Section 3.6
Land Use and Planning

SECTION SUMMARY

The analysis of Land Use evaluates the consistency of the Proposed Project and alternatives with Port of Los Angeles Port Master Plan designations, City of Los Angeles General Plan designations, Municipal Code zoning designations, and other applicable plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over landside and waterside areas. Inconsistencies with land use policies are only considered significant impacts if the inconsistencies result in significant adverse effects on the physical environment.

Section 3.6, Land Use and Planning, provides the following:

- A description of existing land uses in the Port area;
- A description of existing land use regulations and policies including a description of the Port Master Plan;
- A discussion on the methodology used to determine whether the Proposed Project or alternatives result in a land use impact;
- An impact analysis of both the Proposed Project and alternatives; and
- A description of any mitigation measures proposed to reduce any potential impacts, as applicable.

Key Points of Section 3.6

The Proposed Project would involve construction, on currently vacant land, and operation of a new facility that would receive and stockpile dry bulk raw materials (Granulated Blast Furnace Slag GBFS) and gypsum) and process those materials into a dry-bulk product, Ground Granulated Blast Furnace Slag (GGBFS) i.e., a type of cement.

Neither the Proposed Project nor either build alternative (Reduced Project [Alternative 2] and Product Import Terminal [Alternative 3]) would result in a significant impact in terms of land use. Specifically, the Proposed Project and both build alternatives:

- With the Proposed Project's Port Master Plan amendment, would be consistent with the Port Master Plan and the uses described for Planning Area 2;
- Would be consistent with the objectives of the Port of Los Angeles Strategic Plan; and
- Would be consistent with the site’s current zoning of [Q] M3-1 (Qualified Heavy Industrial).
Introduction

This land use analysis evaluates the consistency of the Proposed Project with City of Los Angeles General Plan designations, Municipal Code zoning designations, and other applicable plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over landside and waterside areas. Inconsistencies with land use policies are only considered significant impacts if the inconsistencies result in significant adverse environmental impacts on the physical environmental.

3.6.1 Environmental Setting

The Project site, as shown in Figure 2-2 (Chapter 2, Project Description), includes the backlands behind Berths 192-194 and the wharf at Berth 191. The Project site was constructed in the early 20th Century by dredging and filling the original salt marsh-lagoon system. A yacht club constructed in the early 1920s occupied the Berths 192-194 portion of the site until after World War II, but by 1971, the yacht club structures had been removed and only light industrial activities, including a small tank farm, remained. Those uses were subsequently terminated, and the site has been largely vacant for at least 35 years. Recent uses have occupied only small portions of the site. These have included: equipment and materials storage at Berth 194 and its backland by the Port’s Construction and Maintenance Division since 1987; work vessel mooring and barge and float repair activities at Berth 193 since 2011; and since 2000, small vessel mooring and light-duty repair activities at Berth 192 and its backland. Berth 191 has been occupied by a wharf since the 1920s, although the current structure is more recent. The berth was used for cement unloading for a number of years but that operation has been inactive since 2009.

3.6.1.1 Port of Los Angeles

The Los Angeles Harbor Department (LAHD) administers the Port of Los Angeles, which includes 28 miles of waterfront and 7,500 acres of land and water area. The LAHD administers automobile, container, omni, lumber, cruise ship, liquid and dry bulk terminals, and commercial fishing facilities. Port facilities include slips for 6,000 pleasure craft, sport fishing boats, and charter vessels, as well as community facilities, which include a waterfront youth center, Cabrillo Aquarium, and the Maritime Museum. Major Port activities include commercial shipping and transfer of containerized cargo, liquid bulk cargo, break-bulk and dry bulk cargo, commercial fishing, recreation, and tourism.

3.6.1.2 Land Uses in the Project Area

As designated by the Port Master Plan (PMP), the Proposed Project is located in Planning Area 2 (West Basin/Wilmington) (LAHD 2018a). The principal land use in Planning Area 2 is container cargo handling, but other major uses in the Proposed Project’s vicinity include liquid bulk, dry bulk, breakbulk cargo, and institutional uses. The Project site, which is designated in the PMP for liquid bulk use, is largely surrounded by industrial activities. Land uses immediately adjacent to the Project site include the Vopak liquid bulk terminal to the north and west and the University of Southern California (USC) Boathouse and the East Basin to the south and east. Transportation infrastructure uses in the immediate vicinity include Avalon Boulevard, Harry Bridges Boulevard, Alameda Street, and SR 47/Schuyler Heim Bridge over the Cerritos Channel.

The nearest residences are located in the neighborhood of Wilmington, approximately 0.7 miles north of the Project site. Additionally, a small number of live-aboard boaters are...
assumed to be present in the East Basin marinas, which are located approximately 1,000 feet east of the Project site.

3.6.1.3 Zoning

The Project site’s zoning classification under the City’s Municipal Code is [Q] M3-1 (Qualified Heavy Industrial). The site’s primary Heavy Industrial (M-3) designation has been qualified, as indicated by the bracketed [Q] symbol. The “qualified” designation indicates that a parcel so designated might be restricted or prohibited from some uses ordinarily permitted in the underlying zone classification, and/or that development on such designated sites may be required to conform to certain additional use standards. Accordingly, the [Q] Condition in this zone restricts uses of the Project site to General Cargo, commercial, commercial fishing, industrial, and maritime support uses. The [Q] M3-1 Condition allows for breakbulk and neobulk terminals and associated operations, with which the Proposed Project is consistent (City of Los Angeles 2022).

3.6.2 Applicable Regulations

Land use and development within the Port and its vicinity are governed by several state and local plans and policies, as described in this section.

3.6.2.1 California Coastal Act

The Proposed Project is within in the Coastal Zone, which was established pursuant to the federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972. The California Coastal Act (Coastal Act) of 1976 (PRC Section 30000 et seq.) was enacted to implement the federal legislation by establishing policies and guidelines that provide direction for the conservation and development of the California coastline. The Coastal Act established the California Coastal Commission and created a State and local government partnership to ensure that public concerns regarding coastal development are addressed. The relevant policies of the Coastal Act that guide specific regulations pertaining to coastal zone conservation and development decisions include:

- Provide for maximum public access to and recreational use of the coast, consistent with private rights and environmental protection;
- Protect marine and land resources—including wetlands, rare and endangered habitat areas, environmentally sensitive areas, tide pools, and stream channels;
- Protect the scenic beauty of the coastal landscape; and
- Locate any needed coastal energy and industrial facilities where such facilities will have the least adverse impact.

The Coastal Act established the California Coastal Commission as the coastal management and regulatory agency over the Coastal Zone (PRC§ 30103), within which the Port of Los Angeles is included.

Chapter 8 of the Coastal Act establishes specific planning and regulatory procedures for California “commercial ports,” which include the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, and requires each port to prepare a coastal plan, termed the port master plan, for the coastal zone area under its jurisdiction (see Section 3.6.3.3, below). The port master plan, once certified by the Coastal Commission, grants regulatory authority over coastal
resources to the port, with the exception of certain projects that are appealable to the commission.

The standards for master plans, contained in Chapter 8 of the Coastal Act, require environmental protection while expressing a preference for port-dependent projects. (PRC sections 30708 and 30711.) Additionally, Section 30701 establishes the number and locations of California ports that fall at least partially within the Coastal Zone. This section of the Coastal Act encourages existing ports to modernize and construct necessary facilities within their boundaries to minimize the need to build new ports in the state. It is environmentally and economically preferable to locate major shipping terminals and other existing maritime facilities in the major ports rather than creating new ports in new areas of the state. Each commercial port in California has a certified port master plan that identifies acceptable development uses.

### 3.6.2.2 Port of Los Angeles Port Master Plan (PMP)

Chapter 8, Article 3, of the Coastal Act stipulates that ports shall prepare and adopt master plans containing provisions within that chapter (PRC §30710–30721). Port master plans are then certified by the Coastal Commission, and development projects authorized or approved pursuant to an adopted and certified port master plan are deemed to be in conformity with the Coastal Zone Management Program.

The PMP, originally adopted in 1980 and most recently updated in 2018, establishes policies and guidelines to direct future development of the Port and to better promote and safely accommodate foreign and domestic waterborne commerce, navigation, and fisheries in the national, state, and local interests (LAHD 2018a). The PMP’s major objectives are:

- To develop the Port in a manner that is consistent with federal, state, county and city laws, including the California Coastal Act of 1976 and the Charter of the City of Los Angeles;
- To integrate economic, engineering, environmental and safety considerations into the Port development process for measuring the long-term impact of varying development options on the Port’s natural and economic environment;
- To promote the orderly long-term development and growth of the Port by establishing functional areas for Port facilities and operations; and
- To allow the Port to adapt to changing technology, cargo trends, regulations, and competition from other U.S. and foreign seaports.

Goals of the PMP include optimizing uses of Port lands, increasing cargo terminal efficiency, increasing public access to the waterfront, accommodating diverse cargoes, and protecting historic resources.

The PMP divides the Port into five planning areas, for which it identifies short-term plans and preferred long-range uses. The PMP provides a map of each planning area that designates the land use for each parcel in the area. The PMP states that “All developments and use of Port land and water are to be consistent with their corresponding use designation(s) in the land use map… a Plan amendment is required if a new land use is proposed on a site that is inconsistent with its land use designation(s)”.

The Project site is in Planning Area 2 – West Basin/Wilmington. The PMP states that Planning Area 2 focuses on container operations in the West Basin and a variety of cargo-related, open space, and recreational uses in the remainder of the area. The PMP...
designates the Project site for liquid bulk uses. Uses under the “liquid bulk” category are
defined as “water-dependent uses focused on storage, receipt, and delivery of liquid bulk
commodities.” The PMP defines uses that are “water-dependent” as “facilities which
depend on access to or front on navigable waters for the movement of raw or processed
materials, shipbuilding and ship repair operations, commercial sport fishing operations
and limited areas for access to industrial water supplies or for access to harbor water for
appropriate wastewater discharge” (LAHD 2018a).

The PMP contemplates that future projects in Planning Area 2 will provide additional
space for expanding cargo-related activities by creating land by filling, clearing
underutilized and vacant facilities, and reconfiguring existing operations, and will expand
recreational and visitor-serving uses through the Wilmington Waterfront Project and
possible enhancements to the East Basin marinas.

3.6.2.3 City of Los Angeles General Plan

The City of Los Angeles General Plan Framework Element establishes the City’s strategy
for long-term growth and sets a concept for the development and updating of community
plans and city-wide planning elements. The framework sets forth policies for, among other
elements, land use, industrial districts, economic development, and transportation. Policies
encouraging development of the Port of Los Angeles are specifically mentioned in the
economic development and transportation elements. The land use element (Chapter 3),
includes goals and policies for related to industrial uses, the economic development
element (Chapter 7) recognizes the Port’s crucial role in jobs creation and supports future
expansion, and the transportation element recognizes the need to implement
improvements in the goods movement sector in order to support port development.

3.6.2.4 Port of Los Angeles Strategic Plan 2018–2022

The Port of Los Angeles Strategic Plan (LAHD 2018b) has four objectives, each with
three initiatives that will be implemented to accomplish the LAHD’s mission for the Port.
The following objectives and initiatives may be relevant to the Proposed Project or an
alternative:

- Objective 1: Develop World-Class Infrastructure That Promotes Growth
  - Initiative 1: Develop key near-term cargo-related infrastructure projects;

- Objective 3: Improved Financial Performance of Port Assets
  - Initiative 1: Increase cargo revenue by attracting new volumes and
    establishing long-term volume commitments and additional lines of
    business;
  - Initiative 2: Increase the utilization of Port facilities; and
  - Initiative 3: Ensure that Port properties are revenue efficient and reflect
    current land values and market-based compensation.
3.6.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

3.6.3.1 Methodology

This analysis evaluates consistency or compliance of the Proposed Project and alternatives with adopted plans and policies governing land use and development. Land use plans with policies applicable to development under the Proposed Project and alternatives were included in the evaluation, including the California Coastal Act, the Port Master Plan, the City of Los Angeles General Plan, the City of Los Angeles Planning and Zoning Code, and plans prepared by other agencies with jurisdiction over areas in which the Proposed Project might create a land use impact.

Inconsistency with a land use policy or objective is only considered a significant impact if the inconsistency would result in a significant adverse effect on the physical environment. Further, physical impacts on the environment that might result from an inconsistency with land use policies or objectives are addressed in the appropriate resource section, not in the analysis of land use.

This analysis includes the following considerations:

- The Proposed Project and the two build alternatives (Reduced Project [Alternative 2] and Product Import Terminal [Alternative 3]) would depend upon ocean-going vessels and waterfront berthing facilities to bring raw materials or finished product to the Orcem facility from foreign sources, as importation by another means of transportation would be infeasible;

- The Proposed Project and the two build alternatives include, as a project element, amending the Port Master Plan to designate Berth 191 and the backlands at Berths 192-194 for dry bulk uses. The site boundaries for the Proposed Project and the two build alternatives are the same at 6.1 acres; therefore, the land use areas that would be amended from liquid bulk to dry bulk are identical for the Proposed Project and the two build alternatives;

- The PMP Amendment would replace approximately 6.1 acres of liquid bulk use with dry bulk use at Berths 192-194. The dry bulk use is designated for “water-dependent uses focused on non-containerized, dry bulk cargoes shipped in large unpackaged amounts”; and

- Prior to the 2014 Update (e.g., from 1980 through 2014), the PMP allowed for dry bulk uses at the Project site (Berths 191-194). The 2014 Update amended the PMP to allow only for liquid bulk uses at Berths 191-194, based on an anticipated relocation project that proposed to relocate existing liquid bulk berthing operations at Berths 187-189 to Berths 191-194. This new designation was inconsistent with the then-current existing conditions, which included a dry bulk cement import terminal, and are further described in Section 2.4.2. However, since the 2014 Update, the liquid bulk relocation project has been abandoned.

CEQA Baseline

The CEQA Guidelines (§15125) require Environmental Impact Reports (EIR)s to include a description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of a project that exist at the time of the Notice of Preparation (NOP). The NOP for the Proposed Project was published in March 2022 accordingly, in accordance with LAHD practice the LAHD has determined that 2021 is the baseline year for the CEQA analysis. As described in Section
2.6, in 2021, the Project site was largely vacant and activity consisted of occasional light vehicles and maintenance equipment activity.

3.6.3.2 Thresholds of Significance

The following criteria are based on the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G Thresholds and are the basis for determining the significance of impacts associated with land use consistency and compatibility resulting from development of the Proposed Project or an alternative. The IS/NOP for the Proposed Project (Appendix A) concluded that there would be no impacts related to CEQA Guidelines Appendix G checklist issue XIa “Would the project physically divide an established community?” Accordingly, the analysis in this Draft EIR considers only checklist issue X Ib), “Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?”

Impacts of the Proposed Project and alternatives related to land use are considered to be significant if they would:

LU-1: Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact.

3.6.3.3 Impact Determination

Proposed Project

Impact LU-1: Would the Proposed Project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact?

Coastal Act/PMP: The Proposed Project would comply with the California Coastal Act’s Chapter 8 requirement that development be “Port-related” (PRC § 30708) because the Proposed Project would depend upon receipts of raw materials (GBFS) that could only be delivered by oceangoing vessels given the quantities involved and the trans-ocean location of most of the potential sources. Those vessels would require waterfront wharf facilities for berthing and unloading. The quantities and nature of the GBFS that would be handled prohibit locating the processing facility at a substantial distance from the wharf, as transporting the material from the wharf to the processing facility would be impracticable.

The Proposed Project was not envisioned in the PMP, which was updated in 2018, and the Project site, as described in Section 3.6.2, is designated in the PMP for liquid bulk uses. However, the Proposed Project would amend the PMP to re-designate the Project site for dry bulk cargo. The PMP amendment would rectify any inconsistencies or incompatibilities with the PMP. The amendment process for the PMP would be conducted in accordance with California Coastal Act Section 30716. Amendment of the PMP would require approval and certification by the California Coastal Commission.

The PMP describes dry bulk as “water-dependent uses focused on non-containerized, dry bulk cargoes shipped in large unpackaged amounts.” The PMP defines uses that are “water-dependent” as “facilities which depend on access to or front on navigable waters for the movement of raw or processed materials, shipbuilding and ship repair operations, commercial sport fishing operations and limited areas for access to industrial water supplies...
or for access to harbor water for appropriate wastewater discharge” (LAHD 2018a).
Examples of dry bulk uses include cement, potash and similar, grain, and scrap metal. Dry
bulk is one of the allowable uses in Planning Area 2. The Proposed Project would be a “dry
bulk” use that is “water-dependent” because it requires access to navigable waters to import
non-containerized dry raw materials (i.e., GBFS) via oceangoing vessels in order to
facilitate the GGBFS manufacturing process. The Proposed Project would be water-
dependent and port related, and thus consistent with the Coastal Act, and the dry bulk land
use designation would be consistent with PMP land uses for Planning Area 2.

Port of Los Angeles Strategic Plan: The Proposed Project would be consistent with
Strategic Plan Initiative 1 of Objective 1 (develop key near-term cargo-related
infrastructure projects) because it would develop a new cargo terminal. It would be
consistent with the three initiatives of Objective 3 (Improved Financial Performance of
Port Assets). Consistent with Initiative 1 it would increase cargo revenue by attracting a
new cargo. Consistent with Initiative 2, it would increase the utilization of a currently
under-used Port facility (i.e., the Berths 192-194 backlands). Finally, consistent with
Initiative 3, it would ensure that the project site would reflect current land values and
market-based compensation which, because the site is essentially vacant, is currently not
the case.

Zoning and General Plan: Because the Proposed Project would contemplate
manufacturing GGBFS, an alternative to cement that relies on importation of dry materials
from oceangoing vessels, it would constitute a port-related “heavy industrial” use under
the City’s Zoning Code (LAMC § 12.20.36(c)), and therefore would be consistent with the
site’s [Q] M3-1 (Qualified Heavy Industrial) zoning designation as described in Section
3.6.2.1. As a development of an Industrial-Heavy use that would provide job opportunities
and attract a new industry, it would be consistent with Goal 3J (“Industrial growth that
provides job opportunities for the City's residents and maintains the City's fiscal
viability”) and Objective 3.14 (“Accommodate the development of industrial uses”) of the
General Plan. As an industrial development that facilitates environmental goals of the Port
and includes a land use redesignation that mitigates an existing conflict it would be
consistent with Goal 7B (“land appropriately and sufficiently designated to sustain a
robust commercial and industrial base”) and Objective 7.2 (“Establish a balance of land
uses that provides for commercial and industrial development which meets the needs of
local residents, sustains economic growth, and assures maximum feasible environmental
quality”) of the General Plan.

Impact Determination

The Proposed Project would be consistent with the PMP’s “dry bulk” use designation for
“water dependent” projects that would apply to the Project site through the Project’s
proposed PMP amendment. As a “port-related” use, the Proposed Project would also be
consistent with the Coastal Act. The Proposed Project would be consistent with the
objectives of the Port’s Strategic Plan and with the site’s zoning designation and relevant
General Plan policies. Accordingly, with the proposed PMP Amendment the Proposed
Project’s impacts related to consistency with land use plans and policies would be less
than significant.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.
Alternative 1 – No Project

Under the No Project Alternative (Alternative 1), no construction or operational activities would take place. The Berths 192-194 site would continue to be largely vacant, likely used, as at present, for temporary storage and other small-scale activities, and would maintain the Project site’s existing land use designation under the PMP. Accordingly, no PMP amendment would occur. The No Project Alternative (Alternative 1) would not preclude future improvements to the Berths 192-194 site. However, any future changes in use or new improvements that could have significant impacts on the environment would be analyzed in a separate environmental document.

Impact LU-1: Would Alternative 1 cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact?

The No Project Alternative (Alternative 1) would maintain the Project site’s existing land use designation (liquid bulk) under the PMP and would not include a use that conflicts with the provisions of the Coastal Act. Furthermore, leaving the site vacant would be inconsistent with the objectives of the Port’s Strategic Plan and the PMP because it would not improve cargo facilities and would not increase the use of Port facilities or improve the financial performance of those facilities.

Impact Determination

Although the No Project Alternative (Alternative 1) would not be entirely consistent with relevant land use plans and policies, those inconsistencies would not result in a significant adverse effect on the physical environment. Accordingly, impacts of the No Project Alternative (Alternative 1) would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

Alternative 2 – Reduced Project

This Reduced Project Alternative (Alternative 2) would differ from the Proposed Project only in the total annual throughput of the facility (523,000 tons of GGBFS and 18 vessel calls per year rather than 775,000 tons and 24 vessel calls), which would result in reduced activity levels.

Impact LU-1: Would Alternative 2 cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact?

The Reduced Project Alternative (Alternative 2) would involve the same land use and activities as the Proposed Project and therefore includes the same proposed PMP amendment that the Proposed Project contemplates. Therefore, for the same reasons as the Proposed Project, the Reduced Project Alternative (Alternative 2) would be consistent with the policies of the Coastal Act, the PMP, the Port’s Strategic Plan the General Plan, and the site’s zoning designation.
Impact Determination

Because the Reduced Project Alternative (Alternative 2) would be consistent with the applicable land use plans and policies with the proposed PMP Amendment, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

Alternative 3 – Product Import Terminal

The Product Import Terminal Alternative (Alternative 3) would differ from the Proposed Project in that raw materials (GBFS and gypsum) would not be stored on the Project site. Instead, finished product (GGBFS and/or other cementitious materials) would be offloaded from oceangoing vessels (OGV)’s and stored in a domed facility located in the approximate area where the GBFS stockpile of the Proposed Project would be located.

Impact LU-1: Would Alternative 3 cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact?

The Product Import Terminal (Alternative 3) would involve the same land use (i.e., dry bulk) and essentially the same activities as the Proposed Project and therefore includes the same proposed PMP amendment as the Proposed Project. For the same reasons as the Proposed Project, Alternative 3 would be consistent with the policies of the Coastal Act, the PMP, the Port of Los Angeles Strategic Plan and the site’s zoning designation.

Impact Determination

Because the Product Import Terminal (Alternative 3) would also include a proposed PMP Amendment allowing dry bulk uses, it would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

3.6.4 Summary of Impact Determinations

Table 3.6-1 below presents a summary of the impact determinations of the Proposed Project and alternatives related to Land Use and Planning, as described above. This table is meant to allow easy comparison between the potential impacts of the Proposed Project and alternatives with respect to this resource. Identified potential impacts may be based on state or City significance criteria; LAHD criteria; and the scientific judgment of the report preparers.
For each impact threshold, the Table 3.6-1 describes the impact, notes the impact determinations, describes any applicable mitigation measures, and notes the residual impacts (i.e., the impact remaining after mitigation). All impacts, whether significant or not, are included in this table.
### Table 3.6-1: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Land Use Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination</th>
<th>Applied Mitigation/Lease Measures or Controls</th>
<th>Residual Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td>LU-1: Would the Proposed Project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact?</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
<td>No mitigation is required</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1 – No Project</td>
<td>LU-1: Would Alternative 1 cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact?</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2 – Reduced Project</td>
<td>LU-1: Would Alternative 2 cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact?</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
<td>No mitigation is required</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3 – Product Import Terminal</td>
<td>LU-1: Would Alternative 3 cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact?</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
<td>No mitigation is required</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6.5 Mitigation Monitoring

In the absence of significant impacts associated with land use, mitigation measures are not required.

3.6.6 Significant Unavoidable Impacts

No significant unavoidable impacts to land use would occur as a result of construction or operation of the Proposed Project or any of the alternatives.
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