II: Proposed Project Site Map
Berths 121-131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal
Redevelopment Project



4.3 Regulatory Permit Requirements

The proposed Project involves work and structures and discharges of dredged or fill material in navigable waters of the U.S., and potential transport of dredged material for the purpose of ocean disposal at a designated offshore disposal site. These activities require USACE approval under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act, Section 103 of the MPRSA, and Section 404 permit under the Clean Water Act.

5.0 Project Baselines

To determine whether the proposed Project would have significant and unavoidable impacts on the environment, impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed Project and project alternatives are compared to a baseline condition. The difference between the proposed Project or project alternative and the baseline is then compared to a threshold to determine if the difference between the two is significant. For the purposes of the EIS/EIR, the City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds will be used for determining significance under both NEPA and CEQA. However, NEPA and CEQA use different baseline conditions from which significance is determined. Accordingly, review under NEPA and CEQA could reach different conclusions concerning the significance of project impacts.

5.1 NEPA Baseline

The evaluation of significance under NEPA (in an EIS) is defined by comparing the proposed Project or project alternative to the NEPA baseline scenario in future years. The NEPA baseline is the set of actions that would reasonably be expected to occur in the absence of federal action, in this case a USACE permit. The NEPA baseline, or No Federal Action Alternative, would not include any dredging, fill, dredge material disposal, wharf construction, or new cranes in, over, or under navigable waters of the United States. In addition, under the NEPA baseline scenario, the backlands improvements would likely not occur (because there would be no need for them), the existing lease would remain in place, and existing operations—including projected growth in goods movement using existing infrastructure—would continue up to the terminal's maximum physical capacity. Accordingly, the NEPA baseline scenario would correspond to the CEQA No Project scenario.

5.2 CEQA Baseline

The CEQA baseline is the set of conditions that exist at the time this NOP is circulated. The CEQA baseline normally represents conditions existing immediately prior to the start of environmental review of the proposed Project. For purposes of the EIS/EIR, the CEQA baseline for the proposed Project includes the cargo throughput (expressed as TEU [Twenty-foot Equivalent Units, a measure of containerized cargo volume]) for the calendar year preceding the NOP date (i.e., calendar year 2013). For the 12-month period between January 1 and December 31, 2013, the YM Terminal handled approximately 362,868 TEUs.

Berths 121–131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project	18	April 2014
---	----	------------

6.0 Project Alternatives

The Draft EIS/EIR will include analysis of alternatives to the proposed Project. Alternatives being considered include the following:

1. Reduced Project Alternative: The Reduced Project Alternative would consist of Phase I of the Proposed Project as described in Section 4.1; Phase II as described in Section 4.2 would not be constructed. Accordingly at full buildout the Reduced Project Alternative would consist of a 1260' wharf with up to 10 new cranes and 5 existing cranes (15 total cranes), and two new rail loading tracks.
2. No Project Alternative: The No Project Alternative required by CEQA represents what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the proposed Project were not approved. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no construction or upgrades at the terminal. However, the existing lease would remain in place and existing operations would continue at the YM Terminal until 2021.
3. No Federal Action Alternative: The No Federal Action Alternative required by NEPA includes all of the construction and operational activities which would reasonably be expected to occur without a USACE permit, including current and projected increases in goods movement. Without berth deepening, there would be no need for the proposed WBICTF expansion and other backlands improvements. Furthermore, the existing lease would remain in place and current operations would continue at the terminal. This alternative would have limited construction impacts and would constitute the NEPA baseline.

Additional alternatives may be added in the Draft EIS/EIR based on public comment and additional environmental analysis.

7.0 Environmental Issues

Issues identified as potentially significant or requiring further analysis under CEQA are described in the attached CEQA Environmental Checklist Form. Additional issues may be identified during the scoping process.

Berths 121–131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project	19	April 2014
---	----	------------

Environmental Checklist Form

1. Project Title:	Berths 121–131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project	
2. Lead Agency Name and Address:	NEPA Lead Agency: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Los Angeles District, Regulatory Division Ventura Field Office 2151 Alessandro Drive, Suite 110 Ventura, CA 93001	CEQA Lead Agency: Los Angeles Harbor Department Environmental Management Division 425 S. Palos Verdes Street San Pedro, CA 90731
3. Contact Person and Phone Number:	NEPA Lead Agency: Theresa Stevens, Ph.D. (805) 585-2146	CEQA Lead Agency: Kevin Grant (310) 732-7693
4. Project Location:	Yang Ming Terminal 2001 John S. Gibson Street Terminal Island, CA 90731	
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:	Los Angeles Harbor Department Engineering Division 425 S. Palos Verdes Street San Pedro, CA 90731	
6. Port Master Plan Designation:	General/Bulk Cargo (Non Hazardous Industrial and Commercial)	
7. Zoning:	[Q]M3-1	
8. Description of Project:	<p>The proposed Project would be accomplished in two phases. Phase I includes performing deepening and improvements at Berths 126-129, disposal of dredge material, expanding the West Basin Container Transfer Facility (WBICTF) by adding two loading tracks, demolishing the existing wharf and constructing a new wharf, replacing three of the eight existing 50-foot-gauge container cranes with up to ten new 100-or 120-foot-gauge cranes, installing associated infrastructure, and replacing and reconstructing asphalt and concrete to accommodate those changes. Phase II would demolish the existing wharf at Berths 121-126, cut back 3.7 acres of the land and create 2.1 acres of new land, construct a new, 1,400-foot-long wharf, reconfigure the container yard, demolish existing buildings and construct new ones, and further expand and modernize the WBICTF. Additional details of both phases are provided in Section 4.0.</p>	

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

The environmental factors checked below would potentially be affected by this proposed Project (i.e., the proposed Project would involve at least one impact that is a “potentially significant impact”), as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

X	Aesthetics		Agriculture and Forest Resources	X	Air Quality
X	Biological Resources	X	Cultural Resources		Geology/Soils
X	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	X	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	X	Hydrology/Water Quality
	Land Use/Planning		Mineral Resources	X	Noise
	Population/Housing		Public Services		Recreation
X	Transportation/Traffic		Utilities/Service Systems	X	Mandatory Findings of Significance

Determination:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

	I find that the proposed Project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
	I find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions to the proposed Project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
X	I find that the proposed Project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
	I find that the proposed Project MAY have an impact on the environment that is “potentially significant” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis, as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
	I find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed Project, nothing further is required.
Christopher Cannon, Director of Environmental Management Division	
	Date

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “no impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “no impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “no impact” answer should be explained if it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off site as well as on site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially significant impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “potentially significant impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Negative declaration: less than significant with mitigation incorporated” applies when the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from a “potentially significant impact” to a “less than significant impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used if, pursuant to tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration (Section 15063[c][3][D]). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - (a) Earlier analysis used. Identify and state where earlier analyses are available for review.
 - (b) Impacts adequately addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - (c) Mitigation measures. For effects that are “less than significant with mitigation incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, when appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

Berths 121–131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project	22	April 2014
---	----	------------

7. Supporting information sources. A source list should be attached and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - (a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question, and
 - (b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

Berths 121–131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project	23	April 2014
---	----	------------

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS.	Would the project:				
a.	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	X			
b.	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a scenic highway?			X	
c.	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	X			
d.	Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?	X			

Discussion:

a. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Potentially Significant Impact. Installation and operation of additional, larger cranes may result in adverse impacts on scenic vistas from public and private vantage points. Therefore, potentially significant impacts may occur and this issue will be discussed further in the EIS/EIR.

b. Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

Less Than Significant Impact. The nearest officially designated state scenic highway is approximately 33 miles north of the proposed Project (State Highway 2, from approximately three miles north of Interstate 210 in La Cañada to the San Bernardino County Line). The nearest eligible state scenic highway is approximately nine miles northeast of the proposed Project (State Highway 1, from State Highway 19 near Long Beach to Interstate 5 south of San Juan Capistrano) (California Department of Transportation 2013). The proposed project site is not visible from either of these locations. In addition to the California Department of Transportation's officially designated and eligible state scenic highways, the City of Los Angeles has city-designated scenic highways that are considered for local planning and development decisions. These include several streets in San Pedro that are in the vicinity of the proposed Project. John S. Gibson Boulevard, Pacific Avenue, Front Street, and Harbor Boulevard are city-designated scenic highways because they afford views of the Port and the Vincent Thomas Bridge.

The project site is on one of the city-designated highways (John S Gibson Boulevard) and near two others (Pacific Avenue and Front Street). However, significant impacts to those highways are not anticipated because the site is an existing container terminal and the proposed Project would not substantially alter the basic character of the view (port industrial). Although a less than significant impact is anticipated, this issue will be discussed further in the EIS/EIR.

c. Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

Potentially Significant Impact. Currently there are eight 50-foot-gauge cranes at the YM Terminal. Implementation of Phase I would replace three of those cranes with up to ten super-post-Panamax, 100-foot- to 120-foot-gauge, cranes, resulting in a total of up to 15 cranes at buildout. The new cranes would be approximately 60 feet higher than the existing cranes. Phase II would remove the remaining five old cranes and add up to ten more super-post-Panamax cranes, resulting in up to 20 large cranes at full buildout. While the project site is composed largely of industrial uses consistent with the proposed project improvements, impacts to the visual character or quality may be considered significant by certain viewers based on the increased height and number of wharf cranes. This issue will be discussed further in the EIS/EIR.

d. Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Potentially Significant Impact. The amount of onsite lighting would be increased above existing levels as a result of the lighting required for the additional, larger operating cranes. This issue will be discussed further in the EIS/EIR.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.	Would the project:				
a.	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
b.	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract?				X
c.	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in PRC Section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in PRC Section 4526)?				X
d.	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
e.	Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X

Discussion:

- a. **Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**

No Impact. According to the California Department of Conservation’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), the proposed project site is an area designated as Urban and Built-Up Land, which is described as land occupied by structures that has a variety of uses, including industrial, commercial, or railroad or other transportation yards. There is no Prime or Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance in the proposed project vicinity (California Department of Conservation 2010.) No Farmland currently exists on the proposed project site; therefore, none would be converted to

accommodate the proposed Project. Therefore, this issue will not be discussed in the EIS/EIR.

b. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?

No Impact. The proposed project site is zoned for heavy industrial use, and there are no agricultural zoning designations or agricultural uses within the proposed project limits or adjacent areas. The Williamson Act applies to parcels consisting of at least 20 acres of Prime Farmland or at least 40 acres of land not designated as Prime Farmland. The proposed project site is not located within a Prime Farmland designation, nor does it consist of more than 40 acres of farmland. Williamson Act contracts do not apply to the proposed project site. Therefore, this issue will not be discussed in the EIS/EIR.

c. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in PRC Section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in PRC Section 4526)?

No Impact. The proposed project site is zoned for industrial uses ([Q]M3-1). There is no forest land on or near the proposed Project site. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land or timberland. Therefore, this issue will not be discussed in the EIS/EIR.

d. Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. There is no forest land on or near the project site. The proposed improvements would occur on an existing container terminal and over navigable waters and would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, this issue will not be discussed in the EIS/EIR.

e. Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could individually or cumulatively result in loss of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. As discussed above, no farmland or forest land is located within the surrounding area or at the proposed project site. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not involve changes in the existing environment that would result in the loss of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, this issue will not be discussed in the EIS/EIR.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III.	AIR QUALITY. Would the project:				
a.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
b.	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	X			
c.	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a non-attainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	X			
d.	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	X			
e.	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	X			

Discussion:

a. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plans?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Port is located within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which consists of the urbanized areas of Los Angeles, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Orange Counties. Due to the combined air pollution sources from over 15 million people and meteorological and geographical effects that limit the dispersion of these pollutants, the SCAB can experience high air pollutant concentrations. As a result, the region currently does not attain the national and California ambient air quality standards for ozone (O3), particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM10), particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM2.5), and lead (national standard only).

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), in cooperation with the California Air Resource Board (CARB) and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), have developed air quality plans that are designed to bring the SCAB into attainment of the national and state ambient air quality standards. Periodically, the SCAQMD prepares an overall air quality management plan (AQMP) update to meet the federal requirements and/or to incorporate the latest technical planning information. Each iteration of the plan is an update of the previous plan. The Final 2012 AQMP was adopted by the AQMD Governing Board on December 7, 2012 (SCAQMD 2012).

Through this attainment planning process, the SCAQMD develops the SCAQMD Rules and Regulations to regulate stationary sources of air pollution in the SCAB. The National Ambient Air Quality Standards as defined in the Clean Air Act of 1970 identify six common air pollutants and set standards for their maximum allowable concentration in the atmosphere. If the standards are exceeded in any given area, then the pollutants are in “nonattainment” and the area in which the standards are exceeded is called a “nonattainment” area.

Construction and operational activities associated with the proposed Project would produce emissions of nonattainment pollutants in the form of (1) combustive emissions due to the use of fossil fuels in vessels and land-based vehicles and (2) fugitive dust emissions (PM10 and PM2.5) due to the operation of vehicles on roads and exposed soils. The 2012 AQMP proposes emission reduction measures that are designed to bring the SCAB into attainment of the national and state ambient air quality standards. These attainment strategies include emission control measures and clean fuel programs that are enforced at the federal and state level on engine manufacturers and petroleum refiners and retailers. The SCAQMD also adopts control measures proposed by the 2012 AQMP into the SCAQMD rules and regulations, which are then used to regulate sources of air pollution in the SCAB. Activities associated with the proposed Project would comply with these regulatory requirements, such as SCAQMD Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust).

The LAHD, in conjunction with the Port of Long Beach (POLB), implements the 2010 Update – San Pedro Bay Ports Clean Air Action Plan (CAAP). This planning policy sets goals and implementation strategies that reduce air emissions and health risks from Port operations. The CAAP implements emission control measures for ocean-going vessels (OGVs), harbor craft, trains, trucks, and terminal equipment. In some cases, these measures have produced emission reductions from these sources that are greater than those forecasted in the 2012 AQMP. Operational activities associated with the proposed Project would comply with the source-specific performance standards found in the CAAP and therefore would be consistent with emission reduction goals in the 2012 AQMP.

In addition, the AQMD Governing Board adopted an amendment to include control measure IND-01 in the Final 2012 AQMP at the February 1, 2013 Governing Board meeting. Control Measure IND-01 would ensure that the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach meet their voluntary commitments to reducing air pollution from ships, trucks, trains, and other equipment. This represents a backstop measure for indirect sources of emissions from ports and port-related facilities, and would take effect only if the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach fail to meet emission reduction targets needed to achieve federal health standards for fine particulates (PM2.5) by 2015. Under control measure IND-01, any additional port emission reductions must be technically feasible, cost-effective, and within the legal authority of the ports. Such measures potentially could include clean technology funding programs and lease agreements designed by the ports.

The LAHD provided cargo forecasts that were used by SCAG to simulate future growth and emission scenarios in the 2012 AQMP. These cargo forecasts encompass the operational activities associated with the YM Terminal. As a result, activities associated with the proposed Project would not exceed the future emission growth projections in the 2012 AQMP.

Berths 121–131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project	29	April 2014
---	----	------------

The SCAQMD staff is initiating an early development process for the 2015 AQMP, which will be a comprehensive and integrated Plan primarily focused on addressing the ozone standards. The 2015 AQMP will incorporate the latest scientific and technical information and planning assumptions, including the latest applicable growth assumptions, Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, and updated emission inventory methodologies for various source categories.

In conclusion, construction and operational activities associated with the proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. This impact is considered less than significant and will not be addressed further in the EIS/EIR.

b. Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Potentially Significant Impact. Proposed project construction, including dredging, backland, wharf, and infrastructure improvements, would likely result in fugitive dust and equipment emissions. Proposed project operations may result in increased emissions of air pollutants from terminal operations (compared to existing conditions), including emissions from terminal equipment, truck and train trips, and vessels. These issues will be further evaluated in the EIS/EIR.

c. Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

Potentially Significant Impact. Due to the elevated concentrations of air pollutants that currently occur in the SCAB and Port region, the proposed Project, in conjunction with other related projects, has the potential to make a substantial contribution to significant cumulative air quality impacts. This issue will be further evaluated in the EIS/EIR.

d. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Potentially Significant Impact. Sensitive receptors represent members of the population that are more susceptible to health impacts from air emissions. Sensitive receptor groups include children, the elderly, and the acutely and chronically ill. The locations of these groups include residences, schools, daycare centers, convalescent homes, hospitals, and residences. Within the project area, sensitive receptors are represented by residents of the Knoll Hill section of San Pedro (immediately south of Front Street and Pacific Avenue) and residents in the southwestern portion of Wilmington, immediately north of Harry Bridges Boulevard. The Knoll Hill area is approximately 0.4 mile from the southwestern boundary of the project site and the Wilmington area is approximately 0.3 mile from the northern boundary of the project site. Construction activities may expose sensitive receptors in those areas to air pollution in the form of dust and equipment emissions. Compliance with SCAQMD rules and regulations would be required during these construction phases.

Operational activities may also expose nearby sensitive receptors to increased levels of air pollution. In addition, there is the potential for the proposed Project to result in

Berths 121–131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project	30	April 2014
---	----	------------

increased toxic air pollutants associated with diesel emissions from ships, trains, trucks, and cargo handling equipment. These issues will be further evaluated in the EIS/EIR.

e. Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Potentially Significant Impact. Short-term odors from the use of diesel-powered heavy equipment, paving and use of asphalt, and temporary storage/stockpiling of dredged sediments for berth deepening may occur during construction. Odors from operation of the proposed Project would be similar to the odors produced from existing terminal operations and related activity. Impacts are potentially significant, and this issue will be further evaluated in the EIS/EIR.

Berths 121–131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project	31	April 2014
---	----	------------

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.	Would the project:				
a.	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	X			
b.	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	X			
c.	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
d.	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	X			
e.	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
f.	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

Discussion:

- a. **Would the project have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

Potentially Significant Impact. Federal and state endangered species are found in the harbor area. The California least tern (*Sterna antillarum browni*), which is on the federal and state endangered species list, nests and forages within the Port. A 15-acre California least tern nesting area is located on Pier 400, about three miles south of the proposed project site. In addition, Belding's savannah sparrows (*Passerculus rostratus/sandwichensis beldingi*) are found in the Port area (although not near the proposed Project site) and are on the state endangered species list. The delisted California brown pelican (*Pelecanus occidentalis californicus*) uses the outer breakwaters as resting habitat, and the delisted peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus*) nests on certain bridges within the harbor complex, including the nearby Vincent Thomas Bridge. Other non-listed special-status species with the potential to occur near the proposed Project site include black-crowned night heron (*Nycticorax nycticorax*), great blue heron (*Ardea herodias*), black oystercatcher (*Haematopus bachmani*), black skimmer (*Rynchops niger*), Caspian tern (*Hydroprogne caspia*), elegant tern (*Thalasseus elegans*), double-crested cormorant (*Phalacrocorax auritus*), and burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*) (POLA 2012). Several of these species are known to nest within the harbor complex. Accordingly, impacts on federal and state sensitive species are potentially significant, and this issue will be further evaluated in the EIS/EIR.

- b. **Would the project have a substantial adverse impact on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

Potentially Significant Impact. Dredging and filling activities could adversely affect marine biota through resuspension of dredged materials and removal or burial of benthic communities. Installation of new piles for the new wharf would create underwater noise and could result in injury or mortality of fish and harassment of marine mammals such as sea lions and harbor seals. The piles would add hard substrate in the water column and provide new attachment surfaces for native and non-native fouling organisms. Implementation of Phase II would result in an increase in the amount of open-water marine habitat in the harbor as a result of the net removal of 1.6 acres of land.

In addition, the proposed Project could introduce invasive species or affect local biological communities through ballast water discharges from arriving cargo vessels. Additionally, impacts to Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) as defined by the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson Act) could occur as a result of disturbance of the benthic food resource. The proposed Project is located in an area (Los Angeles Harbor) designated as EFH for species managed under the National Marine Fisheries Service Coastal Pelagic Species and Pacific Groundfish Management Plans. Of the 95 species managed under these plans, 24 are known to occur in the Port of Los Angeles/Port of Long Beach complex and could potentially be affected by the proposed dredging activities associated with the proposed Project. Impacts on sensitive species are potentially significant, and these issues will be further evaluated in the EIS/EIR.

- c. **Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**

No Impact. The only federally protected wetlands in the Port of Los Angeles area, the Cabrillo Salt Marsh and the Anchorage Road Salt Marsh, would not be in any way affected by the proposed Project. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not affect federally protected wetlands (as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act [CWA]) during in-water construction activities (i.e., dredging and installation of pilings). No impact would occur, and this issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.

- d. **Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites?**

Potentially Significant Impact. The harbor area includes known terrestrial wildlife migration corridors. Operations associated with the proposed Project could result in a barrier to wildlife passage and potentially affect wildlife movement or migration in the harbor. Common fish habitat could be affected by dredging, filling, and the installation of piles. Therefore, this impact is considered potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIS/EIR.

- e. **Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?**

No Impact. The proposed Project's landside area is a highly urbanized and industrial site that contains no undeveloped habitat. Although the proposed project site has a small amount of landscaped trees and shrubs around the main administration building and parking lot, the trees are not considered protected trees in accordance with the City of Los Angeles Tree Preservation Policy (Ordinance No. 177404; City of Los Angeles 2006). No impact would occur and this issue will not be discussed further in the EIS/EIR.

- f. **Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural communities conservation plan, or any other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?**

No Impact. There is only one NCCP approved near the Port, and it was designed to protect coastal scrub (Palos Verdes Peninsula Sub-Regional Plan); this area is located approximately four miles from the proposed Project site. The proposed Project would not be located within or near an adopted Natural Communities Conservation Plan (NCCP) or Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). The NCCP program, which began in 1991 under California's Natural Community Conservation Planning Act, is administered by the CDFW and is a cooperative effort between resource agencies and developers that takes a broad-based ecosystem approach to planning for the protection and perpetuation of biological diversity.

HCPs are administered by the USFWS and are designed to identify how impacts would be mitigated when a project would impact endangered species. There are no HCPs in place for the Port. A Memorandum of Understanding is in place for the LAHD, CDFW, USFWS, and USACE to protect the California least tern, and requires a 15-acre nesting site to be protected during the annual nesting season (May to October). The nesting site

is on Pier 400, over one mile from the proposed Project site, and is being considered for designation as a Significant Ecological Area by the County of Los Angeles (POLA 2012).

The proposed Project would have no impact on HCPs, NCCPs, the Memorandum of Understanding regarding California least tern, or the Significant Ecological Area for least tern. The project site is located approximately three miles from the California least tern nesting site and does not contain nesting habitat or foraging habitat. Therefore, no impact would occur, and this issue will not be discussed further in the EIS/EIR.

Berths 121–131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project	35	April 2014
---	----	------------

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.	Would the project:				
a.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	X			
b.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	X			
c.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	X			
d.	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X	

Discussion:

- a. **Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in State CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?**

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed Project includes disturbance to existing structures at Berths 121-131. The presence and potential significance of historic resources is currently unknown but will be evaluated and discussed further in the EIS/EIR.

- b. **Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?**

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed Project site is composed of both native soils and dredged and fill material, and the proposed Project would result in ground-disturbing activities (including the elimination of existing land) that could potentially uncover previously undiscovered historical archaeological resources. This issue will be discussed in the EIS/EIR.

- c. **Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed Project site is composed of both native soils and imported dredged or fill material, and the proposed Project would result in ground-disturbing activities (including the elimination of existing land) that could potentially uncover unique paleontological resources. Impacts are potentially significant, and this issue will be discussed in the EIS/EIR.

d. **Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project area is composed of both native soils and dredged and fill material placed for the purpose of creating solid land in the early 20th century. The proposed Project includes dredging and fill in harbor waters that have been disturbed by dredge and fill activities over the past 100 years. Additionally, the proposed Project includes ground disturbance associated with rail track installation, utility relocations, and, in Phase II, the elimination of existing land originally created with imported dredged or fill material. Accordingly, the likelihood of encountering human remains is extremely remote. Should any unanticipated human remains be discovered, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 require all ground disturbances must cease and the county coroner must be notified. Section 7052 establishes a felony penalty for mutilating, disinterring, or otherwise disturbing human remains, except by relatives. Sections 5097.94 and 5907.98 of the Public Resources Code specify a protocol to be followed when the Native American Heritage Commission receives notification of a discovery of Native American human remains from a county coroner. Given these control measures, impacts are expected to be less than significant, and this issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.

Berths 121–131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project	37	April 2014
---	----	------------

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.	Would the project:				
a.	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
	i.) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the state geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			X	
	ii.) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
	iii.) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
	iv.) Landslides?				X
b.	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
c.	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in an onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?			X	
d.	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	
e.	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				X

Discussion:

a. **Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:**

(i) **Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the state geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.**

Less Than Significant Impact. Southern California is one of the most seismically active areas in the U.S. Numerous active faults and fault zones are located within the general region, including the active Palos Verdes Fault that traverses the harbor area, as well as the Newport-Inglewood, Elysian Park, Whittier-Elsinore, and Santa Monica-Raymond faults within 25-miles. The harbor area, as with the southern California region as a whole, cannot avoid earthquake-related hazards, such as liquefaction, ground rupture, ground acceleration, and ground shaking. Although the Alquist-Priolo Act has not zoned any faults within the Port area, potential hazards exist due to the presence of hydraulic fill and seismic activities associated with the Palos Verdes Fault Zone, which, as the Port Master Plan Update (PMPU) PEIR (LAHD 2013, p. 3.5-4) states, “most likely crosses [the West Basin] north-northwest across Berths 121-132”. Accordingly, the exposure of people to seismic ground shaking is a potential risk with or without the proposed Project.

The City of Los Angeles Building Code, Section 91.000 et seq. of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC), regulates construction. These building codes and criteria provide requirements for construction, grading, excavations, use of fill, and foundation work, including type of materials, design, procedures, etc. These codes are intended to limit the probability of occurrence and the severity of consequences from geological hazards, such as earthquakes. Necessary permits, plan checks, and inspections are also specified. The LAMC also incorporates structural seismic requirements of the California Building Code (CBC). LAHD’s and City of Los Angeles’ Department of Building and Safety engineers would review the proposed Project plans for compliance with the appropriate standards in the building codes, including seismic requirements. Emergency planning and coordination would also contribute to reducing injuries to on-site in the event of a seismic event.

The proposed Project features would not cause or accelerate geologic hazards. Wharf and terminal improvements would be conducted in accordance with LAHD seismic design and engineering criteria, including recommendations in a geotechnical report prepared as part of the design process, to minimize potential damage risks in the event of seismically-induced geologic hazards. Such design and construction practices would include, but not be limited to, completion of a site-specific geotechnical investigation regarding construction and engineering. The design would incorporate measures pertaining to temporary construction conditions, such as maximum temporary slope gradient.

The PMPU PEIR (LAHD 2013) concluded that with compliance with appropriate engineering standards and building codes, the impact of seismic events on Port projects, specifically including improvements at the Yang Ming Terminal, is considered less than significant. Accordingly, this issue will not be addressed further in the EIS/EIR.

Berths 121–131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project	39	April 2014
---	----	------------

(ii.) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Los Angeles Basin, including the harbor, is an area of known seismic activity. The risk of seismic hazards such as ground shaking cannot be avoided. Building and construction design codes are meant to minimize structural damage resulting from a seismic event. The proposed Project would comply with the applicable engineering standards and building codes discussed under item VI(a)(i) above, including the Los Angeles Building Code, LAHD seismic design and engineering criteria and recommendations of geotechnical investigations. Emergency planning and coordination would also contribute to reducing injuries to on-site personnel during seismic activity. The PMPU PEIR (LAHD 2013, p. 3.5-19) concluded that with incorporation of emergency planning and compliance with current building regulations and standard engineering practices, the impact of seismic events on Port projects, specifically including improvements at the Yang Ming Terminal, is considered less than significant. Accordingly, this issue will not be addressed further in the EIS/EIR.

(iii.) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less Than Significant Impact. The harbor area, including the Project site, is identified as an area susceptible to liquefaction in the City of Los Angeles General Plan, Safety Element because of the presence of recent alluvial deposits and groundwater less than 30 feet below ground surface (City of Los Angeles, 1996). However, the proposed Project would be completed in compliance with established building codes and LAHD design criteria, as described above under item VI(a)(i). The PMPU PEIR (LAHD 2013) concluded that with incorporation of modern construction engineering and safety standards and compliance with current building regulations, the impact of seismic events on Port projects, specifically including improvements at the Yang Ming Terminal, is considered less than significant. Accordingly, this issue will not be addressed further in the EIS/EIR.

(iv.) Landslides?

No Impact. The proposed Project would be constructed and operated on a flat parcel of land that has no substantial natural or graded slopes. According to the California Department of Conservation Seismic Hazard Maps (1999), the proposed project area is not located near any landslide hazard areas. No impacts would occur, and this issue will not be evaluated in the EIS/EIR.

b. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed improvements would include pavement removal, minor excavation and grading, and re-paving. These actions could result in the temporary exposure of soils or the loss of soil, but the limited extent of construction activities and the standard control measures employed in construction would ensure that impacts would be less than significant. Construction projects resulting in the disturbance of one-acre or more are required to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) to control soil erosion due to stormwater. Prior to the start of construction activities for the proposed Project, the contractor would prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that specifies logistics and schedule for construction activities that would minimize potential for erosion and sedimentation. The SWPPP be prepared and submitted prior to the start of construction and would identify standard practices that

include implementation of best management practices (BMPs) for the installation, monitoring, and maintenance of control measures. The control measures would be installed at the construction sites prior to ground disturbance. After construction is completed, the entire Project site would be covered by paving and no large areas of exposed soil that would be exposed to erosion effects of wind or water would remain. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. This impact is considered less than significant and will not be addressed further in the EIS/EIR.

Operational-phase stormwater runoff affecting water quality will be evaluated in the Water Quality section of the EIS/EIR.

c. Is the project located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in onsite or offsite landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project site is constructed partially on imported dredged or fill material, which could be subject to lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse and could potentially become unstable. However, the proposed Project features would not cause or accelerate geologic hazards and would be constructed in accordance with design and engineering criteria, including recommendations in a geotechnical report prepared as part of the design process, and applicable building and safety requirements (such as the building standards contained in the most recent edition of the LAMC and CBC) as discussed under item VI(a)(i) above. With incorporation of modern construction engineering and safety standards and compliance with current building regulations, this impact is considered less than significant and will not be addressed further in the EIS/EIR.

d. Is the project located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

Less Than Significant Impact. Expansive soils generally result from specific clay minerals that expand when saturated and shrink in volume when dry. These expansive clay minerals are common in the geologic units in the adjacent Palos Verdes Peninsula. Clay minerals in geologic units within the Project area could be expansive, and previously imported fill soils could be expansive as well. However, the proposed Project features would not cause or accelerate risks associated being located on expansive soils and would be constructed in accordance with design and engineering criteria, including recommendations in a geotechnical report prepared as part of the design process and applicable building and safety requirements (such as the building standards contained in the most recent edition of the LAMC and CBC) as discussed under item VI(a)(i) above. With incorporation of modern construction engineering and safety standards and compliance with current building regulations, this impact is considered less than significant and will not be addressed further in the EIS/EIR.

e. Would the project have soils that are incapable of supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

No Impact. The proposed Project does not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems. This issue will not be evaluated in the EIS/EIR.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:					
a.	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	X			
b.	Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	

Discussion:

- a. **Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?**

Potentially Significant Impact. Greenhouse gas emissions would be released as a result of the proposed Project during both construction and operation. This issue will be discussed further in the EIS/EIR.

- b. **Would the project conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project is not expected to conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency. However, this issue will be discussed further in the EIS/EIR.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.	Would the project:				
a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
b.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	X			
c.	Emit hazardous emissions or involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?			X	
d.	Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	X			
e.	Be located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, be within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f.	Be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
g.	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
h.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X

Discussion:

- a. **Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?**

Less Than Significant Impact. Hazardous materials could be encountered during ground-disturbing construction activities. Any hazardous material discovered during construction of the proposed Project would be handled in accordance with existing regulations. Cargo movement may include the transport of material considered to be hazardous. The transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials would be handled in accordance with existing regulations. Although a less-than-significant impact is anticipated, this issue will be discussed further in the EIS/EIR.

- b. **Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment?**

Potentially Significant Impact. Hazardous materials may accidentally be released while excavating soil contaminated by past uses and activities at the project site. Although a less-than-significant impact is anticipated, this issue will be evaluated in the EIS/EIR.

- c. **Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The nearest schools to the project site include Hawaiian Avenue Elementary School and Children’s Center, approximately 0.6 mile to the north in the community of Wilmington, and several schools in the community of San Pedro (Taper Avenue Elementary School approximately 0.7 mile west of the project site, Barton Hill Elementary School approximately 0.6 mile south of the project site, and World Tots Los Angeles Preschool and Port of Los Angeles High School, both approximately one mile south of the proposed project site). Other schools in the vicinity are more than one mile from the project site. Therefore, the proposed project site is not within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school. Although impacts would be less than significant, these issues will be evaluated in the air quality section of the EIS/EIR.

- d. **Is the project located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?**

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project site may have documented or undocumented releases of hazardous materials that could be encountered during construction. This issue will be discussed in the EIS/EIR.

- e. **For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

No Impact. The proposed Project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport. The closest airport is Torrance

Municipal Airport, which is approximately five miles northwest of the proposed project site. This issue will not be evaluated in the EIS/EIR.

f. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

No Impact. Helicopter-landing pads are currently located at Berth 95 (Island Express), about 0.5 mile south of the project site, and at 1175 Queens Highway, in Long Beach (Island Express), four miles east of the project site. Therefore, the proposed Project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the proposed project area. This issue will not be evaluated in the EIS/EIR.

g. Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project area is currently used for the handling and transport of cargo. Project construction and operation would occur primarily on site and is not expected to affect emergency response or evacuations. As is standard procedure for activities occurring on Port property, as well as within the Port area, the contractor would be required to coordinate with the Port and fire protection/service providers, as appropriate, on traffic management issues and any Port improvement plans occurring in the vicinity. Traffic control equipment would be in place to direct local traffic around the work area. During proposed project operation, standard Yang Ming, U.S. Coast Guard, Port Police, and fire emergency response plans would be employed as necessary in accordance with the Port's Risk Management Plan. Impacts are likely to be less than significant but this issue will be further analyzed in the EIS/EIR.

h. Would the project expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

No Impact. There are no wildlands at or near the proposed project site. Because the majority of the site is paved, developed, and industrial in nature, no increased wildland fire hazard is expected as a result of the proposed Project. Therefore, this issue will not be discussed in the EIS/EIR.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a.	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	X			
b.	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, resulting in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X
c.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on site or off site?			X	
d.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on site or off site?			X	
e.	Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X	
f.	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	X			
g.	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary, Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
h.	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?			X	

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			X	
j.	Contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	X			

Discussion:

- a. Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?**

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed Project would not include substantial modifications to the existing storm drainage system. However, dredging, filling, dredged material disposal, and wharf construction could result in discharges to harbor waters that could cause temporary water quality impacts such as turbidity and resuspension of sediments. Best management practices (BMPs) would be implemented during construction in accordance with the USACE and the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) requirements related to dredging, dredged material disposal, and construction requirements. .

Project operations have the potential to leach contaminants from vessel hull coatings and to result in accidental discharges to harbor waters. However, project operations would adhere to the NPDES-General Industrial Activities Stormwater Permit (GIASP) to reduce the potential of accidental or incidental discharges to the storm drain and harbor waters. Despite the controls employed during construction and operation, the proposed Project has the potential to affect water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. These issues will be further evaluated in the EIS/EIR.

- b. Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (i.e., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?**

No Impact. The proposed Project would not affect drinking water supplies, groundwater supplies, or groundwater recharge facilities because none of these resources are located in the proposed project area, nor would the proposed Project have an impact upon aquifers. This issue will not be discussed further in the EIS/EIR.

- c. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on site or off site?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project would not increase impervious surface area or surface runoff, and the site runoff would continue to be captured and conveyed via a stormwater control system into the harbor. Construction and operations at the proposed project site would have to comply with the Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements in the NPDES-MS4 Permit, which would minimize the amount of runoff from the site. Although a less-than-significant impact is anticipated, this issue will be discussed further in the EIS/EIR.

- d. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on site or off site?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The majority of the proposed project area is currently paved and impervious. The proposed Project would not increase impervious surfaces (Phase II would result in a decrease in land area of 1.6 acres) but would instead resurface existing paved areas. Construction could result in temporary alterations of existing drainage patterns, but the limited extent of construction and the employment of BMPs would prevent substantial site flooding. Operational drainage patterns would be essentially identical to existing drainage patterns. Impacts would, therefore, be less than significant, but this issue will be discussed in the EIS/EIR.

- e. Would the project create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project would not increase the area of impervious surfaces on the proposed project site because it is fully paved (Phase II would result in a decrease in land area of 1.6 acres), but would instead re-surface existing paved areas. The proposed Project site is currently served by existing storm drainage systems, which may be somewhat modified by the proposed Project, and the proposed improvements would not exceed the capacity of those systems. The storm drain system would continue to comply with the NPDES requirements regarding discharges, including complying with City SUSMP requirements. Although impacts would be less than significant, this issue will be discussed in the EIS/EIR.

- f. Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?**

Potentially Significant Impact. In-water pile driving and dredging, placement of fill in harbor waters, and disposal of dredged material in waters of the U.S. could potentially affect harbor waters or waters at the LA-2 ocean disposal site. Construction permits would be required from the RWQCB and the USACE to perform these activities. Terminal operations are not expected to affect or otherwise degrade the water quality beyond the issues discussed in Checklist Item IX (a) above. This issue will be discussed further in the EIS/EIR.

- g. Would the project place housing within a 100-year floodplain, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary, Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?**

No Impact. No housing is proposed as part of the proposed Project. Therefore, this impact will not be evaluated in the EIS/EIR.

h. Would the project place within a 100-year floodplain structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project site is located primarily in FEM-mapped Zone X (FEMA 2008), which consists of areas of 0.2% annual chance of flood; areas of 1% annual chance flood (100-year flood) with average depths of less than one foot or with drainage areas less than one square mile; and areas protected by levees from the 1% annual chance flood. The proposed structures included in the proposed project area would replace existing structures (i.e., the wharf at Berths 126-129) and would be constructed so as not to impede or redirect flood flows. Although impacts are expected to be less than significant, this issue will be evaluated in the EIS/EIR.

i. Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project site is not within a potential dam or levee inundation area as identified in the Los Angeles General Plan Safety Element (City of Los Angeles 1996). As discussed above, the project is subject to flooding hazards from a 100-year flood, meaning a one percent annual chance of flooding; however the proposed Project is an industrial facility with few structures and a low potential for exposing people or structures to flooding hazards. Although the impact is expected to be less than significant, this issue will be evaluated in the EIS/EIR.

j. Would the project contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed Project would not contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Seiches are waves formed in response to seismic activity in an enclosed body of water, and small seiches have occurred in the San Pedro Bay harbor complex. The Port is open to the ocean, allowing entry of seismically induced waves (i.e., tsunamis). According to the City of Los Angeles Safety Element of the General Plan (City of Los Angeles 1996), the proposed project site is within an area susceptible to impacts from a tsunami and subject to possible inundation. Recent Port studies (e.g., Moffatt & Nichol 2007) have confirmed that under extreme conditions of seismic events and normal tides, a tsunami could induce flooding at the project site. Topography at the proposed project site has relatively no grade elevation differences. A lack of a slope on the proposed project site would prevent the occurrence of mudflows. Because the Port has historically been subject to seiches and tsunamis, this issue will be discussed in the EIS/EIR.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X.	LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a.	Physically divide an established community?			X	
b.	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X	
c.	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X

Discussion:

a. Would the project physically divide an established community?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project is located in a heavy industrial area that does not contain any established communities. However, communities are near the site to the south and west. Proposed project improvements would be confined to the terminal and would not physically divide an existing community. In addition, the transportation of containers would occur along established roads and rail lines, and no new transportation right-of-way would be required. Although impacts would be less than significant, this issue will be discussed in the EIS/EIR.

b. Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project site is currently operating as a container terminal. The proposed project area is located within the Port Master Plan and is located within Planning Area 2 (West Basin and Wilmington), which contains container cargo, liquid bulk, dry bulk, open space, maritime support, recreational boating, and commercial land uses. The proposed project site is zoned for heavy industrial uses, and the backland area is designated in the Port Master Plan as Container (POLA 2013b); operation of the proposed Project would be consistent with those designations. Although a less than significant impact is anticipated, the consistency of the proposed Project with existing and proposed applicable plan policies, including environmental justice policies, will be discussed further in the EIS/EIR.

c. **Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?**

No Impact. The project site does not fall within an area covered by a habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan. This issue will not be discussed further in the EIS/EIR.

Berths 121–131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project	51	April 2014
---	----	------------

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES.	Would the project:				
a.	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b.	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				X

Discussion:

- a. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?**

No Impact. The proposed Project is located in an area of the Port that was constructed mostly of imported dredged and fill material. No known mineral resources would be adversely affected by the proposed Project. According to the California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, the nearest mineral resource area (sand and gravel) is located in the San Gabriel Valley (POLA 2009). According to the City of Los Angeles General Plan Safety Element and the California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermic Resources, the proposed project site is located south of the Wilmington Oil Field (City of Los Angeles 1996; California Department of Conservation 2001). Because the proposed Project would not be located within the oil field and construction would be at the surface or shallow depths relative to the oil field, no impacts are anticipated. Therefore, this issue will not be discussed further in the EIS/EIR.

- b. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?**

No Impact. No known locally-important mineral resources would be affected by the proposed Project. Therefore, this issue will not be discussed further in the EIS/EIR.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. NOISE.	Would the project:				
a.	Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?	X			
b.	Expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	X			
c.	Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	X			
d.	Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	X			
e.	Be located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
f.	Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

Discussion:

- a. **Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?**

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project site is located in an area zoned for heavy industrial uses that is characterized by periodic increases in noise levels associated with container terminal operations and associated industrial uses. The nearest sensitive receptors are located less than 0.5 mile from the project site in the Knoll Hill area of San Pedro and the southwestern corner of Wilmington. Construction activities could generate substantial noise levels, which people would be exposed to on a periodic basis. Expanded operational activities could also result in increased noise levels above existing conditions as a result of additional trains, trucks, and cargo handling equipment. This issue will be further evaluated in the EIS/EIR.

b. Expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise?

Potentially Significant Impact. Implementation of the proposed Project may result in a temporary generation of groundborne vibration or noise levels. The proposed project site is in an area that is zoned for heavy industrial uses, which is characterized by periodic groundborne vibration and noise associated with adjacent container terminal operations and industrial uses. Construction activities, including dredging and pile driving, could generate excessive vibration and underwater noise levels on a periodic basis. This issue will be further evaluated in the EIS/EIR.

c. Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Potentially Significant Impact. Expanded terminal operations could result in increased noise above ambient conditions as a result of increased train, truck, and terminal equipment activities. This issue will be further evaluated in the EIS/EIR.

d. Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Potentially Significant Impact. Construction activities may generate temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels. This issue will be further evaluated in the EIS/EIR.

e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact. The proposed Project is not located within two miles of a public airport. The closest airport, Torrance Municipal Airport, is located approximately five miles to the northwest of the proposed project site. The proposed Project is not located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, this issue will not be discussed in the EIS/EIR.

f. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact. The proposed Project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, this impact will not be discussed in the EIS/EIR.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING.	Would the project:				
a.	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X	
b.	Displace a substantial number of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c.	Displace a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

Discussion:

- a. **Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and business) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project involves marine terminal improvements that would accommodate larger container vessels and additional train and truck activity. The proposed Project does not include the extension of roadways or other transportation infrastructure sufficient to induce substantial population growth, or result in the relocation of substantial numbers of people from outside of the region. The proposed Project would result in an increase in employment opportunities but given the proposed Project's location within a well-established urban community with a large population base and an existing housing stock and established infrastructure, it would not induce population growth in the area. Therefore, the proposed Project would not induce substantial population growth either directly or indirectly. Although impacts are expected to be less than significant, the socio-economics section of the EIS/EIR will evaluate the potential for increased employment opportunities.

- b. **Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

No Impact. There is no housing within the proposed project boundaries that would be displaced as a result of the proposed Project. Therefore, this issue will not be discussed in the EIS/EIR.

- c. **Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

No Impact. There is no population within or adjacent to the proposed project boundaries that would be displaced as a result of the proposed Project. Therefore, this issue will not be discussed in the EIS/EIR.

Berths 121–131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project	56	April 2014
---	----	------------

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV.	PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project:				
a.	Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:				
	i.) Fire protection?			X	
	ii.) Police protection?			X	
	iii.) Schools?				X
	iv.) Parks?				X
	v.) Other public facilities?			X	

Discussion:

- a. **Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:**

i.) Fire Protection

Less Than Significant Impact. The Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) currently provides fire protection and emergency services within the proposed project area. The proposed terminal improvements may increase demand for LAFD personnel, equipment, facilities, or firefighting capabilities. However, the nature, timing, and magnitude are unknown at this time. The proposed Project improvements would, as a standard practice, be reviewed by the LAFD, and any recommendations would be incorporated into proposed project design. Although impacts are considered less than significant, this issue will be discussed further in the EIS/EIR.

ii.) Police Protection

Less Than Significant Impact. The Los Angeles Harbor Department Port Police (Port Police) and the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) provide police services to the Port. The Port Police is the primary responding agency in the Port and is responsible for operations within the Port's property boundaries. Port Police headquarters is located at

330 Centre Street in San Pedro. The proposed terminal improvements may potentially increase demand for Port Police services or officers, or LAPD officers. However, the nature, timing, and magnitude are unknown at this time. Although impacts are considered less than significant, this issue will be discussed further in the EIS/EIR.

iii) Schools

No Impact. The demand for new schools is generally associated with increases in the school-aged population or decreases in the accessibility and availability of existing schools. The proposed Project consists of industrial Port-related uses and would not include residential uses that could increase school age population in the area. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in an increased demand on schools. This issue will not be discussed in the EIS/EIR.

iv) Parks

No Impact. The proposed Project is not expected to induce population growth nor result in increased demand for parks beyond those which currently exist. The proposed Project does not include the creation of additional recreational facilities or parks. In addition, proposed project improvements would be confined to the proposed project site and would not require physical modifications of park facilities. This issue will not be discussed in the EIS/EIR.

v) Other Public Facilities

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project would not result in an increased demand for other public facilities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and this issue will not be discussed further in the EIS/EIR.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. RECREATION.	Would the project:				
a.	Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
b.	Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

Discussion:

- a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?**

No Impact. The proposed Project is not expected to result in an increase in the number of terminal employees and therefore is not expected to increase demand for parks or recreational facilities beyond those which currently exist. This issue will not be discussed further in the EIS/EIR.

- b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?**

No Impact. The proposed Project does not include recreational facilities or require the expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and this issue will not be discussed further in the EIS/EIR.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.	Would the project:				
a.	Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	X			
b.	Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	X			
c.	Result in a change in marine vessel traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?			X	
d.	Substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
e.	Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	
f.	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X

Discussion:

- a. **Would the project exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?**

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed Project would result in an increase in vehicle trips during construction and operations. During construction these would primarily be construction worker private vehicles and heavy trucks. Operation of the Project would increase the number of cargo truck trips and rail trips. These issues will be evaluated in the EIS/EIR.

- b. **Would the project conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?**

Potentially Significant Impact. Operation of the proposed Project would result in an increased number of truck trips. Given that roads and highways in the vicinity of the proposed Project currently experience various levels of congestion, the proposed Project could have the potential, individually or cumulatively, to affect a Congestion Management Plan roadway or highway. This issue will be further evaluated in the EIS/EIR.

- c. **Would the project result in a change in marine vessel traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?**

Less Than Significant Impact. Although the proposed Project would result in larger vessels berthing at the site, the number of vessels and their traffic patterns would not substantially change. The increase in vessel size could increase navigational hazards somewhat, but because the Port's maritime infrastructure is designed to accommodate large cargo vessels, safety risks would not likely differ substantially from existing conditions. Although a less than significant impact is anticipated, this issue will be discussed further in the EIS/EIR.

- d. **Would the project substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

No Impact. The proposed Project would not include modification of any roadways or access roads to or within the terminal. Furthermore, the proposed Project does not include any design features that would be incompatible with the current zoning or land use designation. As such, this issue will not be discussed further in the EIS/EIR.

- e. **Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?**

Less Than Significant Impact. Project construction and operation could potentially affect emergency access to and from the site. The LAFD, Port Police, and LAPD provide emergency response to the proposed project site and would review and approve the plans to ensure that they comply with applicable access requirements. Compliance would ensure that emergency access to, from, and within the site is adequate. Construction activities could result in temporary traffic impacts, requiring traffic control measures to ensure adequate emergency access. However, the nature, timing, and magnitude of these impacts are unknown at this time. Although the proposed Project is not expected to result in inadequate emergency access, this issue will be discussed further in the EIS/EIR.

f. **Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?**

No Impact. The proposed project site is located in an area that supports industrial uses related to the transfer of containers between ocean-going vessels and land-based modes of transportation (e.g., trucks, rail). The proposed Project does not include any modifications to existing roadways that support current or future bike lanes or bus stops. The proposed Project would not include visitor-serving uses that would benefit from alternative modes of transportation. The proposed Project would therefore have no impact on alternative transportation policies or facilities, and this issue will not be discussed in the EIS/EIR.

Berths 121–131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project	62	April 2014
---	----	------------

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.	Would the project:				
a.	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable regional water quality control board?			X	
b.	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
c.	Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
d.	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed?			X	
e.	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X	
f.	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X	
g.	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

Discussion:

a. Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable regional water quality control board?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project is not expected to result in a change in wastewater generation or wastewater treatment requirements. Existing sewer and wastewater infrastructure exists within the proposed project area, and wastewater would flow to the Terminal Island Treatment Plant, which is operated by the City's Department of Public Works Bureau of Sanitation. Because of present uncertainties in

capacity, the existing conditions and proposed project–related impacts to wastewater treatment will be further analyzed in the EIS/EIR.

- b. Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project is not expected to generate significant increases in water demands or wastewater generation and is not expected to require construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities, or the expansion of existing facilities. Existing water supply and wastewater infrastructure exists within the proposed project area. Because of present uncertainties in capacity, the existing conditions and proposed Project–related impacts to water and wastewater treatment will be further analyzed in the EIS/EIR.

- c. Would the project require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project would not increase paved areas on the proposed project site. The proposed project site is currently served by an existing storm drainage system that complies with the NPDES requirements regarding discharges, including complying with City SUSMP requirements. Any Project-related changes to the system would also comply with those requirements, and operation of the proposed Project would not exceed the system’s capacity. Although impacts would be less than significant, this issue will be discussed further in the EIS/EIR.

- d. Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The YM Terminal uses water from existing supplies and infrastructure for domestic purposes and for washing containers. The proposed Project is not expected to require additional water supply and would incorporate water conservation and other LEED measures as part of Phase II construction for the administration/maintenance building. Because of present uncertainties in capacity, however, the existing conditions and proposed Project–related impacts to water supply will be further analyzed in the EIS/EIR.

- e. Has the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project determined that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project is not expected to require additional wastewater treatment services. Existing sewer and wastewater infrastructure exists within the proposed project area, and wastewater would be conveyed to the Terminal Island Treatment Plant, which is operated by the City’s Department of Public Works Bureau of Sanitation. Because of present uncertainties in capacity, the existing conditions and proposed Project–related impacts to wastewater treatment will be further analyzed in the EIS/EIR.

Berths 121–131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project	64	April 2014
---	----	------------

f. Is the project served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction of the proposed Project would generate construction debris that would require disposal. LAHD maintains an asphalt/concrete recycling facility at the intersection of East Grant Street and Foote Avenue in east Wilmington. Asphalt/concrete debris from demolition activities is crushed at the facility for construction reuse within the Port. Accordingly, construction debris would not place a substantial demand on disposal facilities.

Solid waste generated by existing terminal operations consists primarily of nonhazardous materials, such as food and beverage containers, paper products, and other miscellaneous personal trash disposed of by onsite staff. The proposed Project would continue to generate wastes of a similar nature and quantity. Solid waste generated by terminal operations complies with federal, state, and local regulations and codes pertaining to 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 U.S. Solid Waste Disposal Code. The City has initiated the Recovering Energy, Natural Resources, and Economic Benefit from Waste for Los Angeles Plan (RENEW LA) as a guide for solid waste and resource management in the future. RENEW LA is a comprehensive plan for the recovery and beneficial use of materials currently being disposed of in landfills. The City is developing a Solid Waste Integrated Resources Plan (SWIRP), which will serve as the 20-year master plan for City solid waste and recycling programs. The Port also requires through its Green Building Policy recycling of construction materials and use of materials with recycled content to minimize impacts to solid waste. Given the anticipated shortfall in landfill capacity by the year 2037, however, solid waste that cannot be recycled could represent a significant impact. Although impacts are expected to be less than significant, this issue will be further analyzed in the EIS/EIR.

g. Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

No Impact. The proposed Project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Although no impact on landfills is expected, this issue will be discussed in the EIS/EIR.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE					
a.	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	X			
b.	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	X			
c.	Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	X			

Discussion:

- a. **Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?**

Potentially Significant Impact. As set forth above, the proposed Project has the potential to degrade the quality of the environment with regard to several biological resources. These potential impacts will be evaluated in the EIS/EIR.

- b. **Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)**

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed Project, in conjunction with other related projects, has the potential to result in significant cumulative impacts. The potential for cumulative impacts will be evaluated in the EIS/EIR.

- c. **Does the project have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?**

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed Project could result in adverse impacts on human beings, either directly or indirectly. This issue will be further evaluated in the EIS/EIR.

Berths 121–131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project	67	April 2014
---	----	------------

References

California Department of Conservation. 1999. *Seismic Hazard Zones, San Pedro Quadrangle*. Released March 25, 1999.

———. 2001. *Oil, Gas, and Geothermic Fields in California 2001*. Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermic Resources. Map S-1.

———. 2010. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. 2010 data. <ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2010/los10.pdf>. Last accessed February 19, 2013.

California Department of Transportation. 2013. List of Officially Designated Scenic Highways, Office of the State Landscape Architect. Available at: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/cahisys.htm>. Last accessed February 19, 2013.

City of Los Angeles. 1996. *City of Los Angeles General Plan, Safety Element*. Approved August 8; adopted November 26.

———. 2002. *City of Los Angeles Environmental Quality Act Guidelines*. Adopted July 31.

———. 2006. City of Los Angeles Tree Preservation Policy (Ordinance No. 177404). Available at: http://cityplanning.lacity.org/Code_Studies/Other/ProtectedTreeOrd.pdf. Adopted February 28; effective April 23.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2008. Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), Los Angeles County, California, Panel 1945 of 2350, Map Number 0603777C1945F. September 26, 2008

Los Angeles Harbor Department (LAHD). 2002. *Port of Los Angeles Port Master Plan, Amendment No. 21*. February.

———. 2013. Port of Los Angeles Master Plan Update Final Program Environmental Impact Report. July.

Moffatt & Nichol. 2007. Tsunami Hazard Assessment for the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles, Final Report. Prepared for Port of Long Beach and Port of Los Angeles. Dated April.

Port of Los Angeles (POLA). 2007. LAHD Green Building Policy. Resolution No. 6493 adopted August 16, 2007.

———. 2009. Berths 302-306 [APL] Container Terminal Project and Transmittal of the Notice of Intent (NOI)/Notice of Preparation (NOP) of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report. July. Los Angeles, CA

———. 2012. Notice of Preparation of a Program Environmental Impact Report for the Port of Los Angeles Master Plan Update. July. Prepared by Environmental Management Division, City of Los Angeles Harbor Department. Available at: http://portoflosangeles.org/planning/pmp/PMP_NOP_IS_07-2012.pdf

Berths 121–131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project	68	April 2014
---	----	------------

_____. 2013a. *Facts and Figures Card*. Available at:
<http://www.portoflosangeles.org/about/facts.asp>. Accessed October 10, 2013.

_____. 2013b. The Port of Los Angeles Port Master Plan. August 2013,
http://www.portoflosangeles.org/planning/pmp/PMP_Final.pdf South Coast Air Quality
Management District (SCAQMD). 2012. Final 2012 Air Quality Management Plan. Adopted
December 7, 2012.

Laws and Regulations

California Code of Regulations, Title 14. State CEQA Guidelines

California Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5

California Health and Safety Code, Section 7052

California Public Resources Code, Section 21000, et seq.

Public Resources Code, Sections 5097.94 and 5907.98.

U.S. Government Code, Title 33, Sections 1344 et seq. (Section 404 of the Clean Water Act of
1972, as amended.)

U.S. Government Code, Title 33, Sections 1401 et seq. (Section 103 of the Marine Protection,
Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972.)

U.S. Government Code, Title 33, Sections 403 et seq. (Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors
Act of 1899)

Berths 121–131 [Yang Ming] Container Terminal Redevelopment Project	69	April 2014
--	----	------------