

PORT MASTER PLAN RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Public comment for the Draft Port Master Plan (PMP) and Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) were received electronically, in written letters, in public hearings, and in comment cards for public hearings. On March 13, 2013, a public meeting was held on the Draft PEIR. On April 4, 2013, a public hearing was held on the Draft PMP during a regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Harbor Commissioners (Board). Written comments were solicited from interested persons, organizations, and governmental agencies, including the California Coastal Commission (Coastal Commission) and all Port of Los Angeles (Port) tenants. The cutoff for comments was April 8, 2013. Responses to all comments received on the Draft PMP are included in this section. Responses to comments on the Draft PEIR and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process are addressed in the Final PEIR.

The Port received 28 comment letters, 3 public hearing comment cards, and 77 oral comments on these documents during the public review period. Summaries of the comments and the responses are identified below. Copies of the comments received, and transcripts of the public hearings are included after the responses.

ORGANIZATIONS

Herb Zimmer, Port Tech Los Angeles

- **Supports the Marine Research Center at City Dock No. 1 because it complements the work of Port Tech Los Angeles, benefits the environment, creates well-paid jobs, and provides a career ladder for local students studying marine science.**

Response: City Dock No. 1 is identified in the PMP as a Proposed Project for Planning Area 1 (see 5.3.1).

Donald Galaz, Project Street Legal

- **Requests the Port institute a program that allows organized street racing on port property as part of the solution to illegal street racing, which is a significant public safety issue. The temporary program would be used to evaluate opportunities for a long term opportunity.**

Response: The Port is an essential element of the national maritime industry and is recognized as one of the state's primary economic and coastal resources. Street racing would be inconsistent with the intent of the Coastal Act for Port lands, which is focused on maritime related uses.

Adrian Fine, Los Angeles Conservancy

- a. Asserts that the Draft PMP and associated Draft PEIR do not prioritize or provide a path for preservation or full consideration of adaptive reuse opportunities, and does not fully identify impacts or preservation alternatives, as required by CEQA. Furthermore, the comment suggests prioritization of preservation is necessary to fulfill the Public Trust Doctrine.**

Response: The Port recognizes the importance of historic resources and does provide an implementation path. Generally, the preservation of historic resources does not conflict with the Public Trust Doctrine when accomplished in connection with a project or development that furthers a Public Trust Doctrine purpose. The PMP, along with the *Built Environment Historic, Architectural, and Cultural Resource Policy*, and through the evaluation and assessment of proposed projects pursuant to the CEQA, collectively address the protection, preservation, and adaptive reuse of historic structures.

The PMP identifies “Protection of Historic Resources” as one of its five goals (see 3.2.5) and includes development guidelines that require the Board to make findings regarding impacts on historic resources for Coastal Development Permits.

Based on public input during the development of the PMP update, the Port developed a *Built Environment Historic, Architectural, and Cultural Resource Policy*, adopted by the Board on May 2, 2013. The policy provides procedures and processes by which the Port identifies and treats historic resources. The policy commits the Port to conducting a comprehensive survey of cultural resources in the Port, establishes a protocol for evaluating such resources, and describes the mechanisms that will be used to ensure the preservation and adaptive re-use, where feasible.

Finally, consideration for the preservation and adaptive reuse of historical resources is also accomplished through the evaluation and assessment of proposed projects pursuant to CEQA. Any proposed project affecting a historic resource at the Port would undergo the appropriate process under CEQA.

With regard to the memorialization of significant events, the Port acknowledges the desirability of retaining any remaining built fabric. Currently, 12 buildings either listed or eligible for listing on a historic register are being reused or converted for reuse. However, such a policy needs to recognize that in some cases it may not be feasible to retain some or all of the existing structures and sites, given the other goals of the PMPU. Further, in other cases those features may be so modified or degraded that their retention would add little if anything to the resource. Accordingly, the wording suggested by the commenter would be unduly restrictive.

- b. This comment recommends edits to the PMP’s goal to preserve historic resources. Requested edits include deletion of the words “when feasible” and the addition of “and associated existing buildings and sites.”**

Response: The Port has adopted the recommended language and revised the overall text of Goal 5 (see 3.2.5) to clarify and strengthen the Port’s commitment to adaptive reuse.

- c. Objects to a land use boundary that bisects existing buildings in the Southwest Marine site and raises the question as to whether the Port intends to demolish these structures.**

Response: Land use the boundaries have been modified to traverse the existing Seaside Avenue alignment and no longer bisect any existing structures. The PMP does not identify a proposed project that would result in the demolition of structures in the Southwest Marine site. Any proposed projects would be subject to CEQA review. Historic structures would be subject to the *Built Environment Historic, Architectural, and Cultural Resource Policy*.

- d. Limiting the land uses allowed on historic resources may limit their opportunities to be adaptively reused. The commenter requests that additional and ancillary uses that may expand opportunities for reuse. To address this, the commenter suggests the Port adopt “hatching” or protection zones to further attract creative reuse ideas.**

Response: The Port’s designated land uses provide for the orderly development of the Port. If, for any reason, best practice requires that an allowed land use be modified the PMP amendment process allows for this. Also, Goal 5 includes a general policy to periodically review whether additional port related land uses would enhance the opportunity for reuse of vacant or underutilized historic resources (see 3.2.5).

As a commercial port, the comprehensive designation of land uses is based on a number of factors, including, addressing market demand and cargo forecasts, safety, land use compatibility, proximity to infrastructure, and proximity to community. A protection zone or hatching layer for historic resources would be overly broad and impact the Port’s ability to carry out its primary mandate, which is to accommodate trade and maritime activities.

In response to the comment, the Port increased land use flexibility at specific sites with identified historic structures. The land use designation at the former Southwest Marine site was revised to include Maritime Support activities to the designated Breakbulk use (see Figure 8) and Warehouse No. 1 site was revised to include Visitor Serving Commercial activities to the designated Institutional use (see Figure 5).

Brian Turner, National Trust for Historic Preservation

- a. States that the Public Trust Doctrine does not require the port to limit its allowable future activities of properties and asserts that protection of historic resources is consistent with the public trust doctrine.**

Response: The Port agrees that preservation of historic resources is consistent with the Public Trust Doctrine. The PMP does apply specific land use designations in order to reduce land use conflicts and optimize the use of port lands. The Port has also enacted specific goals, provisions, and policies to better protect historic resources through adaptive reuse, as addressed in the response to *Organizations, Los Angeles Conservancy, "e"*.

- b. Opposes the designation of specific land uses and argues that in order to promote historic uses related to maritime activities, the Port need not limit its allowable future activities.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations, Los Angeles Conservancy, "e"*.

- c. Questions why land use designations identify only one land use. For example, the canneries and Japanese Village are designated only for Commercial Fishing. The commenter is concerned that if a tenant cannot be found for the land use designated, the land will continue to be vacant, underused, and in disrepair.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations, Los Angeles Conservancy, "e"*.

- d. Requests that Planning Area 3 boundaries to include all historic resources in the Fish Harbor area including Canner's Steam Plant and the historic Japanese Commercial Village. Additionally, the commenter recommends that more flexible uses be allowed and financial incentives be granted for historic resources.**

Response: The comment provides no evidence that the conversion of land in Planning Area 3 to container cargo uses near Planning Area 4 (Fish Harbor) would eliminate historical buildings. The PEIR has imposed mitigation measures that ensure the protection of identified historic resources. Through the CEQA comment process the Port has strengthened **MM CR-3** to specify additional protective measures (e.g., in-situ preservation, adaptive reuse, and relocation; see Response to Comment LAC-11). Finally, the Port's recently adopted *Built Environment Historic, Architectural, and Cultural Resource Policy* will enhance the protection of historic resources in the Port.

The Port has no current plans to demolish any of the historic resources within Planning Area 3, and would not contemplate such an action unless there was a proposed development project requiring their removal. In such a case, project-level cultural resource evaluations would be conducted in accordance with CEQA and the *Built Environment Historic, Architectural, and Cultural Resource Policy* to ensure that historic resources are adequately considered. Changes to the PMP to allow for additional flexibility are addressed in the response to *Organizations, Los Angeles Conservancy, "e"*.

Lori Minick, Trini Nunez, Loren Decker, The Art Spot

- **Proposes a project for the adaptive re-use of the former Pan Pacific Cannery for a restaurant and brewery. Other project features include art by survivors of domestic violence and all food coming within a local 100-mile radius. The request is that the proposed project be included in the PMP with a land use designation that allows for the project.**

Response: The proposed project has not been included in the PMP since a formal application has not been submitted. As described, the proposed project at the former Pan Pacific Cannery would not be consistent with the allowed land use designation for the area, which is Commercial Fishing. Under Section 30703 of the California Coastal Act, ports shall not eliminate or reduce commercial fishing space unless demand no longer exists. The Harbor Department has not concluded demand for commercial fishing activities no longer exists, therefore the site of the former Pan Pacific Cannery is designated for commercial fishing uses. The proposed visitor-serving commercial use concept would be consistent with other areas of the Port, including Ports O'Call.

In compliance with the *Built Environment Historic, Architectural, and Cultural Resource Policy*, adaptive re-use of the Pan Pacific Cannery is not foreclosed, but will be examined upon review of a specific project proposal.

Jesse N. Marquez, Coalition for a Safe Environment

- a. **Assert that property outside the Coastal Zone should be included in the PMP. The comment also broadly claims that project approvals such as the China Shipping Terminal, TraPac Terminal Expansion, and BNSF Southern California International Gateway (SCIG) projects do not comply with the PMP, State Lands Commission, California Coastal Commission and CEQA. Finally, the comment accuses the Port of illegally obtained properties.**

Response: The PMP is not a master plan of all properties owned by the Harbor Department, but is instead carries out the provisions of the California Coastal Act, which requires the preparation of a PMP whose boundaries are within the Coastal Zone.

Designating land uses for properties outside the Coastal Zone in the PMP would be inappropriate because they are not subject to the policies and procedures provided in the Coastal Act.

The previous approvals for the China Shipping Terminal, TraPac Terminal Expansion, and BNSF SCIG projects were consistent with the PMP. There are no properties to be obtained as part of the PMP. Properties previously acquired by the Port met all legal requirements.

b. States that the berth numbers described in the text are not identified on the maps.

Response: Maps with berth numbers can be found on the Port website (<http://www.portoflosangeles.org>).

c. States that wetland or potential wetlands were not identified in the PMP.

Response: "Wetlands" was added to the definition of the Open Space land use designation.

d. Asserts that the on-dock rail was not considered for the potential Pier 500 project.

Response: Pier 500 is not an approved project in the PMP. The current concept would designate Container use for the landfill. The comment incorrectly states that on-dock rail is not considered for Pier 500 since the definition of container use includes on-dock rail.

e. The comment requests a 90 day extension for public comment.

Response: The Draft PMP and Draft PEIR were released on February 21, 2013 and public comment was accepted until April 8, 2013. The 45 comment day period was consistent with both the Coastal Act and CEQA.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Kit Fox, City of Rancho Palos Verdes

a. Requests that the PMP facilitate the relocation of liquid bulk facilities to Planning Area 3 (Terminal Island), including Pier 500.

Response: All current liquid bulk facilities are consistent with the Risk Management Plan and therefore do not pose a risk.

b. Requests that the Port assess the risks associated with the movement of liquid bulk commodities (vessels, trucks, rail cars, and pipelines).

Response: As discussed in the Risk Management Plan, risk assessments of commodities either transiting on a vessel, tank truck, rail tank car or in a pipeline are not addressed in the Risk Management Plan due to their transitory nature. For example, tank cars transit into and out of a rail yard frequently carrying a variety of commodities. Therefore, it is difficult to determine at any one time what commodities may be inside a tank car and where that tank car might be located in the rail yard. The transitory nature of these operations, including vessels moving within the Port, prevents accurate and representative hazard footprints from being prepared.

c. Requests that the location or extent of hazard footprints generated by liquid bulk facilities at the port under the Risk Management Plan be publically disclosed.

Response: Hazardous footprint calculations from existing hazardous liquid bulk facilities, as defined by the Port's Risk Management Plan, are not released to the general public due to security/safety reasons expressed by the U.S. Coast Guard. Nevertheless, coastal permits on liquid bulk facilities before the Board of Harbor Commissioners are required to include information on whether the proposed project conforms to the Risk Management Plan. Presently, all existing liquid bulk facilities are consistent with the Risk Management Plan.

BUSINESSES

Barna Szabo, SA Recycling

- **Advocates for the PMP to allow for continued dry bulk operations at Berths 210-211, as well as for the possible addition of another wharf available for loading bulk cargo and the construction of an elevated connecting roadway between the two adjacent terminals.**

Response: The text relative to the potential relocation of SA Recycling was revised to include several options with regard to SA Recycling's existing facility. Under the new text, the existing dry bulk facility may be allowed to remain in its current location and potentially expand its operations, depending upon the operational scheme and acreage requirements for the container terminal expansion, including the elevated connected roadway. The land use plan for SA Recycling and Berths 206-209 are consistent with the options identified in the text, including the elevated roadway, since Berths 210-211

allows for Container and/or Dry Bulk and Berths 206-209 allows for Breakbulk, Container, and/or Dry Bulk.

Thomas K. Saiget, ExxonMobil Pipeline Co.

- a. Requests that the Southwest Terminal Area 2 be designated a dual use for both Container and Liquid Bulk use.**

Response: The land use designation for ExxonMobil's Southwest Terminal Area 2 on Terminal Island has been designated for Container use.

- b. Asserts that the rezone of Southwest Terminal Area 2 will result in an unnecessary environmental impact due to the deconstruction of fully functional liquid bulk tanks and reconstruction of new tanks less than a mile away.**

Response: The ExxonMobil site has been designated for container use, to provide for expanded operations for the adjacent container terminal. Liquid bulk uses are provided within the rail loop on Terminal Island which provides a relocation site for ExxonMobil's operations. All impacts relating to any relocation of ExxonMobil's facilities would be assessed under CEQA.

- c. Requests that the Port consider the financial loss associated with liquid bulk relocations and potential impacts to the Port's ability to diversity revenue and import liquid bulk commodities.**

Response: The Port considers several factors relating to proceeding with a proposed project, including financial considerations.

INDIVIDUALS

Patricia Ross

- **Requests the Port to prioritize the preservation of historic resources and their adaptive reuse. The commenter highlights concern over the demolition of structures in Southwest Marine.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the responses to *Organizations, Los Angeles Conservancy, "a" and "c"*.

Stanley Green

- **Requests the Port to develop a historic preservation plan in the PMP.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations, Los Angeles Conservancy, "a"*.

Lawrence Fafarman

- **Suggests adaptive reuse to preserve historic structures.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations, Los Angeles Conservancy, "a"*.

Philip Belfer

- **Supports the historic aspects of Terminal Island while also improving port facilities and expanding rail.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations, Los Angeles Conservancy, "a"*.

Jay Ross

- a. **Requests that historic structures on Terminal Island not be demolished. Additionally, the commenter requests the Port prioritize the preservation and reuse of historic buildings, on par with other goals of the plan.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations, Los Angeles Conservancy, "a"*.

- b. **Expresses concern that the land use designations over buildings in the Southwest Marine may limit their ability to be adaptively reused.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations, Los Angeles Conservancy, "c"*.

- c. **Promotes creative reuse opportunities through public-private partnerships.**

Response: The Port is supportive of potential public-private partnerships but does not propose any specific public-private projects. The PMP sets long term land use policy and Coastal Development Permit procedures in compliance with the California Coastal Act. Specific development projects may be implemented through public-private partnerships.

- d. **Opposes the realignment Seaside Avenue through Southwest Marine because it will bisect the historic district, jeopardize its continued eligibility, and result in the demolition of its structures.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations, Los Angeles Conservancy, "c"*.

Donna Ethington

a. Requests that the Figures 3 (Pedestrian Pathways) and 4 (California Coastal Trail) identify connections to the Anchorage Road Soil Storage Site.

Response: Pedestrian pathways, consistent with the Wilmington Marinas Planning Study, have been added along Anchorage and Shore Roads in Figure 3. In Figure 4, a proposed pedestrian trail from the Wilmington Marinas to the California Coastal Trail has also been added to the PMP.

b. Seeks clarification on why the marinas located on the south side of the Consolidated Slip are not identified on Figure 7.

Response: The existing marinas in the Consolidated Slip are permitted under the PMP as an allowable use in Planning Area 5, which addresses the water area of the Port. They do not appear in the land use map for Planning Area 2 because the marina slips are located in water.

c. Seeks clarification on the land located north of the Consolidated Slip. The commenter requests information on whether the Port has any specific projects for the site and if recreational boating is an allowed land use.

Response: The area is designated for Maritime Support. There are currently no specific project proposals for the area. Recreational Boating within the water area of the Consolidated Slip would be allowed but recreational boating facilities on the land side north of the Consolidated Slip are not permitted under the PMP.

d. Requests that the Port reevaluate the need for recreational boatyard repair facilities.

Response: Language has been added to Goal 3 (see 3.2.3) so that market studies for specific ancillary uses should be pursued periodically as feasible. Boat yards and ship repair facilities are an allowable use within the Maritime Support land use designation.

e. Expresses opposition to the relocation of SA Recycling and requests that the Port evaluate an elevated access road that would allow Yusen Terminals to expand to Berths 206-209 while allowing SA Recycling to remain in its existing site. Additionally, the commenter supports the evaluation of a multi-use facility (breakbulk or dry bulk and container) at Berths 206-209.

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Businesses, SA Recycling*.

- f. Addresses the East Basin Marina Improvements, listed as an Other Project in Planning Area 2. The commenter opposes the construction of a breakwater that would displace existing marina slips and reduce recreational boating opportunities in Wilmington.**

Response: The PMP states that the breakwater improvements “may” be constructed based on project proposals at Berth 206-209 and related impacts on the marinas. If there are no impacts, the breakwater would not be constructed. Impacts from any proposed projects would be analyzed under CEQA on a project specific basis. There are no specific project proposals for this area at this time.

- g. Observes that San Pedro has more public access than Wilmington. The commenter suggests two opportunities to increase public access in Wilmington. The first is a proposed access road from Avalon Blvd to Leeward Bay marina (part of the Berth 200 railyard) and the second is an ACTA Truck Expressway, which would be an at-grade vehicular bridge to the support columns in the Consolidated Slip.**

Response: The PMP incorporates the concepts presented in the Wilmington Marinas Planning Study. As part of the study, the Port examined the proposed access road and an ACTA Truck Expressway. Both were denied by the Board due to impacts to accommodating and moving cargo efficiently in and out of the Port. Increased public access in the Wilmington community is accommodated in the PMP in the area of Slip 5, Anchorage Road, and the Wilmington Marinas.

- h. Requests that Goal 4 include language supporting the landscaping of the Port boundary, as approved by the Board in PCAC recommendation #42.**

Response: The goal was modified to provide that public access areas and residential areas adjacent to the port should be buffered through landscaping, as feasible.

- i. The comment requests a review of all PCAC recommendations to ensure Board approved projects and mitigation measures are carried forward in the PMP.**

Response: The PMP is a long term policy document that pertains to the California Coastal Act. Results from long term planning efforts that were developed with or through PCAC are included in the plan, including the San Pedro and Wilmington Waterfront Projects and Wilmington Marinas Planning Study.

Linda Alexander

- a. Requested that the proposed outer harbor cruise terminal not be considered until the existing cruise terminal at Berths 91-93 is maximized.**

Response: Additional language has been added to Planning Area 1 – San Pedro, Proposed Projects (see 5.3.3). Under the proposed project, the Outer Harbor Cruise Terminal would be initiated upon demand for additional cruise facilities.

- b. Requests tourist and visitor transportation between the waterfront, Cabrillo Beach and downtown San Pedro via street car or alternate light rail system.**

Response: A section, Visitor and Tourist Transportation, was added to the Plan (See 5.2.4). It identifies the existing Red Car Line, rubber-tire trolley, and potential water taxi as means for visitor transportation throughout the waterfront areas of the Port.

- c. Requests a Japanese History Museum no smaller than one acre on Terminal Island.**

Response: The Plan does not include a proposed project to construct a Japanese History Museum. There is an existing Japanese memorial, located at 1124 South Seaside Ave., in Fish Harbor.

Sue Castillo

- a. Requested that the proposed outer harbor cruise terminal not be considered until the existing cruise terminal at Berths 91-93 is maximized.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Individuals*, Linda Alexander, “a”.

- b. Requests tourist and visitor transportation between the waterfront, Cabrillo Beach and downtown San Pedro via street car or alternate light rail system.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Individuals*, Linda Alexander, “b”.

- c. Requests a Japanese History Museum no smaller than one acre on Terminal Island.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Individuals*, Linda Alexander, “c”.

Christine Esprabens

- a. Requests that the goal to preserve historic resources should be on par with other identified goals in the Plan.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations, Los Angeles Conservancy*, “a”.

- b. Requests policies that allow for adaptive reuse of historic buildings, rather than their demise.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations, Los Angeles Conservancy*, “d”.

- c. Requests that historic, cultural and archaeological resources should be clearly identified within the Plan.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations, Los Angeles Conservancy*, “a”.

- d. Requests that the historic buildings, which represent the last vestige of Terminal Island’s WWI, WWII shipbuilding, tuna canning, and Japanese-American built environment, should be maintained and preserved.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations, Los Angeles Conservancy*, “a”.

- e. Opposed to the realignment Seaside Avenue through Southwest Marine since it will further demolish historic buildings.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations, Los Angeles Conservancy*, “c”.

Denise and Stephen Smith

- a. Requests that the goal to preserve historic resources should be on par with other identified goals in the Plan.**

Response: Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations, Los Angeles Conservancy*, “a”.

- b. Requests policies that allow for adaptive reuse of historic buildings, rather than their demise.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations, Los Angeles Conservancy*, “d”.

- c. Suggests that Terminal Island’s historic buildings can be successfully adapted for new uses using creative re-use opportunities, including public-private partnerships.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Individuals, Jay Ross, “c”*.

- d. Requests that historic, cultural and archaeological resources should be clearly identified within the Plan.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations, Los Angeles Conservancy, “a”*.

- e. Requests that historic buildings, the last vestige of Terminal Island’s WWI, WWII shipbuilding, tuna canning, and Japanese-American built environment, should be maintained and preserved.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations, Los Angeles Conservancy, “a”*.

- f. Opposed to the realignment Seaside Avenue through Southwest Marine since it will further demolish historic buildings.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations, Los Angeles Conservancy, “c”*.

Frank Anderson

- a. Requested that the proposed outer harbor cruise terminal not be considered until the existing cruise terminal at Berths 91-93 is maximized.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Individuals, Linda Alexander, “a”*.

- b. Requests tourist and visitor transportation between the waterfront, Cabrillo Beach and downtown San Pedro via street car or alternate light rail system.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Individuals, Linda Alexander, “b”*.

- c. Requests a Japanese History Museum no smaller than one acre on Terminal Island.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Individuals, Linda Alexander, “c”*.

PMP PUBLIC HEARING

Adrian Fine, Los Angeles Conservancy

The issues stated during the public hearing repeat written comments and were addressed in responses to Adrian Fine of the Los Angeles Conservancy.

Jeff Ferrano, SA Recycling

The issues stated during the public hearing repeat written comments and were addressed in responses to Barna Szabo of SA Recycling.

Brian Turner, National Trust for Historic Preservation

The issues stated during the public hearing repeat written comments and were addressed in responses to Brian Turner of the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

Larry Pearson, Teamster Local 399

- a. **Expressed concern over the potential loss of facilities such as Southwest Marine, former canneries, Starkist, and Warehouse No. 1 will reduce opportunities for filming in Los Angeles.**

Response: The PMP does not include any proposals to demolish the facilities mentioned. Any such proposals would be subject to project specific analysis under CEQA and the Port's Historic Resources Policy. The *Built Environment Historic, Architectural, and Cultural Resource Policy* commits the Port to conducting a comprehensive survey of cultural resources in the Port, establishes a protocol for evaluating such resources, and describes the mechanisms that will be used to ensure the preservation and adaptive re-use, where feasible.

Temporary filming activities are permitted in any land use designation. However, the principal focus of the PMP is to provide for land uses and activities that serve to promote waterborne trade and maritime activities.

Keith Nikata, Teamsters Local 399

- a. **Expresses the difficulty in finding filmable locations and how many port sites, including Southwest Marine are frequently used for filming.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Port Master Plan Hearing, Larry Pearson*.

- b. Encourages the port in the master plan's goal concerning historic preservation. Recommend a comprehensive historic plan be part of the master plan, instead of just discussing the need to develop one.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations, Los Angeles Conservancy, "a"*.

- c. Expresses preference for the adaptive re-use and proper maintenance of historic buildings on Terminal Island that are the last record of WWI and WWII, shipbuilding, tuna canning, and the Japanese/American community that once existed there.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Port Master Plan Hearing, Larry Pearson*.

- d. Express concern that the plan, as presented, would lead to the destruction of historic resources. The alignment of Seaside Avenue through Southwest Marine could jeopardize it and lead to its demise.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the responses to *Organizations, Los Angeles Conservancy, "a" and "c"*.

- e. Requests that a historic preservation plan be completed before the master plan is approved.**

Response: The *Built Environment Historic, Architectural, and Cultural Resource Policy* was adopted by the Board of Harbor Commissioners on May 2, 2013.

Lori Minick, Trini Nunez, Loren Decker, The Art Spot

The issues stated during the public hearing repeat written comments and were addressed in responses to Lori Minick, Trini Nunez, Loren Decker of The Art Spot.

PEIR HEARING

(Comment Cards)

Thomas Saiget, ExxonMobil Pipeline Co.

The issues identified in the comment repeat written comments and were addressed in responses to Thomas K. Saiget, of ExxonMobil Pipeline Co.

Angel Nieves, Project Street Legal – Harbor Area

The issues identified in the comment repeat written comments and were addressed in responses to Donald Galaz, of Project Street Legal.

(Public Comment)

Donald Galaz, Project Street Legal

The issues identified in the public hearing repeat written comments and were addressed in responses to Donald Galaz, of Project Street Legal.

Jesse N. Marquez, Coalition for a Safe Environment

b. Expresses support for alternative land uses, similar to those expressed by Project Street legal.

Response: The PMP designates allowed land uses in order to meet to primary objectives: (1) promote the orderly, long-term development and growth of the Port by establishing functional areas for Port facilities and operations, and allow the Port to adapt to changing technology, cargo trends, regulations and competition from other U.S. and foreign ports (see 1.3)

Rich Whearty, American Shipyard Group

c. Advocates and proposes for the Port to reopen San Pedro Boat Works, and expresses the need for shipyard repair and services to be located at the Port.

Responses: A detailed project proposal has not been submitted to the Port. Therefore it would be premature to evaluate the project, which would require a Coastal Development Permit and CEQA review. Under the PMP, shipyard repair requires a Maritime Suppose land use designation. Since the former San Pedro Boat Works site is designated for Recreational Boating, a shipyard repair proposal would be inconsistent as the site, but could be accommodated at other sites.

Adrian Fine, Los Angeles Conservancy

The comments stated during the public hearing repeat written comments and were addressed in responses to Adrian Fine of the Los Angeles Conservancy.

Brian Turner, National Trust for Historic Preservation

The comments stated during the public hearing repeat written comments and were addressed in responses to Brian Turner of the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

Rachel Bruhnke, Harbor Farms

Advocates for urban farming in the harbor area, including the planting of fruit trees in local parks, and family and community uses in open space.

Responses: The comments received are general and can be better evaluated when specific proposals are submitted. Overall, the PMP does allow for a variety of maritime related uses, including open space. However, agricultural use is not a permitted use.

Daneil Neri

a. Requests that Planning Area 3, Fish Harbor, be expanded north of Cannery Street in order to better preserve the cultural resources and heritage of the previous canning industry and previous Japanese fishing village.

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations, National Trust for Historic Preservation, "c"*.

b. Addresses historic resources and the need to adaptively reuse the Starkist, Pan-Pacific fisheries and Canner's steam Plant, with the latter potentially being used to support the trucking industry.

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations, Los Angeles Conservancy, "a"*.

Carol (Carrie) Scoville

a. Addresses land uses on Terminal Island, and states while planning with tenant groups has occurred recently, the general public did not have opportunities to provide input into this process.

Response: A planning study, the Terminal Island Land Use Plan was developed with the community, tenants, and potential tenants of Terminal Island. Also, the development of the PMP included two public workshops on July 19, 2012 and October 25, 2012. Finally, a draft of the PMP was released on February 21, 2013 with a comment period that ended on April 8, 2013.

b. Objects to the limited public access to Terminal Island, including bicycle access.

Response: The Port is a major commercial Port. Terminal Island is the area of the port that has been designated to primarily accommodate cargo handling maritime support and commercial fishing activities due to its access to deep water and distance from residential communities. Planning Areas 1 and 2, which are adjacent to the San Pedro and Wilmington communities, are identified as the areas for increased public access.

c. Raises issues related to the China Shipping, Yang Ming, and TraPac container terminals and their proximity to residential communities.

Response: The long term land use for China Shipping, Yang Ming, and TraPac terminals in Planning Area 2 are for container. Where appropriate, the Port has established landscape areas to separate impacts from local residential neighborhoods. For example, Knoll Hill and the Wilmington Waterfront Park both provide open space that segregate port operations from residential communities.