

3.12 UTILITIES

3.12.1 Introduction

This section addresses the potential for impacting public utilities within the Port, the Main Channel, and Outer Harbor area, associated with implementing the Proposed Action.

3.12.2 Environmental Setting

The relocation or removal of utilities associated with dredging operations was addressed in Section 3.12.3 of the 2000 SEIR/SEIS that was prepared for the Channel Deepening Project. In summary, channel deepening required the relocation or removal of 13 utility lines, including three Mobil oil pipelines, two Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) water lines, two LADWP power lines, a Pacific Telephone line, and three sewer force main crossings. The Mobil oil pipelines were removed or relocated to a deeper depth. The water lines were replaced with new lines. The LADWP power lines were also replaced. The three sewer force main crossings were all relocated. New lines were installed by directional drilling. The telephone line was abandoned and therefore was not replaced. Existing utility lines were not taken out of service until the new lines were available. No new utility demand was generated by dredging itself, other than the electrical power required to operate the dredge. The existing electrical grid was determined to have adequate capacity to power the dredge, and was not considered to be a significant impact.

There are no utility lines associated with the new disposal sites.

3.12.2.1 Water Services

The LADWP provides potable water to the project area. LADWP is responsible for supplying, conserving, treating, and distributing water for domestic, industrial, agricultural, and firefighting purposes within the City of Los Angeles. Water sources utilized by the LADWP consist of local sources, such as wells and recycled water (for nonpotable uses); and imported sources, including the Los Angeles Aqueducts and purchases from the Metropolitan Water Districts of Southern California (Metropolitan). Water supply and conveyance structures that serve the City and Port comprise a series of reservoirs and a network of pipelines, including reservoir outlets, major trunk lines, and other delivery lines, into which LADWP has built capacity to ensure adequate accommodation of increased future growth and demand through at least 2015.

3.12.2.2 Waste Water

The Los Angeles Department of Public Works (LADPW), Bureau of Sanitation, provides sewer service to the project area. The Bureau of Sanitation maintains both sewer lines throughout the project area and a nearby wastewater treatment facility. The Terminal Island Treatment Plant (TITP) is located at 455 Ferry Street. The plant treats all wastewater flows received to third-stage tertiary treatment levels, discharging treated effluent into the harbor in the vicinity of Pier 400.

No sewer lines or appurtenant structures have been identified at any of the proposed disposal sites.

3.12.2.3 Storm Drainage

Storm drains are located throughout the project area and are maintained by the Los Angeles Housing Department (LAHD), the City, and Los Angeles County. The locations and potential impacts to storm drains within the area of each disposal site are discussed below.

Berths 243-245 – There are eight local storm drain lines that discharge from the adjacent terminal surrounding the slip. Upon final project design, the storm drainage systems for the terminal area will be revised, new lines installed and possibly a collector drain provided.

Northwest Slip – An LADPW 84” reinforced concrete pipe (RCP) storm drain discharges within the northeast corner of the slip. This line would be extended through the new fill site. An abandoned 36” RCP storm drain and an 8” RCP storm drain will be stubbed and removed. A double 12’x14” reinforced concrete box (LADPW) storm drain discharges immediately adjacent to the new fill site. A 50-foot offset is maintained between this large concrete box culvert and top of fill. The new fill site would not impact discharge from this outfall.

No storm drains have been identified in the area of the CSWH Expansion Area, ~~Eelgrass Habitat Area~~, ARSSS, LA-2 or LA-32.

3.12.2.4 Solid Waste

The City Bureau of Sanitation and private waste management services provide solid waste collection and disposal services within the project area. As discussed in Section 2.3.3, approximately 0.080 mcy of contaminated sediments would be dredged and disposed under the Proposed Action. As discussed in Section 3.13, Water Quality and Oceanography, contaminants that have been detected in sediments of the Port include low levels of heavy metals (cadmium, chromium, copper, lead, mercury, nickel, silver and zinc), oil and grease, polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), chlorinated hydrocarbons (i.e., DDT and DDE), and polychlorinated

biphenyls (PCBs). Contaminated materials would be placed at Berths 243-245 in a Confined Disposal Facility (CDF) under Alternative 1 or at the ARSSS under Alternative 2.

3.12.2.5 Energy (Electricity and Natural Gas)

The LADWP provides electrical services within the project area. The LADWP maintains the Harbor Generating Station at the intersection of Island Avenue and Harry Bridges Boulevard. Receiving Station Q and numerous above- and below-ground electrical transmission lines are also located in the project area. In addition to LADWP's electrical service, the Southern California Gas Company (SCG) serves natural gas to the project area.

LADWP provides electrical power to the project site. LADWP maintains various generating and distributing substations throughout the greater Los Angeles area, including generating and distribution centers near the Port. LADWP's power system serves approximately ~~3.9~~ four million people, and is the nation's largest municipal utility. LADWP's all time peak ~~load~~ demand was ~~5,708~~ 6,165 MW which occurred in July ~~2005~~ 2006, and has an installed generation capacity of ~~7,336~~ 331 MW. In the 2004 baseline year, the peak load was 5,418 MW. LADWP's service territory covers 465 square miles including Los Angeles and Owens Valley, with annual sales exceeding ~~2324~~ million MW-hours (MWh). LADWP estimates that in ~~the first year of project construction~~ (2009 there will be a generation capacity of 7, ~~400~~ 537 MW to support an energy demand of 6, ~~184~~ 194 MW, and in 2010 there will be a generation capacity of 7,560 MW to support an energy demand of 6,239 MW (LADWP, ~~2006~~ 2007).

No electrical or gas lines have been identified at any of the proposed disposal sites.

3.12.3 Applicable Regulations

AB 939: California Integrated Waste Management Act

AB 939 was designed to focus on source reduction, recycling and composting, and environmentally safe landfilling and transformation activities. This act required cities and counties to divert 25 percent of all solid waste from landfills and transformation facilities by 1995, and 50 percent by year 2000. The City met and exceeded the year 2000 goals with 58 percent solid waste diversion.

3.12.4 Methodology

Assessment of Proposed Action impacts on utilities (water, wastewater, storm drainage, solid waste, and others) and energy providers (electricity and natural gas) varies depending on the utility. Generally, the assessment includes the identification of utilities impacted by construction and operation of the Proposed Action.

The CEQA and NEPA Baseline for the Proposed Action comprises ~~a total of~~ approximately ~~4,563~~ acres of open water areas at ~~the~~ Berths 243-245 Slip, the Northwest Slip, and the CSWH; approximately 1,330 acres of open water at ocean disposal sites LA-2, ~~as well as~~ and LA-3; and approximately 31 acres of land area at the ARSSS, which is currently used for soil storage. The open water areas do not support uses that have existing energy demands or waste generation. The ARSSS is a soil storage site that periodically requires minimal amounts of nonpotable water for dust control.

3.12.5 Thresholds of Significance

Significance criteria are specified in the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* (City of Los Angeles, 2006) to judge potential impacts on water resources, wastewater treatment capacity, solid waste, and energy use (electricity and natural gas). Utilizing these thresholds, a project would be considered to have a significant impact on these public utilities if it would result in any of the following:

- PS-1** Require or result in the construction or expansion of water, wastewater, or storm drain lines, which could cause significant environmental effects.
- PS-2** Exceed existing water supply, wastewater, or landfill capacities.
- PS-3** Require new, offsite energy supply and distribution infrastructure, or capacity-enhancing alterations to existing facilities that are not anticipated by adopted plans or programs.

3.12.6 Impact Analysis and Mitigation Measures

3.12.6.1 Alternative 1: Port Development and Environmental Enhancement

Alternative 1, Port Development and Environmental Enhancement, would consist of disposing dredged material at the following disposal sites: Berths 243-245; Northwest Slip; CSWH Expansion Area; ~~Eelgrass Habitat Area~~ and LA-2.

A Confined Disposal Facility (CDF) would be created at the Berths 243-245 disposal site and would be covered with clean dredge material placed as surcharge to an elevation of approximately +30 feet MLLW, which would remain in place until a future geotechnical investigation and/or monitoring determines that the fill has been consolidated. In the future, if the Port decides to remove the surcharge material, an appropriate CEQA document would be prepared to analyze potential impacts of surcharge removal. Potential environmental impacts of future development of the new 5-acre land area at the Northwest Slip have been addressed in the Berth 136-147 Container Terminal Project Final EIS/EIR, which is summarized in Section 3.14.

Impact PS-1: **Alternative 1 would require or result in the construction or expansion of water, wastewater, or storm drain lines, which could cause significant environmental effects.**

Construction activities would impact storm drain lines as identified below. No other utility lines have been identified in the area of the disposal sites.

Berths 243-245. Eight local storm drain lines exist within the limits of the Berths 243-245 disposal site. Upon final project design, the storm drainage system for the terminal area at Berths 243-245 would be revised, new lines installed and possibly a collector drain provided as a result of filling in the slips. The system would be designed to ensure adequate storm drainage at this location.

Northwest Slip. Implementation of Alternative 1 includes extension of an existing 84" RCP (LADPW) storm drain through the new fill site prior to placement of dredge materials. The abandoned 36" and 8" RCP storm drains would be stubbed and removed. Additionally, a water line located at the project limits would be stubbed.

CSWH Expansion Area. There are no utility lines within the CSWH Expansion Area.

~~**Eelgrass Habitat Area.** There are no utility lines within the Eelgrass Habitat Area.~~

LA-2. There are no utility lines within LA-2.

The final project design would incorporate the relocation or redesign of any storm drainage systems that would be impacted by the placement of dredge materials and containment dikes. As discussed in Section 3.12.3 of the 2000 SEIS/SEIR, existing utility lines would not be taken out of service until the new lines are available; therefore, no significant environmental effects are anticipated.

Impact Determination

While Alternative 1 would require the demolition, removal, and construction of storm drains at Berths 243-245 and the Northwest Slip, it would not require construction or expansion of any water, or wastewater lines. However, the storm drainage system for the terminal area at Berths 243-245 would be revised upon construction of the CDF to ensure adequate storm drainage at this location such that adverse environmental effects would not occur. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures. Under Alternative 1, no significant adverse impacts would occur; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Residual Impacts. No mitigation measures for implementation of Alternative 1 are required. Therefore, no residual impacts would occur.

Impact PS-2: Alternative 1 would exceed existing water supply, wastewater, or landfill capacities.

Construction activities would require minimal amounts of potable water for personal use by construction workers, which would not exceed general construction water requirements. Due to the temporary and short-term nature of construction, the water consumed would be considered negligible and would not impact the local water supply. Operation of the proposed disposal locations as fill sites would not require any water usage.

Construction activities would also generate minimal amounts of wastewater, primarily generated by construction personnel. The amount of wastewater generated by construction workers into the Los Angeles City sanitary sewer would be considered a short-term minimal impact and would not result in a permanent increase to the Terminal Island Treatment Plant (TITP) that receives the wastewater. The TITP is capable of processing 30 million gallons per day (gpd) and averages approximately 16 million gpd; treating wastewater from over 130,000 people and 100 businesses in the Los Angeles Harbor Area including the communities of Wilmington, San Pedro, and a portion of Harbor City (LADPW, 2008 and LADPW, 2007). As such, the TITP is operating just over 50% capacity and would be able to accommodate any wastewater generated by construction workers. Therefore, wastewater generated by construction workers would have a less than significant impact on the local wastewater treatment facility (TITP).

For Alternative 1, all dredge material would be placed at disposal locations within the Port or at LA-2. Therefore, landfill capacities would not be impacted by Alternative 1.

Impact Determination

Use of water by construction workers during construction activities would not exceed existing water supplies and would therefore not result in significant impacts to water suppliers. Furthermore, the amount of wastewater generated by construction personnel would be short-term and minimal; therefore impacts to wastewater treatment providers would be less than significant. No impact to landfill capacities would occur as dredge materials would not be sent to off-site landfills.

Mitigation Measures. Under Alternative 1, no significant adverse impacts would occur; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Residual Impacts. No mitigation measures for implementation of Alternative 1 are required. Therefore, no residual impacts would occur.

Impact PS-3: **Alternative 1 would not require new, offsite energy supply and distribution infrastructure, or capacity-enhancing alterations to existing facilities that are not anticipated by adopted plans or programs.**

Energy (diesel fuel and electricity) would be used during project construction. Construction would not result in substantial waste or inefficient use of energy because construction would be competitively bid, which would facilitate efficiency in all construction stages. Current LAHD bid specifications include provisions to reduce energy consumption, such as staging work during non-peak hours when appropriate. Operation of the proposed disposal sites would not require substantial, if any, energy use.

Additionally, LADWP estimates that in ~~the first year of project construction~~ 2009 there will be a generation capacity of 7, ~~400~~⁵³⁷ MW to support an energy demand of 6,184 ~~194~~ ¹⁹⁴ MW, and in 2010 there will be a generation capacity of 7,560 MW to support an energy demand of 6,239 MW (LADWP, 2006~~2007~~). LADWP's energy forecasts for industrial energy use (such as that of the Proposed Action) are based on historical demand and regression techniques. Sales are regressed against a combination of the demographic, economic, weather and electric price variables and variables are applied to account for extraordinary events like earthquakes, civil disturbances, billing problems, and the recent California Energy Crisis, and have proven to fit historical data quite accurately (LADWP, 2006). Therefore, based on LADWP's estimates, the electricity demand for construction and operation of Alternative 1 is expected to be met by existing energy sources. Therefore, construction and operation would not require new, offsite energy supply and distribution infrastructure, or capacity-enhancing alterations to existing facilities.

Impact Determination

Energy required to construct and operate Alternative 1 is not expected to exceed the existing supply. Therefore implementation of Alternative 1 would not require new, offsite energy supply and distribution infrastructure, or capacity-enhancing alterations to existing facilities that are not anticipated by adopted plans or programs, and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures. Under Alternative 1, no significant adverse impacts would occur; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Residual Impacts. No mitigation measures for implementation of Alternative 1 are required. Therefore, no residual impacts would occur.

3.12.6.2 Alternative 2: Environmental Enhancement and Ocean Disposal

Alternative 2, Environmental Enhancement and Ocean Disposal, consists of placing dredge material at the following locations: CSWH Expansion Area, ~~Eelgrass Habitat Area~~, Anchorage Road Soil Storage Site (ARSSS), LA-2, and ~~LA-3~~. No new land area would be created as a result of this alternative.

Implementation of Alternative 2 would result in the same type and extent of development at the CSWH Expansion Area and ~~the Eelgrass Habitat Area~~ LA-2 disposal locations as described for Alternative 1. ~~Alternative 2 and would also result in the same type of disposal activities at LA-2, although more sediment would be disposed of under Alternative 2; this higher volume would have no effect on the need for or removal of utilities. Alternative 2 would therefore result in identical less than significant impacts as described for Alternative 1 at the CSWH Expansion Area, the Eelgrass Habitat Area, and LA-2 at these locations.~~ Therefore, the impact discussion for Alternative 2 is focused on the disposal sites that ~~was~~ were not included or discussed under Alternative 1, the ARSSS and LA-3.

Impact PS-1: **Alternative 2 would not require or result in the construction or expansion of water, wastewater, or storm drain lines, which could cause significant environmental effects.**

No existing water, wastewater, or storm drain lines have been identified at the ARSSS or LA-3. Minimal amounts of non-potable water, however, are used at ~~this site~~ the ARSSS for dust control. Sediments disposed at this location would be placed on top of soils/sediments that are currently watered and therefore would not increase the amount of water required for dust control at this location. Disposal of contaminated sediments at this location would not result in increased generation of wastewater.

Impact Determination

No existing water, wastewater or storm drain lines would ~~require removal~~ be removed and no new lines would be required at any of the disposal sites under Alternative 2, including the ARSSS, CSWH Expansion Area, ~~Eelgrass Habitat Area~~ LA-2, and ~~LA-3~~. Additionally, Alternative 2 would not result in increased usage of water. Therefore no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures. Under Alternative 2, no significant adverse impacts would occur; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Residual Impacts. No mitigation measures for implementation of Alternative 2 are required. No impacts would occur; therefore, no residual impacts would occur.

Impact PS-2: Alternative 2 would not exceed existing water supply, wastewater, or landfill capacities.

As discussed above for Alternative 1 under Impact PS-2, construction activities would require minimal amounts of potable water for personal use by construction workers, which would not exceed general construction water requirements. Due to the temporary and short-term nature of construction, the water consumed would be considered less than significant and would not impact the local water supply.

Construction activities would also generate minimal amounts of wastewater, primarily generated by construction personnel. The amount of wastewater generated by construction workers into the Los Angeles City sanitary sewer would be considered a short-term minimal impact and would not result in a permanent increase to the Terminal Island Treatment Plant (TITP) that receives the wastewater. The TITP is capable of processing 30 million gpd and averages approximately 16 million gpd; treating wastewater from over 130,000 people and 100 businesses in the Los Angeles Harbor Area including the communities of Wilmington, San Pedro, and a portion of Harbor City (LADPW, 2008 and LADPW, 2007). As such, the TITP is operating just over 50% capacity and would be able to accommodate any wastewater generated by construction workers. Therefore, wastewater generated by construction workers would have a less than significant impact on the local wastewater treatment facility (TITP).

For Alternative 2, all dredge material would be placed at disposal locations within the Port or at LA-2 and LA-3. Therefore, landfill capacities would not be impacted by Alternative 2.

Impact Determination

Use of water during Alternative 2 construction activities by construction workers would be considered negligible, would not exceed existing water supplies and would therefore not result in significant impacts to water supplies. Furthermore, the amount of wastewater generated by construction personnel would be short-term and minimal, and would therefore not result in significant impacts to the wastewater treatment facility (TITP). No impact to landfill capacities would occur as dredge materials would not be sent to off-site landfills.

Mitigation Measures. Under Alternative 2, no significant adverse impacts would occur; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Residual Impacts. Less than significant impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are required for implementation of Alternative 2; therefore, no residual impacts would occur.

Impact PS-3: Alternative 2 would not require new, offsite energy supply and distribution infrastructure, or capacity-enhancing alterations to

existing facilities that are not anticipated by adopted plans or programs.

Implementation of Alternative 2 would involve dredging and disposal of the same amount of material as Alternative 1. Therefore, Alternative 2 construction activities would require a similar amount of energy as those of Alternative 1. As discussed above for Alternative 1, energy required for construction and operation of Alternative 2 is expected to be met by existing energy sources. Therefore, construction and operation would not require new, offsite energy supply and distribution infrastructure, or capacity-enhancing alterations to existing facilities.

Impact Determination

Energy required to construct and operate Alternative 2 is not expected to exceed the existing supply. Therefore implementation of Alternative 2 would not require new, offsite energy supply and distribution infrastructure, or capacity-enhancing alterations to existing facilities that are not anticipated by adopted plans or programs, and impacts would be less than significant.

~~Impact Determination~~

~~Since dredge and disposal operations at Alternative 2 disposal locations, including the ARSSS, CSWH Expansion Area, Eelgrass Habitat Area, and LA-2 would not require new energy or energy infrastructure or result in capacity-enhancing alterations to existing facilities, no impacts would occur.~~

Mitigation Measures. Under Alternative 2, no significant adverse impacts would occur; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Residual Impacts. No mitigation measures for implementation of Alternative 2 are required. No impacts would occur; therefore, no residual impacts would occur.

3.12.6.3 Alternative 3: No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, no construction activities related to the Proposed Action would occur. No new landfills or new shallow water areas would be created. Since all approved disposal sites have been completed, no further dredging would take place and the Channel Deepening Project would not be completed. Existing environmental conditions at the Proposed Action disposal sites would continue to exist. Approximately 1.025 mcy of material within the federally-authorized channel and 0.675 mcy of berth dredging would remain to be dredged and disposed. In addition the 0.815 mcy of surcharge on the Southwest Slip Area would remain to be removed and disposed. Additionally, the 0.080 mcy of contaminated dredge material would remain within the Main Channel of the Port.

Impact PS-1: **Alternative 3 would not require or result in the construction or expansion of water, wastewater, or storm drain lines, which could cause significant environmental effects.**

Under the No Action Alternative, no construction activities related to additional dredging and disposal would occur. As a result, removal, construction, or expansion of water, wastewater, or storm drain lines would not be required.

Impact Determination

Since Alternative 3 would not require removal, construction, or expansion of water, wastewater, or storm drain lines, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures. Under Alternative 3, no significant adverse impacts would occur; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Residual Impacts. No mitigation measures for implementation of Alternative 3 are required. Therefore, no residual impacts would occur.

Impact PS-2: **Alternative 3 would not exceed existing water supply, wastewater, or landfill capacities.**

The No Action Alternative would not require additional water supply and would not generate additional wastewater or solid waste.

Impact Determination

Since Alternative 3 would not result in increased water usage or generation of wastewater or solid waste, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures. No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts. No mitigation measures for implementation of Alternative 3 are required. Therefore, no residual impacts would occur.

Impact PS-3: **Alternative 3 would not require new, offsite energy supply and distribution infrastructure, or capacity-enhancing alterations to existing facilities that are not anticipated by adopted plans or programs.**

Under the No Action Alternative, no dredging or sediment disposal would occur. As a result, Alternative 3 would not require new energy supply, distribution infrastructure, or capacity-enhancing alternations to existing facilities.

Impact Determination

Since Alternative 3 would not require new energy supply, distribution infrastructure, or capacity-enhancing alternations to existing facilities, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures. Under Alternative 3, no significant adverse impacts would occur; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Residual Impacts. No mitigation measures for implementation of Alternative 3 are required. Therefore, no residual impacts would occur.

3.12.7 Impact Summary

This section summarizes the conclusions of the impact analysis presented above in Section 3.12.6. Table 3.12-1, below, lists each impact identified for each alternative of the Proposed Action, along with the significance of each impact.

Table 3.12-1 Impact Summary

Impact	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3
PS-1. The construction or expansion of water, wastewater, or storm drain lines would not occur or be required.	LTS	NI	NI
PS-2. Existing water supply, wastewater, or landfill capacities would not be exceeded.	LTS	LTS	NI
PS-3. New, offsite energy supply and distribution infrastructure would not be required and capacity-enhancing alterations to existing facilities that are not anticipated by adopted plans or program would not occur.	LTS	LTS	NI

S&U = Significant and Unavoidable
 LTS = Less than Significant

SM = Significant but Mitigated
 NI = No Impact

Implementation of Alternative 1 would result in less than significant impacts to existing utilities lines, water supply, wastewater generation, solid waste generation, and energy demand.

Alternative 2 would have less than significant impacts to water supply and wastewater, and energy demand. Under Alternative 2, storm drains at Berths 243-245 would not need to be revised and therefore no impacts to utility lines would occur. Alternative 3 would have no impacts to utilities.

3.12.8 Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts to utilities would occur; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

3.12.9 Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable impacts would occur.

3.12.10 Mitigation Monitoring Plan

Since no mitigation measures are required for impacts to utilities, a mitigation monitoring plan is not required.