

Contents

| | Page |
|----|-------------|
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |
| 28 | |
| 29 | |
| 30 | |
| 31 | |
| 32 | |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Executive Summary | ES-1 |
| ES.1 Introduction | ES-1 |
| ES.2 Purpose of this Draft EIS/EIR | ES-3 |
| ES.2.1 NEPA Introduction | ES-3 |
| ES.2.2 CEQA Introduction | ES-4 |
| ES.2.3 USACE Purpose and Need | ES-4 |
| ES.2.4 CEQA Project Objectives | ES-5 |
| ES.2.5 Baselines | ES-5 |
| ES.3 Proposed Project | ES-6 |
| ES.3.1 Overview | ES-6 |
| ES.3.2 Local Setting | ES-9 |
| ES.3.3 Project Site and Surrounding Uses | ES-11 |
| ES.4 Alternatives to the Project | ES-16 |
| ES.4.1 Basis of Alternatives | ES-16 |
| ES.4.2 Alternatives Considered | ES-16 |
| ES.4.3 Alternatives Eliminated from Further Consideration | ES-21 |
| ES.5 Environmental Impacts..... | ES-22 |
| ES.5.1 Impacts Considered in this Draft EIS/EIR..... | ES-22 |
| ES.5.2 Impacts of the Proposed Project and Alternatives | ES-22 |
| ES.5.3 Environmentally Preferred and Environmentally Superior Alternative..... | ES-69 |
| ES.5.4 Public Comment | ES-71 |
| ES.5.5 Issues to be Resolved..... | ES-74 |
| Chapter 1 Introduction | 1-1 |
| 1.1 Introduction | 1-3 |
| 1.2 Background..... | 1-4 |
| 1.2.1 Project Location and Brief Project Overview | 1-4 |
| 1.2.2 Goods Movement Overview | 1-6 |
| 1.2.3 San Pedro Bay Ports Cargo Growth and Port Capacity..... | 1-22 |
| 1.3 Purpose of an EIS/EIR..... | 1-29 |
| 1.3.1 NEPA and the Purpose of an EIS | 1-29 |

1 1.3.2 CEQA and the Purpose of an EIR..... 1-29

2 1.4 Lead, Responsible, and Trustee Agencies..... 1-30

3 1.5 Scope and Content of the Draft EIS/EIR 1-34

4 1.5.1 Scope of Analysis 1-39

5 1.5.2 Intended Uses of This Draft EIS/EIR 1-40

6 1.5.3 Draft EIS/EIR Organization 1-42

7 1.6 Key Principles Guiding Preparation of this Draft EIS/EIR 1-43

8 1.6.1 CEQA/NEPA Terminology 1-43

9 1.6.2 Emphasis on Significant Environmental Effects 1-44

10 1.6.3 Forecasting 1-45

11 1.6.4 Reliance on Environmental Thresholds and Substantial Evidence 1-45

12 1.6.5 Disagreement Among Experts 1-46

13 1.6.6 Duty to Mitigate..... 1-46

14 1.6.7 Requirements to Evaluate Alternatives 1-48

15 1.6.8 Port of Los Angeles Plans and Programs..... 1-49

16 1.7 Availability of the Draft EIS/EIR..... 1-54

17 **Chapter 2 Project Description2-1**

18 2.1 Introduction 2-5

19 2.2 Background and Project Overview 2-5

20 2.2.1 Port Planning 2-5

21 2.2.2 Project Overview..... 2-7

22 2.3 NEPA Purpose and Need 2-7

23 2.3.1 Project Purpose 2-7

24 2.3.2 Project Need 2-8

25 2.4 CEQA Project Objectives 2-8

26 2.5 Project Location and Setting 2-9

27 2.5.1 Regional Setting 2-9

28 2.5.2 Local Setting 2-9

29 2.5.3 Project Site and Surrounding Uses 2-9

30 2.5.4 Existing Terminal Facilities, Operations, and Project Site..... 2-11

31 2.5.5 Historical Use of the Proposed Project Site..... 2-26

32 2.6 Proposed Project Development..... 2-27

33 2.6.1 Proposed Project Elements..... 2-27

34 2.6.2 Proposed Project Operations 2-38

35 2.7 Analysis Baselines 2-40

36 2.7.1 CEQA Baseline 2-40

37 2.7.2 NEPA Baseline 2-41

38 2.8 Federal Scope of Analysis 2-42

39 2.9 Alternatives 2-44

1 2.9.1 Alternatives Evaluated in this Draft EIS/EIR 2-44

2 2.9.2 Alternatives Considered but not Further Evaluated 2-53

3 2.10 Relationship to Existing Statutes, Plans, Policies, and Other

4 Regulatory Requirements 2-57

5 **Chapter 3 Environmental Analysis 3-1**

6 3.1 Introduction 3-1

7 3.2 Terminology Used in This Environmental Analysis..... 3-2

8 3.3 Requirements to Evaluate Alternatives 3-3

9 **Section 3.1 Aesthetics and Visual Resources..... 3.1-1**

10 3.1.1 Introduction 3.1-3

11 3.1.2 Environmental Setting 3.1-4

12 3.1.3 Applicable Regulations 3.1-14

13 3.1.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures 3.1-14

14 3.1.2 Significant Unavoidable Impacts 3.1-49

15 **Section 3.2 Air Quality and Meteorology 3.2-1**

16 3.2.1 Introduction 3.2-5

17 3.2.2 Environmental Setting 3.2-5

18 3.2.3 Applicable Regulations 3.2-10

19 3.2.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures 3.2-12

20 3.2.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts 3.2-263

21 **Section 3.3 Biological Resources 3.3-1**

22 3.3.1 Introduction 3.3-3

23 3.3.2 Environmental Setting 3.3-3

24 3.3.3 Applicable Regulations 3.3-26

25 3.3.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures 3.3-28

26 3.3.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts 3.3-91

27 **Section 3.4 Cultural Resources..... 3.4-1**

28 3.4.1 Introduction 3.4-3

29 3.4.2 Environmental Setting 3.4-4

30 3.4.3 Applicable Regulations 3.4-51

31 3.4.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures 3.4-61

32 3.4.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts 3.4-100

33 **Section 3.5 Greenhouse Gas Emissions 3.5-1**

34 3.5.1 Introduction 3.5-3

35 3.5.2 Environmental Setting 3.5-3

36 3.5.3 Greenhouse Gas Pollutants 3.5-3

37 3.5.4 Applicable Regulations 3.5-5

38 3.5.5 Impacts and Mitigation Measures 3.5-14

39 3.5.6 Significant Unavoidable Impacts 3.5-111

1 **Section 3.6 Ground Transportation 3.6-1**

2 3.6.1 Introduction 3.6-3

3 3.6.2 Environmental Setting 3.6-3

4 3.6.3 Applicable Regulations 3.6-24

5 3.6.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures 3.6-22

6 3.6.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts 3.6-210

7 **Section 3.7 Groundwater and Soils 3.7-1**

8 3.7.1 Introduction 3.7-3

9 3.7.2 Environmental Setting 3.7-3

10 3.7.3 Applicable Regulations 3.7-15

11 3.7.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures 3.7-19

12 3.7.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts 3.7-49

13 **Section 3.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials 3.8-1**

14 3.8.1 Introduction 3.8-3

15 3.8.2 Environmental Setting 3.8-3

16 3.8.3 Applicable Regulations 3.8-8

17 3.8.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures 3.8-9

18 3.8.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts 3.8-27

19 **Section 3.9 Marine Transportation 3.9-1**

20 3.9.1 Introduction 3.9-5

21 3.9.2 Environmental Setting 3.9-5

22 3.9.3 Applicable Regulations 3.9-15

23 3.9.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures 3.9-18

24 3.9.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts 3.9-49

25 **Section 3.10 Noise 3.10-1**

26 3.10.1 Introduction 3.10-3

27 3.10.2 Environmental Setting 3.10-10

28 3.10.3 Applicable Regulations 3.10-18

29 3.10.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures 3.10-20

30 3.10.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts 3.10-59

31 **Section 3.11 Water Quality, Sediments, and Oceanography 3.11-1**

32 3.11.1 Introduction 3.11-3

33 3.11.2 Environmental Setting 3.11-3

34 3.11.3 Applicable Regulations 3.11-21

35 3.11.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures 3.11-28

36 3.11.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts 3.11-86

37 **Chapter 4 Cumulative Analysis 4-1**

38 4.1 Introduction 4-3

39 4.1.1 Requirements for Cumulative Impact Analysis 4-3

| | | | |
|----|------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | 4.1.2 | Projects Considered in the Cumulative Analysis | 4-4 |
| 2 | 4.2 | Cumulative Impact Analysis | 4-21 |
| 3 | 4.2.1 | Aesthetics and Visual Resources | 4-21 |
| 4 | 4.2.2 | Air Quality and Meteorology | 4-30 |
| 5 | 4.2.3 | Biological Resources | 4-49 |
| 6 | 4.2.4 | Cultural Resources | 4-64 |
| 7 | 4.2.5 | Greenhouse Gas Emissions | 4-70 |
| 8 | 4.2.6 | Ground Transportation | 4-72 |
| 9 | 4.2.7 | Groundwater and Soils | 4-104 |
| 10 | 4.2.8 | Hazards and Hazardous Materials | 4-108 |
| 11 | 4.2.9 | Marine Transportation | 4-111 |
| 12 | 4.2.10 | Noise | 4-113 |
| 13 | 4.2.11 | Water Quality, Sediments, and Oceanography | 4-118 |
| 14 | Chapter 5 | Environmental Justice..... | 5-1 |
| 15 | 5.1 | Introduction | 5-3 |
| 16 | 5.2 | Environmental Setting | 5-3 |
| 17 | 5.2.1 | Minority and Low-Income Populations..... | 5-3 |
| 18 | 5.3 | Applicable Regulations | 5-9 |
| 19 | 5.3.1 | Executive Order 12898: Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations..... | 5-9 |
| 20 | 5.3.2 | Council on Environmental Quality: Environmental Justice—Guidance under the National Environmental Policy Act..... | 5-10 |
| 21 | 5.3.3 | California Government Code Sections 65041–65049; Public Resources Code Sections 71110–71116 | 5-12 |
| 22 | 5.3.4 | California State Lands Commission Environmental Justice Policy | 5-13 |
| 23 | 5.3.5 | City of Los Angeles General Plan | 5-14 |
| 24 | 5.3.6 | South Coast Air Quality Management District: Environmental Justice Program..... | 5-14 |
| 25 | 5.4 | Assessment | 5-15 |
| 26 | 5.4.1 | Methodology | 5-15 |
| 27 | 5.4.2 | Proposed Project and Cumulative Effects | 5-17 |
| 28 | 5.4.3 | Alternative 1 – No Federal Action..... | 5-29 |
| 29 | 5.4.4 | Alternative 2 – No Project | 5-30 |
| 30 | 5.4.5 | Alternative 3 – Reduced Project: Reduced Wharf Improvements | 5-30 |
| 31 | 5.4.6 | Alternative 4 – Reduced Project: No Backland Improvements..... | 5-32 |
| 32 | 5.4.7 | Alternative 5 – Expanded On-Dock Railyard: Wharf and Backland Improvements with an Expanded TICTF | 5-34 |
| 33 | 5.4.8 | Summary of Disproportionate Effects on Minority and/or Low-Income Populations | 5-37 |
| 34 | 5.5 | Public Outreach | 5-38 |
| 35 | | | |
| 36 | | | |
| 37 | | | |
| 38 | | | |
| 39 | | | |
| 40 | | | |

| | | | |
|----|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1 | 5.5.1 | Alternative Forms of Distribution | 5-39 |
| 2 | 5.5.2 | Spanish Translation | 5-39 |
| 3 | Chapter 6 | Comparison of Alternatives | 6-1 |
| 4 | 6.1 | Introduction | 6-3 |
| 5 | 6.2 | CEQA Evaluation of Alternatives..... | 6-4 |
| 6 | 6.2.1 | CEQA Requirements | 6-4 |
| 7 | 6.2.2 | CEQA Alternatives Comparison | 6-5 |
| 8 | 6.2.3 | NEPA Requirements..... | 6-8 |
| 9 | 6.2.4 | NEPA Alternatives Comparison | 6-8 |
| 10 | Chapter 7 | Socioeconomics | 7-1 |
| 11 | 7.1 | Introduction | 7-3 |
| 12 | 7.2 | Environmental Setting..... | 7-3 |
| 13 | 7.2.1 | Socioeconomic Topics | 7-3 |
| 14 | 7.2.2 | Environmental Quality and the Role of the Port..... | 7-29 |
| 15 | 7.3 | Project Effects Related to Socioeconomics | 7-31 |
| 16 | 7.3.1 | Impact Methodology..... | 7-32 |
| 17 | 7.3.2 | Impact Determination..... | 7-38 |
| 18 | 7.3.3 | Summary of Impact Determinations | 7-56 |
| 19 | Chapter 8 | Growth-Inducing Impacts | 8-1 |
| 20 | 8.1 | Introduction | 8-1 |
| 21 | 8.2 | Summary of Growth-Inducing Impacts | 8-2 |
| 22 | 8.2.1 | Direct Growth-Inducing Impacts | 8-2 |
| 23 | 8.2.2 | Indirect Growth-Inducing Impacts..... | 8-3 |
| 24 | Chapter 9 | Significant Irreversible Impacts | 9-1 |
| 25 | 9.1 | Introduction | 9-1 |
| 26 | 9.2 | Analysis of Irreversible Changes..... | 9-1 |
| 27 | Chapter 10 | References | 10-1 |
| 28 | | Executive Summary | 10-1 |
| 29 | | Chapter 1 Introduction..... | 10-1 |
| 30 | | Chapter 2 Project Description..... | 10-2 |
| 31 | | Chapter 3, Environmental Analysis..... | 10-4 |
| 32 | | Section 3.1 Aesthetics and Visual Resources..... | 10-4 |
| 33 | | Section 3.2 Air Quality and Meteorology | 10-5 |
| 34 | | Section 3.3 Biological Resources | 10-7 |
| 35 | | Section 3.4 Cultural Resources | 10-15 |
| 36 | | Section 3.5 Greenhouse Gas Emissions | 10-24 |
| 37 | | Section 3.6 Ground Transportation..... | 10-27 |
| 38 | | Section 3.7 Groundwater and Soils | 10-28 |

| | | |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1 | Section 3.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials | 10-30 |
| 2 | Section 3.9 Marine Transportation..... | 10-30 |
| 3 | Section 3.10 Noise | 10-31 |
| 4 | Section 3.11 Water Quality, Sediments, and Oceanography | 10-32 |
| 5 | Chapter 4 Cumulative Analysis | 10-37 |
| 6 | Chapter 5 Environmental Justice..... | 10-42 |
| 7 | Chapter 6 Comparison of Alternatives | 10-43 |
| 8 | Chapter 7 Socioeconomics..... | 10-43 |
| 9 | Chapter 8 Growth-Inducing Impacts | 10-45 |
| 10 | Chapter 9 Significant Irreversible Impacts | 10-45 |
| 11 | Chapter 11 List of Preparers and Contributors..... | 11-1 |
| 12 | 11.1 Los Angeles Harbor Department..... | 11-1 |
| 13 | 11.2 U. S. Army Corps of Engineers | 11-1 |
| 14 | 11.3 CDM Smith Inc..... | 11-1 |
| 15 | 11.3.1 Project Management Team..... | 11-1 |
| 16 | 11.3.2 Technical Team | 11-2 |
| 17 | 11.4 CDM Smith Inc. Subconsultant Firms..... | 11-2 |
| 18 | 11.4.1 EnviCraft..... | 11-2 |
| 19 | 11.4.2 Castle Environmental Consulting | 11-2 |
| 20 | 11.4.3 Starcrest Consulting Group, LLC | 11-2 |
| 21 | 11.4.4 MBC Applied Environmental Sciences | 11-2 |
| 22 | 11.4.5 Iteris, Inc. | 11-2 |
| 23 | 11.4.6 Cambridge Systematics, Inc. | 11-2 |
| 24 | 11.4.7 Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc..... | 11-3 |
| 25 | 11.4.8 SWCA Environmental Consultants..... | 11-3 |
| 26 | Chapter 12 Acronyms and Abbreviations | 12-1 |
| 27 | | |

Appendices

1

| | | |
|----|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | Appendix A | Notice of Intent/Notice of Preparation |
| 3 | Appendix B | Air Quality Appendices |
| 4 | | Appendix B1 Air Quality Regulations/Methodology and Air Quality |
| 5 | | and GHG Emission |
| 6 | | Appendix B2 Air Quality Dispersion Modeling |
| 7 | | Appendix B3 Health Risk Assessment |
| 8 | | Appendix B4 Draft General Conformity Determination |
| 9 | Appendix C | Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) Assessment |
| 10 | Appendix D | Cultural Resources Evaluation |
| 11 | Appendix E | Ground Transportation Appendices |
| 12 | | Appendix E1 Traffic Count Methodology |
| 13 | | Appendix E2 Traffic Count Worksheets |
| 14 | Appendix F | Sampling and Dredged Disposal |
| 15 | | Appendix F1 Sampling and Analysis Report |
| 16 | | Appendix F2 Evaluation of Dredged Material Disposal Option |
| 17 | | |

Figures

| | | |
|----|--------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | Page |
| 3 | Figure ES-1 | Regional Location Map ES-2 |
| 4 | Figure ES-2 | Project Vicinity Map ES-8 |
| 5 | Figure ES-3 | Proposed Project ES-10 |
| 6 | Figure 1-1 | Goods Movement Chain: Transportation Distribution 1-7 |
| 7 | Figure 1-2 | General Container Terminal Operations..... 1-11 |
| 8 | Figure 1-3 | Local Cargo Distribution from Port of Los Angeles 1-16 |
| 9 | Figure 1-4: | Transloaded Cargo 1-17 |
| 10 | Figure 1-5: | Direct Intermodal Cargo Flow 1-18 |
| 11 | Figure 1-6 | Location of Existing Near-Dock and Off-Dock Railyards..... 1-20 |
| 12 | Figure 1-7 | Cargo Forecasts for the San Pedro Bay Port Complex 1-24 |
| 13 | Figure 1-8 | San Pedro Bay Port Complex On-Dock Railyards..... 1-28 |
| 14 | Figure 2-1 | Regional Location Map 2-10 |
| 15 | Figure 2-2 | Project Vicinity Map 2-12 |
| 16 | Figure 2-3 | Project Site Map 2-13 |
| 17 | Figure 2-4 | Proposed Project 2-28 |
| 18 | Figure 2-5 | Proposed Buildings to be Demolished and Streets to be Closed or |
| 19 | | Improved..... 2-30 |
| 20 | Figure 2-6 | Berths 226-229 Typical Cross Sections 2-32 |
| 21 | Figure 2-7 | Berths 230-232 Typical Cross Sections 2-33 |
| 22 | Figure 2-8 | USACE Scope of Federal Review Permit Area 2-45 |
| 23 | Figure 3.1-1 | Location of Viewpoints and Scenic Routes 3.1-8 |
| 24 | Figure 3.1-2 | Simulation of Main Channel Viewpoint..... 3.1-21 |
| 25 | Figure 3.1-3 | Simulation of San Pedro Waterfront Viewpoint..... 3.1-22 |

1 Figure 3.1-4 Simulation of Nearest San Pedro Residential Area O'Farrell/Palos
 2 Verdes Viewpoint (VP-3).....3.1-23

3 Figure 3.2-1 Isopleths of Residential Cancer Risk – Unmitigated Proposed Project
 4 – Future CEQA Increment.....3.2-70

5 Figure 3.2-2 Isopleths of Residential Cancer Risk – Unmitigated Proposed Project
 6 – NEPA Increment3.2-73

7 Figure 3.2-3 Isopleths of Residential Cancer Risk – Mitigated Proposed Project –
 8 NEPA Increment3.2-75

9 Figure 3.2-4 Isopleths of Residential Cancer Risk – Unmitigated Alternative 3 –
 10 Future CEQA Increment.....3.2-155

11 Figure 3.2-5 Isopleths of Residential Cancer Risk – Unmitigated Alternative 3 –
 12 NEPA Increment3.2-159

13 Figure 3.2-6 Isopleths of Residential Cancer Risk – Mitigated Alternative 3 – NEPA
 14 Increment.....3.2-161

15 Figure 3.2-7 Isopleths of Residential Cancer Risk – Unmitigated Alternative 4 –
 16 Future CEQA Increment.....3.2-200

17 Figure 3.2-8 Isopleths of Residential Cancer Risk – Unmitigated Alternative 4 –
 18 NEPA Increment3.2-203

19 Figure 3.2-9 Isopleths of Residential Cancer Risk – Unmitigated Alternative 5 –
 20 Future CEQA Increment.....3.2-239

21 Figure 3.2-10 Isopleths of Residential Cancer Risk – Unmitigated Alternative 5 –
 22 NEPA Increment3.2-242

23 Figure 3.2-11 Isopleths of Residential Cancer Risk – Mitigated Alternative 5 – NEPA
 24 Increment.....3.2-244

25 Figure 3.3-1 Location of the Project site in Los Angeles Harbor. Fish/invertebrate
 26 Stations LA 4 and LA 15 (MBC, 2016) marked with green circle.3.3-4

27 Figure 3.3-2 Least Tern Nesting at Los Angeles Harbor Nesting Sites, 1981–20143.3-15

28 Figure 3.4-1 Project Site and USACE Permit Area.....3.4-5

29 Figure 3.4-2 Port Development3.4-6

30 Figure 3.4-3 Geologic Map.....3.4-8

31 Figure 3.4-4 Former Rattlesnake Island3.4-9

32 Figure 3.4-5 Built Environment Survey Results3.4-31

33 Figure 3.4-6 Cultural Resources Within and Adjacent to Project Site and USACE
 34 Permit Area.....3.4-44

35 Figure 3.4-7 Archaeological Survey Map3.4-45

| | | | |
|----|---------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| 1 | Figure 3.5-1 | GHG Emissions 2005-2015 | 3.5-42 |
| 2 | Figure 3.5-2 | Actual GHG Emissions 2005-2015 & 2015-2050 GHG Compliance | |
| 3 | | Trajectory..... | 3.5-43 |
| 4 | Figure 3.6-1 | Study Intersections | 3.6-4 |
| 5 | Figure 3.6-2 | Study Freeway Segments | 3.6-9 |
| 6 | Figure 3.6-3 | Map of Southern California Freight Railroad Lines | 3.6-22 |
| 7 | Figure 3.6-4 | Total Arrivals and Departures for an Isolated Blockage..... | 3.6-30 |
| 8 | Figure 3.7-1 | Areas of Potential Concern | 3.7-6 |
| 9 | Figure 3.9-1 | Precautionary Area and Designated Vessel Traffic Lanes..... | 3.9-5 |
| 10 | Figure 3.10-1 | Noise Sensitive Receptors and Corresponding Noise Monitoring Sites..... | 3.10-11 |
| 11 | Figure 3.10-2 | Noise Measurement Results at LT-1 | 3.10-13 |
| 12 | Figure 3.10-3 | Noise Measurement Results at LT-2..... | 3.10-14 |
| 13 | Figure 3.10-4 | Noise Measurement Results at LT-3..... | 3.10-15 |
| 14 | Figure 3.11-1 | Location of proposed Project site and water quality stations LA 26 and | |
| 15 | | LA 30 | 3.11-5 |
| 16 | Figure 3.11-2 | Temperature, DO, & pH in 2013 at Stations LA 26 (left) and LA 30 | |
| 17 | | (right) | 3.11-7 |
| 18 | Figure 3.11-3 | Light transmission, turbidity, & salinity in 2013 at Stations LA 26 (left) | |
| 19 | | and LA 30 (right) | 3.11-10 |
| 20 | Figure 3.11-4 | Location of Everport DMMUs and sediment sampling locations (from | |
| 21 | | Ramboll Environ, 2015)..... | 3.11-15 |
| 22 | Figure 3.11-5 | Current patterns in Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors predicted | |
| 23 | | by the WRAP Model (POLA and POLB, 2009). Top: Typical flood tide | |
| 24 | | currents. Bottom: Typical ebb tide currents | 3.11-20 |
| 25 | Figure 4-1 | Related and Cumulative Projects | 4-5 |
| 26 | Figure 5-1 | Percent Minority Population | 5-7 |
| 27 | Figure 5-2 | Percent of Low-Income Populations..... | 5-8 |
| 28 | | | |
| 29 | | | |
| 30 | | | |

Tables

| | | |
|----|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | Page |
| 3 | Table ES-1: | Everport Container Terminal Crane Specifications..... ES-13 |
| 4 | Table ES-2: | Summary of Proposed Project and Alternatives ES-17 |
| 5 | Table ES-3: | Summary of Potential Significant Impacts and Mitigation for the |
| 6 | | Proposed Project and Alternatives ES-24 |
| 7 | Table ES-4: | Summary of Comments on the NOI/NOP..... ES-71 |
| 8 | Table 1-1: | San Pedro Bay Ports Direct Intermodal Cargo Forecast1-26 |
| 9 | Table 1-2: | Existing and Planned On-Dock Railyards.....1-27 |
| 10 | Table 1-3: | Agencies that Are Expected to Use This EIS/EIR.....1-31 |
| 11 | Table 1-4: | Summary of Key NOI/NOP Comments1-35 |
| 12 | Table 1-5: | Organization and Contents of the Draft EIS/EIR1-42 |
| 13 | Table 1-6: | Correlated CEQA and NEPA Terminology1-44 |
| 14 | Table 2-1: | Existing and Projected Berths 226-236 [Everport] Container Terminal |
| 15 | | Throughput2-4 |
| 16 | Table 2-2: | Existing Everport Container Terminal Crane Specifications2-14 |
| 17 | Table 2-3: | Construction Schedule2-37 |
| 18 | Table 2-4: | Terminal Throughput for NEPA Baseline Study Years2-42 |
| 19 | Table 2-5: | Summary of Proposed Project and Alternatives2-46 |
| 20 | Table 2-6: | Consistency with Applicable Plans, Policies, and Regulatory |
| 21 | | Requirements2-58 |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | | |

1

2 Table 3.1-1: Visual Modification Class Definitions.....3.1-17

3 Table 3.1-2: Everport Container Terminal Crane Specifications.....3.1-18

4 Table 3.1-3: Summary of AES-5 Impacts for Proposed Project.....3.1-27

5 Table 3.1-4: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for
6 Aesthetics and Visual Resources Associated with the Proposed
7 Project and Alternatives3.1-43

8 Table 3.2-1: Adverse Effects Associated with Criteria Pollutants3.2-7

9 Table 3.2-2: Maximum Pollutant Concentrations Measured at the TITP Station.....3.2-9

10 Table 3.2-3: Peak Daily Operational Emissions: CEQA Baseline (2013) (lbs/day)3.2-16

11 Table 3.2-4: Peak Daily Construction Emissions—NEPA Baseline (lbs/day).....3.2-17

12 Table 3.2-5: Peak Daily Operational Emissions—NEPA Baseline (lbs/day)3.2-18

13 Table 3.2-6: SCAQMD Thresholds for Construction Emissions.....3.2-20

14 Table 3.2-7: SCAQMD Thresholds for Ambient Air Quality Concentrations
15 Associated with Project Construction3.2-21

16 Table 3.2-8: SCAQMD Thresholds for Operational Emissions3.2-22

17 Table 3.2-9: SCAQMD Thresholds for Ambient Air Quality Concentrations
18 Associated with Project Operation3.2-23

19 Table 3.2-10A: Peak Daily Construction Emissions — Proposed Project — Ocean
20 Disposal (lbs/day)3.2-25

21 Table 3.2-10B: Peak Daily Construction Emissions — Proposed Project — Upland
22 Disposal (lbs/day)3.2-27

23 Table 3.2-11: Peak Daily Combined Construction and Operational Emissions —
24 Proposed Project (lbs/day).....3.2-29

25 Table 3.2-12: Maximum Off-site Ambient NO₂, SO₂, and CO Concentrations
26 (CEQA) — Proposed Project Construction.....3.2-35

27 Table 3.2-13: Maximum Off-site Ambient PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} Concentrations (CEQA)
28 — Proposed Project Construction3.2-36

29 Table 3.2-14: Maximum Off-site Ambient NO₂, SO₂, and CO Concentrations
30 (CEQA) — Proposed Project Combined Construction and Operation3.2-37

31 Table 3.2-15: Maximum Off-site Ambient PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} Concentrations (CEQA)
32 — Proposed Project Combined Construction and Operation.....3.2-38

33 Table 3.2-16: Maximum Off-site Ambient NO₂, SO₂, and CO Concentrations
34 (NEPA) — Proposed Project Construction3.2-41

| | | |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| 1 | Table 3.2-17: Maximum Off-site Ambient PM10 and PM2.5 Concentrations (NEPA) | |
| 2 | — Proposed Project Construction | 3.2-42 |
| 3 | Table 3.2-18: Maximum Off-site Ambient NO2, SO2, and CO Concentrations | |
| 4 | (NEPA) — Proposed Project Combined Construction and Operation..... | 3.2-43 |
| 5 | Table 3.2-19: Maximum Off-site Ambient PM10 and PM2.5 Concentrations (NEPA) | |
| 6 | — Proposed Project Combined Construction and Operation..... | 3.2-44 |
| 7 | Table 3.2-20: Peak Daily Operational Emissions — Proposed Project (lbs/day)..... | 3.2-46 |
| 8 | Table 3.2-21: Comparison between San Pedro Bay Ports 2010 CAAP Update | |
| 9 | Control Measures and Proposed Project Mitigation Measures | 3.2-53 |
| 10 | Table 3.2-22: Maximum Off-site Ambient NO2, SO2, and CO Concentrations | |
| 11 | (CEQA) — Proposed Project Operation | 3.2-60 |
| 12 | Table 3.2-23: Maximum Off-site Ambient PM10 and PM2.5 Concentrations (CEQA) | |
| 13 | — Proposed Project Operation | 3.2-61 |
| 14 | Table 3.2-24: Maximum Off-site Ambient NO2, SO2, and CO Concentrations | |
| 15 | (NEPA) — Proposed Project Operation | 3.2-63 |
| 16 | Table 3.2-25: Maximum Off-site Ambient PM10 and PM2.5 Concentrations (NEPA) | |
| 17 | — Proposed Project Operation | 3.2-64 |
| 18 | Table 3.2-26: Maximum CEQA Health Impacts Estimated for Construction and | |
| 19 | Operation of the Proposed Project | 3.2-68 |
| 20 | Table 3.2-27: Maximum NEPA Health Impacts Estimated for Construction and | |
| 21 | Operation of the Proposed Project | 3.2-71 |
| 22 | Table 3.2-28: Comparison of Air Quality Impacts Associated with Proposed Project | |
| 23 | and Alternatives | 3.2-78 |
| 24 | Table 3.2-29: Peak Daily Construction Emissions — Alternative 1, No Federal Action | |
| 25 | (lbs/day) | 3.2-83 |
| 26 | Table 3.2-30: Peak Daily Combined Construction and Operational Emissions — | |
| 27 | Alternative 1, No Federal Action (lbs/day) | 3.2-85 |
| 28 | Table 3.2-31: Maximum Off-site Ambient NO2, SO2, and CO Concentrations | |
| 29 | (CEQA)—Alternative 1 Construction | 3.2-89 |
| 30 | Table 3.2-32: Maximum Off-site Ambient PM10 and PM2.5 Concentrations | |
| 31 | (CEQA)—Alternative 1 Construction | 3.2-90 |
| 32 | Table 3.2-33: Maximum Off-site Ambient NO2, SO2, and CO Concentrations | |
| 33 | (CEQA)—Alternative 1 Construction and Operation..... | 3.2-91 |
| 34 | Table 3.2-34: Maximum Off-site Ambient PM10 and PM2.5 Concentrations | |
| 35 | (CEQA)—Alternative 1 Construction and Operation..... | 3.2-92 |
| 36 | Table 3.2-35: Peak Daily Operational Emissions—Alternative 1 (lbs/day)..... | 3.2-95 |

| | | |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| 1 | Table 3.2-36: Maximum Off-site NO ₂ , SO ₂ , and CO Concentrations (CEQA)— | |
| 2 | Alternative 1 Operation | 3.2-100 |
| 3 | Table 3.2-37: Maximum Off-site PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} Concentrations (CEQA)— | |
| 4 | Alternative 1 Operation | 3.2-101 |
| 5 | Table 3.2-38: Maximum CEQA Health Impacts Estimated for Construction and | |
| 6 | Operation of Alternative 1 | 3.2-105 |
| 7 | Table 3.2-39: Maximum Off-site NO ₂ , SO ₂ , and CO Concentrations (CEQA)— | |
| 8 | Alternative 2 Operation | 3.2-112 |
| 9 | Table 3.2-40: Maximum Off-site PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} Concentrations (CEQA)— | |
| 10 | Alternative 2 Operation | 3.2-113 |
| 11 | Table 3.2-41: Maximum CEQA Health Impacts Estimated for Operation of | |
| 12 | Alternative 2..... | 3.2-117 |
| 13 | Table 3.2-42A: Peak Daily Construction Emissions — Alternative 3 – Ocean Disposal | |
| 14 | (lbs/day)..... | 3.2-121 |
| 15 | Table 3.2-42B: Peak Daily Construction Emissions — Alternative 3 – Upland | |
| 16 | Disposal (lbs/day) | 3.2-123 |
| 17 | Table 3.2-43: Peak Daily Combined Construction and Operational Emissions – | |
| 18 | Alternative 3 (lbs/day) | 3.2-125 |
| 19 | Table 3.2-44: Maximum Off-site Ambient NO ₂ , SO ₂ , and CO Concentrations | |
| 20 | (CEQA) — Alternative 3 Construction | 3.2-130 |
| 21 | Table 3.2-45: Maximum Off-site Ambient PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} Concentrations (CEQA) | |
| 22 | — Alternative 3 Construction | 3.2-131 |
| 23 | Table 3.2-46: Maximum Off-site Ambient NO ₂ , SO ₂ , and CO Concentrations | |
| 24 | (CEQA)—Alternative 3 Construction and Operation..... | 3.2-132 |
| 25 | Table 3.2-47: Maximum Off-site Ambient PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} Concentrations | |
| 26 | (CEQA)—Alternative 3 Construction and Operation..... | 3.2-133 |
| 27 | Table 3.2-48: Maximum Off-site Ambient NO ₂ , SO ₂ , and CO Concentrations | |
| 28 | (NEPA)—Alternative 3 Construction..... | 3.2-135 |
| 29 | Table 3.2-49: Maximum Off-site Ambient PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} Concentrations (NEPA) | |
| 30 | — Alternative 3 Construction | 3.2-136 |
| 31 | Table 3.2-50: Maximum Off-site Ambient NO ₂ , SO ₂ , and CO Concentrations | |
| 32 | (NEPA) — Alternative 3 Construction and Operation | 3.2-137 |
| 33 | Table 3.2-51: Maximum Off-site Ambient PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} Concentrations | |
| 34 | (NEPA)—Alternative 3 Construction and Operation without Mitigation | 3.2-138 |
| 35 | Table 3.2-52: Peak Daily Operational Emissions — Alternative 3 (lbs/day) | 3.2-141 |

| | | |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| 1 | Table 3.2-53: Maximum Off-site NO ₂ , SO ₂ , and CO Concentrations (CEQA)— | |
| 2 | Alternative 3 Operation | 3.2-146 |
| 3 | Table 3.2-54: Maximum Off-site PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} Concentrations (CEQA) — | |
| 4 | Alternative 3 Operation | 3.2-147 |
| 5 | Table 3.2-55: Maximum Off-site NO ₂ , SO ₂ , and CO Concentrations (NEPA) — | |
| 6 | Alternative 3 Operation | 3.2-149 |
| 7 | Table 3.2-56: Maximum Off-site PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} Concentrations (NEPA) — | |
| 8 | Alternative 3 Operation | 3.2-150 |
| 9 | Table 3.2-57: Maximum CEQA Health Impacts Estimated for Construction and | |
| 10 | Operation of Alternative 3 | 3.2-153 |
| 11 | Table 3.2-58: Maximum NEPA Health Impacts Estimated for Construction and | |
| 12 | Operation of Alternative 3 | 3.2-157 |
| 13 | Table 3.2-59A: Peak Daily Construction Emissions — Alternative 4 – Ocean Disposal | |
| 14 | (lbs/day) | 3.2-164 |
| 15 | Table 3.2-59B: Peak Daily Construction Emissions — Alternative 4 – Upland | |
| 16 | Disposal (lbs/day) | 3.2-166 |
| 17 | Table 3.2-60: Peak Daily Combined Construction and Operational Emissions – | |
| 18 | Alternative 4 (lbs/day) | 3.2-168 |
| 19 | Table 3.2-61: Maximum Off-site Ambient NO ₂ , SO ₂ , and CO Concentrations | |
| 20 | (CEQA) — Alternative 4 Construction | 3.2-173 |
| 21 | Table 3.2-62: Maximum Off-site Ambient PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} Concentrations (CEQA) | |
| 22 | — Alternative 4 Construction | 3.2-174 |
| 23 | Table 3.2-63: Maximum Off-site Ambient NO ₂ , SO ₂ , and CO Concentrations | |
| 24 | (CEQA) — Alternative 4 Construction and Operation | 3.2-175 |
| 25 | Table 3.2-64: Maximum Off-site Ambient PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} Concentrations | |
| 26 | (CEQA)—Alternative 4 Construction and Operation | 3.2-176 |
| 27 | Table 3.2-65: Maximum Off-site Ambient NO ₂ , SO ₂ , and CO Concentrations | |
| 28 | (NEPA) — Alternative 4 Construction | 3.2-178 |
| 29 | Table 3.2-66: Maximum Off-site Ambient PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} Concentrations (NEPA) | |
| 30 | — Alternative 4 Construction | 3.2-179 |
| 31 | Table 3.2-67: Maximum Off-site Ambient NO ₂ , SO ₂ , and CO Concentrations | |
| 32 | (NEPA) — Alternative 4 Construction and Operation | 3.2-180 |
| 33 | Table 3.2-68: Maximum Off-site Ambient PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} Concentrations (NEPA) | |
| 34 | — Alternative 4 Construction and Operation | 3.2-181 |
| 35 | Table 3.2-69: Peak Daily Operational Emissions — Alternative 4 (lbs/day) | 3.2-184 |

| | | |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| 1 | Table 3.2-70: Maximum Off-site NO ₂ , SO ₂ , and CO Concentrations (CEQA) — | |
| 2 | Alternative 4 Operation | 3.2-190 |
| 3 | Table 3.2-71: Maximum Off-site PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} Concentrations (CEQA) — | |
| 4 | Alternative 4 Operation | 3.2-191 |
| 5 | Table 3.2-72: Maximum Off-site NO ₂ , SO ₂ , and CO Concentrations (NEPA) — | |
| 6 | Alternative 4 Operation | 3.2-193 |
| 7 | Table 3.2-73: Maximum Off-site PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} Concentrations (NEPA) — | |
| 8 | Alternative 4 Operation | 3.2-194 |
| 9 | Table 3.2-74: Maximum CEQA Health Impacts Estimated for Construction and | |
| 10 | Operation of Alternative 4 | 3.2-198 |
| 11 | Table 3.2-75: Maximum NEPA Health Impacts Estimated for Construction and | |
| 12 | Operation of Alternative 4 | 3.2-202 |
| 13 | Table 3.2-76A: Peak Daily Construction Emissions — Alternative 5 – Ocean Disposal | |
| 14 | (lbs/day) | 3.2-206 |
| 15 | Table 3.2-76B: Peak Daily Construction Emissions — Alternative 5 — Upland | |
| 16 | Disposal (lbs/day) | 3.2-208 |
| 17 | Table 3.2-77: Peak Daily Combined Construction and Operational Emissions – | |
| 18 | Alternative 5 (lbs/day) | 3.2-210 |
| 19 | Table 3.2-78: Maximum Off-site Ambient NO ₂ , SO ₂ , and CO Concentrations | |
| 20 | (CEQA)—Alternative 5 Construction | 3.2-215 |
| 21 | Table 3.2-79: Maximum Off-site Ambient PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} Concentrations (CEQA) | |
| 22 | — Alternative 5 Construction | 3.2-216 |
| 23 | Table 3.2-80: Maximum Off-site Ambient NO ₂ , SO ₂ , and CO Concentrations | |
| 24 | (CEQA)— Alternative 5 Combined Construction and Operation..... | 3.2-217 |
| 25 | Table 3.2-81: Maximum Off-site Ambient PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} Concentrations (CEQA) | |
| 26 | — Alternative 5 Combined Construction and Operation | 3.2-218 |
| 27 | Table 3.2-82: Maximum Off-site Ambient NO ₂ , SO ₂ , and CO Concentrations | |
| 28 | (NEPA) — Alternative 5 Construction..... | 3.2-220 |
| 29 | Table 3.2-83: Maximum Off-site Ambient PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} Concentrations | |
| 30 | (NEPA)— Alternative 5 Construction..... | 3.2-221 |
| 31 | Table 3.2-84: Maximum Off-site Ambient NO ₂ , SO ₂ , and CO Concentrations | |
| 32 | (NEPA) — Alternative 5 Combined Construction and Operation | 3.2-222 |
| 33 | Table 3.2-85: Maximum Off-site Ambient PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} Concentrations (NEPA) | |
| 34 | — Alternative 5 Combined Construction and Operation | 3.2-223 |
| 35 | Table 3.2-86: Peak Daily Operational Emissions — Alternative 5 (lbs/day) | 3.2-225 |

| | | |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| 1 | Table 3.2-87: Maximum Off-site NO ₂ , SO ₂ , and CO Concentrations (CEQA) — | |
| 2 | Alternative 5 Operation | 3.2-230 |
| 3 | Table 3.2-88: Maximum Off-site PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} Concentrations (CEQA) — | |
| 4 | Alternative 5 Operation | 3.2-231 |
| 5 | Table 3.2-89: Maximum Off-site NO ₂ , SO ₂ , and CO Concentrations (NEPA) — | |
| 6 | Alternative 5 Operation | 3.2-233 |
| 7 | Table 3.2-90: Maximum Off-site PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} Concentrations (NEPA) — | |
| 8 | Alternative 5 Operation | 3.2-234 |
| 9 | Table 3.2-91: Maximum CEQA Health Impacts Estimated for Construction and | |
| 10 | Operation of Alternative 5 | 3.2-237 |
| 11 | Table 3.2-92: Maximum NEPA Health Impacts Estimated for Construction and | |
| 12 | Operation of Alternative 5 | 3.2-241 |
| 13 | Table 3.2-93: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Air | |
| 14 | Quality Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives..... | 3.2-247 |
| 15 | Table 3.3-1: Plant Species Observed at the 22-acre Expansion Site, January 2015 | 3.3-6 |
| 16 | Table 3.3-2: Bird Species Observed and Heard at the 22-acre Expansion Site, | |
| 17 | January 2015 | 3.3-7 |
| 18 | Table 3.3-3: Threatened and Endangered Bird Species in the Proposed Project | |
| 19 | Area | 3.3-12 |
| 20 | Table 3.3-4: Special Status Bird Species (Designated by CDFW and USFWS) in | |
| 21 | the Proposed Project Area | 3.3-13 |
| 22 | Table 3.3-5: Special-Status Marine Mammal Species (Designated by CDFW and | |
| 23 | USFWS) in the Project Area | 3.3-17 |
| 24 | Table 3.3-6: Managed Fish/Invertebrate Species Most Likely to Occur at or near | |
| 25 | the Project Site in Los Angeles Harbor Based on Past Occurrences..... | 3.3-22 |
| 26 | Table 3.3-7: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for | |
| 27 | Biological Resources Associated with the Proposed Project and | |
| 28 | Alternatives | 3.3-85 |
| 29 | Table 3.4-1: Properties on Terminal Island Evaluated for Historic Significance..... | 3.4-32 |
| 30 | Table 3.4-2: Coordination with Local Native American Groups by LAHD | 3.4-49 |
| 31 | Table 3.4-3: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for | |
| 32 | Cultural Resources Associated with the Proposed Project and | |
| 33 | Alternatives | 3.4-95 |
| 34 | Table 3.5-1: Annual Operational GHG Emissions—CEQA Baseline 2013 (mty) | 3.5-17 |
| 35 | Table 3.5-2: Annual Construction GHG Emissions – NEPA Baseline (mty) | 3.5-19 |

| | | |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| 1 | Table 3.5-3: Annual Operational GHG Emissions – NEPA Baseline (mty) | 3.5-20 |
| 2 | Table 3.5-4A: Construction GHG Emissions without Mitigation – Proposed Project – | |
| 3 | Ocean Disposal (mty) | 3.5-26 |
| 4 | Table 3.5-4B: Construction GHG Emissions without Mitigation – Proposed Project – | |
| 5 | Upland Disposal (mty)..... | 3.5-26 |
| 6 | Table 3.5-5: Construction and Operational GHG Emissions without Mitigation – | |
| 7 | Proposed Project (mty) | 3.5-27 |
| 8 | Table 3.5-6A: Construction GHG Emissions with Mitigation – Proposed Project (mty) | |
| 9 | – Ocean Disposal..... | 3.5-35 |
| 10 | Table 3.5-6B: Construction GHG Emissions with Mitigation – Proposed Project (mty) | |
| 11 | – Upland Disposal..... | 3.5-35 |
| 12 | Table 3.5-7: Construction and Operational GHG Emissions with Mitigation – | |
| 13 | Proposed Project (mty) | 3.5-36 |
| 14 | Table 3.5-8: Consideration of Key State and Local GHG-Reducing Plans and | |
| 15 | Policies | 3.5-44 |
| 16 | Table 3.5-9: Construction GHG Emissions without Mitigation – Alternative 1 (mty)..... | 3.5-53 |
| 17 | Table 3.5-10: Construction and Operational GHG Emissions without Mitigation – | |
| 18 | Alternative 1 (mty)..... | 3.5-53 |
| 19 | Table 3.5-11: Construction and Operational GHG Emissions with Mitigation – | |
| 20 | Alternative 1 (mty)..... | 3.5-56 |
| 21 | Table 3.5-12: Operational GHG Emissions – Alternative 2 (mty)..... | 3.5-60 |
| 22 | Table 3.5-13A: Construction GHG Emissions without Mitigation – Alternative 3 – | |
| 23 | Ocean Disposal (mty) | 3.5-64 |
| 24 | Table 3.5-13B: Construction GHG Emissions without Mitigation – Alternative 3 – | |
| 25 | Upland Disposal (mty)..... | 3.5-64 |
| 26 | Table 3.5-14: Construction and Operational GHG Emissions without Mitigation – | |
| 27 | Alternative 3 (mty)..... | 3.5-65 |
| 28 | Table 3.5-15A: Construction GHG Emissions With Mitigation – Alternative 3 – Ocean | |
| 29 | Disposal (mty)..... | 3.5-71 |
| 30 | Table 3.5-15B: Construction GHG Emissions With Mitigation – Alternative 3 – Upland | |
| 31 | Disposal (mty)..... | 3.5-71 |
| 32 | Table 3.5-16: Construction and Operational GHG Emissions with Mitigation – | |
| 33 | Alternative 3 (mty)..... | 3.5-72 |
| 34 | Table 3.5-17A: Construction GHG Emissions without Mitigation – Alternative 4 – | |
| 35 | Ocean Disposal (mty) | 3.5-78 |

1 Table 3.5-17B: Construction GHG Emissions without Mitigation – Alternative 4 –
 2 Upland Disposal (mty).....3.5-79

3 Table 3.5-18: Construction and Operational GHG Emissions without Mitigation –
 4 Alternative 4 (mty).....3.5-79

5 Table 3.5-19A: Construction GHG Emissions with Mitigation – Alternative 4 (mty) –
 6 Ocean Disposal3.5-85

7 Table 3.5-19B: Construction GHG Emissions with Mitigation – Alternative 4 (mty) –
 8 Upland Disposal.....3.5-86

9 Table 3.5-20: Construction and Operational GHG Emissions with Mitigation –
 10 Alternative 4 (mty).....3.5-86

11 Table 3.5-21A: Construction GHG Emissions without Mitigation – Alternative 5 –
 12 Ocean Disposal (mty)3.5-93

13 Table 3.5-21B: Construction GHG Emissions without Mitigation – Alternative 5 –
 14 Upland Disposal (mty).....3.5-93

15 Table 3.5-22: Construction and Operational GHG Emissions without Mitigation –
 16 Alternative 5 (mty).....3.5-94

17 Table 3.5-23A: Construction GHG Emissions with Mitigation – Alternative 5 (mty) –
 18 Ocean Disposal3.5-100

19 Table 3.5-23B: Construction GHG Emissions with Mitigation – Alternative 5 (mty) –
 20 Upland Disposal.....3.5-100

21 Table 3.5-24: Construction and Operational GHG Emissions with Mitigation –
 22 Alternative 5 (mty).....3.5-101

23 Table 3.5-25: Summary Matrix of Impacts and Mitigation Measures for GHG
 24 Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives.....3.5-107

25 Table 3.6-1: Level of Service Criteria—Intersections3.6-11

26 Table 3.6-2: Freeway HCM Level of Service Criteria3.6-13

27 Table 3.6-3: Freeway CMP Level of Service.....3.6-14

28 Table 3.6-4: CEQA Baseline Intersection Level of Service.....3.6-15

29 Table 3.6-5: CEQA Baseline Freeway Level of Service3.6-16

30 Table 3.6-6: Baseline Transit Service3.6-19

31 Table 3.6-7: Time Periods of the Day.....3.6-33

32 Table 3.6-8: Alameda Corridor Train Volume by Time of Day, 20103.6-34

33 Table 3.6-9: BNSF Train Volume at Highgrove in Riverside County by Time of Day,
 34 2010.....3.6-34

| | | |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| 1 | Table 3.6-10: Hourly Factors Applied to Average Daily Traffic (ADT), by County..... | 3.6-35 |
| 2 | Table 3.6-11: BNSF San Bernardino Subdivision, from Hobart Yard to San | |
| 3 | Bernardino, 2013 CEQA Baseline..... | 3.6-36 |
| 4 | Table 3.6-12: BNSF Cajon Subdivision from San Bernardino to Barstow, 2013 | |
| 5 | CEQA Baseline..... | 3.6-39 |
| 6 | Table 3.6-13: UP Alhambra Subdivision from Los Angeles Transportation Center | |
| 7 | (LATC) to Colton Crossing, 2013 CEQA Baseline (Excluding Segment | |
| 8 | That is Combined with UP Los Angeles Subdivision)..... | 3.6-40 |
| 9 | Table 3.6-14: UP Los Angeles Subdivision from East Los Angeles Yard to West | |
| 10 | Riverside Junction, 2013 CEQA Baseline (Excluding Segment That is | |
| 11 | Combined with UP Alhambra Subdivision)..... | 3.6-42 |
| 12 | Table 3.6-15: Combined UP Alhambra and Los Angeles Subdivisions in Pomona | |
| 13 | and Montclair Area, 2013 CEQA Baseline..... | 3.6-44 |
| 14 | Table 3.6-16: UP Yuma Subdivision from Colton Crossing to Indio, 2013 CEQA | |
| 15 | Baseline..... | 3.6-45 |
| 16 | Table 3.6-17: Annual TEUs: CEQA Baseline and 2038 Proposed Project and | |
| 17 | Alternatives..... | 3.6-52 |
| 18 | Table 3.6-18: Analysis Scenario Average Vehicle Miles Traveled by Trip..... | 3.6-54 |
| 19 | Table 3.6-19: Impact Threshold for Rail Impacts..... | 3.6-57 |
| 20 | Table 3.6-20: Intersection Level of Service Analysis—CEQA Baseline Compared to | |
| 21 | Proposed Project Construction Period Conditions..... | 3.6-61 |
| 22 | Table 3.6-21: Intersection Level of Service Analysis—2017 NEPA Baseline | |
| 23 | Compared to Proposed Project - 2017 Construction Period Conditions | 3.6-62 |
| 24 | Table 3.6-22: Intersection Level of Service Analysis—2018 NEPA Baseline | |
| 25 | Compared to Proposed Project - 2018 Construction Period Conditions | 3.6-63 |
| 26 | Table 3.6-23: Trip Generation Analysis Assumptions and Input Data for Everport | |
| 27 | Container Terminal: CEQA Impact Determination..... | 3.6-66 |
| 28 | Table 3.6-24: Trip Generation Analysis Assumptions and Input Data for Everport | |
| 29 | Container Terminal: Year 2019..... | 3.6-67 |
| 30 | Table 3.6-25: Trip Generation Analysis Assumptions and Input Data for Everport | |
| 31 | Container Terminal: Year 2026..... | 3.6-67 |
| 32 | Table 3.6-26: Trip Generation Analysis Assumptions and Input Data for Everport | |
| 33 | Container Terminal: Year 2038..... | 3.6-67 |
| 34 | Table 3.6-27: Intersection Level of Service Analysis—CEQA Baseline Compared to | |
| 35 | 2038 With Proposed Project | 3.6-69 |

| | | |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| 1 | Table 3.6-28: Intersection Level of Service Analysis—2019 NEPA Baseline | |
| 2 | Compared to 2019 With Proposed Project | 3.6-70 |
| 3 | Table 3.6-29: Intersection Level of Service Analysis—2026 NEPA Baseline | |
| 4 | Compared to 2026 With Proposed Project | 3.6-71 |
| 5 | Table 3.6-30: Intersection Level of Service Analysis—2038 NEPA Baseline | |
| 6 | Compared to 2038 With Proposed Project | 3.6-72 |
| 7 | Table 3.6-31: State Highway System Queuing Analysis – 2038 With Project | |
| 8 | Conditions..... | 3.6-75 |
| 9 | Table 3.6-32: CEQA Baseline Compared to 2038 With Proposed Project - Freeway | |
| 10 | Analysis—A.M. Peak | 3.6-77 |
| 11 | Table 3.6-33: CEQA Baseline Compared to 2038 With Proposed Project - Freeway | |
| 12 | Analysis—P.M. Peak | 3.6-78 |
| 13 | Table 3.6-34: 2019 NEPA Baseline Compared to 2019 With Proposed Project - | |
| 14 | Freeway Analysis—A.M. Peak | 3.6-79 |
| 15 | Table 3.6-35: 2019 NEPA Baseline Compared to 2019 With Proposed Project - | |
| 16 | Freeway Analysis—P.M. Peak | 3.6-80 |
| 17 | Table 3.6-36: 2026 NEPA Baseline Compared to 2026 With Proposed Project - | |
| 18 | Freeway Analysis—A.M. Peak | 3.6-81 |
| 19 | Table 3.6-37: 2026 NEPA Baseline Compared to 2026 With Proposed Project - | |
| 20 | Freeway Analysis—P.M. Peak | 3.6-82 |
| 21 | Table 3.6-38: 2038 NEPA Baseline Compared to 2038 With Proposed Project - | |
| 22 | Freeway Analysis—A.M. Peak | 3.6-83 |
| 23 | Table 3.6-39: 2038 NEPA Baseline Compared to 2038 With Proposed Project - | |
| 24 | Freeway Analysis—P.M. Peak | 3.6-84 |
| 25 | Table 3.6-40: CEQA Baseline Conditions (2013) Average Daily Rail Volumes in the | |
| 26 | Peak Month and Project Trains by Rail Segment, Trains per Day | 3.6-86 |
| 27 | Table 3.6-41: BNSF Cajon Subdivision, from San Bernardino to Barstow, 2013 | |
| 28 | Baseline Plus 2038 Proposed Project | 3.6-90 |
| 29 | Table 3.6-42: BNSF San Cajon Subdivision, from San Bernardino to Barstow, 2013 | |
| 30 | Baseline Plus 2038 Proposed Project | 3.6-94 |
| 31 | Table 3.6-43: UP Alhambra Subdivision from Los Angeles Transportation Center | |
| 32 | (LATC) to Colton Crossing, 2013 Baseline Plus 2038 Proposed | |
| 33 | Project (Excluding Segment That is Combined with UP Los Angeles | |
| 34 | Subdivision) | 3.6-96 |
| 35 | Table 3.6-44: UP Los Angeles Subdivision from East Los Angeles Yard to West | |
| 36 | Riverside Junction, 2013 Baseline Plus 2038 Proposed Project | |
| 37 | (Excluding Segment That is Combined with UP Alhambra Subdivision) | 3.6-98 |

| | | |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| 1 | Table 3.6-45: Combined UP Alhambra and Los Angeles Subdivisions in Pomona | |
| 2 | and Montclair Area, 2013 Baseline Plus 2038 Proposed Project..... | 3.6-100 |
| 3 | Table 3.6-46: UP Yuma Subdivision from Colton Crossing to Indio, 2013 Baseline | |
| 4 | Plus 2038 Proposed Project..... | 3.6-101 |
| 5 | Table 3.6-47: Trip Generation Analysis Assumptions and Input Data for Everport | |
| 6 | Container Terminal: CEQA Impact Determination..... | 3.6-106 |
| 7 | Table 3.6-48: Intersection Level of Service Analysis—CEQA Baseline Compared to | |
| 8 | Alternative 1 - 2038 Conditions | 3.6-109 |
| 9 | Table 3.6-49: CEQA Baseline Compared to Alternative 1 - 2038 Freeway Analysis— | |
| 10 | A.M. Peak | 3.6-113 |
| 11 | Table 3.6-50: CEQA Baseline Compared to Alternative 1 - 2038 Freeway Analysis— | |
| 12 | P.M. Peak | 3.6-114 |
| 13 | Table 3.6-51: Trip Generation Analysis Assumptions and Input Data for Everport | |
| 14 | Container Terminal: Year 2038 | 3.6-124 |
| 15 | Table 3.6-52: Trip Generation Analysis Alternative 3 Assumptions and Input Data for | |
| 16 | Everport Container Terminal: Year 2019..... | 3.6-125 |
| 17 | Table 3.6-53: Trip Generation Analysis Alternative 3 Assumptions and Input Data for | |
| 18 | Everport Container Terminal: Year 2026..... | 3.6-125 |
| 19 | Table 3.6-54: Trip Generation Analysis Alternative 3 Assumptions and Input Data for | |
| 20 | Everport Container Terminal: Year 2038..... | 3.6-125 |
| 21 | Table 3.6-55: Intersection Level of Service Analysis—CEQA Baseline Compared to | |
| 22 | 2038 with Alternative 3..... | 3.6-127 |
| 23 | Table 3.6-56: Intersection Level of Service Analysis—2019 NEPA Baseline | |
| 24 | Compared to 2019 with Alternative 3 | 3.6-128 |
| 25 | Table 3.6-57: Intersection Level of Service Analysis—2026 NEPA Baseline | |
| 26 | Compared to 2026 with Alternative 3 | 3.6-129 |
| 27 | Table 3.6-58: Intersection Level of Service Analysis—2038 NEPA Baseline | |
| 28 | Compared to 2038 with Alternative 3 | 3.6-130 |
| 29 | Table 3.6-59: CEQA Baseline Compared to Alternative 3 - 2038 Freeway Analysis— | |
| 30 | A.M. Peak | 3.6-133 |
| 31 | Table 3.6-60: CEQA Baseline Compared to Alternative 3 - 2038 Freeway Analysis— | |
| 32 | P.M. Peak | 3.6-134 |
| 33 | Table 3.6-61: 2019 NEPA Baseline Compared to 2019 With Alternative 3 - Freeway | |
| 34 | Analysis—A.M. Peak | 3.6-135 |
| 35 | Table 3.6-62: 2019 NEPA Baseline Compared to 2019 With Alternative 3 - Freeway | |
| 36 | Analysis—P.M. Peak | 3.6-136 |

| | | |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| 1 | Table 3.6-63: 2026 NEPA Baseline Compared to 2026 With Alternative 3 - Freeway | |
| 2 | Analysis—A.M. Peak | 3.6-137 |
| 3 | Table 3.6-64: 2026 NEPA Baseline Compared to 2026 With Alternative 3 - Freeway | |
| 4 | Analysis—P.M. Peak | 3.6-138 |
| 5 | Table 3.6-65: 2038 NEPA Baseline Compared to 2038 With Alternative 3 - Freeway | |
| 6 | Analysis—A.M. Peak | 3.6-139 |
| 7 | Table 3.6-66: 2038 NEPA Baseline Compared to 2038 With Alternative 3 - Freeway | |
| 8 | Analysis—P.M. Peak | 3.6-140 |
| 9 | Table 3.6-67: Trip Generation Analysis Assumptions and Input Data for Everport | |
| 10 | Container Terminal: Year 2038 – Alternative 4..... | 3.6-144 |
| 11 | Table 3.6-68: Trip Generation Analysis Alternative 4 Assumptions and Input Data for | |
| 12 | Everport Container Terminal: Year 2019..... | 3.6-145 |
| 13 | Table 3.6-69: Trip Generation Analysis Alternative 4 Assumptions and Input Data for | |
| 14 | Everport Container Terminal: Year 2026..... | 3.6-146 |
| 15 | Table 3.6-70: Trip Generation Analysis Alternative 4 Assumptions and Input Data for | |
| 16 | Everport Container Terminal: Year 2038..... | 3.6-146 |
| 17 | Table 3.6-71: Intersection Level of Service Analysis—CEQA Baseline Compared to | |
| 18 | 2038 With Alternative 4..... | 3.6-149 |
| 19 | Table 3.6-72: Intersection Level of Service Analysis—2019 NEPA Baseline | |
| 20 | Compared to 2019 With Alternative 4..... | 3.6-150 |
| 21 | Table 3.6-73: Intersection Level of Service Analysis—2026 NEPA Baseline | |
| 22 | Compared to 2026 With Alternative 4..... | 3.6-151 |
| 23 | Table 3.6-74: Intersection Level of Service Analysis—2038 NEPA Baseline | |
| 24 | Compared to 2038 With Alternative 4..... | 3.6-154 |
| 25 | Table 3.6-75: CEQA Baseline Compared to Alternative 4 - 2038 Freeway Analysis— | |
| 26 | A.M. Peak | 3.6-155 |
| 27 | Table 3.6-76: CEQA Baseline Compared to Alternative 4 - 2038 Freeway Analysis— | |
| 28 | P.M. Peak | 3.6-156 |
| 29 | Table 3.6-77: 2019 NEPA Baseline Compared to 2019 With Alternative 4 - Freeway | |
| 30 | Analysis—A.M. Peak | 3.6-157 |
| 31 | Table 3.6-78: 2019 NEPA Baseline Compared to 2019 With Alternative 4 - Freeway | |
| 32 | Analysis—P.M. Peak | 3.6-158 |
| 33 | Table 3.6-79: 2026 NEPA Baseline Compared to 2026 With Alternative 4 - Freeway | |
| 34 | Analysis—A.M. Peak | 3.6-159 |
| 35 | Table 3.6-80: 2026 NEPA Baseline Compared to 2026 With Alternative 4 - Freeway | |
| 36 | Analysis—P.M. Peak | 3.6-160 |

| | | |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| 1 | Table 3.6-81: 2038 NEPA Baseline Compared to 2038 With Alternative 4 - Freeway | |
| 2 | Analysis—A.M. Peak | 3.6-161 |
| 3 | Table 3.6-82: 2038 NEPA Baseline Compared to 2038 With Alternative 4 - Freeway | |
| 4 | Analysis—P.M. Peak | 3.6-162 |
| 5 | Table 3.6-83: Trip Generation Analysis Assumptions and Input Data for Everport | |
| 6 | Container Terminal: Year 2038 – Alternative 5..... | 3.6-166 |
| 7 | Table 3.6-84: Trip Generation Analysis Alternative 5 Assumptions and Input Data for | |
| 8 | Everport Container Terminal: Year 2019..... | 3.6-167 |
| 9 | Table 3.6-85: Trip Generation Analysis Alternative 5 Assumptions and Input Data for | |
| 10 | Everport Container Terminal: Year 2026..... | 3.6-167 |
| 11 | Table 3.6-86: Trip Generation Analysis Alternative 5 Assumptions and Input Data for | |
| 12 | Everport Container Terminal: Year 2038..... | 3.6-168 |
| 13 | Table 3.6-87: Intersection Level of Service Analysis—CEQA Baseline Compared to | |
| 14 | 2038 With Alternative 5 | 3.6-169 |
| 15 | Table 3.6-88: Intersection Level of Service Analysis—2019 NEPA Baseline | |
| 16 | Compared to 2019 With Alternative 5..... | 3.6-170 |
| 17 | Table 3.6-89: Intersection Level of Service Analysis—2026 NEPA Baseline | |
| 18 | Compared to 2026 With Alternative 5..... | 3.6-171 |
| 19 | Table 3.6-90: Intersection Level of Service Analysis—2038 NEPA Baseline | |
| 20 | Compared to 2038 With Alternative 5..... | 3.6-172 |
| 21 | Table 3.6-91: CEQA Baseline Compared to Alternative 5 - 2038 Freeway Analysis— | |
| 22 | A.M. Peak | 3.6-175 |
| 23 | Table 3.6-92: CEQA Baseline Compared to Alternative 5 - 2038 Freeway Analysis— | |
| 24 | P.M. Peak | 3.6-176 |
| 25 | Table 3.6-93: 2019 NEPA Baseline Compared to 2019 With Alternative 5 - Freeway | |
| 26 | Analysis—A.M. Peak | 3.6-177 |
| 27 | Table 3.6-94: 2019 NEPA Baseline Compared to 2019 With Alternative 5 - Freeway | |
| 28 | Analysis—P.M. Peak | 3.6-178 |
| 29 | Table 3.6-95: 2026 NEPA Baseline Compared to 2026 With Alternative 5 - Freeway | |
| 30 | Analysis—A.M. Peak | 3.6-179 |
| 31 | Table 3.6-96: 2026 NEPA Baseline Compared to 2026 With Alternative 5 - Freeway | |
| 32 | Analysis—P.M. Peak | 3.6-180 |
| 33 | Table 3.6-97: 2038 NEPA Baseline Compared to 2038 With Alternative 5 - Freeway | |
| 34 | Analysis—A.M. Peak | 3.6-181 |
| 35 | Table 3.6-98: 2038 NEPA Baseline Compared to 2038 With Alternative 5 - Freeway | |
| 36 | Analysis—P.M. Peak | 3.6-182 |

1 Table 3.6-99: CEQA Baseline Conditions (2013) Average Daily Rail Volumes in the
 2 Peak Month and Alt 5 – Additional TICTF - Project Trains by Rail
 3 Segment (Trains per Day)3.6-184

4 Table 3.6-100: BNSF Cajon Subdivision, from San Bernardino to Barstow, 2013
 5 Baseline Plus 2038 Alternative 5 – Additional TCITF Capacity Project.....3.6-187

6 Table 3.6-101: BNSF San Cajon Subdivision, from San Bernardino to Barstow, 2013
 7 Baseline Plus 2038 Alternative 5 – Additional TCITF Capacity Project.....3.6-191

8 Table 3.6-102: UP Alhambra Subdivision from Los Angeles Transportation Center
 9 (LATC) to Colton Crossing, 2013 Baseline Plus 2038 Alternative 5 –
 10 Additional TCITF Capacity Project (Excluding Segment That is
 11 Combined with UP Los Angeles Subdivision).....3.6-193

12 Table 3.6-103: UP Los Angeles Subdivision from East Los Angeles Yard to West
 13 Riverside Junction, 2013 Baseline Plus 2038 Alternative 5 – Additional
 14 TCITF Capacity Project (Excluding Segment That is Combined with
 15 UP Alhambra Subdivision)3.6-195

16 Table 3.6-104: Combined UP Alhambra and Los Angeles Subdivisions in Pomona
 17 and Montclair Area, 2013 Baseline Plus 2038 Alternative 5 –
 18 Additional TCITF Capacity Project3.6-198

19 Table 3.6-105: UP Yuma Subdivision from Colton Crossing to Indio, 2013 Baseline
 20 Plus 2038 Alternative 5 – Additional TCITF Capacity Project3.6-199

21 Table 3.6-106: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for
 22 Ground Transportation Associated with the Proposed Project and
 23 Alternatives3.6-203

24 Table 3.7-1: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for
 25 Groundwater and Soils Associated with the Proposed Project and
 26 Alternatives3.7-46

27 Table 3.8-1: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for
 28 Hazards and Hazardous Materials Associated with the Proposed
 29 Project and Alternatives3.8-25

30 Table 3.9-1: Existing and Projected Terminal Throughput, Vessel Activity, and
 31 Vessel Size for the Proposed Project and Alternatives.....3.9-3

32 Table 3.9-2: Allisions, Collisions, and Groundings – Port Complex (Ports of Los
 33 Angeles and Long Beach), 1996–20133.9-11

34 Table 3.9-3: Number of VTS-Recorded Close-Quarters Incidents, Ports of Los
 35 Angeles and Long Beach (1998–2013)3.9-12

36 Table 3.9-4: Water Depths within the Port of Los Angeles3.9-14

37 Table 3.9-5: Ship Calls at the Port of Los Angeles3.9-15

38 Table 3.9-6: Proposed Project Marine-Based Construction Equipment.....3.9-22

| | | |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| 1 | Table 3.9-7: Existing and Projected Annual Ship Calls under the Proposed Project | |
| 2 | at Full Build-Out (2038)..... | 3.9-25 |
| 3 | Table 3.9-8: Existing and Projected Annual Ship Calls under Alternative 1 at Full | |
| 4 | Build-Out (2038) | 3.9-29 |
| 5 | Table 3.9-9: Existing and Projected Annual Ship Calls under Alternative 2 at Full | |
| 6 | Build-Out (2038) | 3.9-31 |
| 7 | Table 3.9-10: Existing and Projected Annual Ship Calls under Alternative 3 at Full | |
| 8 | Build-Out (2038) | 3.9-35 |
| 9 | Table 3.9-11: Existing and Projected Annual Ship Calls under Alternative 4 at Full | |
| 10 | Build-Out (2038) | 3.9-39 |
| 11 | Table 3.9-12: Existing and Projected Annual Ship Calls under Alternative 5 at Full | |
| 12 | Build-Out (2038) | 3.9-43 |
| 13 | Table 3.9-13: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for | |
| 14 | Marine Transportation Associated with the Proposed Project and | |
| 15 | Alternatives | 3.9-46 |
| 16 | Table 3.10-1: Definitions of Acoustical Terms | 3.10-3 |
| 17 | Table 3.10-2: Typical Noise Levels in the Environment..... | 3.10-5 |
| 18 | Table 3.10-3: Typical Levels of Groundborne Vibration..... | 3.10-9 |
| 19 | Table 3.10-4: Long-Term Noise Monitoring Results | 3.10-17 |
| 20 | Table 3.10-5: Short-Term Noise Monitoring Results..... | 3.10-17 |
| 21 | Table 3.10-6: City of Los Angeles General Plan - Guidelines for Noise Compatible | |
| 22 | Land Uses..... | 3.10-20 |
| 23 | Table 3.10-7: LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Land Use Noise Compatibility Guidelines..... | 3.10-23 |
| 24 | Table 3.10-8: Construction Equipment Maximum Noise Emission Levels | 3.10-24 |
| 25 | Table 3.10-9: Summary of Daytime Construction Noise Impacts..... | 3.10-26 |
| 26 | Table 3.10-10: Summary of Nighttime Construction Noise Impacts..... | 3.10-29 |
| 27 | Table 3.10-11: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for | |
| 28 | Noise Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives..... | 3.10-54 |
| 29 | Table 3.11-1: Sediment Grain Size Results | 3.11-16 |
| 30 | Table 3.11-2: Sediment Chemistry Results..... | 3.11-17 |
| 31 | Table 3.11-3: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for | |
| 32 | Water Quality, Sediments and Oceanography Associated with the | |
| 33 | Proposed Project and Alternatives | 3.11-85 |
| 34 | Table 4-1: Related and Cumulative Projects..... | 4-8 |

1 Table 4-2: Passenger Car Equivalent (PCE) Trip Generation Estimates for the
 2 Proposed Project4-74

3 Table 4-3: Passenger Car Equivalent (PCE) Trip Generation Estimates for the
 4 Alternative 3.....4-74

5 Table 4-4: Passenger Car Equivalent (PCE) Trip Generation Estimates for the
 6 Alternative 4.....4-74

7 Table 4-5: Passenger Car Equivalent (PCE) Trip Generation Estimates for the
 8 Alternative 5.....4-75

9 Table 4-5: Intersection Level of Service Analysis—2019 Cumulative Baseline
 10 Compared to 2019 Cumulative Baseline with Proposed Project.....4-79

11 Table 4-6: Intersection Level of Service Analysis—2026 Cumulative Baseline
 12 Compared to 2026 Cumulative Baseline with Proposed Project.....4-80

13 Table 4-7: Intersection Level of Service Analysis—2038 Cumulative Baseline
 14 Compared to 2038 Cumulative Baseline with Proposed Project.....4-81

15 Table 4-8: 2038 Cumulative Baseline Compared to 2038 Cumulative Baseline
 16 With Proposed Project Freeway Analysis—A.M. Peak4-86

17 Table 4-9: 2038 Cumulative Baseline Compared to 2038 Cumulative Baseline
 18 With Proposed Project Freeway Analysis—P.M. Peak4-87

19 Table 4-10: 2038 Cumulative Baseline Scenario and 2038 Cumulative Baseline
 20 with proposed Project Scenario Peak Month Average Daily Rail
 21 Volumes by Segment, Trains per Day4-89

22 Table 4-11: BNSF San Bernardino Subdivision, from Hobart Yard to San
 23 Bernardino, 2038 with Proposed Project Scenario4-91

24 Table 4-12: BNSF Cajon Subdivision from San Bernardino to Barstow, 2038 with
 25 Proposed Project Scenario4-95

26 Table 4-13: UP Alhambra Subdivision from Los Angeles Transportation Center
 27 (LATC) to Colton Crossing, 2038 with Proposed Project Scenario
 28 (Excluding Segment that Is Combined with UP LA Subdivision).....4-96

29 Table 4-14: UP Los Angeles Subdivision from East Los Angeles Yard to West
 30 Riverside Junction, 2038 with Proposed Project Scenario (Excluding
 31 Segment that Is Combined with UP Alhambra Subdivision)4-98

32 Table 4-15: Combined UP Alhambra and LA Subdivisions in Pomona and
 33 Montclair Area, 2038 with Proposed Project Scenario.....4-100

34 Table 4-16: UP Yuma Subdivision from Colton Crossing to Indio, 2038 with
 35 Proposed Project Scenario4-101

36 Table 5-1: Minority and Low-Income Populations.....5-4

1 Table 5-2: Minority and Low-Income Characteristics in the Vicinity of the
 2 Proposed Project Site5-5

3 Table 5-3: Summary of Disproportionate Effects on Minority and/or Low-Income
 4 Populations Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives5-37

5 Table 6-1: Summary of Proposed Project and Alternatives6-4

6 Table 6-2: Summary of CEQA Significance Analysis by Alternative6-5

7 Table 6-3: Summary of NEPA Significance Analysis by Alternative6-9

8 Table 7-1: Total Civilian Employment by County (1990–2015).....7-4

9 Table 7-2: Total Civilian Employment Projection by County and City (2020–2035)7-6

10 Table 7-3: Unemployment Rate (%) by County (1990–2015).....7-7

11 Table 7-4: Total Farm and Non-Farm Employment for Los Angeles County,
 12 California (1990–2015)7-8

13 Table 7-5: Distribution of Direct Cargo Jobs by Place of Residency for the Port of
 14 Los Angeles7-12

15 Table 7-6: Occupational Breakdown (%) by Place of Residence (Zip Code Area)
 16 2010–2014 Five-Year Estimate (Employed Civilian Population 16
 17 years and over).....7-13

18 Table 7-7: Household and Family Income by Source of Income by County, 2010–
 19 2014 Five-Year Estimate.....7-15

20 Table 7-8: Household and Family Income by Source of Income by Zip Code,
 21 2010–2014 Five-Year Estimate.....7-16

22 Table 7-9: Population by Region, County, and Local Jurisdictions (1990–2010)7-17

23 Table 7-10: Population Projections for Region and County (2010–2060)7-18

24 Table 7-11: Housing Characteristics between 2010 and 20147-21

25 Table 7-12: Existing Home Sale Prices (Median) by County (2004–2014)7-24

26 Table 7-13: New Home Sale Prices (Median) by County (2004–2014)7-25

27 Table 7-14: Average Home Sale Prices by Community (2001–2012).....7-27

28 Table 7-15: Port Industry Activities Associated with Cargo Movement7-33

29 Table 7-16: Proposed Project: Direct and Secondary Construction Employment
 30 Over the Construction Period7-40

31 Table 7-17: Proposed Project: Net Direct and Secondary Operations Employment7-41

32 Table 7-18: Proposed Project: Gross Direct and Secondary Operations
 33 Employment.....7-41

| | | | |
|----|-------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 1 | Table 7-19: | Alternative 1: Direct and Secondary Construction Employment Over | |
| 2 | | the Construction Period..... | 7-44 |
| 3 | Table 7-20: | Alternative 1: Net Direct and Secondary Operations Employment..... | 7-44 |
| 4 | Table 7-21: | Alternative 1: Gross Direct and Secondary Operations Employment..... | 7-45 |
| 5 | Table 7-22: | Alternative 2: Net Direct and Secondary Operations Employment..... | 7-47 |
| 6 | Table 7-23: | Alternative 2: Gross Direct and Secondary Operations Employment..... | 7-47 |
| 7 | Table 7-24: | Alternative 3: Direct and Secondary Construction Employment Over | |
| 8 | | the Two-Year Construction Period | 7-50 |
| 9 | Table 7-25: | Alternative 3: Net Direct and Secondary Operations Employment..... | 7-50 |
| 10 | Table 7-26: | Alternative 3: Gross Direct and Secondary Operations Employment..... | 7-50 |
| 11 | Table 7-27: | Alternative 4: Direct and Secondary Construction Employment Over | |
| 12 | | the Two-Year Construction Period | 7-52 |
| 13 | Table 7-28: | Alternative 4: Net Direct and Secondary Operations Employment..... | 7-52 |
| 14 | Table 7-29: | Alternative 4: Gross Direct and Secondary Operations Employment..... | 7-53 |
| 15 | Table 7-30: | Alternative 5: Direct and Secondary Construction Employment Over | |
| 16 | | the Two-Year Construction Period | 7-55 |
| 17 | Table 7-31: | Alternative 5: Net Direct and Secondary Operations Employment..... | 7-55 |
| 18 | Table 7-32: | Alternative 5: Gross Direct and Secondary Operations Employment..... | 7-55 |