

1  
2

## Section 3.6 Land Use and Planning

### 3 SECTION SUMMARY

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

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

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

### 18 Key Points of Section 3.6

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

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

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

1 Introduction

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

8 **3.6.1 Environmental Setting**

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

23 **3.6.1.1 Port of Los Angeles**

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

32 **3.6.1.2 Land Uses in the Project Area**

33 As designated by the Port Master Plan (PMP), the Proposed Project is located in Planning  
34 Area 2 (West Basin/Wilmington) (LAHD 2018a). The principal land use in Planning Area  
35 2 is container cargo handling, but other major uses in the Proposed Project's vicinity  
36 include liquid bulk, dry bulk, breakbulk cargo, and institutional uses. The Project site,  
37 which is designated in the PMP for liquid bulk use, is largely surrounded by industrial  
38 activities. Land uses immediately adjacent to the Project site include the Vopak liquid  
39 bulk terminal to the north and west and the University of Southern California (USC)  
40 Boathouse and the East Basin to the south and east. Transportation infrastructure uses in  
41 the immediate vicinity include Avalon Boulevard, Harry Bridges Boulevard, Alameda  
42 Street, and SR 47/Schuyler Heim Bridge over the Cerritos Channel.

43 The nearest residences are located in the neighborhood of Wilmington, approximately 0.7  
44 miles north of the Project site. Additionally, a small number of live-aboard boaters are

1 assumed to be present in the East Basin marinas, which are located approximately 1,000  
2 feet east of the Project site.

### 3 3.6.1.3 Zoning

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

## 14 3.6.2 Applicable Regulations

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

### 17 3.6.2.1 California Coastal Act

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

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

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

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

1 resources to the port, with the exception of certain projects that are appealable to the  
2 commission.

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

### 13 **3.6.2.2 Port of Los Angeles Port Master Plan (PMP)**

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

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

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

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

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

43 The Project site is in Planning Area 2 – West Basin/Wilmington. The PMP states that  
44 Planning Area 2 focuses on container operations in the West Basin and a variety of cargo-  
45 related, open space, and recreational uses in the remainder of the area. The PMP

1 designates the Project site for liquid bulk uses. Uses under the “liquid bulk” category are  
 2 defined as “water-dependent uses focused on storage, receipt, and delivery of liquid bulk  
 3 commodities.” The PMP defines uses that are “water-dependent” as “facilities which  
 4 depend on access to or front on navigable waters for the movement of raw or processed  
 5 materials, shipbuilding and ship repair operations, commercial sport fishing operations  
 6 and limited areas for access to industrial water supplies or for access to harbor water for  
 7 appropriate wastewater discharge” (LAHD 2018a).

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

### 13 **3.6.2.3 City of Los Angeles General Plan**

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

### 24 **3.6.2.4 Port of Los Angeles Strategic Plan 2018–2022**

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

- 29 • Objective 1: Develop World-Class Infrastructure That Promotes Growth
  - 30 – Initiative 1: Develop key near-term cargo-related infrastructure projects;
- 31 • Objective 3: Improved Financial Performance of Port Assets
  - 32 – Initiative 1: Increase cargo revenue by attracting new volumes and
  - 33 establishing long-term volume commitments and additional lines of
  - 34 business;
  - 35 – Initiative 2: Increase the utilization of Port facilities; and
  - 36 – Initiative 3: Ensure that Port properties are revenue efficient and reflect
  - 37 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 oceangoing vessels and waterfront berthing facilities to bring raw materials or finished product to the Orcem facility from foreign sources, as importation by any other 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

1 2.6, in 2021, the Project site was largely vacant and activity consisted of occasional light  
2 vehicles and maintenance equipment activity.

### 3 3.6.3.2 Thresholds of Significance

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

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

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

### 18 3.6.3.3 Impact Determination

#### 19 Proposed Project

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

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

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

39 The PMP describes dry bulk as “water-dependent uses focused on non-containerized, dry  
40 bulk cargoes shipped in large unpackaged amounts.” The PMP defines uses that are “water-  
41 dependent” as “facilities which depend on access to or front on navigable waters for the  
42 movement of raw or processed materials, shipbuilding and ship repair operations,  
43 commercial sport fishing operations and limited areas for access to industrial water supplies

1 or for access to harbor water for appropriate wastewater discharge” (LAHD 2018a).  
2 Examples of dry bulk uses include cement, potash and similar, grain, and scrap metal. Dry  
3 bulk is one of the allowable uses in Planning Area 2. The Proposed Project would be a “dry  
4 bulk” use that is “water-dependent” because it requires access to navigable waters to import  
5 non-containerized dry raw materials (i.e., GBFS) via oceangoing vessels in order to  
6 facilitate the GGBFS manufacturing process. The Proposed Project would be water-  
7 dependent and port related, and thus consistent with the Coastal Act, and the dry bulk land  
8 use designation would be consistent with PMP land uses for Planning Area 2.

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

19 **Zoning and General Plan:** Because the Proposed Project would contemplate  
20 manufacturing GGBFS, an alternative to cement that relies on importation of dry materials  
21 from oceangoing vessels, it would constitute a port-related “heavy industrial” use under  
22 the City’s Zoning Code (LAMC § 12.20.36(c)), and therefore would be consistent with the  
23 site’s [Q] M3-1 (Qualified Heavy Industrial) zoning designation as described in Section  
24 3.6.2.1. As a development of an Industrial-Heavy use that would provide job opportunities  
25 and attract a new industry, it would be consistent with Goal 3J (“Industrial growth that  
26 provides job opportunities for the City’s residents and maintains the City’s fiscal  
27 viability”) and Objective 3.14 (“Accommodate the development of industrial uses”) of the  
28 General Plan. As an industrial development that facilitates environmental goals of the Port  
29 and includes a land use redesignation that mitigates an existing conflict it would be  
30 consistent with Goal 7B (“land appropriately and sufficiently designated to sustain a  
31 robust commercial and industrial base”) and Objective 7.2 (“Establish a balance of land  
32 uses that provides for commercial and industrial development which meets the needs of  
33 local residents, sustains economic growth, and assures maximum feasible environmental  
34 quality”) of the General Plan.

### 35 **Impact Determination**

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

### 44 **Mitigation Measures**

45 No mitigation is required.

### 46 **Residual Impacts**

47 Impacts would be less than significant.



## 1 **Alternative 1 – No Project**

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

### 10 **Impact LU-1: Would Alternative 1 cause a significant environmental** 11 **impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation** 12 **adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental** 13 **impact?**

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

### 20 **Impact Determination**

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

### 25 ***Mitigation Measures***

26 No mitigation is required.

### 27 ***Residual Impacts***

28 Impacts would be less than significant.

## 29 **Alternative 2 – Reduced Project**

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

### 34 **Impact LU-1: Would Alternative 2 cause a significant environmental** 35 **impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation** 36 **adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental** 37 **impact?**

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

1                   **Impact Determination**

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

5                   ***Mitigation Measures***

6                   No mitigation is required.

7                   ***Residual Impacts***

8                   Impacts would be less than significant.

9                   **Alternative 3 – Product Import Terminal**

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

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

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

24                  **Impact Determination**

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

30                  ***Mitigation Measures***

31                  No mitigation is required.

32                  ***Residual Impacts***

33                  Impacts would be less than significant.

34                  **3.6.4 Summary of Impact Determinations**

35                  Table 3.6-1 below presents a summary of the impact determinations of the Proposed  
36                  Project and alternatives related to Land Use and Planning, as described above. This table  
37                  is meant to allow easy comparison between the potential impacts of the Proposed Project  
38                  and alternatives with respect to this resource. Identified potential impacts may be based on  
39                  state or City significance criteria; LAHD criteria; and the scientific judgment of the report  
40                  preparers.

1 For each impact threshold, the Table 3.6-1 describes the impact, notes the impact  
2 determinations, describes any applicable mitigation measures, and notes the residual  
3 impacts (i.e., the impact remaining after mitigation). All impacts, whether significant or  
4 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**

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Applied Mitigation/Lease Measures or Controls	Residual Impacts
Proposed Project	<b>LU-1:</b> 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?	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
Alternative 1 – No Project	<b>LU-1:</b> 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?	Less than significant	Not applicable	Less than significant
Alternative 2 – Reduced Project	<b>LU-1:</b> 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?	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
Alternative 3 – Product Import Terminal	<b>LU-1:</b> 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?	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant

1 **3.6.5 Mitigation Monitoring**

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

4 **3.6.6 Significant Unavoidable Impacts**

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

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

## References

City of Los Angeles. 2022. Department of City Planning. ZIMAS (Zone Information and Map Access System). <https://planning.lacity.org/zoning/zoning-search>.

LAHD (Los Angeles Harbor Department). 2018a. Port Master Plan. September. [https://kentico.portoflosangeles.org/getmedia/adf788d8-74e3-4fc3-b774-c6090264f8b9/port-master-plan-update-with-no-29\\_9-20-2018](https://kentico.portoflosangeles.org/getmedia/adf788d8-74e3-4fc3-b774-c6090264f8b9/port-master-plan-update-with-no-29_9-20-2018).

\_\_\_\_\_. 2018b. 2018-2022 Strategic Plan. <https://kentico.portoflosangeles.org/getmedia/6ac20c8e-f574-44a8-b28e-da8683b41cf6/Strategic-Plan-2018-2022>.