

1.1 Final EIS/EIR Organization

This chapter presents background and introductory information for the Berths 212–224 Yusen Terminal International (YTI) Container Terminal Improvements Project (proposed Project), located in the industrial area of Terminal Island, within the Port of Los Angeles (Port). Additionally, this chapter discusses general changes and modifications made to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR), which are mostly editorial in nature. Chapter 2, Response to Comments, presents information regarding the distribution of and comments on the Draft EIS/EIR, and the responses to these comments. Chapter 3, Modifications to the Draft EIS/EIR, presents the changes made to the text of the Draft EIS/EIR.

This Final EIS/EIR has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 United States Code [USC] 4341 et seq.) and in conformance with the Council for Environmental Quality (CEQ) Guidelines and the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) NEPA Implementing Regulations. The document also fulfills the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code [PRC] 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations [CCR] 15000 et seq.). USACE is the NEPA lead agency for this proposed Project, and the Los Angeles Harbor Department (LAHD) is the CEQA lead agency.

1.2 Project Overview

This section provides an overview of the proposed Project. A description of alternatives to the proposed Project is provided in Chapter 2 of the Draft EIS/EIR. YTI has a long-term lease with the Port for operation of the terminal through 2016 with an option to extend to 2026. YTI plans to exercise the option to extend its lease through 2026. The proposed project horizon year is 2026, the final year of the lease extension. The proposed project area encompasses approximately 185 acres at Berths 212–224 on Terminal Island. The existing terminal consists of two operating berths, Berths 212–213 and Berths 214–216, and one non-operating berth, Berths 217–220. Physical improvements proposed at the existing YTI Terminal include dredging and installing sheet piles and king piles at Berths 214–216 and Berths 217–220, adding and replacing/extending wharf gantry cranes, extending the 100-foot gauge crane rail along the wharf deck to Berths 217–220, improving/repairing backlands across the entire site, and adding a new operational rail track within the existing Terminal Island Container

1 Transfer Facility (TICTF) on-dock rail yard. All improvements would occur within the
2 existing boundaries of the YTI Terminal. The proposed Project does not include physical
3 improvements at Berths 221–224 except for resurfacing of backland areas.
4 Improvements at Berths 212–213 would be limited to raising the height and extending the
5 booms of cranes, and resurfacing backland areas. All dredged material would be
6 disposed of at an approved site, such as the LA-2 Ocean Dredge Material Disposal Site
7 (ODMDS) (LA-2), the Berths 243–245 confined disposal facility (CDF), or another
8 approved location. After construction, the terminal would have three operating berths.
9 These improvements would enable the terminal to accommodate the projected fleet mix
10 of larger container ships (up to 13,000 twenty-foot equivalent units [TEUs]) that are
11 anticipated to call at the terminal through 2026, and the capacity of the terminal would
12 increase from 1,692,000 TEUs to 1,913,000 TEUs annually.

13 **1.3 Existing Conditions**

14 **1.3.1 Regional Context**

15 The Port Complex, which includes the Port of Los Angeles and the Port of Long Beach,
16 is located in the San Pedro Bay approximately 20 miles south of downtown Los Angeles
17 and serves as one of the nation’s primary gateways for international trade (Figure 2-1 in
18 the Draft EIS/EIR). International trade is a key economic engine for the region and the
19 country. The Port Complex serves as a vital link in the goods movement chain delivering
20 goods for local markets as well as those shipped by truck and rail throughout the country.
21 The Port Complex serves as the country’s primary gateway for Asian-based trading
22 partners. Approximately half of the cargo coming through the Ports is delivered by truck
23 to the regional market, which is an area roughly 500 to 700 miles from the Port Complex.
24 The local freeways that directly serve the Port Complex are Interstate (I) 110, I-710, State
25 Route (SR) 47, and SR-103. The Alameda Corridor is the primary rail line between the
26 Port and downtown Los Angeles railyards (Union Pacific [UP] East LA Yard and
27 Burlington Northern Santa Fe [BNSF] Hobart Yard). Other rail lines extend from the
28 downtown area north and east.

29 **1.3.2 Project Setting**

30 The Port consists of 7,500 acres and 43 miles of waterfront and provides a major gateway
31 for international goods and services. The Port is administered by LAHD under the
32 California Tidelands Trust Act of 1911. LAHD is chartered to develop and operate the
33 Port to benefit maritime uses, and it functions as a property owner by leasing Port
34 properties to more than 300 tenants. With 23 major cargo terminals, including dry and
35 liquid bulk, container, breakbulk, automobile, and passenger facilities, the Port handled
36 about 158 million metric revenue tons of cargo in fiscal year 2011/2012 (July 2011–June
37 2012) (POLA 2012). Of the 23 major cargo terminals, nine are container terminals and
38 include 85 container cranes. In addition to cargo business operations, the Port is home to
39 commercial fishing vessels, a shipyard, a boat repair facility, and recreational,
40 community, and educational facilities.

1.3.3 Project Site and Surrounding Uses

The proposed project site encompasses a total of approximately 185 acres, including the YTI Terminal and a portion of the TICTF. The berths and container yard occupy approximately 157 acres, YTI's portion of the TICTF on-dock rail is approximately 24 acres, and an additional 4 acres located to the south of the main terminal are unused. The site is generally bounded on the north by confluence of the Cerritos and East Basin Channels, SA Recycling at Berths 210–211 to the east, Seaside Avenue and SR-47 to the south, and the East Basin Channel to the west (Figure ES-2 in the Draft EIS/EIR). Four bridges provide vehicular and rail access to Terminal Island from the mainland: the Vincent Thomas Bridge, the Schuyler Heim Bridge, the Gerald Desmond Bridge, and the Badger Avenue Railroad Lift Bridge.

Land uses in the proposed project vicinity support a variety of cargo handling operations, including container, liquid bulk, and dry bulk, as well as commercial fishing, seafood processing, and maritime support. To the southwest at Berths 226–236 is the Evergreen/STS container terminal, with whom YTI shares the TICTF on-dock railyard; the U.S. Customs Building is to the south of the proposed project area; the Navy Reserve Center former site is to the southeast; the Shell Liquid Bulk Terminal at Berths 167–169 and the Pasha Breakbulk Terminal at Berths 174–181 are across the East Basin Channel to the north; and the Vopak Liquid Bulk Terminal at Berths 187–191 is across Cerritos Channel to the north.

1.3.4 Historic Use of the Project Site

Berths 212–224 have a rich history dating back to the late 1920s, serving a variety of tenants including oil companies, lumber companies, shipbuilding and dismantling operations, and cargo terminals.

The first facilities at Berths 212–214 were originally constructed in the 1920s. From about 1941 through 1945, during World War II, California Shipbuilding Company (Calship) manufactured Liberty- and Victory-class transports at the site. Calship was the largest wartime shipbuilder in Los Angeles Harbor during World War II. Following the war, Calship was acquired by the National Metal and Steel Corporation, which was the final destination for many decommissioned U.S. Navy ships to be dismantled and exported as scrap metal.

Fellows and Stewart, a yacht builder, also occupied Berth 214 from 1949 through 1976, at which point Al Larson Boat Shop took over the site from 1977 through the mid-1980s. Al Larson Boat Shop was used for boat cleaning, painting, repair, refitting, and boat building. Proctor and Gamble also occupied a portion of the Berth 214 backland for warehousing operations from about 1961 through the mid-1980s.

Berth 215 once housed a liquid bulk transfer/storage facility and included oil storage tanks, office, storage, and pump buildings. Hancock Oil occupied Berth 215 from 1928 through 1958, when it was sold to Signal Oil. Signal Oil continued operations at the site until about 1965, at which time Gulf Oil took over the site and operated until the mid-1980s. Quaker oil also operated on the backlands portion of Berth 215 from about 1965 through 1980.

1.4.2 NEPA Purpose and Need

The purpose of the proposed Project is to improve maritime shipping and commerce by upgrading container terminal infrastructure in, over, and under water and on terminal backlands to accommodate the projected fleet mix of larger container ships (up to 13,000 TEUs) that are anticipated to call at the YTI Terminal through 2026. The proposed Project would optimize the terminal's efficiency and would improve maritime shipping and commerce. This would be accomplished through dredging to deepen two berths at the terminal, including the addition of subsurface king piles and sheet piles to stabilize the existing wharf structure, replacing or extending gantry cranes, extending the 100-foot gauge crane rail along the wharf deck to Berths 217–220, and adding a new operational rail track within the existing TICTF on-dock rail yard.

The proposed Project is needed for several reasons, primarily related to projected increases in the size of vessels in the fleet mix throughout the life of the proposed Project. Forecasts show that vessel fleets calling at the YTI Terminal will include larger vessels (up to 13,000 TEUs). The existing berths that would be upgraded as part of the proposed Project are currently dredged to -45 feet Mean Lower Low Water (MLLW)¹ but are not deep enough to accommodate the projected fleet mix through 2026. The deepest existing berth can only accommodate 8,500 TEU vessels. In addition to depth restrictions, the majority of the existing cranes and crane infrastructure cannot accommodate the larger vessels. The existing 50-foot gauge crane rail at Berths 217–220 is not of sufficient size or gauge to accommodate the type and size of cranes capable of efficiently loading and unloading the existing fleet mix calling at the terminal or the larger container ships expected to call through 2026. Currently, all operating cranes have a 100-foot width between the rails. A temporary 100-foot gauge rail extends partially onto Berths 217–220 to allow cranes to be moved out of the way for storage, but the temporary crane rail lacks the structural integrity to support operating cranes. Only four of the existing 14 cranes at the terminal are tall enough and have an outreach long enough to load and off-load the largest vessels anticipated to call at the terminal. Also, the TICTF on-dock rail yard at the YTI Terminal does not have the capacity to efficiently accommodate an increase in peak container volumes associated with larger container ships calling at the terminal. Consequently, an additional operational on-dock rail track is needed. Finally, the YTI Terminal container yard backlands are deteriorating and in need of repair and strengthening to prevent further damage to equipment and pavement throughout the life of the proposed Project.

1.4.3 Federal Scope of Analysis

In general, the scope of federal review for evaluating the potential impacts of a proposed project is focused on those aspects of the project that affect federal agency jurisdiction. USACE has jurisdiction over activities affecting navigable waters and other waters of the United States, as well as any transport of dredged material for the purpose of ocean disposal.

As presented in Section 1.5.1 of the Draft EIS/EIR, under federal law, “the District Engineer should establish the scope of the NEPA document to address the impacts of the specific activity requiring the Department of the Army (DA) permit and those portions of

¹ Mean Lower Low Water is the average height of the lowest tide recorded at a tide station each day during the recording period.

1 the entire project over which the District Engineer has sufficient control and
2 responsibility to warrant Federal review” (33 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part
3 325, Appendix B).

4 USACE regulations also identify four factors to be considered in determining “sufficient
5 control and responsibility,” which include:

- 6 1) whether or not the regulated activity represents merely a link in a corridor-type
7 project;
- 8 2) whether there are aspects of the upland facility in the immediate vicinity of the
9 regulated activity that affect the location and configuration of the regulated
10 activity;
- 11 3) the extent to which the entire project would be within USACE jurisdiction; and
12 4) the extent of cumulative federal control and responsibility.

13 With respect to the first factor, the proposed Project is a container terminal improvement
14 project, which consists of dredging, wharf improvements, overwater cranes, backlands,
15 and rail infrastructure. Thus, it is not “merely a link” in a corridor-type project, such as a
16 highway or a utility line crossing.

17 Considering the second factor, as the YTI Terminal is an existing container terminal in
18 the Port, there is a physical link between the upland container yard/backlands and the
19 adjacent wharves and associated cranes in and over waters of the United States that
20 support YTI’s operations. While this factor might suggest expanding the scope of
21 analysis to include the upland container yard/backlands, the existing YTI Terminal is a
22 fully functioning container terminal that has been operating at this location for many
23 years, and, as such, many of the upland/backland impacts that would or could occur at the
24 site under the proposed Project represent non-jurisdictional activities or operations and
25 the resultant impacts could occur regardless of whether USACE’s regulated activities, as
26 proposed, are authorized.

27 In evaluating the third factor, the extent of waters of the United States that would be
28 affected by the proposed Project represents a relatively small portion of the
29 approximately 185-acre proposed project area. The proposed dredging at Berths 214–216
30 would impact approximately 70,000 square feet, and the dredging at Berths 217–220
31 would impact approximately 60,000 square feet of navigable waters of the United States.

32 For the fourth factor, other than the requirement to obtain the USACE permit, there is no
33 other federal involvement on this site that would warrant broadening the federal scope of
34 analysis, such as use, transfer, or sale of federal property; federal funding including cost
35 sharing, guarantee, or financial assistance; or impact to federally listed historic resources,
36 threatened or endangered species, designated critical habitat, or other federally
37 recognized natural resources. There is also no other federal agency that controls the
38 environmental effects of land development on the upland portions of the proposed project
39 area, and state and local regulations would control the design of the proposed Project.
40 Further, the federal and non-federal portions of the proposed Project could take place
41 independently of each other. In summary, the environmental consequences of the whole
42 proposed Project would not be essentially products of the federal action. Rather, they
43 would be primarily the product of non-federal interest and designs.

1 Based on USACE regulations, including the four factors at 33 CFR 325, Appendix B, the
2 appropriate scope of analysis for the federal action consists of permanent and temporary,
3 direct and indirect impacts to waters of the United States associated with dredging,
4 dredged material disposal, installation of subsurface king piles and sheet piles, wharf
5 improvements, crane extension and/or replacement, and construction-related activities in
6 uplands within the scope of federal control that would take place within 100 feet of the
7 water's edge and are required to complete work and structures in waters of the United
8 States, such as extension of the 100-foot crane rail (i.e., actions directly traceable to the
9 proposed in/over/under water work and structures). Figure 2-10 in the Draft EIS/EIR
10 shows the USACE permit area considered in the federal scope of analysis.

11 Based on the information provided by the proposed project proponent, USACE has also
12 identified potentially significant cumulative impacts that would occur in conjunction with
13 the proposed Project (i.e., federal and non-federal, past, present, and reasonably
14 foreseeable projects in the vicinity of the Port). Therefore, USACE prepared an EIS for
15 the proposed Project and its alternatives. While operational impacts in the uplands would
16 occur outside the jurisdiction and permit authority of USACE, NEPA requires USACE to
17 disclose all potentially significant direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts occurring as a
18 result of a proposed permit action. Significance of the proposed Project or alternative
19 under NEPA is defined by comparing the impacts of the proposed Project or alternative
20 to the NEPA baseline (i.e., increment). This represents the incremental difference
21 between implementation of the proposed Project or alternative and the future conditions
22 that are likely to occur without federal action, in this case, the issuance of the USACE
23 permit. The USACE permit decision would focus on direct and indirect impacts to the
24 aquatic environment.

25 **1.5 Proposed Project**

26 This section describes the proposed improvements on the YTI Terminal, the anticipated
27 construction phasing, and the anticipated terminal operations once the improvements are
28 completed.

29 **1.5.1 Proposed Project Elements**

30 **1.5.1.1 Overview**

31 The proposed Project would be constructed in two phases over an approximately
32 22-month period, and is expected to begin in mid-2015. Phase I is expected to last
33 approximately 12 months and would consist of deepening Berths 217–220 (including
34 installation of sheet piles), extending the 100-foot gauge crane rail, expanding the TICTF,
35 relocating two Port-owned cranes, relocating and realigning two YTI cranes, delivering
36 and installing up to four new cranes, raising and extending up to six YTI cranes, and
37 conducting backland surface improvements. Phase II is expected to take approximately
38 10 months and would involve deepening Berths 214–216 (including installation of king
39 piles and sheet piles) and conducting backland surface improvements. No physical
40 changes would occur at Berths 221–224 except for paving work in the backland area.
41 The improvements to Berths 217–220, including the extension of the 100-foot gauge
42 crane rail, would add a new operating berth at the YTI Terminal (currently at two
43 operating berths, three after implementation of the proposed Project).

1 Below is a summary of the improvements that would occur at the terminal, with more
2 detailed descriptions following.

- 3 ▪ extending the height and outreach of up to six existing cranes;
- 4 ▪ replacing up to four existing non-operating cranes;
- 5 ▪ dredging and installing sheet piles and king piles at Berths 214–216
6 and 217–220;
- 7 ▪ extending the existing 100-foot gauge landside crane rail to Berths 217–220;
- 8 ▪ performing ground repairs and maintenance activities in the backlands area; and
- 9 ▪ expanding the TICTF on-dock rail by adding a single operational rail track.

10 **1.5.1.2 Terminal Improvements**

11 **Dredging and Pilings**

12 The proposed improvements to Berths 214–216 include: (1) dredging to increase the
13 depth from -45 to -53 feet MLLW (with an additional two feet of overdredge depth, for a
14 total depth of -55 feet MLLW); and (2) installing sheet piles and king piles to
15 accommodate the dredging activities and help to support and stabilize the existing wharf
16 structure. Dredging would remove approximately 21,000 cubic yards (cy) of sediment
17 from the berth. The king piles would be installed approximately 35 feet below the
18 mudline and the sheet piles would be installed 15 feet below the mudline, across
19 approximately 1,400 linear feet along the berth.

20 The proposed improvements at Berths 217–220 would include dredging to increase the
21 depth from -45 to -47 feet MLLW (with an additional two feet of overdredge depth, for a
22 total depth of -49 feet MLLW). Dredging would require the removal of approximately
23 6,000 cy of sediment. Sheet piles would be installed approximately 15 feet below the
24 mudline and across approximately 1,200 linear feet along the berth.

25 All of the dredged material, approximately 27,000 cubic yards, would be disposed of at
26 an approved site, which may include the LA-2 ocean disposal site, the Berths 243–245
27 CDF, or another approved location. A sediment characterization study was performed at
28 Berths 212–224 in 2014 to determine the suitability of sediments from the proposed
29 dredge footprint for unconfined aquatic disposal (AMEC 2014). Testing indicated that
30 the majority of sediments within the Berths 212–224 footprint complied with the
31 chemistry, toxicity, and bioaccumulation suitability requirements for ocean disposal
32 (Title 40 CFR Parts 220–228), with some higher levels associated with unconsolidated
33 surface (top-layer) sediments at Berths 214–216. Therefore, the majority of dredged
34 material (21,800 cubic yards) would be suitable for placement at LA-2, and
35 approximately two feet of surface sediments from Berths 214–216 (5,200 cubic yards)
36 would be placed within the Berths 243–245 CDF or another upland location.

37 **Crane Extension/Replacement**

38 Currently, there are 10 operating wharf cranes (14 cranes total) at the terminal. Under the
39 proposed Project, there would be up to 14 operating cranes and two non-operating cranes.
40 The proposed Project includes raising and increasing the outreach of some of the existing
41 cranes and replacing some existing cranes with super post-Panamax cranes. The four

1 existing largest super post-Panamax cranes (cranes 5–8) would remain and would not be
2 modified. Up to six existing cranes (cranes 1–4 and 9–10) would be raised, and the
3 booms would be extended to match the size of the four largest cranes (197 feet) to
4 accommodate loading and unloading of 22-container-wide cargo vessels. A maximum of
5 four new super post-Panamax cranes would be added to replace smaller cranes at the YTI
6 Terminal. The existing non-operating cranes (cranes 11–12) would be moved to the far
7 end of Berths 217–220 and stored for non-use. Additionally, the existing non-operating
8 cranes owned by the Port (cranes P18–P19) would be relocated off site. The cranes are
9 designed to move along the wharves and would be located where needed to efficiently
10 load and unload vessels.

11 **Extension of Wharf Crane Rail**

12 The existing 100-foot gauge landside crane rail at Berths 212–216 would be extended by
13 approximately 1,500 feet to accommodate 100-foot gauge cranes at Berths 217–220.
14 Approximately 1,500 linear feet of existing 1,000-amp crane bus bar would be replaced
15 with a new 1,500-amp system to provide power to the 100-foot gauge cranes.

16 **Backland Improvements**

17 Backland improvements would occur on approximately 160 acres of the 185-acre
18 terminal and would consist of ground repairs and maintenance activities involving slurry
19 sealing, deep cold planing, asphalt concrete overlay, construction of approximately 5,600
20 linear feet of concrete runways for rubber tire gantry (RTG) cranes, restriping, and
21 possible removal/relocation/modification of underground conduits and pipes, as needed
22 to accommodate the repairs.

23 **TICTF Improvements**

24 Expansion of the TICTF on-dock railyard would include the addition of a single 3,200-
25 linear-foot operational rail loading track, including two turnouts, and reconstruction of a
26 portion of the container terminal backlands to accommodate the rail expansion. These
27 improvements would involve grading, paving, lighting, drainage, utility
28 relocation/modifications, striping, relocation of an existing fence, and third-party utility
29 modifications, relocations, or removals, as needed. The relocation of the fence would
30 move approximately five acres from the YTI Terminal backlands to the TICTF.

31 **1.5.1.3 Project Construction Phasing and Schedule**

32 The proposed Project would be constructed in two phases: Phase I is expected to take
33 approximately 12 months beginning in mid-2015, and Phase II is expected to take
34 approximately 10 months beginning in mid-2016. During Phase I of construction,
35 Berths 212–213 and Berths 214–216 would remain in operation. During Phase II of
36 construction, Berths 212–213 and the newly improved Berths 217–220 would be in
37 operation.

38 **1.5.2 Proposed Project Operations**

39 **1.5.2.1 Lease Amendment**

40 As part of the proposed Project, YTI would exercise the option to extend its lease for an
41 additional ten-year period to 2026. The option to extend the term of the lease is included

1 in YTI's current Permit No. 692. Therefore, no permit amendment would be required for
2 exercising this option. However, all mitigation measures, lease measures, and standard
3 conditions included in this document for which YTI is responsible would be incorporated
4 into Permit No. 692 through a lease amendment, and compliance would be enforced
5 through the lease.

6 **1.5.2.2 Terminal Operations**

7 The YTI Terminal would continue operating as a container terminal similar to existing
8 conditions. At this time, no foreseeable changes in the type of operations are expected
9 through 2026.

10 **Anticipated Throughput**

11 The proposed Project would improve the container-handling efficiency of the existing
12 YTI Terminal at the Port to accommodate the projected fleet mix of larger container
13 vessels (up to 13,000 TEUs) that are anticipated to call at the YTI Terminal through
14 2026. The proposed Project would increase the throughput capacity of the YTI Terminal
15 from 1,692,000 TEUs to 1,913,000 TEUs annually. The Draft EIS/EIR appropriately
16 accounts for projected growth at the terminal up to its physical capacity limitations of the
17 terminal to represent a worst-case scenario and to ensure all potential environmental
18 impacts are disclosed. The Draft EIS/EIR analyzes the proposed Project at capacity in
19 2026 with the throughput ramping up in interim study years (2015, 2017, and 2020). The
20 actual throughput levels for the proposed Project may be lower than the projected
21 throughput at capacity as analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR due to market conditions.

22 **Ship Operations**

23 Currently, the terminal can service up to three smaller vessels concurrently at the two
24 operating berths. After construction of the proposed Project, up to two larger vessels and
25 one smaller vessel could be berthed concurrently at the three operating berths. At the
26 throughput capacity of approximately 1,913,000 TEUs, the terminal is anticipated to
27 receive 206 ship calls by 2026, along with associated tugboats, which are used to safely
28 guide container ships in and out of the harbor.

29 **Rail Operations**

30 Under the proposed Project, the volume of cargo passing through YTI's portion of the
31 TICTF on-dock railyard is expected to increase from 347,405 TEUs in 2012 to
32 669,550 TEUs by 2026. The additional 3,200-foot rail track would increase the capacity
33 of the YTI portion of TICTF from 567,000 TEUs to 680,400 TEUs, providing sufficient
34 capacity to handle the full amount of anticipated demand for on-dock rail facilities
35 associated with maximum terminal throughput. The percentage of terminal throughput
36 that would be handled by on-dock rail is expected to remain at 35%. Loading, unloading,
37 and hauling of rail cars would occur as it does under existing conditions.

38 In addition to transportation of cargo by on-dock rail, draying of containers to near- and
39 off-dock facilities would continue to occur under the proposed Project, just as it occurs
40 under existing conditions. Generally, trains are composed of containers that are all
41 destined for one location. Where there is not a sufficient number of containers destined
42 for the same location to make up a train, those containers are hauled to near- and off-dock
43 facilities to be grouped with containers from other terminals bound for that same

1 destination. Trucks would haul those containers on public highways to and from off-
2 dock railyards, including the UP Carson ICTF, the BNSF Hobart Yard in Vernon, the UP
3 East Los Angeles Yard, and the proposed BNSF Southern California International
4 Gateway. Local and national (long-haul) containers would be hauled to and from the
5 terminal gates by trucks.

6 **Truck Operations**

7 Based on the anticipated mode splits for the proposed Project, the throughput capacity of
8 1,913,000 TEUs in 2026 would require a total of 4,470 peak daily and 1,236,402 annual
9 truck trips. Of the approximately 1,243,450 TEUs transported by trucks in 2026,
10 approximately 95,650 TEUs (approximately 5%) would be intermodal cargo trucked to
11 off-dock railyards.

12 **Cargo-handling Equipment**

13 The existing types of cargo handling yard equipment are not expected to change as part
14 of the proposed Project. As throughput increases, equipment may be added. In addition,
15 yard equipment would be replaced or modified as needed to comply with California Air
16 Resources Board (CARB) requirements as new requirements take effect.

17 **Terminal Operating Hours**

18 The terminal operating hours are not expected to change from existing conditions. The
19 number of employees working at the terminal is expected to increase from a peak daily
20 total of 533 in 2012 to approximately 845 in 2026. The terminal is run as a continuous
21 operation, in which more employees are hired to supplement operations as needed.

22 **1.6 Port of Los Angeles Environmental** 23 **Initiatives**

24 LAHD's Environmental Management Policy, as described in this section, was approved
25 by the Harbor Commission on April 27, 2003. The purpose of the Environmental
26 Management Policy is to provide an introspective, organized approach to environmental
27 management; further incorporate environmental considerations into day-to-day Port
28 operations; and achieve continual environmental improvement.

29 The Environmental Management Policy includes existing environmental initiatives for
30 LAHD and its customers, such as the voluntary Vessel Speed Reduction Program
31 (VSRP), Source Control Program, Least Tern Nesting Site Agreement, Hazardous
32 Materials Management Policy, and the Clean Engines and Fuels Policy. In addition, the
33 Policy encompasses initiatives such as the Environmental Management System (EMS)
34 with LAHD's Construction and Maintenance Division and a Clean Marina Program.
35 These programs are Port-wide initiatives to reduce environmental pollution. Many of the
36 programs relate to the proposed Project. The following discussion includes details on a
37 number of the programs and their goals.

1.6.1 LAHD's Environmental Policy

LAHD is committed to managing resources and conducting Port developments and operations in an environmentally and fiscally responsible manner. LAHD strives to improve the quality of life and minimize the impacts of its development and operations on the environment and surrounding communities. This is done through the continuous improvement of its environmental performance and the implementation of pollution-prevention measures, in a feasible and cost-effective manner that is consistent with LAHD's overall mission and goals and with those of its customers and the community.

To ensure this policy is successfully implemented, LAHD will develop and maintain an environmental management program that will:

- ensure that environmental policy is communicated to LAHD staff, its customers, and the community;
- ensure compliance with all applicable environmental laws and regulations;
- ensure that environmental considerations include feasible and cost-effective options for exceeding applicable regulatory requirements;
- define and establish environmental objectives, targets, and best management practices (BMPs), and monitor performance;
- ensure LAHD maintains a Customer Outreach Program to address common environmental issues; and
- fulfill the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations through environmental awareness and communication with employees, customers, regulatory agencies, and neighboring communities.

LAHD is committed to the spirit and intent of this policy and the laws, rules, and regulations, which give it foundation.

1.6.2 Environmental Plans and Programs

LAHD has implemented a variety of plans and programs to reduce the environmental effects associated with operations at the Port. These programs include the San Pedro Bay Port Complex Clean Air Action Plan (CAAP), Water Resources Action Plan (WRAP), deepening the channels of the Port to accommodate larger and more efficient ships, and converting to electric and alternative-fuel vehicles. All of these efforts ultimately reduce environmental effects.

1.6.2.1 Clean Air Action Plan

The Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, with the participation and cooperation of the staff of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), CARB, and South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), prepared the San Pedro Bay Port Complex CAAP, a planning and policy document that sets goals and implementation strategies to reduce air emissions and health risks associated with Port operations while allowing Port development to continue. In addition, the CAAP sought the reduction of criteria pollutant emissions to the levels that assure Port-related sources decrease their "fair share" of regional emissions to enable the South Coast Air Basin to attain state and

1 federal ambient air quality standards. Each individual CAAP measure is a proposed
2 strategy for achieving these emissions reductions goals. The Ports approved the first
3 CAAP in November 2006. Specific strategies to significantly reduce the health risks
4 posed by air pollution from Port-related sources include:

- 5 ▪ aggressive milestones with measurable goals for air quality improvements;
- 6 ▪ specific goals set forth as standards for individual source categories to act as a
7 guide for decision-making;
- 8 ▪ recommendations to eliminate emissions of ultrafine particulates;
- 9 ▪ technology advancement programs to reduce greenhouse gases; and
- 10 ▪ public participation processes with environmental organizations and the business
11 communities.

12 The CAAP focuses primarily on reducing diesel particulate matter (DPM), along with
13 nitrogen oxide (NO_x) and sulfur oxides (SO_x). This reduces emissions and health risk
14 and thereby allows for future Port growth while progressively controlling the impacts
15 associated with growth. The CAAP includes emission control measures as proposed
16 strategies that are designed to further these goals expressed as Source-Specific
17 Performance Standards which may be implemented through the environmental review
18 process, or could be included in new leases or Port-wide tariffs, Memoranda of
19 Understanding (MOU), voluntary action, grants, or incentive programs.

20 The CAAP Update, adopted in November 2010, includes updated and new emission
21 control measures as proposed strategies that support the goals expressed as the
22 Source-Specific Performance Standards and the Project-Specific Standards. In addition,
23 the CAAP Update includes the recently developed San Pedro Bay Standards, which
24 establish emission and health risk reduction goals to assist the Ports in their planning for
25 adopting and implementing strategies to significantly reduce the effects of cumulative
26 Port-related operations.

27 The goals set forth as the San Pedro Bay Standards are the most significant addition to
28 the CAAP and include both a Bay-wide health risk reduction standard and a Bay-wide
29 mass emission reduction standard. Ongoing Port-wide CAAP progress and effectiveness
30 will be measured against these Bay-wide Standards, which consist of the following
31 reductions as compared to 2005 emissions levels:

- 32 ▪ Health Risk Reduction Standard: 85% reduction in DPM by 2020
- 33 ▪ Emission Reduction Standards:
 - 34 ▪ by 2014, reduce emissions by 72% for DPM, 22% for NO_x, and 93% for
35 SO_x
 - 36 ▪ by 2023, reduce emissions by 77% for DPM, 59% for NO_x, and 92% for
37 SO_x

38 The Project-Specific Standard remains as adopted in the original CAAP in 2006, that new
39 projects meet the 10 in 1,000,000 excess residential cancer risk threshold, as determined
40 by health risk assessments conducted subject to CEQA statutes, regulations, and
41 guidelines, and implemented through required CEQA mitigations and/or lease
42 negotiations. Although each Port has adopted the Project-Specific Standard as a policy,

1 the Board of Harbor Commissioners retain the discretion to consider and approve projects
2 that exceed this threshold if the Board deems it necessary by adoption of a statement of
3 overriding considerations at the time of project approval.

4 The Draft EIS/EIR analysis assumes compliance with applicable CAAP control
5 measures. Proposed project-specific mitigation measures applied to reduce air emissions
6 and public health impacts are consistent with the emission-reduction strategies of the
7 CAAP.

8 **1.6.2.2 Water Resources Action Plan**

9 Both LAHD and the Port of Long Beach face ongoing challenges from contaminants that
10 remain in Port sediments, flow into the harbor from Port land, and flow from upstream
11 sources in the watershed, well beyond the Ports' boundaries. Therefore, the Ports
12 undertook a collaborative, scientific effort to address existing and potential sources of
13 water and sediment pollution. Building on the collaborative model developed by the
14 CAAP, under the WRAP the Ports will continue to work together and with other
15 stakeholders to achieve further progress in water and sediment quality improvement. The
16 WRAP establishes a program of water quality improvement measures necessary to
17 achieve the goals and targets that will be established by the Los Angeles RWQCB in
18 upcoming regulations. The WRAP targets the four basic types of potential sources of
19 pollutants to harbor waters (land use discharges, on-water discharges, sediments, and
20 watershed discharges) and includes control measures zeroing in on known and potential
21 sources of water and sediment contamination in the harbor area (POLA/POLB 2009).

22 **1.6.2.3 Port of Los Angeles Sustainable Construction Guidelines**

23 LAHD adopted the Port of Los Angeles Sustainable Construction Guidelines in February
24 2008 and revised them in November of 2009. The guidelines are used to establish air
25 emission criteria for inclusion in bid specifications for construction. The guidelines
26 reinforce and require sustainability measures during performance of the contracts,
27 balancing the need to protect the environment, be socially responsible, and provide for
28 the economic development of the Port. Future resolutions are anticipated to expand the
29 guidelines to cover other aspects of construction, as well as planning and design. These
30 guidelines support the Port Sustainability Program.

31 The intent of the guidelines is to facilitate the integration of sustainable concepts and
32 practices into all capital projects at the Port and to phase in the implementation of these
33 procedures in a practical, yet aggressive, manner (LAHD 2009). These guidelines are
34 made a part of all construction specifications advertised for bids.

35 Significant features of the guidelines include, but are not limited to:

- 36 ▪ all ships and barges used primarily to deliver construction-related materials for
37 LAHD construction contracts shall comply with the VSRP and use low-sulfur
38 fuel within 40 nautical miles of Point Fermin;
- 39 ▪ harbor craft shall meet EPA Tier-3 engine emission standards;
- 40 ▪ all dredging equipment shall be electric;
- 41 ▪ on-road heavy-duty trucks shall comply with EPA 2007 on-road emission
42 standards for inhalable particulate matter (PM₁₀) and NO_x;

- 1 ▪ construction equipment (excluding on-road trucks, derrick barges, and harbor
2 craft) shall meet Tier 3 emission off-road standards; the requirement will be
3 raised to Tier 4 by January 1, 2015; in addition, construction equipment shall be
4 retrofitted with a CARB-certified Level 3 diesel emissions control device;
- 5 ▪ equipment will comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 regarding fugitive dust, and
6 other fugitive dust control measures; and
- 7 ▪ additional Best Management Practices, based largely on Best Available Control
8 Technology (BACT), will be required on construction equipment (including on-
9 road trucks) to reduce air emissions further.

10 **1.6.2.4 Other Environmental Programs**

11 **Air Quality**

12 **Alternative Maritime Power.** AMP reduces emissions from container vessels docked at
13 the Port. Normally, ships shut off their propulsion engines when at berth, but use
14 auxiliary diesel engines to power electrical needs such as lights, pumps, and refrigerator
15 units. These engines emit an array of pollutants, primarily NO_x, SO_x, and particulate
16 matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}). The Port is in the process of providing shore-based electricity
17 as an alternative to running the auxiliary engines (a process also referred to as cold
18 ironing). The AMP program allows ships to “plug in” to shoreside electrical power while
19 at dock instead of using on-board engines, a practice that will dramatically reduce
20 emissions. Before being used at the Port, AMP was used commercially only by the
21 cruise ship industry in Juneau, Alaska. Now, AMP facilities have been installed and are
22 currently in use at China Shipping Terminal, Yusen Terminal, Evergreen Terminal,
23 TraPac Terminal, Yang Ming Terminal, APL Terminal, APM Terminal, California
24 United Terminals, and the Cruise Ship Terminal. AMP has been incorporated into the
25 CAAP as a project-specific measure.

26 **Off-Peak Program.** Extending cargo terminal operations by five night and weekend
27 work shifts, the Off-Peak Program, managed by PierPASS (an organization created by
28 marine terminal operators) has been successful in increasing cargo movement, reducing
29 the waiting time for trucks inside Port terminals, and reducing truck traffic during peak
30 daytime commuting periods.

31 **On-Dock Rail and the Alameda Corridor.** Use of rail for long-haul cargo is
32 acknowledged as an air quality benefit. Four existing on-dock railyards at the Port,
33 including the existing TICTF on-dock facility on the proposed project site (another two
34 on-dock yards are proposed—refer to Figure 1-7 in the Draft EIS/EIR), significantly
35 reduce the number of short-distance truck trips (the trips that normally would convey
36 containers to and from off-site railyards). Combined, these intermodal facilities eliminate
37 an estimated 1,400,000 truck trips per year and the emissions and traffic congestion that
38 go along with them. A partner in the Alameda Corridor project, LAHD is using the
39 corridor to transport cargo to downtown railyards at 10 to 15 miles per hour faster. Use
40 of the Alameda Corridor allows cargo to travel the 20 miles to downtown Los Angeles at
41 a faster pace and promotes the use of rail versus truck. In addition, the Alameda Corridor
42 eliminates 200 rail/street crossings and emissions produced by cars with engines idling
43 while the trains pass.

1 **Tugboat Retrofit Project.** The engines of several tugboats in the Port were replaced
2 with ultra-low-emission diesel engines. This was the first time such technology had been
3 applied to such a large engine. Emissions testing showed a reduction of more than
4 80 tons of NO_x per year, nearly three times better than initial estimates. Under the Carl
5 Moyer Program,² the majority of tugboats operating in the Port Complex have been
6 retrofitted.

7 **Electric and Alternative Fuel Vehicles.** LAHD has converted more than 35% of its
8 fleet to electric or alternative-fuel vehicles. These include heavy-duty vehicles and
9 passenger vehicles. LAHD proactively has embarked on the use of emulsified fuels that
10 are verified by CARB to reduce diesel particulates by more than 60% compared to diesel-
11 powered equipment.

12 **Electrified Terminal Operating Equipment.** The 85 ship-loading cranes currently in
13 use at the Port operate under electric power. In addition, numerous other terminal
14 operations equipment has been fitted with electric motors.

15 **Yard Equipment Retrofit Program.** Over the past five years, diesel oxidation catalysts
16 have been applied to nearly all yard tractors at the Port. This program has been carried
17 out with Port funds and funding from the Carl Moyer Program.

18 **Vessel Speed Reduction Program.** Under this voluntary program, oceangoing vessels
19 slow to 12 knots within 20 to 40 nautical miles of the entrance to Los Angeles Harbor,
20 thus reducing emissions from main propulsion engines. Currently, approximately 94% of
21 ships comply with the voluntary program within 20 nautical miles and 79% comply
22 within 40 nautical miles.

23 **Greenhouse Gas Reduction.** Under a December 2007 agreement with the Attorney
24 General's office, LAHD conducts annual comprehensive inventories of Port-related
25 greenhouse gas emissions, tracking these emissions from their foreign sources to
26 domestic distribution points throughout the United States. LAHD reports this data
27 annually to the California Climate Action Registry. The annual reports include emissions
28 of all ships bound to and from the Port terminals, encompassing points of origin and
29 destination; emissions of all rail transit to and from Port terminals, encompassing major
30 rail cargo destination and distribution points in the United States; and emissions of all
31 truck transit to and from Port terminals, encompassing major truck destinations and
32 distribution points. The Port-wide inventory will be conducted annually until Assembly
33 Bill (AB) 32 regulations become effective.³ Under the agreement, LAHD will also
34 construct a 10-megawatt photovoltaic solar system to offset approximately 17,000 metric
35 tons of carbon dioxide equivalent annually. In addition to the agreement with the
36 Attorney General, many of the environmental programs described in this section (such as
37 the Green Terminal Program, the Recycling Program, the Green Ports Program, and all of
38 the air quality improvement programs described above) will serve to reduce greenhouse
39 gas emissions.

² The Carl Moyer Program is a grant program implemented by CARB and administered by SCAQMD to fund the incremental cost of cleaner-than-required engines.

³ The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, also known as AB 32, requires CARB to adopt regulations to require the reporting and verification of statewide greenhouse gas emissions and to monitor and enforce compliance with the program. In general, the bill requires CARB to reduce statewide greenhouse gas emissions to the equivalent of those in 1990 by 2020.

1 **Water Quality**

2 **Clean Marinas Program.** To help protect water and air quality in the harbor, LAHD
3 developed a Clean Marinas Program. The program advocates that marina operators and
4 boaters use BMPs—environmentally friendly alternatives to some common boating
5 activities that could cause pollution or contaminate the environment. The program also
6 includes several innovative clean water measures unique to the Port. The Clean Marinas
7 Program features voluntary components and measures required through Port leases,
8 CEQA mitigation requirements, or established federal, state, and local regulations.

9 **Water Quality Monitoring.** LAHD has been monitoring water quality at 31 established
10 stations in San Pedro Bay since 1967, and the water quality today at the Port is among the
11 best of any industrialized port in the world. Samples are tested on a monthly basis for
12 dissolved oxygen, biological oxygen demand, and temperature. Other observations are
13 noted, such as odor and color, as well as the presence of oil, grease, and floating solids.
14 The overall results of this long-term monitoring initiative show the tremendous
15 improvement in harbor water quality that has occurred over the last four decades.

16 **Inner Cabrillo Beach Water Quality Improvements.** The Port is one of the few
17 industrial ports in the world to have a swimming beach. Inner Cabrillo Beach provides
18 quiet water for families with small children. However, in recent years, upland runoff has
19 resulted in high levels of bacteria in shoreline waters. LAHD has invested hundreds of
20 thousands of dollars in water circulation/quality models and studies to investigate the
21 problem. Recently, LAHD repaired storm drains and sewer lines, replaced poor quality
22 beach sand with clean sand, removed the groin at the northern end of the beach, and
23 installed a bird exclusion device, all as part of its commitment to make sure that Inner
24 Cabrillo Beach continues to be an important regional recreational asset and, more
25 importantly, to improve water quality. In 2004, the Los Angeles RWQCB adopted an
26 Amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan to incorporate the Los Angeles Harbor
27 Bacteria Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL). The TMDL was developed to address
28 impairments of water quality standards by coliform and beach closures at Inner Cabrillo
29 Beach and the Main Ship Channel at the Port. A TMDL specifies the maximum amount
30 of a pollutant that a water body can receive and still meet water quality standards, and
31 allocates the pollutant loadings to point and nonpoint sources.

32 **Habitat Management and Endangered Species**

33 **California Least Tern Site Management.** The federal- and state-listed endangered
34 California least tern (a species of small sea bird) nests from April through August on Pier
35 400 in the Port adjacent to the Pier 400 container terminal. Through an interagency
36 nesting site agreement, LAHD maintains, monitors, and protects the approximately 15-
37 acre nesting site on Pier 400.

38 **Interagency Biomitigation Team.** As part of the development of mitigation for the
39 Deep-Draft Navigation Improvements, including the Pier 400 Landfill, the Port Complex
40 helped establish an interagency mitigation team to evaluate and provide solutions for
41 impacts of landfill and terminal construction on marine resources in the Ports. The
42 primary agencies involved include USACE, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
43 (USFWS), the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), and the California Department
44 of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). A number of mitigation agreements have been established

1 through this coordination, and the team continues to meet as necessary to address
2 environmental issues associated with Port development and operations.

3 **General Port Environmental Programs**

4 **Green Building Policy.** In August 2007, LAHD adopted a Green Building Policy, which
5 outlines the environmental goals for newly constructed and existing buildings, dictates
6 the incorporation of solar power and technologies that are efficient with respect to the use
7 of energy and water, dedicates staffing for the advancement and refinement of sustainable
8 building practices, and maintains communication with other City of Los Angeles
9 departments for the benefit of the community. The policy incorporates sustainable
10 building design and construction guidelines based on the United States Green Building
11 Council – Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design Green Building Rating
12 System (POLA 2007).

13 **Recycling.** LAHD incorporates a variety of innovative environmental ideas into its
14 construction projects. For example, when building an on-dock rail facility, LAHD saved
15 nearly \$1,000,000 and thousands of cubic yards of landfill space by recycling existing
16 asphalt pavement instead of purchasing new pavement. LAHD also maintains an annual
17 contract to crush and recycle broken concrete and asphalt. In addition, LAHD
18 successfully has used recycled plastic products, such as fender piles and protective
19 front-row piles, in many wharf construction projects.

20 **1.7 Changes to the Draft EIS/EIR**

21 This section of the Final EIS/EIR discusses general changes and modifications that have
22 been made to the Draft EIS/EIR. Actual changes to the text, organized by Draft EIS/EIR
23 chapters and sections, can be found in Chapter 3, Modifications to the Draft EIS/EIR, of
24 this Final EIS/EIR.

25 Changes noted in Chapter 3 are identified by text strikeout and underline. These changes
26 are referenced in Chapter 2, Responses to Draft EIS/EIR Comments, of this Final
27 EIS/EIR, where applicable. The project description is presented above and summarized
28 in the Executive Summary, incorporating the editorial changes noted in the Responses to
29 Comments and other minor corrections. Changes to the Draft EIS/EIR include:

- 30 ▪ addition of a lease measure to Section 3.2, Air Quality and Meteorology, and a
31 mitigation measure to Section 3.6, Greenhouse Gas Emissions;
- 32 ▪ modifications to mitigation measures in Section 3.2, Air Quality and
33 Meteorology, and Section 3.8, Groundwater and Soils;
- 34 ▪ changes to the environmental justice finding related to construction-related noise
35 impacts;
- 36 ▪ minor editorial corrections to Section 3.8, Groundwater and Soils; Chapter 5,
37 Environmental Justice; and Chapter 7, Socioeconomics; and
- 38 ▪ minor addition of background information in Section 3.8, Groundwater and Soils
39 and Chapter 7, Socioeconomics.

1 The changes and clarifications presented in Chapter 3 were reviewed to determine
2 whether or not they warranted recirculation of the Draft EIS/EIR prior to certification of
3 the EIS/EIR according to CEQA and NEPA guidelines and statutes. The changes would
4 not result in any new significant environmental impacts or a substantial increase in the
5 severity of an existing environmental effect. In response to public comments, changes
6 and clarifications have been made throughout the Draft EIS/EIR. There would be no new
7 or increased significant effects on the environment due to the proposed changes, and no
8 new alternatives have been identified that would reduce significant effects of the
9 proposed Project. Therefore, the Draft EIS/EIR does not need to be recirculated, and the
10 EIS/EIR can be certified without additional public review, consistent with PRC Section
11 21092.1 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, and NEPA regulations in 40 CFR
12 1502 and 1503.

13

1.8 References

- 2 AMEC. 2014. Final. Sediment characterization report for Berths 212–224 YTI container terminal
3 improvements project Los Angeles harbor. Submitted to: Port of Los Angeles, Environmental
4 Management Division. May. 72 p. plus appendices
- 5 Los Angeles Harbor Department (LAHD). 2009. Port of Los Angeles Sustainable Construction
6 Guidelines.
- 7 Port of Los Angeles (POLA). 2007. Executive Director’s Report to the Board of Harbor
8 Commissioners—Port of Los Angeles Green Building Policy. August 7. Available:
9 http://www.portoflosangeles.org/Board/2007/August/081607_item8.pdf
- 10 ———. 2012. Facts & Figures. San Pedro, CA.
- 11 Port of Los Angeles (POLA) and Port of Long Beach (POLB). 2009. *Water Resources Action Plan*.
12 August. Available: http://www.portoflosangeles.org/DOC/WRAP_Final.pdf.
- 13
- 14