CONTENTS

Executive Summary ES-1
- ES.1 Introduction ES-1
- ES.2 Purpose of the Draft EIR/EIS ES-3
  - ES.2.1 CEQA Introduction ES-3
  - ES.2.2 NEPA Introduction ES-5
  - ES.2.3 CEQA Purpose ES-5
  - ES.2.4 USACE Purpose and Need ES-6
  - ES.2.5 Baselines ES-6
- ES.3 Proposed Project ES-7
  - ES.3.1 Overview ES-7
  - ES.3.2 Local Setting ES-11
  - ES.3.3 Project Site and Surrounding Uses ES-11
  - ES.3.4 Project Construction ES-12
- ES.4 Alternatives to the Project ES-22
  - ES.4.1 Basis of Alternatives ES-22
  - ES.4.2 Alternatives Considered ES-23
  - ES.4.3 Alternatives Eliminated from Further Consideration ES-33
- ES.5 Environmental Impacts ES-33
  - ES.5.1 Impacts Not Considered in this Draft EIS/EIR ES-34
  - ES.5.2 Impacts of the Proposed Project and Alternatives ES-34
  - ES.5.3 Environmentally Preferred and Environmentally Superior Alternative ES-113
  - ES.5.4 Public Comment ES-114
  - ES.5.5 Community Concerns ES-114
  - ES.5.6 Issues to be Resolved ES-119
  - ES.5.7 PCAC Issues Raised/Resolution ES-119

Chapter 1 Introduction 1-1
- 1.1 Introduction 1-2
- 1.2 Background 1-2
  - 1.2.1 Project Location and Brief Project Overview 1-2
  - 1.2.2 Goods Movement Overview 1-6
  - 1.2.3 Increasing Intermodal Cargo Volumes 1-23
  - 1.2.4 Containerized Cargo Growth and Port Capacity 1-23
- 1.3 Purposes of an EIS/EIR 1-30
  - 1.3.1 NEPA and the Purpose of an EIS 1-30
  - 1.3.2 CEQA and the Purpose of an EIR 1-30
- 1.4 Lead, Responsible and Trustee Agencies 1-31
- 1.5 Scope and Content of the Draft EIS/EIR 1-35
  - 1.5.1 Scope of Analysis 1-40
  - 1.5.2 Intended Uses of this Draft EIS/EIR 1-42
  - 1.5.3 Draft EIS/EIR Organization 1-44
- 1.6 Key Principles Guiding Preparation of this Draft EIS/EIR 1-45
  - 1.6.1 Emphasis on Significant Environmental Effects 1-45
  - 1.6.2 Forecasting 1-46

1.6.3 Reliance on Environmental Thresholds and Substantial Evidence 1-46
1.6.4 Disagreement Among Experts 1-46
1.6.5 NEPA and CEQA Baselines 1-47
1.6.6 Duty to Mitigate 1-48
1.6.7 Requirements to Evaluate Alternatives 1-49
1.7 Port of Los Angeles Environmental Initiatives 1-50
1.7.1 Port Environmental Policy 1-50
1.7.2 Environmental Plans and Programs 1-51
1.7.3 Port of Los Angeles Leasing Policy 1-57
1.7.4 Port Community Advisory Committee 1-58
1.8 Availability of the Draft EIS/EIR 1-58

Chapter 2 Project Description 2-1
2.1 Introduction 2-4
2.2 Background and Project Overview 2-4
2.2.1 Port Planning 2-4
2.2.2 Project Environmental Review History 2-5
2.2.3 Project Overview 2-6
2.3 Project Purpose and Need 2-8
2.3.1 Project Need 2-8
2.3.2 Project Purpose 2-10
2.3.3 CEQA Project Objectives 2-10
2.3.4 USACE Purpose and Need 2-11
2.4 Project Location and Setting 2-11
2.4.1 Regional Setting 2-11
2.4.2 Local Setting 2-13
2.4.3 Project Site and Surrounding Uses 2-13
2.4.4 Historical Use of the Project Site 2-15
2.5 Proposed Project Development 2-16
2.5.1 Project Elements 2-16
2.5.2 Project Construction 2-28
2.5.3 Proposed Project Operations 2-32
2.6 Analysis Baselines 2-43
2.6.1 CEQA Baseline 2-44
2.6.2 NEPA Baseline 2-45
2.7 Federal Scope of Analysis 2-46
2.8 Alternatives 2-48
2.8.1 Alternatives Evaluated in this Draft EIS/EIR 2-48
2.8.2 Alternatives Considered But Not Further Evaluated 2-58
2.9 Relationship to Existing Statutes, Plans, Policies, and Other Regulatory Requirements 2-71

Chapter 3.0 Environmental Analysis 3-1
3.1 Introduction 3-1
3.2 Terminology Use in the Environmental Analysis 3-2
3.3 Requirements to Evaluate Alternatives 3-3

Section 3.1 Aesthetics and Visual Resources 3.1-1
3.1.1 Introduction 3.1-3
3.1.2 Environmental Setting 3.1-4
3.1.3 Applicable Regulations 3.1-30
3.1.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures 3.1-31

3.1.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts....3.1-85

Section 3.2 Air Quality, Meteorology, and Greenhouse Gases....3.2-1
3.2.1 Introduction....3.2-5
3.2.2 Environmental Setting....3.2-5
3.2.3 Applicable Regulations....3.2-19
3.2.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures....3.2-36
3.2.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts....3.2-343

Section 3.3 Biological Resources....3.3-1
3.3.1 Introduction....3.3-3
3.3.2 Environmental Setting....3.3-3
3.3.3 Applicable Regulations....3.3-28
3.3.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures....3.3-31
3.3.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts....3.3-131

Section 3.4 Cultural Resources....3.4-1
3.4.1 Introduction....3.4-3
3.4.2 Environmental Setting....3.4-3
3.4.3 Applicable Regulations....3.4-12
3.4.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures....3.4-15
3.4.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts....3.4-41

Section 3.5 Geology....3.5-1
3.5.1 Introduction....3.5-3
3.5.2 Environmental Setting....3.5-3
3.5.3 Applicable Regulations....3.5-14
3.5.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures....3.5-15
3.5.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts....3.5-87

Section 3.6 Ground Transportation....3.6-1
3.6.1 Introduction....3.6-3
3.6.2 Environmental Setting....3.6-3
3.6.3 Applicable Regulations....3.6-25
3.6.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures....3.6-25
3.6.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts....3.6-277

Section 3.7 Groundwater and Soils....3.7-1
3.7.1 Introduction....3.7-4
3.7.2 Environmental Setting....3.7-4
3.7.3 Applicable Regulations....3.7-14
3.7.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures....3.7-15
3.7.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts....3.7-62

Section 3.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials....3.8-1
3.8.1 Introduction....3.8-3
3.8.2 Environmental Setting....3.8-3
3.8.3 Applicable Regulations....3.8-16
3.8.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures....3.8-19
3.8.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts....3.8-153

Section 3.9 Land Use 3.9-1
3.9.1 Introduction 3.9-2
3.9.2 Environmental Setting 3.9-2
3.9.3 Applicable Regulations 3.9-7
3.9.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures 3.9-18
3.9.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts 3.9-53

Section 3.10 Marine Transportation 3.10-1
3.10.1 Introduction 3.10-1
3.10.2 Environmental Setting 3.10-2
3.10.3 Applicable Regulations 3.10-12
3.10.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures 3.10-14
3.10.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts 3.10-34

Section 3.11 Noise 3.11-1
3.11.1 Introduction 3.11-3
3.11.2 Environmental Setting 3.11-3
3.11.3 Applicable Regulations 3.11-18
3.11.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures 3.11-20
3.11.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts. 3.11-52

Section 3.12 Recreation 3.12-1
3.12.1 Introduction 3.12-3
3.12.2 Environmental Setting 3.12-3
3.12.3 Applicable Regulations 3.12-7
3.12.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures 3.12-9
3.12.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts. 3.12-27

Section 3.13 Public Services and Utilities 3.13-1
3.13.1 Introduction 3.13-3
3.13.2 Environmental Setting 3.13-3
3.13.3 Applicable Regulations 3.13-13
3.13.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures 3.13-18
3.13.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts 3.13-87

Section 3.14 Water Quality, Sediments, and Oceanography 3.14-1
3.14.1 Introduction 3.14-2
3.14.2 Environmental Setting 3.14-2
3.14.3 Applicable Regulations 3.14-23
3.14.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures 3.14-33
3.14.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts 3.14-110

Chapter 4 Cumulative Analysis 4-1
4.1 Introduction 4-2
4.1.1 Requirements for Cumulative Impact Analysis 4-2
4.1.2 Projects Considered in the Cumulative Analysis 4-3
4.2 Cumulative Impact Analysis 4-27
4.2.1 Aesthetics and Visual Resources 4-27
4.2.2 Air Quality Meteorology and Greenhouse Gases 4-35
4.2.3 Biological Resources 4-48
4.2.4 Cultural Archaeological, and Paleontological Resources 4-63
4.2.5 Geology 4-68

4.2.6 Ground Transportation and Circulation 4-78
4.2.7 Groundwater and Soils 4-111
4.2.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials 4-116
4.2.9 Land Use 4-127
4.2.10 Marine Transportation 4-132
4.2.11 Noise 4-135
4.2.12 Recreation 4-140
4.2.13 Public Service and Utilities 4-142
4.2.14 Water Quality, Sediments, and Oceanography 4-153
4.3 Alternatives 4-162
4.3.1 Alternative 1 – No Project 4-162
4.3.2 Alternative 2 – No Federal Action 4-163
4.3.3 Alternative 3 – Reduced Project: Four New Cranes 4-164
4.3.4 Alternative 4 – Reduced Project: No New Wharf 4-165
4.3.5 Alternative 5 – Reduced Project: No Space Assignment 4-166
4.3.6 Alternative 6 – Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Rail Yard 4-167

Chapter 5 Environmental Justice 5-1
5.1 Background 5-2
5.2 Environmental Setting 5-2
5.3 Applicable Regulations 5-8
5.4 Assessment 5-13
5.5 Public Outreach 5-51

Chapter 6 Comparison of Alternatives 6-1
6.1 Introduction 6-2
6.2 CEQA Evaluation of Alternatives 6-4
6.2.1 CEQA Requirements 6-4
6.2.2 CEQA Alternatives Comparison 6-4
6.3 NEPA Evaluation of Alternatives 6-7
6.3.1 NEPA Requirements 6-7
6.3.2 Comparison of NEPA Alternatives 6-9
6.4 Analysis of Impacts of Alternatives 6-12
6.4.1 Resources with Significant Unavoidable Impacts 6-13
6.4.2 Resources with Significant Impacts that can be Mitigated to Less than Significant 6-16
6.4.3 Resources with Less than Significant Impacts that Can be Further Reduced by Lease Measures or Standard Conditions of Approval 6-17
6.5 Environmentally Preferred and Superior Alternatives 6-19

Chapter 7 Socioeconomics 7-1
7.1 Introduction 7-2
7.2 Environmental Setting 7-2
7.2.1 Socioeconomic Topical Areas 7-2
7.2.2 Environmental Quality and the Role of the Port 7-31
7.3 Project Effects Related to Socioeconomics 7-32
7.3.1 Impact Methodology 7-33
7.3.2 Proposed Project 7-39
7.3.3 Alternative 1 - No Project Alternative 7-48
7.3.4 Alternative 2 - No Federal Action 7-52

7.3.5 Alternative 3 – Reduced Project: Four New Cranes 7-57
7.3.6 Alternative 4 – Reduced Project: No New Wharf 7-63
7.3.7 Alternative 5 – Reduced Project: No Space Assignment 7-68
7.3.8 Alternative 6 – Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Rail 7-74
7.3.9 Proposed Project and Alternatives Summary Tables 7-78
7.3.10 Other Economic Benefits 7-80

Chapter 8 Growth Inducing Impacts 8-1
8.1 Introduction 8-1
8.2 Summary of Growth-Inducing Impacts 8-2
8.2.1 Direct Growth-Inducing Impacts 8-2
8.2.2 Indirect Growth-Inducing Impacts 8-3

Chapter 9 Significant Irreversible Changes 9-1
9-1 Introduction 9-1
9-2 Analysis of Irreversible Changes 9-1

Chapter 10 References 10-1
10.0 Executive Summary 10-1
10.1 Chapter 1 Introduction 10-1
10.2 Chapter 2 Project Description 10-2
10.3 Chapter 3 Environmental Analysis 10-24
10.3.1 Aesthetics and Visual Resources 10-4
10.3.2 Air Quality and Meteorology 10-5
10.3.3 Biological Resources 10-11
10.3.4 Cultural Resources 10-19
10.3.5 Geology 10-21
10.3.6 Ground Transportation 10-24
10.3.7 Groundwater and Soils 10-25
10.3.8 Hazard and Hazardous Materials 10-26
10.3.9 Land Use 10-28
10.3.10 Marine Transportation 10-30
10.3.11 Noise 10-30
10.3.12 Recreation 10-31
10.3.13 Public Service and Utilities 10-31
10.3.14 Water Quality, Sediments and Oceanography 10-34
10.4 Chapter 4 Cumulative Impacts Analysis 10-39
10.5 Chapter 5 Environmental Justice 10-43
10.6 Chapter 6 Comparison of Alternatives 10-45
10.7 Chapter 7 Socioeconomics 10-46
10.8 Chapter 8 Growth Inducing Impacts 10-47
10.9 Chapter 9 Significant Irreversible Impacts 10-47
10.10 Chapter 10 References 10-47
10.11 Chapter 11 List of Preparers 10-48
10.12 Chapter 12 Acronyms 10-48

Chapter 11 List of Preparers and Contributors11-1
11.1 Los Angeles Harbor Department 11-1
11.2 United States Army Corps of Engineers 11-1
11.3 CDM 11-2
11.4 Subconsultant Firms 11-3

Chapter 12 Acronyms and Abbreviations 12-1

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Notice of Intent (NOI)/Notice of Preparation (NOP)

Appendix B: PCAC Involvement

Appendix C: Throughput Assumptions

Appendix C1: Throughput Spreadsheets

Appendix C2: White Paper on the Terminal Capacity of Pier 300 with the Automation of the 41-acre Backland at Proposed Berth 306

Appendix D: Aesthetics and Visual Resources Visual Simulation Method and Photograph Collection

Appendix E: Air Quality, Greenhouse Gases and Health Risk Assessment

Appendix E1: Construction and Operational Emissions and Greenhouse Gases

Appendix E2: Air Dispersion Modeling

Appendix E3: Health Risk Assessment Technical Memorandum

Appendix F: Essential Fish Habitat Assessment

Appendix G: Cultural Resources – Results of Section 106 Coordination

Appendix H: Ground Transportation

Appendix H1: Traffic Worksheets

Appendix H2: Grade Crossing Delay Calculation Methodology Including Mathematical Derivation of Delay Equation

Appendix I: Environmental Data Resources Radius Map™ Report with GeoCheck®

Appendix J: Water Supply Assessment

Appendix K: Final APL Terminal Dredged Material Characterization Study Berths 302-306, Port of Los Angeles, San Pedro, California

TABLES

Table ES-1: Terminal Throughput ES-8

Table ES-2: Summary of Proposed Project and Alternatives at Full Build-out (2027) ES-24

Table ES-3: Summary of Proposed Project and Alternatives at Full Build-out (2012-2027) ES-35

Table ES-4: Summary of Potential Significant Impacts and Mitigation for the Proposed Project and Alternatives ES-112

Table ES-5: Proposed Project – Direct and Secondary Construction Employment Over the Two-Year Construction Period ES-112

Table ES-6: Proposed Project – Net Direct and Secondary Long Term Operations Employment ES-115

Table 1-1: Current and Proposed Project Elements for Berths 302-306 1-5

Table 1-2: Mode Split of Containers Handled at the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach in 2008 1-23

Table 1-3: 2007 Base Case/Base Share Cargo Demand Forecast, in Millions of TEUs 1-25

Table 1-4: 2007 San Pedro Bay Port Complex Cargo Forecast (shown in TEUs) 1-28

Table 1-5: 2009 San Pedro Bay Port Complex Cargo Forecast (shown in TEUs) 1-29

Table 1-6: Agencies Expected to Use this EIS/EIR 1-32

Table 1-7: Summary of Key NOI/NOP Comments 1-36

Table 1-8: Organization and Contents of the Draft EIS/EIR 1-44

Table 2-1: Existing and Projected Berths 302-306 Container Terminal Throughput 2-2

Table 2-2: Berths 302-306 [APL] Container Terminal Construction Phasing 2-29

Table 2-3: Project Throughput Comparison 2-36

Table 2-4: Summary of Proposed Project and Alternatives at Full Build-out (2027) 2-57

Table 2-5: Applicable Statutes, Plans, Policies, and Other Regulatory Requirements 2-72

Table 3.1-1: San Pedro Community Plan Viewpoints 3.1-31

Table 3.1-2: Visual Modifications Class Definitions 3.1-35

Table 3.1-3: Summary of AES-5 Impacts for Proposed Project 3.1-47

Table 3.1-4: Summary of AES-5 Impacts for Alternative 3 ..... 3.1-58

Table 3.1-5: Summary of AES-5 Impacts for Alternative 4 ..... 3.1-65
Table 3.1-6: Summary of AES-5 Impacts for Alternative 5 ..... 3.1-70
Table 3.1-7: Summary of AES-5 Impacts for Alternative 6 ..... 3.1-76
Table 3.1-8: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives 3.1-80
Table 3.2-1: Adverse Effects Associated with the Criteria Pollutants 3.2-7
Table 3.2-2: Maximum Pollutant Concentrations Measured at the North Long Beach Monitoring Station 3.2-10
Table 3.2-3: CEQA Baseline (July 2008 - June 2009) Average Daily Operational Emissions 3.2-16
Table 3.2-4: CEQA Baseline (July 2008 - June 2009) Peak Daily Operational Emissions 3.2-17
Table 3.2-5: Annual Operational GHG Emissions – Berths 302-305 Terminal – CEQA Baseline (July 2008 - June 2009) 3.2-18
Table 3.2-6: USEPA Emission Standards for Heavy-Duty Diesel Engines, g/bhp hr 3.2-22
Table 3.2-7a: Regulations and Agreements Assumed in the Unmitigated Construction Emissions 3.2-37
Table 3.2-7b: Regulations and Agreements Assumed as Part of the Unmitigated Operational Emissions 3.2-41
Table 3.2-8a: Baseline and Forecasted Ship Calls by Ship Size, TEU Throughput, and Daily/Hourly Activity 3.2-43
Table 3.2-8b: Annual and Peak Day CHE Activity and Size Parameters 3.2-46
Table 3.2-8c: Annual and Peak Day Truck Trips and Operating Hours 3.2-49
Table 3.2-8d: Annual and Peak Day Rail Locomotive Operations 3.2-51
Table 3.2-9: AMP Power Generation 3.2-53
Table 3.2-10: Annual 2005 Statewide PM and Ozone Health Effects Associated with Ports and Goods Movement in California[a] 3.2-58
Table 3.2-11: Peak Daily Construction Emissions – NEPA Baseline 3.2-62
Table 3.2-12: Average Daily Operational Emissions — NEPA Baseline 3.2-62
Table 3.2-13: Peak Daily Operational Emissions — NEPA Baseline 3.2-64
Table 3.2-14: Greenhouse Gas Construction Emissions - NEPA Baseline 3.2-66
Table 3.2-15: Annual Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions – NEPA Baseline 3.2-66
Table 3.2-16: SCAQMD Thresholds for Construction Emissions 3.2-69
Table 3.2-17: SCAQMD Thresholds for Ambient Air Quality Concentrations Associated with Project Construction 3.2-70
Table 3.2-18: SCAQMD Thresholds for Operational Emissions 3.2-71
Table 3.2-19: SCAQMD Thresholds for Ambient Air Quality Concentrations Associated with Project Operations 3.2-72

Table 3.2-20a: Peak Daily Emissions Associated with Proposed Project Construction Activities – Proposed Project Without Mitigation 3.2-75
Table 3.2-20b: Peak Dailya Combined Construction and Operational Emissions Without Mitigation–Proposed Project..... 3.2-76
Table 3.2-21: Regulations, Agreements, and Mitigation Measures Assumed in the Construction Emissions with Mitigation..... 3.2-77
Table 3.2-22a: Peak Daily Emissions Associated with Proposed Project Construction Activities – Proposed Project With Mitigation 3.2-81
Table 3.2-22b: Peak Dailya Combined Construction and Operational Emissions With Mitigation – Proposed Project..... 3.2-82
Table 3.2-23a: Maximum Off-site Ambient Concentrations –Proposed Project Construction without Mitigation..... 3.2-85
Table 3.2-23b: Maximum Off-site Ambient Concentrations –Proposed Project Construction and Operations without Mitigation 3.2-86
Table 3.2-24a: Maximum Off-site Ambient Concentrations –Proposed Project Construction with Mitigation..... 3.2-87
Table 3.2-24b: Maximum Off-site Ambient Concentrations –Proposed Project Construction and Operations with Mitigation 3.2-88
Table 3.2-25: Average Dailya Operational Emissions Without Mitigation – Proposed Project 3.2-90
Table 3.2-26: Peak Dailya Operational Emissions Without Mitigation – Proposed Project 3.2-94
Table 3.2-27: Comparison between San Pedro Bay Ports 2010 CAAP Update Control Measures and Proposed Project Mitigation Measures..... 3.2-101
Table 3.2-28: Regulations, Agreements, and Mitigation Measures Assumed as Part of the Proposed Project with Mitigation Emissions..... 3.2-106
Table 3.2-29: Average Dailya Operational Emissions With Mitigation – Proposed Project 3.2-113
Table 3.2-30: Peak Dailya Operational Emissions With Mitigation – Proposed Project 3.2-116
Table 3.2-31: Maximum Off-site NO2, SO2, and CO Concentrations Associated with Operation of the Proposed Project without Mitigation 3.2-126
Table 3.2-32: Maximum Off-site PM10 and PM2.5 Concentrations Associated with Operation of the Proposed Project without Mitigation 3.2-127
Table 3.2-33: Maximum Off-site NO2 Concentration Associated with Operation of the Proposed Project after Mitigation..... 3.2-128
Table 3.2-34: Maximum Off-site PM2.5 Concentration Associated with Operation of the Proposed Project after Mitigation..... 3.2-128
Table 3.2-35: Maximum CO Concentrations at the Ferry St/Terminal Way Intersection – Proposed Project Without Mitigation..... 3.2-131

Table 3.2-36: Maximum CO Concentrations at the Seaside Ave/Navy Way Intersection – Proposed Project Without Mitigation 3.2-131
Table 3.2-37a: Maximum Incremental CEQA Health Impacts Associated With The Proposed Project Without Mitigation, 2012 – 2081 ..... 3.2-134
Table 3.2-37b: Maximum Incremental CEQA Health Impacts Associated With The Proposed Project With Mitigation, 2012 – 2081 ..... 3.2-142
Table 3.2-38a: Maximum Incremental NEPA Health Impacts Associated With The Proposed Project Without Mitigation, 2012 – 2081 ..... 3.2-148
Table 3.2-38b: Maximum Incremental NEPA Health Impacts Associated With The Proposed Project With Mitigation, 2012 – 2081 ..... 3.2-149
Table 3.2-39: Total GHG Emissions from Berth 302-306 Terminal Construction Activities – Proposed Project 3.2-151
Table 3.2-40: Annual Operational GHG Emissions – Unmitigated Proposed Project 3.2-152
Table 3.2-41: Project Applicability Review of Potential GHG Emission Reduction Strategies 3.2-155
Table 3.2-42: Annual Operational GHG Emissions – Mitigated Proposed Project 3.2-157
Table 3.2-43: Comparison Of Air Quality Impacts Associated With Project Alternatives 3.2-160
Table 3.2-44: Average Daily Operational Emissions– Alternative 1 ..... 3.2-166
Table 3.2-45: Peak Daily Operational Emissions – Alternative 1 ..... 3.2-168
Table 3.2-46: Maximum Off-site NO2, SO2, and CO Concentrations Associated with Operation of Alternative 1 ..... 3.2-171
Table 3.2-47: Maximum Off-site PM10 and PM2.5 Concentrations Associated with Operation of the Alternative 1 ..... 3.2-171
Table 3.2-48: Annual Operational GHG Emissions – Alternative 1 (No Project Alternative) 3.2-176
Table 3.2-49: Average Daily Operational Emissions without Mitigation – Alternative 2 ..... 3.2-182
Table 3.2-50: Peak Daily Operational Emissions without Mitigation – Alternative 2 ..... 3.2-184
Table 3.2-51: Maximum Off-site NO2, SO2, and CO Concentrations Associated with Operation of Alternative 2 without Mitigation 3.2-188
Table 3.2-52: Maximum Off-site PM10 and PM2.5 Concentrations Associated with Operation of the Alternative 2 without Mitigation 3.2-188
Table 3.2-53: Maximum Incremental CEQA and NEPA Health Impacts Associated With Alternative 2 Without Mitigation, 2012 – 2081 ... 3.2-192
Table 3.2-54: Total GHG Emissions from Berth 302-306 Terminal Construction Activities – Alternative 2 ..... 3.2-195
Table 3.2-55: Annual Operational GHG Emissions – Alternative 2 (No Federal Action Alternative) 3.2-196

Table 3.2-56: Average Daily Operational Emissions Without Mitigation – Alternative 3 ..... 3.2-202
Table 3.2-57: Peak Daily Operational Emissions Without Mitigation – Alternative 3 ..... 3.2-206
Table 3.2-58: Average Daily Operational Emissions With Mitigation – Alternative 3 ..... 3.2-211
Table 3.2-59: Peak Daily Operational Emissions With Mitigation – Alternative 3 ..... 3.2-214
Table 3.2-60: Maximum Off-site NO2, SO2, and CO Concentrations Associated with Operation of Alternative 3 without Mitigation 3.2-217
Table 3.2-61: Maximum Off-site PM10 and PM2.5 Concentrations Associated with Operation of Alternative 3 ..... 3.2-218
Table 3.2-62: Maximum Off-site NO2 Concentration Associated with Operation of Alternative 3 with Mitigation 3.2-219
Table 3.2-63: Maximum Incremental CEQA and NEPA Health Impacts Associated With Alternative 3 Without Mitigation, 2012 – 2081 ... 3.2-222
Table 3.2-64: Maximum Incremental CEQA and NEPA Health Impacts Associated With Alternative 3 With Mitigation, 2012 – 2081 ..... 3.2-223
Table 3.2-65: Total GHG Emissions from Berth 302-306 Terminal Construction Activities – Alternative 3 ..... 3.2-224
Table 3.2-66: Annual Operational GHG Emissions – Alternative 3 without Mitigation 3.2-226
Table 3.2-67: Annual Operational GHG Emissions – Alternative 3 with Mitigation 3.2-228
Table 3.2-68: Average Daily Operational Emissions Without Mitigation – Alternative 4 ..... 3.2-233
Table 3.2-69: Peak Daily Operational Emissions Without Mitigation – Alternative 4 ..... 3.2-237
Table 3.2-70: Average Daily Operational Emissions With Mitigation – Alternative 4 ..... 3.2-240
Table 3.2-71: Peak Daily Operational Emissions With Mitigation – Alternative 4 ..... 3.2-243
Table 3.2-72: Maximum Off-site NO2, SO2, and CO Concentrations Associated with Operation of Alternative 4 without Mitigation 3.2-246
Table 3.2-73: Maximum Off-site PM10 and PM2.5 Concentrations Associated with Operation of the Alternative 4 ..... 3.2-246
Table 3.2-74: Maximum Off-site NO2 Concentration Associated with Operation of Alternative 4 With Mitigation 3.2-248
Table 3.2-75: Maximum Off-site PM2.5 Concentration Associated with Operation of Alternative 4 With Mitigation 3.2-248
Table 3.2-76: Maximum Incremental CEQA and NEPA Health Impacts Associated With Alternative 4 Without Mitigation, 2012 – 2081 ... 3.2-251

Table 3.2-77: Maximum Incremental CEQA and NEPA Health Impacts Associated With Alternative 4 With Mitigation, 2012 – 2081 ..... 3.2-252
Table 3.2-78: Total GHG Emissions from Berth 302-306 Terminal Construction Activities – Alternative 4 ..... 3.2-254
Table 3.2-79: Annual Operational GHG Emissions – Alternative 4 – Without Mitigation 3.2-255
Table 3.2-80: Annual Operational GHG Emissions – Alternative 4 With Mitigation 3.2-258
Table 3.2-81: Average Daily Operational Emissions Without Mitigation – Alternative 5 ..... 3.2-264
Table 3.2-82: Peak Daily Operational Emissions Without Mitigation – Alternative 5 ..... 3.2-268
Table 3.2-83: Average Daily Operational Emissions With Mitigation – Alternative 5 ..... 3.2-272
Table 3.2-84: Peak Daily Operational Emissions With Mitigation – Alternative 5 ..... 3.2-275
Table 3.2-85: Maximum Off-site NO2, SO2, and CO Concentrations Associated with Operation of Alternative 5 without Mitigation 3.2-278
Table 3.2-86: Maximum Off-site PM10 and PM2.5 Concentrations Associated with Operation of Alternative 5 without Mitigation 3.2-279
Table 3.2-87: Maximum Off-site NO2 Concentration Associated with Operation of Alternative 5 With Mitigation 3.2-280
Table 3.2-88: Maximum Off-site PM2.5 Concentration Associated with Operation of Alternative 5 With Mitigation 3.2-280
Table 3.2-89: Maximum Incremental CEQA and NEPA Health Impacts Associated With Alternative 5 Without Mitigation, 2012 – 2081 ... 3.2-283
Table 3.2-90: Maximum Incremental CEQA and NEPA Health Impacts Associated With Alternative 5 With Mitigation, 2012 – 2081 ..... 3.2-285
Table 3.2-91: Annual Operational GHG Emissions – Alternative 5 Without Mitigation 3.2-286
Table 3.2-92: Annual Operational GHG Emissions – Alternative 5 with Mitigation 3.2-289
Table 3.2-93: Average Daily Operational Emissions Without Mitigation – Alternative 6 ..... 3.2-295
Table 3.2-94: Peak Daily Operational Emissions Without Mitigation – Alternative 6 ..... 3.2-299
Table 3.2-95: Average Daily Operational Emissions With Mitigation – Alternative 6 ..... 3.2-303
Table 3.2-96: Peak Daily Operational Emissions With Mitigation – Alternative 6 ..... 3.2-306
Table 3.2-97: Maximum Off-site NO2, SO2, and CO Concentrations Associated with Operation of Alternative 6 without Mitigation 3.2-309

Table 3.2-98: Maximum Off-site PM10 and PM2.5 Concentrations Associated with Operation of the Alternative 6 without Mitigation 3.2-310
Table 3.2-99: Maximum Off-site NO2 Concentration Associated with Operation of Alternative 6 With Mitigation 3.2-311
Table 3.2-100: Maximum Off-site PM2.5 Concentration Associated with Operation of Alternative 6 With Mitigation 3.2-311
Table 3.2-101: Maximum Incremental CEQA and NEPA Health Impacts Associated With Alternative 6 Without Mitigation, 2012 – 2081 ... 3.2-314
Table 3.2-102: Maximum Incremental CEQA and NEPA Health Impacts Associated With Alternative 6 With Mitigation, 2012 – 2081 ..... 3.2-316
Table 3.2-103: Annual Operational GHG Emissions – Alternative 6 without Mitigation 3.2-317
Table 3.2-104: Annual Operational GHG Emissions – Alternative 6 with Mitigation 3.2-320
Table 3.2-105: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives 3.2-324
Table 3.3-1: Plant Species Observed in the 41-acre Backlands Area, January 2010 ..... 3.3-7
Table 3.3-2: Plant Species Observed Adjacent to the Northeast Corner of the Proposed Project Site (Triangular Habitat), January 2010 ..... 3.3-7
Table 3.3-3: Threatened and Endangered Bird Species in the Proposed Project Area. 3.3-13
Table 3.3-4: Special Status Bird Species (Designated by CDFG and USFWS) in the Proposed Project Area 3.3-15
Table 3.3-5: Managed Fish/invertebrate Species Most Likely to Occur off Pier 300 in Los Angeles Harbor Based on Past Occurrences 3.3-25
Table 3.3-6: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Biological Resources Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives 3.3-120
Table 3.4-1: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Cultural Resources Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives 3.4-37
Table 3.5-1: Earthquakes with Magnitude Greater than 5.5 in the LA Basin Area 3.5-7
Table 3.5-2: Hazardous Faults and Maximum Magnitudes — Los Angeles Basin Area 3.5-8
Table 3.5-3: Sea Level Rise Projections Using 2000 as the Baseline 3.5-12
Table 3.5-4: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Geology Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives 3.5-78
Table 3.6-1: Level of Service Criteria—Signalized Intersections 3.6-11
Table 3.6-2: Freeway CMP Level of Service Criteria 3.6-13

Table 3.6-3: Baseline Intersection Level of Service 3.6-14
Table 3.6-4: Baseline Freeway Level of Service 3.6-15
Table 3.6-5: Baseline Transit Service 3.6-17
Table 3.6-6: Average Train Volumes by Segment of Track (July 2008 to June 2009) 3.6-24
Table 3.6-7: Threshold of Significance 3.6-30
Table 3.6-8: Hourly Factors Applied to Average Daily Traffic (ADT), by County 3.6-30
Table 3.6-9: Time Periods of the Day 3.6-32
Table 3.6-10: Alameda Corridor Train Volume by Time of Day, 2010 ..... 3.6-32
Table 3.6-11: BNSF Train Volume at Highgrove in Riverside County by Time of Day, 2010 ..... 3.6-33
Table 3.6-12: Project Train Volumes, CEQA Baseline and Proposed Project 2027 ..... 3.6-33
Table 3.6-13: Difference between 2027 Project Train Counts per Day and Existing (CEQA baseline) APL Terminal Train Counts per Day 3.6-34
Table 3.6-14: Thresholds of Significance for At-Grade Crossings 3.6-45
Table 3.6-15: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – NOP CEQA Baseline vs. Proposed Project Construction 3.6-49
Table 3.6-16: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2012 CEQA Baseline vs. 2012 Proposed Project Construction 3.6-50
Table 3.6-17: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2012 NEPA Baseline vs. 2012 Proposed Project Construction 3.6-52
Table 3.6-18: Trip Generation Analysis Assumptions and Input Data for Berths 302 306 ..... 3.6-53
Table 3.6-19: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – NOP CEQA Baseline vs. Proposed Project 3.6-55
Table 3.6-20: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2015 CEQA Baseline vs. 2015 Proposed Project 3.6-56
Table 3.6-21: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2020 CEQA Baseline vs. 2020 Proposed Project 3.6-57
Table 3.6-22: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2025 CEQA Baseline vs. 2025 Proposed Project 3.6-58
Table 3.6-23: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2027 CEQA Baseline vs. 2027 Proposed Project 3.6-59
Table 3.6-24: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2020 CEQA Baseline vs. 2020 Proposed Project With Mitigation 3.6-60
Table 3.6-25: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2025 CEQA Baseline vs. 2025 Proposed Project With Mitigation 3.6-60
Table 3.6-26: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2027 CEQA Baseline vs. 2027 Proposed Project With Mitigation 3.6-60

Table 3.6-27: Trip Generation Analysis Assumptions and Input Data for Berths 302-306 ..... 3.6-61
Table 3.6-28: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2015 NEPA Baseline vs. 2015 Proposed Project 3.6-63
Table 3.6-29: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2020 NEPA Baseline vs. 2020 Proposed Project 3.6-64
Table 3.6-30: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2025 NEPA Baseline vs. 2025 Proposed Project 3.6-65
Table 3.6-31: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2027 NEPA Baseline vs. 2027 Proposed Project 3.6-66
Table 3.6-32: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2020 NEPA Baseline vs. 2020 Proposed Project With Mitigation 3.6-67
Table 3.6-33: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2025 NEPA Baseline vs. 2025 Proposed Project With Mitigation 3.6-67
Table 3.6-34: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2027 NEPA Baseline vs. 2027 Proposed Project With Mitigation 3.6-67
Table 3.6-35: NOP CEQA Baseline vs. Proposed Project Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-70
Table 3.6-36: NOP CEQA Baseline vs. Proposed Project Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-70
Table 3.6-37: Future 2012 CEQA Baseline vs. 2012 Proposed Project Construction Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-71
Table 3.6-38: Future 2012 CEQA Baseline vs. 2012 Proposed Project Construction Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-71
Table 3.6-39: Future 2015 CEQA Baseline vs. 2015 Proposed Project Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-72
Table 3.6-40: Future 2015 CEQA Baseline vs. 2015 Proposed Project Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-72
Table 3.6-41: Future 2020 CEQA Baseline vs. 2020 Proposed Project Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-73
Table 3.6-42: Future 2020 CEQA Baseline vs. 2020 Proposed Project Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-73
Table 3.6-43: Future 2025 CEQA Baseline vs. 2025 Proposed Project Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-74
Table 3.6-44: Future 2025 CEQA Baseline vs. 2025 Proposed Project Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-74
Table 3.6-45: Future 2027 CEQA Baseline vs. 2027 Proposed Project Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-75
Table 3.6-46: Future 2027 CEQA Baseline vs. 2027 Proposed Project Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-75
Table 3.6-47: 2012 NEPA Baseline vs. 2012 Proposed Project Construction Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-77

Table 3.6-48: 2012 NEPA Baseline vs. 2012 Proposed Project Construction Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-77
Table 3.6-49: 2015 NEPA Baseline vs. 2015 Proposed Project Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-78
Table 3.6-50: 2015 NEPA Baseline vs. 2015 Proposed Project Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-78
Table 3.6-51: 2020 NEPA Baseline vs. 2020 Proposed Project Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-79
Table 3.6-52: 2020 NEPA Baseline vs. 2020 Proposed Project Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-79
Table 3.6-53: 2025 NEPA Baseline vs. 2025 Proposed Project Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-80
Table 3.6-54: 2025 NEPA Baseline vs. 2025 Proposed Project Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-80
Table 3.6-55: 2027 NEPA Baseline vs. 2027 Proposed Project Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-81
Table 3.6-56: 2027 NEPA Baseline vs. 2027 Proposed Project Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-81
Table 3.6-57: BNSF San Bernardino Subdivision, from Hobart Yard to San Bernardino, Project Impacts Relative to FY 2009 Baseline* 3.6-84
Table 3.6-58: BNSF Cajon Subdivision from San Bernardino to Barstow, Project Impacts Relative to FY 2009 Baseline* 3.6-88
Table 3.6-59: UP Alhambra Subdivision from Los Angeles Transportation Center (LATC) to Colton Crossing (Excluding Segment That is Combined with UP LA Subdivision), Project Impacts Relative to FY 2009 Baseline* 3.6-89
Table 3.6-60: UP Los Angeles Subdivision from East Los Angeles Yard to West Riverside Junction (Excluding Segment That is Combined with UP Alhambra Subdivision), Project Impacts Relative to FY 2009 Baseline* 3.6-92
Table 3.6-61: Combined UP Alhambra and LA Subdivisions in Pomona and Montclair Area, Project Impacts Relative to FY 2009 Baseline* 3.6-95
Table 3.6-62: UP Yuma Subdivision from Colton Crossing to Indio, Project Impacts Relative to FY 2009 Baseline* 3.6-96
Table 3.6-63: Trip Generation Analysis Assumptions and Input Data for Berths 302 306 ..... 3.6-99
Table 3.6-64: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – NOP CEQA Baseline vs. Alternative 1 (No Project) 3.6-101
Table 3.6-65: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2015 CEQA Baseline vs. 2015 Alternative 1 (No Project) 3.6-102
Table 3.6-66: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2020 CEQA Baseline vs. 2020 Alternative 1 (No Project) 3.6-103
Table 3.6-67: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2025 CEQA Baseline vs. 2025 Alternative 1 (No Project) 3.6-104

Table 3.6-68: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2027 CEQA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 1 (No Project) 3.6-105
Table 3.6-69: NOP CEQA Baseline vs. Alternative 1 (No Project) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-108
Table 3.6-70: NOP CEQA Baseline vs. Alternative 1 (No Project) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-108
Table 3.6-71: Future 2015 CEQA Baseline vs. 2015 Alternative 1 (No Project) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-109
Table 3.6-72: Future 2015 CEQA Baseline vs. 2015 Alternative 1 (No Project) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-109
Table 3.6-73: Future 2020 CEQA Baseline vs. 2020 Alternative 1 (No Project) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-110
Table 3.6-74: Future 2020 CEQA Baseline vs. 2020 Alternative 1 (No Project) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-110
Table 3.6-75: Future 2025 CEQA Baseline vs. 2025 Alternative 1 (No Project) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-111
Table 3.6-76: Future 2025 CEQA Baseline vs. 2025 Alternative 1 (No Project) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-111
Table 3.6-77: Future 2027 CEQA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 1 (No Project) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-112
Table 3.6-78: Future 2027 CEQA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 1 (No Project) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-112
Table 3.6-79: Trip Generation Analysis Assumptions and Input Data for Berths 302 306 ..... 3.6-115
Table 3.6-80: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – NOP CEQA Baseline vs. Alternative 2 (No Federal Action) 3.6-117
Table 3.6-81: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2015 CEQA Baseline vs. 2015 Alternative 2 (No Federal Action) 3.6-118
Table 3.6-82: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2020 CEQA Baseline vs. 2020 Alternative 2 (No Federal Action) 3.6-119
Table 3.6-83: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2025 CEQA Baseline vs. 2025 Alternative 2 (No Federal Action) 3.6-120
Table 3.6-84: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2027 CEQA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 2 (No Federal Action) 3.6-121
Table 3.6-85: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2027 CEQA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 2 (No Federal Action) With Mitigation 3.6-122
Table 3.6-86: NOP CEQA Baseline vs. Alternative 2 (No Federal Action) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-125
Table 3.6-87: NOP CEQA Baseline vs. Alternative 2 (No Federal Action) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-125
Table 3.6-88: Future 2015 CEQA Baseline vs. 2015 Alternative 2 (No Federal Action) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-126

Table 3.6-89: Future 2015 CEQA Baseline vs. 2015 Alternative 2 (No Federal Action) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-126
Table 3.6-90: Future 2020 CEQA Baseline vs. 2020 Alternative 2 (No Federal Action) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-127
Table 3.6-91: Future 2020 CEQA Baseline vs. 2020 Alternative 2 (No Federal Action) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-127
Table 3.6-92: Future 2025 CEQA Baseline vs. 2025 Alternative 2 (No Federal Action) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-128
Table 3.6-93: Future 2025 CEQA Baseline vs. 2025 Alternative 2 (No Federal Action) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-128
Table 3.6-94: Future 2027 CEQA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 2 (No Federal Action) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-129
Table 3.6-95: Future 2027 CEQA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 2 (No Federal Action) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-129
Table 3.6-96: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – NOP CEQA Baseline vs. Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) 3.6-132
Table 3.6-97: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2012 CEQA Baseline vs. 2012 Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) Construction. 3.6-133
Table 3.6-98: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2012 NEPA Baseline vs. 2012 Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) Construction 3.6-135
Table 3.6-99: Trip Generation Analysis Assumptions and Input Data for Berths 302 306 ..... 3.6-136
Table 3.6-100: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – NOP CEQA Baseline vs. Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) 3.6-138
Table 3.6-101: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2015 CEQA Baseline vs. 2015 Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) 3.6-139
Table 3.6-102: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2020 CEQA Baseline vs. 2020 Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) 3.6-140
Table 3.6-103: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2025 CEQA Baseline vs. 2025 Alternative 3 - Reduced Project: Four New Cranes 3.6-141
Table 3.6-104: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2027 CEQA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) 3.6-142
Table 3.6-105: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2025 CEQA Baseline vs. 2025 Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) With Mitigation 3.6-143
Table 3.6-106: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2027 CEQA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) With Mitigation 3.6-143

Table 3.6-107: Trip Generation Analysis Assumptions and Input Data for Berths 302-306 ..... 3.6-144
Table 3.6-108: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2015 NEPA Baseline vs. 2015 Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) 3.6-146
Table 3.6-109: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2020 NEPA Baseline vs. 2020 Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) 3.6-147
Table 3.6-110: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2025 NEPA Baseline vs. 2025 Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) 3.6-148
Table 3.6-111: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2027 NEPA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) 3.6-149
Table 3.6-112 : Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2027 NEPA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) 3.6-150
Table 3.6-113: NOP CEQA Baseline vs. Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-153
Table 3.6-114: NOP CEQA Baseline vs. Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-153
Table 3.6-115: Future 2012 CEQA Baseline vs. 2012 Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) Construction Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-154
Table 3.6-116: Future 2012 CEQA Baseline vs. 2012 Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) Construction Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-154
Table 3.6-117: Future 2015 CEQA Baseline vs. 2015 Alternative 3 - Reduced Project: Four New Cranes Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-155
Table 3.6-118: Future 2015 CEQA Baseline vs. 2015 Alternative 3 - Reduced Project: Four New Cranes Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-155
Table 3.6-119: Future 2020 CEQA Baseline vs. 2020 Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour ... 3.6-156
Table 3.6-120: Future 2020 CEQA Baseline vs. 2020 Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour ... 3.6-156
Table 3.6-121: Future 2025 CEQA Baseline vs. 2025 Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour ... 3.6-157
Table 3.6-122: Future 2025 CEQA Baseline vs. 2025 Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour .. 3.6-157
Table 3.6-123: Future 2027 CEQA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour ... 3.6-158
Table 3.6-124: Future 2027 CEQA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour ... 3.6-158
Table 3.6-125: 2012 NEPA Baseline vs. 2012 Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) Construction Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-160
Table 3.6-126: 2012 NEPA Baseline vs. 2012 Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) Construction Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-160

Table 3.6-127: 2015 NEPA Baseline vs. 2015 Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-161

Table 3.6-128: 2015 NEPA Baseline vs. 2015 Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-161

Table 3.6-129: 2020 NEPA Baseline vs. 2020 Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-162

Table 3.6-130: 2020 NEPA Baseline vs. 2020 Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-162

Table 3.6-131: 2025 NEPA Baseline vs. 2025 Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-163

Table 3.6-132: 2025 NEPA Baseline vs. 2025 Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-163

Table 3.6-133: 2027 NEPA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-164

Table 3.6-134: 2027 NEPA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 3 (Reduced Project: Four New Cranes) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-164

Table 3.6-135: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – NOP CEQA Baseline vs. Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) Construction 3.6-167

Table 3.6-136: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2012 CEQA Baseline vs. 2012 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) Construction 3.6-168

Table 3.6-137: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2012 NEPA Baseline vs. 2012 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) Construction 3.6-170

Table 3.6-138: Trip Generation Analysis Assumptions and Input Data for Berths 302 306 ..... 3.6-171

Table 3.6-139: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – NOP CEQA Baseline vs. Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) 3.6-173

Table 3.6-140: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2015 CEQA Baseline vs. 2015 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) 3.6-174

Table 3.6-141: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2020 CEQA Baseline vs. 2020 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) 3.6-175

Table 3.6-142: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2025 CEQA Baseline vs. 2025 Alterative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) 3.6-176

Table 3.6-143: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2027 CEQA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) 3.6-177

Table 3.6-144: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2025 CEQA Baseline vs. 2025 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) With Mitigation. 3.6-178

Table 3.6-145: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2027 CEQA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) With Mitigation 3.6-178

Table 3.6-146: Trip Generation Analysis Assumptions and Input Data for Berths 302- 306 ..... 3.6-179

Table 3.6-147: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2015 NEPA Baseline vs. 2015 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) 3.6-181

Table 3.6-148: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2020 NEPA Baseline vs. 2020 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) 3.6-182

Table 3.6-149: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2025 NEPA Baseline vs. 2025 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) 3.6-183

Table 3.6-150: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2027 NEPA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) 3.6-184

Table 3.6-151: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2027 NEPA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) With Mitigation 3.6-185

Table 3.6-152: NOP CEQA Baseline vs. Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-188

Table 3.6-153: NOP CEQA Baseline vs. Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-188

Table 3.6-154: Future 2012 CEQA Baseline vs. 2012 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) Construction Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-189

Table 3.6-155: Future 2012 CEQA Baseline vs. 2012 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) Construction Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-189

Table 3.6-156: Future 2015 CEQA Baseline vs. 2015 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-190

Table 3.6-157: Future 2015 CEQA Baseline vs. 2015 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-190

Table 3.6-158: Future 2020 CEQA Baseline vs. 2020 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-191

Table 3.6-159: Future 2020 CEQA Baseline vs. 2020 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-191

Table 3.6-160: Future 2025 CEQA Baseline vs. 2025 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-192

Table 3.6-161: Future 2025 CEQA Baseline vs. 2025 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-192

Table 3.6-162: Future 2027 CEQA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-193

Table 3.6-163: Future 2027 CEQA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-193

Table 3.6-164: 2012 NEPA Baseline vs. 2012 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) Construction Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-195
Table 3.6-165: 2012 NEPA Baseline vs. 2012 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) Construction Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-195
Table 3.6-166: 2015 NEPA Baseline vs. 2015 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-196
Table 3.6-167: 2015 NEPA Baseline vs. 2015 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-196
Table 3.6-168: 2020 NEPA Baseline vs. 2020 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) Fwy Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-197
Table 3.6-169: 2020 NEPA Baseline vs. 2020 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) Fwy Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-197
Table 3.6-170: 2025 NEPA Baseline vs. 2025 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-198
Table 3.6-171: 2025 NEPA Baseline vs. 2025 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-198
Table 3.6-172: 2027 NEPA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-199
Table 3.6-173: 2027 NEPA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 4 (Reduced Project: No New Wharf) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-199
Table 3.6-174: Intersection Level of Service Analysis –NOP CEQA Baseline vs. Alternative 5 (Reduced Project: No Space Assignment) Construction 3.6-202
Table 3.6-175: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2012 CEQA Baseline vs. 2012 Reduced Project (No Space Assignment) Construction 3.6-203
Table 3.6-176: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2012 NEPA Baseline vs. 2012 Alternative 5 (Reduced Project: No Space Assignment) Construction 3.6-205
Table 3.6-177: Trip Generation Analysis Assumptions and Input Data for Berths 302 306 ..... 3.6-206
Table 3.6-178: Intersection Level of Service Analysis –NOP CEQA Baseline vs. Alternative 5 (Reduced Project: No Space Assignment) 3.6-208
Table 3.6-179: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2015 CEQA Baseline vs. 2015 Reduced Project (No Space Assignment) 3.6-209
Table 3.6-180: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2020 CEQA Baseline vs. 2020 Reduced Project (No Space Assignment) 3.6-210
Table 3.6-181: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2025 CEQA Baseline vs. 2025 Reduced Project (No Space Assignment) 3.6-211
Table 3.6-182: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2027 CEQA Baseline vs. 2027 Reduced Project (No Space Assignment) 3.6-212

Table 3.6-183: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2020 CEQA Baseline vs. 2020 Reduced Project (No Space Assignment) With Mitigation 3.6-213

Table 3.6-184: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2025 CEQA Baseline vs. 2025 Reduced Project (No Space Assignment) With Mitigation 3.6-213

Table 3.6-185: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2027 CEQA Baseline vs. 2027 Reduced Project (No Space Assignment) With Mitigation 3.6-213

Table 3.6-186: Trip Generation Analysis Assumptions and Input Data for Berths 302-306 ..... 3.6-214

Table 3.6-187: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2015 NEPA Baseline vs. 2015 Alternative 5 (Reduced Project: No Space Assignment) 3.6-216

Table 3.6-188: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2020 NEPA Baseline vs. 2020 Alternative 5 (Reduced Project: No Space Assignment) 3.6-217

Table 3.6-189: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2025 NEPA Baseline vs. 2025 Alternative 5 (Reduced Project: No Space Assignment) 3.6-218

Table 3.6-190: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2027 NEPA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 5 (Reduced Project: No Space Assignment) 3.6-219

Table 3.6-191: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2020 NEPA Baseline vs. 2020 Alternative 5 (Reduced Project: No Space Assignment) With Mitigation 3.6-220

Table 3.6-192: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2025 NEPA Baseline vs. 2025 Alternative 5 (Reduced Project: No Space Assignment) With Mitigation. 3.6-220

Table 3.6-193: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2027 NEPA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 5 (Reduced Project: No Space Assignment) With Mitigation 3.6-220

Table 3.6-194: NOP CEQA Baseline vs. Alternative 5 (Reduced Project: No Space Assignment) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-223

Table 3.6-195: NOP CEQA Baseline vs. Alternative 5 (Reduced Project: No Space Assignment) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-223

Table 3.6-196: Future 2012 CEQA Baseline vs. 2012 Reduced Project (No New Wharf) Construction Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-224

Table 3.6-197: Future 2012 CEQA Baseline vs. 2012 Reduced Project (No New Wharf) Construction Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-224

Table 3.6-198: Future 2015 CEQA Baseline vs. 2015 Reduced Project (No New Wharf) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-225

Table 3.6-199: Future 2015 CEQA Baseline vs. 2015 Reduced Project (No New Wharf) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-225

Table 3.6-200: Future 2020 CEQA Baseline vs. 2020 Reduced Project (No New Wharf) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-226

Table 3.6-201: Future 2020 CEQA Baseline vs. 2020 Reduced Project (No New Wharf) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-226

Table 3.6-202: Future 2025 CEQA Baseline vs. 2025 Reduced Project (No New Wharf) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-227

Table 3.6-203: Future 2025 CEQA Baseline vs. 2025 Reduced Project (No New Wharf) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-227

Table 3.6-204: Future 2027 CEQA Baseline vs. 2027 Reduced Project (No New Wharf) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-228

Table 3.6-205: Future 2027 CEQA Baseline vs. 2027 Reduced Project (No New Wharf) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-228

Table 3.6-206: 2012 NEPA Baseline vs. 2012 Alternative 5 (Reduced Project: No Space Assignment) Construction Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-230

Table 3.6-207: 2012 NEPA Baseline vs. 2012 Alternative 5 (Reduced Project: No Space Assignment) Construction Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour. 3.6-230

Table 3.6-208: 2015 NEPA Baseline vs. 2015 Alternative 5 (Reduced Project: No Space Assignment) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-231

Table 3.6-209: 2015 NEPA Baseline vs. 2015 Alternative 5 (Reduced Project: No Space Assignment) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-231

Table 3.6-210: 2020 NEPA Baseline vs. 2020 Alternative 5 (Reduced Project: No Space Assignment) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-232

Table 3.6-211: 2020 NEPA Baseline vs. 2020 Alternative 5 (Reduced Project: No Space Assignment) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-232

Table 3.6-212: 2025 NEPA Baseline vs. 2025 Alternative 5 (Reduced Project: No Space Assignment) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-233

Table 3.6-213: 2025 NEPA Baseline vs. 2025 Alternative 5 (Reduced Project: No Space Assignment) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-233

Table 3.6-214: 2027 NEPA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 5 (Reduced Project: No Space Assignment) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-234

Table 3.6-215: 2027 NEPA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 5 (Reduced Project: No Space Assignment) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-234

Table 3.6-216: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – NOP CEQA Baseline vs. Alternative 6 (Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard) Construction 3.6-237

Table 3.6-217: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Adjusted 2012 CEQA Baseline vs. 2012 Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard Construction 3.6-238

Table 3.6-218: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2012 NEPA Baseline vs. 2012 Alternative 6 (Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard) Construction 3.6-240

Table 3.6-219: Trip Generation Analysis Assumptions and Input Data for Berths 302 306 ..... 3.6-241

Table 3.6-220: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – NOP CEQA Baseline vs. Alternative 6 (Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard) 3.6-243

Table 3.6-221: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2015 CEQA Baseline vs. 2015 Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard 3.6-244

Table 3.6-222: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2020 CEQA Baseline vs. 2020 Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard 3.6-245

Table 3.6-223: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2025 CEQA Baseline vs. 2025 Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard 3.6-246

Table 3.6-224: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2027 CEQA Baseline vs. 2027 Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard 3.6-247

Table 3.6-225: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2020 CEQA Baseline vs. 2020 Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard With Mitigation 3.6-248

Table 3.6-226: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2025 CEQA Baseline vs. 2025 Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard With Mitigation 3.6-248

Table 3.6-227: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Future 2027 CEQA Baseline vs. 2027 Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard With Mitigation 3.6-248

Table 3.6-228: Trip Generation Analysis Assumptions and Input Data for Berths 302-306 ..... 3.6-249

Table 3.6-229: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2015 NEPA Baseline vs. 2015 Alternative 6 (Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard) 3.6-251

Table 3.6-230: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2020 NEPA Baseline vs. 2020 Alternative 6 (Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard) 3.6-252

Table 3.6-231: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2025 NEPA Baseline vs. 2025 Alternative 6 (Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard) 3.6-253

Table 3.6-232: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2027 NEPA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 6 (Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard) 3.6-254

Table 3.6-233 : Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2020 NEPA Baseline vs. 2020 Alternative 6 (Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard) With Mitigation....3.6-255

Table 3.6-234: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2025 NEPA Baseline vs. 2025 Alternative 6 (Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard) 3.6-255

Table 3.6-235: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2027 NEPA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 6 (Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard) 3.6-255

Table 3.6-236: NOP CEQA Baseline vs. Alternative 6 (Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour....3.6-258

Table 3.6-237: NOP CEQA Baseline vs. Alternative 6 (Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour....3.6-258

Table 3.6-238: Future 2012 CEQA Baseline vs. 2012 Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard Construction Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-259

Table 3.6-239: Future 2012 CEQA Baseline vs. 2012 Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard Construction Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-259

Table 3.6-240: Future 2015 CEQA Baseline vs. 2015 Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour....3.6-260

Table 3.6-241: Future 2015 CEQA Baseline vs. 2015 Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour....3.6-260

Table 3.6-242: Future 2020 CEQA Baseline vs. 2020 Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour....3.6-261

Table 3.6-243: Future 2020 CEQA Baseline vs. 2020 Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour....3.6-261

Table 3.6-244: Future 2025 CEQA Baseline vs. 2025 Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour....3.6-262

Table 3.6-245: Future 2025 CEQA Baseline vs. 2025 Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour....3.6-262

Table 3.6-246: Future 2027 CEQA Baseline vs. 2027 Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour....3.6-263

Table 3.6-247: Future 2027 CEQA Baseline vs. 2027 Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour....3.6-263

Table 3.6-248: 2012 NEPA Baseline vs. 2012 Alternative 6 (Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard) Construction Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-265

Table 3.6-249: 2012 NEPA Baseline vs. 2012 Alternative 6 (Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard) Construction Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-265

Table 3.6-250: 2015 NEPA Baseline vs. 2015 Alternative 6 (Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-266

Table 3.6-251: 2015 NEPA Baseline vs. 2015 Alternative 6 (Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-266

Table 3.6-252: 2020 NEPA Baseline vs. 2020 Alternative 6 (Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-267

Table 3.6-253: 2020 NEPA Baseline vs. 2020 Alternative 6 (Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 3.6-267

Table 3.6-254: 2025 NEPA Baseline vs. 2025 Alternative 6 (Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 3.6-268

Table 3.6-255: 2025 NEPA Baseline vs. 2025 Alternative 6 (Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 6-268

Table 3.6-256: 2027 NEPA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 6 (Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard) Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 6-269

Table 3.6-257: 2027 NEPA Baseline vs. 2027 Alternative 6 (Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard) Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 6-269

Table 3.6-258: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Ground Transportation Associated With the Proposed Project and Alternatives 3.6-272

Table 3.7-1: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Groundwater and Soils Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives 3.7-54

Table 3.8-1: Container-Related Spills at Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach 2006-2009 ..... 3.8-5

Table 3.8-2: Facilities Containing Potentially Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Wastes at Berths 302-305 ..... 3.8-7

Table 3.8-3: Risk Matrix 3.8-20

Table 3.8-4: Criticality and Frequency Classifications 3.8-21

Table 3.8-5: Proposed Project: Existing and Projected Cargo Throughput Volumes at Berths 302-306 and the Port Complex 3.8-36

Table 3.8-6: Proposed Project: Existing and Projected Cargo Throughput Volumes at Berths 302-306 and the Port Complex 3.8-37
Table 3.8-7: Proposed Project: Existing and Projected Truck Trips at Berths 302-306 ..... 3.8-39
Table 3.8-8: Proposed Project: Existing and Projected Truck Trips at Berths 302-306 ..... 3.8-40
Table 3.8-9: Alternative 1: Existing and Projected Capacity (TEUs) at Berths 302-305 ..... 3.8-50
Table 3.8-10: Alternative 1: Existing and Projected Truck Trips at Berths 302-305 ..... 3.8-52
Table 3.8-11: Alternative 2: Existing and Projected Capacity (TEUs) at Berths 302-305 ..... 3.8-60
Table 3.8-12: Alternative 3: Existing and Projected Cargo Throughput Volumes at Berths 302-306 ..... 3.8-75
Table 3.8-13: Alternative 3: Existing and Projected Cargo Throughput Volumes at Berths 302-306 ..... 3.8-76
Table 3.8-14: Alternative 3: Existing and Projected Truck Trips at Berths 302-305 ..... 3.8-78
Table 3.8-15: Alternative 3: Existing and Projected Truck Trips at Berths 302-305 ..... 3.8-79
Table 3.8-16: Alternative 4: Existing and Projected Cargo Throughput Volumes at Berths 302-305 ..... 3.8-93
Table 3.8-17: Alternative 4: Existing and Projected Cargo Throughput Volumes at Berths 302-305 ..... 3.8-94
Table 3.8-18: Alternative 4: Existing and Projected Truck Trips at Berths 302-305 ..... 3.8-96
Table 3.8-19: Alternative 4: Existing and Projected Truck Trips at Berths 302-305 ..... 3.8-97
Table 3.8-20: Alternative 5: Existing and Projected Cargo Throughput Volumes at Berths 302-306 ..... 3.8-111
Table 3.8-21: Alternative 5: Existing and Projected Cargo Throughput Volumes at Berths 302-306 ..... 3.8-112
Table 3.8-22: Alternative 5: Existing and Projected Truck Trips at Berths 302-306 ..... 3.8-114
Table 3.8-23: Alternative 5: Existing and Projected Truck Trips at Berths 302-306 ..... 3.8-115
Table 3.8-24: Alternative 6: Existing and Projected Cargo Throughput Volumes at Berths 302-306 ..... 3.8-129
Table 3.8-25: Alternative 6: Existing and Projected Cargo Throughput Volumes at Berths 302-306 ..... 3.8-130
Table 3.8-26: Alternative 6: Existing and Projected Truck Trips at Berths 302-306 ..... 3.8-132

Table 3.8-27: Alternative 6: Existing and Projected Truck Trips at Berths 302-306 ..... 3.8-133
Table 3.8-28: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Hazards and Hazardous Materials Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives 3.8-140
Table 3.9-1: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Land Use Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives 3.9-49
Table 3.10-1: Allisions, Collisions, and Groundings – Port Complex (1996-2009) 3.10-8
Table 3.10-2: Number of VTS-Recorded Close-Quarters Incidents, 1998-2009 ..... 3.10-9
Table 3.10-3: Water Depths within the Port of Los Angeles 3.10-11
Table 3.10-4: Ship Calls at the Port of Los Angeles 3.10-11
Table 3.10-5: Marine-Based Construction Equipment Associated with the Proposed Project 3.10-16
Table 3.10-6: Existing and Projected Annual Ship Calls at Berths 302-306 at Full Build-out (2027) 3.10-18
Table 3.10-7: Comparison of Ship Calls under the Proposed Project and Alternatives (2012-2027) 3.10-20
Table 3.10-8: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Marine Transportation Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives 3.10-32
Table 3.11-1: Definitions of Acoustical Terms 3.11-4
Table 3.11-2: Typical Noise Levels in the Environment 3.11-5
Table 3.11-3: Short-Term Noise Monitoring Results 3.11-17
Table 3.11-4: Land Use Noise Compatibility Guidelines 3.11-22
Table 3.11-5: Construction Equipment Noise Emission Levels 3.11-23
Table 3.11-6: Summary of Construction Noise Impacts 3.11-24
Table 3.11-7: Summary of Operational Noise Impacts 3.11-27
Table 3.11-8: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Noise Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives 3.11-47
Table 3.12-1: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Recreation Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives 3.12-25
Table 3.13-1: Port Police Demand 3.13-19
Table 3.13-2: Water Demand 3.13-21
Table 3.13-3: Wastewater Generation 3.13-22
Table 3.13-4: Solid Waste Generation 3.13-23

Table 3.13-5: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Public Services and Utilities Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives 3.13-87

Table 3.14-1: Final 2008/2010 Section 303(d) Listed Waters in Los Angeles Harbor 3.14-4

Table 3.14-2: Sediment Chemistry Results (from AMEC, 2011). 3.14-18

Table 3.14-3: Source Control Design Features for Container Terminal Facility Activities 3.14-49

Table 3.14-4: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Water Quality, Sediments and Oceanography Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives 3.14-99

Table 4-1: Related and Cumulative Projects 4-9

Table 4-2: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2012 CEQA Baseline vs. 2012 Proposed Project Construction 4-81

Table 4-3: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2020 CEQA Baseline vs. 2020 Proposed Project 4-83

Table 4-4: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2025 CEQA Baseline vs. 2025 Proposed Project 4-84

Table 4-5: Intersection Level of Service Analysis – 2027 CEQA Baseline vs. 2027 Proposed Project 4-85

Table 4-6: 2015 CEQA Baseline vs. 2015 Proposed Project Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 4-89

Table 4-7: 2015 CEQA Baseline vs. 2015 Proposed Project Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 4-90

Table 4-8: 2020 CEQA Baseline vs. 2020 Proposed Project Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 4-91

Table 4-9: 2020 CEQA Baseline vs. 2020 Proposed Project Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 4-92

Table 4-10: 2025 CEQA Baseline vs. 2025 Proposed Project Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 4-93

Table 4-11: 2025 CEQA Baseline vs. 2025 Proposed Project Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 4-94

Table 4-12: 2027 CEQA Baseline vs. 2027 Proposed Project Freeway Analysis – AM Peak Hour 4-95

Table 4-13: 2027 CEQA Baseline vs. 2027 Proposed Project Freeway Analysis – PM Peak Hour 4-96

Table 4-14: BNSF San Bernardino Subdivision, from Hobart Yard to San Bernardino, CY2027 4-99

Table 4-15: BNSF Cajon Subdivision from San Bernardino to Barstow, CY2027 4-103

Table 4-16: UP Alhambra Subdivision from Los Angeles Transportation Center (LATC) to Colton Crossing, CY2027 (Excluding Segment That is Combined with UP LA Subdivision) 4-104

Table 4-17: UP Los Angeles Subdivision from East Los Angeles Yard to West Riverside Junction, CY2027 (Excluding Segment That is Combined with UP Alhambra Subdivision) 4-106
Table 4-18: Combined UP Alhambra and LA Subdivisions in Pomona and Montclair Area, CY2027 4-108
Table 4-19: UP Yuma Subdivision from Colton Crossing to Indio, CY2027 4-109
Table 5-1: Minority and Low-Income Populations 5-3
Table 5-2: Minority and Low-Income Characteristics in the Vicinity of the Proposed Project Site 5-4
Table 5-3: Summary of Disproportionate Effects on Minority and Low-Income Populations from the Proposed Project and Alternatives 5-5
Table 6-1: Summary of Proposed Project and Alternatives at Buildout (2012-2027) 6-3
Table 6-2: Summary of CEQA Significance Analysis by Alternative 6-4
Table 6-3: Comparison of Alternatives* to the Proposed Project 6-5
Table 6-4: Summary of NEPA Significance Analysis by Alternative 6-10
Table 6-5: Comparison of Alternatives* to the NEPA Baseline 6-11
Table 7-1: Total Civilian Employment by County (1990-2009) 7-5
Table 7-2: Total Civilian Employment Projection by County and City (2010-2030) 7-6
Table 7-3: Unemployment Rate (%) by County (1990-2010) 7-8
Table 7-4: Total Farm and Non-Farm Employment for Los Angeles County, California (1990-2009) 7-9
Table 7-5: Distribution of Direct Cargo Jobs by Place of Residency for the Port of Los Angeles 7-13
Table 7-6: Occupational Breakdown (%) by Place of Residence (Zip Code Area) in 2000 (Employed civilian population 16 years and over) 7-16
Table 7-7: Household and Family Income by Source of Income by County 7-18
Table 7-8: Household and Family Income by Source of Income by Zip Code 7-19
Table 7-9: Population by Region, County, and Local Jurisdictions (1990-2009) 7-20
Table 7-10: Population Projections for Region and County (2010-2030) 7-21
Table 7-11: Housing Characteristics (%) in 2000 7-24
Table 7-12: Existing Home Sale Prices by County (1998-2008) 7-27
Table 7-13: New Home Sale Prices by County (1998-2008) 7-28
Table 7-14: Average Home Sale Prices by Community (2001-2010) 7-29
Table 7-15: Port Industry Activities Associated with Cargo Movement 7-34
Table 7-16: Proposed Project – Direct and Secondary Construction Employment Over the Two-Year Construction Period 7-41

Table 7-17: Proposed Project – Net Direct and Secondary Long Term Operations Employment 7-43
Table 7-18 Proposed Project – Gross Direct and Secondary Operations Employment 7-43
Table 7-19: Proposed Project – Construction Income Over the Two-Year Construction Period 7-45
Table 7-20: Proposed Project– Net Operations Income 7-45
Table 7-21: Proposed Project – Gross Operations Income 7-45
Table 7-22: Proposed Project – Net Operations Tax Revenue 7-45
Table 7-23: Proposed Project – Gross Operations Tax Revenue 7-46
Table 7-24: Alternative 1 – Net Direct and Secondary Operations Employment* 7-49
Table 7-25: Alternative 1 – Gross Direct and Secondary Operations Employment 7-49
Table 7-26: Alternative 1 – Net Operations Income* 7-51
Table 7-27: Alternative 1 – Gross Operations Income 7-51
Table 7-28: Alternative 1–Net Operations Tax Revenue* 7-52
Table 7-29: Alternative 1 – Gross Operations Tax Revenue 7-52
Table 7-30: Alternative 2 – Direct and Secondary Construction Employment Over the Construction Period 7-54
Table 7-31: Alternative 2 – Net Direct and Secondary Operations Employment* 7-54
Table 7-32: Alternative 2 – Gross Direct and Secondary Operations Employment 7-54
Table 7-33: Alternative 2 – Construction Income Over the Two-Year Construction Period 7-55
Table 7-34: Alternative 2 – Net Operations Income 7-55
Table 7-35: Alternative 2 – Gross Operations Income 7-56
Table 7-36: Alternative 2 – Net Operations Tax Revenue 7-56
Table 7-37: Alternative 2 – Operations Tax Revenue 7-56
Table 7-38: Alternative 3 – Direct and Secondary Construction Employment Over the Two-Year Construction Period 7-58
Table 7-39: Alternative 3 – Net Direct and Secondary Operations Employment 7-60
Table 7-40: Alternative 3 – Gross Direct and Secondary Operations Employment 7-60
Table 7-41: Alternative 3 – Construction Income Over the Construction Period 7-61
Table 7-42: Alternative 3 – Net Operations Income 7-61
Table 7-43: Alternative 3 – Gross Operations Income 7-61

Table 7-44: Alternative 3 – Net Operations Tax Revenue 7-61
Table 7-45: Alternative 3 – Gross Operations Tax Revenue 7-61
Table 7-46: Alternative 4 – Direct and Secondary Construction Employment Over the Construction Period 7-64
Table 7-47: Alternative 4 – Net Direct and Secondary Operations Employment 7-64
Table 7-48: Alternative 4 – Gross Direct and Secondary Operations Employment 7-64
Table 7-49: Alternative 4 – Construction Income Over the Construction Period 7-66
Table 7-50: Alternative 4 – Net Operations Income 7-66
Table 7-51: Alternative 4 – Gross Operations Income 7-66
Table 7-52: Alternative 4 – Net Operations Tax Revenue Growth 7-67
Table 7-53: Alternative 4 – Gross Operations Tax Revenue 7-67
Table 7-54: Alternative 5 – Direct and Secondary Construction Employment Over the Construction Period 7-69
Table 7-55: Alternative 5 – Net Direct and Secondary Operations Employment 7-71
Table 7-56: Alternative 5 – Gross Direct and Secondary Operations Employment 7-71
Table 7-57: Alternative 5 – Construction Income Over the Construction Period 7-72
Table 7-58: Alternative 5 – Net Operations Income 7-72
Table 7-59: Alternative 5 – Gross Operations Income 7-72
Table 7-60: Alternative 5 – Net Operations Tax Revenue 7-72
Table 7-61: Alternative 5 – Gross Operations Tax Revenue 7-72
Table 7-62: Alternative 6 – Direct and Secondary Construction Employment Over the Two-Year Construction Period 7-75
Table 7-63: Alternative 6 – Net Direct and Secondary Operations Employment 7-75
Table 7-64: Alternative 6 – Gross Direct and Secondary Operations Employment 7-75
Table 7-65: Alternative 6 – Construction Income Over the Two-Year Construction Period 7-76
Table 7-66: Alternative 6 – Net Operations Income 7-76
Table 7-67: Alternative 6 – Gross Operations Income 7-76
Table 7-68: Alternative 6 – Net Operations Tax Revenue 7-77
Table 7-69: Alternative 6 – Gross Operations Tax Revenue 7-77
Table 7-70: Comparison of Alternatives: Construction Employment Over Two-Year Construction Period (Proposed Project and Alternatives) 7-78

Table 7-71: Comparison of Alternatives: Net Operations Employment 7-79
Table 7-72: Comparison of Alternatives: Gross Operations Employment 7-79

FIGURES

Figure ES-1: Regional Locations ES-2
Figure ES-2: Proposed Project ES-9
Figure ES-3: Proposed Layout - Sections ES-20
Figure ES-4: Landside Transfer Area ES-21
Figure ES-5a: Alternatives Evaluated - Alternatives 1 through 3 ..... ES-25
Figure ES-5b: Alternatives Evaluated - Alternatives 4 through 6 ..... ES-26
Figure 1-1: Regional Location Map 1-4
Figure 1-2: Goods Movement Chain: Transportation Distribution 1-7
Figure 1-3: General Container Terminal Operations 1-9
Figure 1-4: Port-wide Container Mode Splits, Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach 1-14
Figure 1-5: Local Cargo Distribution from Port of Los Angeles 1-16
Figure 1-6: Transloader Cargo 1-17
Figure 1-7: Truck Drayage 1-17
Figure 1-8: San Pedro Bay Port Complex On-Dock Railyards 1-19
Figure 1-9: Location of Existing Near-Dock and Off-Dock Railyards. 1-21
Figure 1-10 Cargo Forecasts for Port Complex 1-27
Figure 2-1: Project Site and Vicinity 2-7
Figure 2-2: USACE Scope of Federal Review 2-12
Figure 2-3: Project Site – Existing Conditions Buildings 2-14
Figure 2-4: Proposed Project 2-17
Figure 2-5 Proposed Layout - Sections 2-26
Figure 2-6 Landside Transfer Area 2-27
Figure 2.7: Proposed Project Terminal Construction Phases I-II 2-31
Figure 2-8: Comparison of Baselines and Proposed Project 2-44
Figure 2-9a: Alternatives Evaluated - Alternatives 1-3 2-49
Figure 2-9b: Alternatives Evaluated - Alternatives 4-6 2-50
Figure 3.1-1: Panoramic Views of Port Landscape Features 3.1-5
Figure 3.1-2: Location of Viewpoints 3.1-10
Figure 3.1-3: Looking South from Baseball Field Near Intersection of Front and Center Streets 3.1-11
Figure 3.1-4: Looking East near John S. Gibson Park, Between Fire Station 112 and LA Maritime Museum (VP-2) 3.1-12

Figure 3.1-5: Looking East from San Pedro Plaza Park (viewing platform) at Beacon and 9th Street 3.1-14
Figure 3.1-6: Looking East from Berth 77 of the Ports O'Call Village Spirit Cruises 3.1-15
Figure 3.1-7: Looking East from 22nd Street Park 3.1-16
Figure 3.1-8: Looking Northeast from Inner Cabrillo Beach 3.1-17
Figure 3.1-9: Looking East from Lookout Point 3.1-19
Figure 3.1-10: Looking Northeast from Eastern Edge of the Korean Bell of Friendship in Angels Gate Park 3.1-20
Figure 3.1-11: Looking East from West 22nd Street at South Cabrillo Avenue 3.1-21
Figure 3.1-12: Looking East from West 17th Street between South Patton and Averill Avenues 3.1-23
Figure 3.1-13: Looking East from West 17th Street at Alma Street Adjacent to San Pedro High School 3.1-24
Figure 3.1-14: Looking East from Averill Park 3.1-25
Figure 3.1-15: Looking East from Deana Dana Friendship Park 3.1-26
Figure 3.1-16: Looking Northeast towards 302-305 APL Container Terminal from the Pier 300 Channel of the Outer Los Angeles Harbor 3.1-28
Figure 3.1-17: Looking East from West 17th Street between South Patton and Averill Avenues during Nighttime Hours 3.1-29
Figure 3.1-18: Zoomed Photo Simulation looking East from Harbor Boulevard at 11th/Beacon Stairway 3.1-42
Figure 3.1-19: Zoomed Photo Simulation looking Southeast from Deana Dana Friendship Park 3.1-46
Figure 3.2-1: NOx Emission Trends for the Proposed Project CEQA/NEPA Impacts 3.2-121
Figure 3.2-2: VOC Emission Trends for the Proposed Project CEQA/NEPA Impacts 3.2-122
Figure 3.2-3: PM10 Emission Trends for the Proposed Project CEQA/NEPA Impacts 3.2-123
Figure 3.2-4: Isopleths of Residential Lifetime Cancer Risk: Unmitigated Proposed Project Minus Future CEQA Baseline 3.2-137
Figure 3.2-5: Isopleths of Occupational Lifetime Cancer Risk: Unmitigated Proposed Project Minus Future CEQA Baseline 3.2-138
Figure 3.2-6: Isopleths of Residential Lifetime Cancer Risk: Mitigated Proposed Project Minus Future CEQA Baseline 3.2-140
Figure 3.2-7: Isopleths of Occupational Lifetime Cancer Risk: Mitigated Proposed Project Minus Future CEQA Baseline 3.2-141
Figure 3.2-8: Isopleths of Residential Lifetime Cancer Risk: Unmitigated Proposed Project Minus NEPA Baseline 3.2-143
Figure 3.2-9: Isopleths of Occupational Lifetime Cancer Risk: Unmitigated Proposed Project Minus NEPA Baseline 3.2-144

Figure 3.2-10: Isopleths of Residential Lifetime Cancer Risk: Mitigated Proposed Project Minus NEPA Baseline 3.2-146
Figure 3.2-11: Isopleths of Occupational Lifetime Cancer Risk: Mitigated Proposed Project Minus NEPA Baseline 3.2-147
Figure 3.3-1: APL Terminal Project site 3.3-6
Figure 3.3-2: Location of Eelgrass in the Adjacent to the Proposed Project Site, September 2008. ..... 3.3-27
Figure 3.4-1: Port Development 3.4-4
Figure 3.5-1: Geologic and Palos Verdes Fault Zone Map 3.5-4
Figure 3.5-2: Major Regional Faults in Southern California 3.5-6
Figure 3.6-1: Project Study Area and Study Intersections 3.6-9
Figure 3.6-2: Study Area Freeway Segment 3.6-10
Figure 3.6-3: Rail Lines in the Harbor Area 3.6-22
Figure 3.6-4: Map of Railroad Main Lines 3.6-23
Figure 3.6-5: Study Area Freeway Segment 3.6-40
Figure 3.7-1: Proposed Project 3.7-7
Figure 3.9-1: Existing Land Uses in the Project Vicinity 3.9-4
Figure 3.9-2: Designated Land Uses (Port of Los Angeles Plan) 3.9-11
Figure 3.10-1: Vessel Navigation Safety Areas at Port of Los Angeles and Port of Long Beach 3.10-3
Figure 3.11-1: Noise Measurement Locations 3.11-8
Figure 3.11-2: Hourly Noise Levels at LT-1 ..... 3.11-10
Figure 3.11-3: Hourly Noise Levels at LT-2 ..... 3.11-11
Figure 3.11-4: Hourly Noise Levels at LT-3 ..... 3.11-12
Figure 3.11-5: Hourly Noise Levels at LT-4 ..... 3.11-13
Figure 3.11-6: Hourly Noise Levels at LT-5 ..... 3.11-14
Figure 3.12-1: On-Land Park and Recreational Facilities 3.12-5
Figure 3.12-2: Water-Related Recreational Facilities 3.12-6
Figure 3.13-1: Public Service Facilities 3.13-5
Figure 3.14-1: Water Quality Monitoring Stations 3.14-6
Figure 3.14-2: Examples of Water Quality off Pier 300, July 2008 - October 2009 ..... 3.14-9
Figure 3.14-3: Sampling Map 3.14-18
Figure 3.14-4: Current patterns in Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors Predicted by the WRAP Model (Top: Flood tide. Bottom: Ebb tide) 3.14-22
Figure 4-1: Related and Cumulative Projects 4-7
Figure 5-1: Percent Minority Population 5-6

Figure 5-2: Percent Low-Income Population 5-7
Figure 5-3: Isopleths of Residential Lifetime Cancer Risk: Mitigated Proposed Project Minus NEPA Baseline (Percent Minority Population) 5-19
Figure 5-4: Isopleths of Residential Lifetime Cancer Risk: Mitigated Proposed Project Minus NEPA Baseline (Percent Low Income Population) 5-20
Figure 5-5: Isopleths of Residential Lifetime Cancer Risk: Mitigated Proposed Project Minus NEPA Baseline (Percent Minority Population) 5-21
Figure 5-6: Isopleths of Residential Lifetime Cancer Risk: Mitigated Proposed Project Minus NEPA Baseline (Percent Low Income Population) 5-22
Figure 7-1: Employment in 5-County Southern California Region (1990-2010) 7-3
Figure 7-2: Unemployment Rate for State and Counties (1990-2010) 7-7
Figure 7-3: Housing Units Permitted in 5-County Southern California Region (1990-2009) 7-23
Figure 7-4: Change in Median House Price, San Pedro and Wilmington (2001–2010) 7-30
Figure 7-5: Proposed Project: Operations Employment 7-42
Figure 7-6: Proposed Project vs. Alternatives 1 and 2: Operations Employment 7-50
Figure 7-7: Proposed Project vs. Alternative 3: Operations Employment 7-59
Figure 7-8: Proposed Project vs. Alternative 4: Operations Employment 7-65
Figure 7-9: Proposed Project vs. Alternatives 5 and 6: Operations Employment 7-70

This page intentionally left blank