

1

Executive Summary

2 ES.1 Introduction and Background

3 The Los Angeles Harbor Department (LAHD) operates the Port of Los Angeles (Port)
4 under the legal mandates of the Port of Los Angeles Tidelands Trust (Los Angeles City
5 Charter, Article VI, Section 601; California Tidelands Trust Act of 1911) and the
6 California Coastal Act (PRC Division 20 Sections 30700 et seq.). The LAHD is
7 chartered to develop and operate the Port to benefit maritime uses, and it functions as a
8 landlord by leasing Port properties to more than 300 tenants.

9 ES.1.1 Background to the Supplemental EIR

10 Among the LAHD's tenants is China Shipping, which leases premises at Berths 97-109
11 to operate a marine container terminal (the "CS Container Terminal"). The terminal
12 handles foreign waterborne commerce in the form of containerized cargo, and has been
13 operational since 2005. On December 18, 2008, the City of Los Angeles Board of
14 Harbor Commissioners certified the Berths 97-109 [China Shipping] Container Terminal
15 Project Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR)
16 (LAHD and USACE, 2008). The 2008 EIS/EIR evaluated the environmental impacts of
17 the construction and operation of the CS Container Terminal (the "Approved Project") at
18 Berths 97-109. Construction of the Approved Project was completed in 2013.

19 On September 18, 2015, the LAHD issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) to inform
20 responsible and trustee agencies, public agencies, and the public that the LAHD was
21 preparing a Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (Draft SEIR) to
22 supplement and update the 2008 EIS/EIR. The Draft SEIR evaluates the continued
23 operation of the CS Container Terminal under modified mitigation measures. These
24 changes were collectively referred to in the Draft SEIR as the "Revised Project" and
25 encompass modifications to the project mitigation measures that were analyzed in the
26 2008 EIS/EIR. The NOP was circulated for a 30-day public review and comment period
27 starting on September 18, 2015 and ending on October 19, 2015. A scoping meeting was
28 held on October 7, 2015. On June 16, 2017, the LAHD released the Draft SEIR for a 45-
29 day public review and comment period which was extended by an additional 60 days
30 through September 29, 2017. A public hearing on the Draft SEIR was held on July 18,
31 2017. LAHD received a total of 34 comments, including oral and written testimony
32 received at the public hearing. Based on a number of issues raised in comments, the
33 LAHD has decided to revise and recirculate the Draft SEIR for public review.

ES.1.2 Scope of the Recirculated Draft SEIR

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, significant new information has been added, as summarized below, which requires a complete recirculation of the entire Draft SEIR.

CEQA Baseline

The 2017 Draft SEIR (LAHD, 2017) utilized, for all impacts, a baseline consisting of conditions in 2014 as they would have been had all of the mitigation measures in the 2008 EIS/EIR been implemented in a timely manner. As described more fully in Section ES 1.7 and Section 2.6.1, this Recirculated Draft SEIR employs a 2008 baseline for air quality and related health risk and greenhouse gas impacts and retains the 2014 baseline for ground transportation impacts.

Project Description

The project description in the 2017 Draft SEIR is revised in this Recirculated Draft SEIR to include the Partial Implementation Period as an element of the Revised Project (i.e., the time period after project approval occurred under the 2008 EIS/EIR, during which mitigation measures were in place but not all were being implemented in a timely manner). Accordingly, three additional interim years – 2012, 2014, and 2018 – have been added to the analysis, 2012 as the first year when most of the mitigation measures in the 2008 EIS/EIR were to have been in effect, 2014 to coincide with the baseline in the 2017 Draft SEIR, and 2018 as the last year before the proposed revised measures in the Revised Project could take effect.

Feasible Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures that comprise the Revised Project have been modified from those analyzed in the 2017 Draft SEIR. In most cases, compliance dates have been adjusted to be based on the effective date of a new lease amendment between LAHD and the tenant, rather than fixed calendar dates. In addition, several air quality and greenhouse gas mitigation measures and lease measures have been revised to take into account public comments and the adoption of the 2017 CAAP (SPBP, 2017).

Transportation Analysis

The analysis of the Revised Project's potential impacts on traffic has been modified to include several additional intersections and freeway segments requested by Caltrans in a comment letter on the 2017 Draft SEIR.

Because the Revised Project does not include any elements requiring federal action subject to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), including approvals, a NEPA document is not required and is not being prepared.

The Recirculated Draft SEIR is being distributed for comment to every agency, person, or organization, including those that commented on the 2017 Draft SEIR. Reviewers are advised that new comments must be submitted on the Recirculated Draft SEIR and that, although part of the administrative record, comments received on the prior Draft SEIR may no longer be considered pertinent and as such, would not require a written response by the LAHD in the Final SEIR.

ES.1.3 Purpose of the Supplemental EIR

The purpose of a Supplemental EIR is to provide the additional information necessary to make the previously certified EIR adequate for the project as revised. Accordingly, a SEIR need only contain the information necessary to respond to the project changes,

1 changed circumstances, or new information that triggered the need for additional
2 environmental review (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15163.) A SEIR does not “re-open” a
3 previously certified EIR or reanalyze the environmental impacts of a project as a whole;
4 the analysis is limited to whether the project changes result in new or substantially more
5 severe significant impacts.

6 The LAHD, in the course of preparing the Draft SEIR, has determined that the physical
7 capacity of the CS Container Terminal is greater than the assumptions used in the 2008
8 EIS/EIR. These changes are “changed circumstances” or “new information” that require
9 analysis in an SEIR. Accordingly, this Draft SEIR, in evaluating the impacts of operation
10 of the CS Terminal under the Revised Project, assumes and analyzes impacts of an
11 incremental increase in the terminal’s throughput in future years, based upon re-
12 assessment of terminal capacity, compared to the assumptions in the 2008 EIS/EIR.

13 This Recirculated Draft SEIR has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of
14 the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code
15 [PRC] Sections 21000 et seq.) and the Guidelines for Implementation of the California
16 Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA Guidelines) (14 California Code of
17 Regulations [CCR] Sections 15000 et seq.). This Executive Summary has been prepared
18 in accordance with Section 15123 (b) of the CEQA Guidelines which states that the EIR
19 should contain a brief summary of the proposed actions and its consequences and should
20 identify: 1) each significant effect with proposed mitigation measures that would reduce
21 or avoid that effect; 2) areas of controversy known to the lead agency; and 3) issues to be
22 resolved including whether or how to mitigate significant effects. This Recirculated
23 Draft SEIR describes the affected resources and evaluates the potential impacts to those
24 resources as a result of operating the Revised Project. Throughout, this Executive
25 Summary contains references to various chapters and sections in the Recirculated Draft
26 SEIR where detailed information and analyses can be reviewed.

27 **ES.1.4 Project Background**

28 The full background of the Approved Project is described in detail in Section 1.2.3 of this
29 Recirculated Draft SEIR. In summary, a previous EIR (LAHD, 1997) was prepared by
30 LAHD and was challenged by project opponents. The lawsuit was settled in 2004
31 through an Amended Stipulated Judgement (ASJ) in which LAHD committed to
32 preparing a new project-specific EIR, agreed to several mitigation measures, and
33 established a \$50 million community impact fund.

34 In the resultant 2008 EIS/EIR the LAHD adopted 52 mitigation and lease measures,
35 including additional measures beyond those in the ASJ, to reduce significant construction
36 and operational impacts of the Approved Project in the areas of aesthetics, air quality,
37 biology, cultural resources, geology, ground water, noise, public services, and
38 transportation. At the time of the 2008 EIS/EIR, many of those measures had never been
39 attempted anywhere in the world, but LAHD believed that they were realistic and could
40 be accomplished by the terminal operator within a reasonable timeframe.

41 Most of the mitigation measures, including all the measures associated with construction
42 and all of the ASJ requirements, have been implemented or are underway. Accordingly,
43 those measures and the ASJ requirements are outside of the scope of the Revised Project
44 and are not considered in this Recirculated Draft SEIR. However, several of the
45 measures associated with air quality and transportation have not been implemented for
46 various reasons, including the permittee’s (China Shipping) assertions that some
47 measures were not feasible due to technological, economic, and operational factors (see

1 Section 1.2.4 for details). The Revised Project (described in Section ES.2 and Chapter 2)
2 makes minor changes to the continued operation of the CS Container Terminal by
3 modifying 10 mitigation measures and one lease measure that were originally adopted in
4 the 2008 EIS/EIR. This SEIR analyzes the impacts of these modifications, in light of
5 conclusions of the certified 2008 EIS/EIR for the CS Container Terminal. The 2008
6 EIS/EIR is used in this Recirculated Draft SEIR as a comparison against which the
7 Revised Project is evaluated (a full description of the baseline is presented in Section 2.6).

8 **ES.1.5 Uses and Scope of the Supplemental EIR**

9 In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15088.5(d) and 15088.5(f), the LAHD is
10 distributing a public Notice of Availability of the Recirculated Draft SEIR to agencies,
11 organizations, and interested groups and persons as well as to every agency, person, or
12 organization that commented on the 2017 Draft SEIR. This Recirculated Draft SEIR will
13 be used to inform decision-makers and the public about the potential significant
14 environmental effects of the Revised Project. Section 1.5 describes the agencies that are
15 expected to use this document, including the lead, responsible, and trustee agencies under
16 CEQA. Reviewers are advised that new comments must be submitted on the
17 Recirculated Draft SEIR, and that although comments received on the 2017 Draft SEIR
18 form part of the administrative record, they may no longer be considered pertinent and as
19 such, would not require a written response by the LAHD in the Final SEIR. The
20 certification by LAHD of the Final SEIR, Notice of Determination, Findings of Fact, and
21 Statement of Overriding Considerations (if necessary) will document the decision of the
22 LAHD as to the adequacy of the Draft SEIR and will inform subsequent decisions by the
23 LAHD whether to approve and implement the Revised Project.

24 Section 1.6 describes the scope and content of the Recirculated Draft SEIR. The scope is
25 based upon the identified environmental issues involved in the Revised Project, namely
26 the modification of operational mitigation measures designed to address air quality and
27 traffic impacts. Accordingly, and pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15163, the
28 SEIR considers only Air Quality, Greenhouse Gases, and Ground Transportation. The
29 Notice of Preparation (NOP) included Noise as an issue to be addressed in the SEIR
30 because mitigation measure MM NOI-2 has not yet been completed. However, the
31 mitigation measure did not specify a completion date and the LAHD is in the process of
32 implementation. Furthermore, a screening analysis conducted by the LAHD has
33 demonstrated that the increases in throughput of the Revised Project compared to the
34 Approved Project would not cause substantial increases in noise levels at sensitive
35 receptors compared to those identified in the 2008 EIS/EIR (see Appendix D). For these
36 reasons, Noise is not considered in the SEIR.

37 The SEIR does not include an analysis of alternatives because the 2008 EIS/EIR analysed
38 a reasonable range of alternatives and because the proposed modifications to mitigation
39 measures in the Revised Project do not concern or alter any analysis of or conclusions
40 reached regarding alternatives analysed in the 2008 EIS/EIR.

41 As described in Section 1.8, if the modifications to the operational mitigation measures
42 proposed as the Revised Project are not approved by the Board of Harbor Commissioners,
43 the CS Container Terminal would continue to operate under the terms previously
44 approved for the project studied in the 2008 EIS/EIR. The environmental impacts
45 determined in the 2008 EIS/EIR for the CS Container Terminal, including significant and
46 unavoidable impacts, would still remain, and the previously approved mitigation
47 measures would still be required.

ES.1.6 Project Objectives

In the 2008 EIS/EIR, the LAHD's objectives for the CS Container Terminal were:

- (1) provide a portion of the facilities needed to accommodate the projected growth in the volume of containerized cargo through the Port;
- (2) comply with the Mayor's goal for the Port to increase growth while mitigating the impacts of that growth on the local communities and the Los Angeles region by implementing pollution control measures, including the elements of the Clean Air Action Plan (CAAP) applicable to the proposed Project; and
- (3) comply with the Port Strategic Plan to maximize the efficiency and capacity of terminals while raising environmental standards through application of all feasible mitigation measures.

The first objective of the 2008 EIS/EIR was achieved by construction of the Approved Project.

The overall purpose of the Revised Project is to further the second and third objectives by eliminating some previously adopted measures that have proved to be infeasible or unnecessary, instituting new, feasible, mitigation measures, and modifying other existing measures to enhance their effectiveness.

ES.1.7 CEQA Baseline

An objective of this Recirculated Draft SEIR is to determine whether modifications to the Approved Project would result in new or substantially more severe significant environmental impacts than disclosed in the 2008 EIS/EIR. To make this determination, impacts resulting from implementation of the Revised Project are compared to a baseline condition. The difference between the Revised Project and the baseline is then compared to a threshold to determine if the difference between the two is significant.

As described in Section 2.6.1.1, a supplemental EIR would typically use the Approved Project, as mitigated, as the baseline conditions for evaluating the impacts of the Revised Project and to disclose the incremental change in environmental impacts between the Approved Project and the Revised Project. This approach is used for analysis of cumulative Ground Transportation impacts to street intersections and at-grade rail crossings (see Section 2.6.1).

The 2017 Draft SEIR used 2014 (the year before the NOP was issued) as the CEQA baseline. Several comments on the 2017 Draft SEIR disagreed with that baseline, alleging that use of a 2014 baseline ignored the period between 2008, when the project was approved, and 2014 during which some mitigation measures were not fully implemented in a timely manner, and that the appropriate baseline would be the year 2000-2001 baseline used in the 2008 EIS/EIR. The LAHD acknowledges that the period of partial implementation was not fully addressed in the 2017 Draft SEIR, and has determined that the appropriate baseline would be 2008. That approach captures the period in question but avoids revisiting the period between 2000 and 2008, which preceded the certification of the 2008 EIS/EIR that this SEIR supplements. Since this SEIR evaluates the effects of proposed modifications to mitigation measures that were analyzed in the previously certified 2008 EIS/EIR, CEQA does not require that this SEIR evaluate impacts compared to a baseline that precedes the conditions analyzed in the 2008 EIS/EIR. Furthermore, it is unnecessary to apply the 2008 baseline to the traffic analysis because no 2008 EIS/EIR mitigation measures related to traffic that are proposed

1 for modification under the Revised Project were required to be implemented before 2015.
2 Accordingly, this Recirculated Draft SEIR employs a 2008 baseline for air quality
3 (including health risk) and greenhouse gases, and a 2014 baseline for the analysis of
4 project-specific traffic impacts.

5 The 2008 baseline for air quality, health risk, and greenhouse gases is a “2008 Actual
6 Baseline”, which employs actual conditions in 2008 including the mitigation measures
7 imposed under the 2008 EIS/EIR that were in place and actually implemented in 2008.
8 The 2008 Actual Baseline also represents conditions in 2008 with full and timely
9 implementation of mitigation measures imposed under the 2008 EIS/EIR, since LAHD
10 has determined that all mitigation measures under the 2008 EIS/EIR that were required to
11 be implemented in 2008 were timely and fully implemented to the extent required in that
12 year.

13 For the analysis of ground transportation, this Recirculated Draft SEIR uses a “2014
14 Mitigated Baseline” to analyze project-specific impacts of proposed modifications to
15 certain ground transportation mitigation measures that were identified in the 2008
16 EIS/EIR. The 2014 Mitigated Baseline for ground transportation impacts assumes that
17 all ground transportation mitigation measures from the 2008 EIS/EIR which were
18 required to be implemented in 2014 were implemented in full in that year. The purpose
19 of assuming full and timely implementation of 2008 EIS/EIR ground transportation
20 mitigation measures in the baseline is to identify the impacts which proposed
21 modifications to certain of those mitigation measures would have, compared to the
22 conditions anticipated, after mitigation, in the previously certified 2008 EIS/EIR which this
23 SEIR supplements.

24 In the case of cumulative impacts related to Ground Transportation, the appropriate
25 baseline is the future conditions that would exist when the related projects and the
26 Revised Project are in full operation. Accordingly, the baselines for this Recirculated
27 Draft SEIR’s analysis of cumulative impacts to street intersections and rail crossings are
28 referred to as “Future Mitigated Baselines,” and they consist of the forecasted 2015, 2030,
29 and 2045 cumulative conditions under the Approved Project, with mitigation, which
30 were disclosed in the 2008 EIS/EIR. The Future Mitigated Baselines represent
31 anticipated traffic conditions (including background traffic growth) at the study
32 intersections and grade crossings during the study years, with the added assumption of
33 timely implementation of all mitigation identified in the 2008 EIS/EIR.

34 **ES.1.8 Analytical Framework**

35 As mentioned above, the 2017 Draft SEIR analyzed the baseline year (2014) and four
36 future years: 2023, 2030, 2036, and 2045. Because this Recirculated Draft SEIR employs
37 a 2008 baseline for air quality and GHG, additional analysis years -- 2012, 2014, and
38 2018 -- have been added to analyze the period of partial implementation of mitigation
39 measures (2012 and 2014 using actual activity data, 2018 using projected activity data).

40 As discussed in Section 2.6.2, this Recirculated Draft SEIR contains several sets of
41 analyses that employ different scenarios evaluating air quality/health risk assessment and
42 greenhouse gas impacts. For cumulative ground transportation impacts, the Recirculated
43 Draft SEIR compares impacts of future operations of the CS Container Terminal as
44 analyzed in the 2008 EIS/EIR to those now projected to occur, based on changes in
45 throughput, technology, and other factors. The Recirculated Draft SEIR also analyzes
46 scenarios in which two intermodal rail projects that could affect traffic related to the CS
47 Container Terminal are or are not built. These projects include the Union Pacific

1 Intermodal Container Transfer Facility (ICTF) near-dock railyard expansion, and the
2 BNSF Southern California International Gateway (SCIG) near-dock railyard. In addition,
3 the traffic analysis added six intersections and two freeway segments in response to a
4 comment on the 2017 Draft SEIR.

5 **ES.2 Revised Project**

6 **ES.2.1 Background**

7 The CS Container Terminal (Figure ES-1) is located in the Port of Los Angeles. The
8 Project site lies on the western side of the Los Angeles Harbor Main Channel, and is
9 generally bounded by the World Cruise Center and San Pedro waterfront to the south, I-
10 110 and the community of San Pedro to the west, the West Basin and the Yang Ming
11 Container Terminal to the north, and the Main Channel, Turning Basin, and Berths 222 –
12 228 to the east. Land access is provided by a network of arterial routes and freeways (I-
13 110, I-710, I- 405, and State Route [SR]-103/SR-47).

14 **ES.2.2 Overview**

15 The Revised Project involves the operation of the CS Container Terminal from 2008 to
16 2014 under the set of mitigation measures imposed on the Approved Project by the 2008
17 EIS/EIR (Section 2.5.1), to the extent those were implemented, and its continued
18 operation in the future under new and/or modified mitigation measures (described in
19 Section 2.5.2). The revisions to the mitigation measures include modifications of details
20 of the implementation of a measure, substitution of new measures, and elimination of
21 some measures altogether. Other components of the Approved Project, including
22 construction and the physical operation of the CS Container Terminal and all other
23 mitigation measures, remain the same as those evaluated in the 2008 EIS/EIR.

24 The 2008 EIS/EIR assumed that at full capacity, in 2030, the 142-acre CS Container
25 Terminal would handle approximately 1,551,000 TEUs, which is roughly equivalent to
26 8,400 standard shipping containers, per year. That throughput would require 1,508,000
27 truck trips, 234 vessel calls, and 817 train trips per year. Those numbers were based on
28 cargo forecasting performed in 2005.

29 Since the 2008 EIS/EIR, there have been a number of changes in the operational activity
30 of the CS Container Terminal. Actual throughput has only slightly exceeded forecasted
31 throughput, but numbers of truck trips and trains trips have been substantially lower than
32 forecasted in the 2008 EIS/EIR (Table 2-3).
33

1

Figure ES-1: Berths 97-109 (China Shipping) Container Terminal

2

3 ES.2.3 Project Description

4 The Revised Project elements are described in detail in Section 2.5.2. Under the Revised
 5 Project, the CS Container Terminal would operate under a different suite of mitigation
 6 and lease measures. For the analysis of future operations the Recirculated Draft SEIR
 7 analyzes the Revised Project with the measures described in Table ES-1 in place instead
 8 of the corresponding measures analyzed for the Approved Project with mitigation in the
 9 2008 EIS/EIR. Mitigation measures (MMs) and lease measures (LMs) are summarized
 10 below and all acronyms used hereafter are defined in Chapter 7.

Table ES-1. Mitigation and Lease Measures in the Approved Project and the Revised Project

2008 EIS/EIR Measure	Approved Project	Revised Project
MM AQ-9 Alternative Maritime Power	China Shipping ships calling at Berths 97-109 must use AMP in the following percentages while hoteling in the Port. Jan-Jun 2005: 60%; July 2005: 70%; Jan 2010: 90%; Jan 2011: 100%. Additionally, by 2010, all ships retrofitted for AMP shall be required to use AMP while hoteling at a 100 percent compliance rate, with the exception of circumstances when an AMP-capable berth is unavailable due to utilization by another AMP-capable ship.	Starting on the effective date of a new lease amendment between the Tenant and the LAHD and annually thereafter, all ships calling at Berths 97-109 must use AMP while hoteling in the Port, with a 95 percent compliance rate. Exceptions may be made if one of the following circumstances or conditions exists: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emergencies • An AMP-capable berth is unavailable • An AMP-capable ship is not able to plug in • The vessel is not AMP-capable. In the event one of these circumstances or conditions exist, an equivalent alternative at-berth emission control capture system shall be deployed, if feasible, based on availability, scheduling, operational feasibility, and contracting requirements between the provider of the equivalent alternative technology and the terminal operator. The equivalent alternative technology must, at a minimum, meet the emissions reductions that would be achieved from AMP.
MM AQ-10 Vessel Speed Reduction Program	Starting in 2009, all ships calling at Berths 97-109 shall comply with the expanded VSRP of 12 knots between 40 nm .	Starting on the effective date of a new lease amendment between the Tenant and the LAHD and annually thereafter, at least 95 percent of vessels calling at Berths 97-109 shall either 1) comply with the expanded VSRP of 12 knots between 40 nm from Point Fermin and the Precautionary Area or 2) comply with an alternative compliance plan approved by the LAHD for a specific vessel and type. Any alternative compliance plan shall be submitted to LAHD at least 90 days in advance for approval, and shall be supported by data that demonstrates the ability of the alternative compliance plan for the specific vessel and type to achieve emissions reductions comparable to or greater than those achievable by compliance with the VSRP. The alternative compliance plan shall be implemented once written notice of approval is granted by the LAHD.
MM AQ-15 Yard Tractors at Berth 97-106 Terminal	Starting in 2015, all yard tractors at the Berths 97-109 terminal to have cleanest available NO _x alternative-fueled engine meeting 0.015 gm/hp-hr for PM.	1) No later than one year after the effective date of a new lease amendment between the Tenant and the LAHD, all LPG yard tractors of model years 2007 or older shall be replaced with alternative-fuel units that

Table ES-1. Mitigation and Lease Measures in the Approved Project and the Revised Project

2008 EIS/EIR Measure	Approved Project	Revised Project
		<p>meet or are lower than a NOx emission rate of 0.02 g/bhp-hr and Tier 4 final off-road emission rates for other criteria pollutants.</p> <p>2) No later than five years after the effective date of a new lease amendment between the Tenant and the LAHD, all LPG yard tractors of model years 2011 or older shall be replaced with alternative-fuel units that meet or are lower than a NOx emission rate of 0.02 g/bhp-hr and Tier 4 final off-road engine emission rates for other criteria pollutants.</p>
MM AQ-16 Yard Equipment at Berth 121-131 Rail Yard	All diesel-powered CHE at the WBICTF rail yard that handles Berth 97-109 terminal's containers shall meet Tier 4 non-road standards by the end of 2014.	CHE at railyard measure combined with MM AQ-17 below.
MM AQ-17 Yard Equipment at Berth 97-106 Terminal	All RTGs to be electric-powered by 2009 and all diesel-powered CHE at the Berth 97-109 terminal shall meet Tier 4 engine standards by the end of 2014.	<p>All yard equipment at the terminal except yard tractors shall implement the following requirements:</p> <p><u>Forklifts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By one year after the effective date of a new lease amendment between the Tenant and the LAHD, all 18-ton diesel forklifts of model years 2004 and older shall be replaced with units that meet or are lower than Tier 4 final off-road engine emission rates for PM and NO_x. • By two years after the effective date of a new lease amendment between the Tenant and the LAHD, all 18-ton diesel forklifts of model years 2005 and older shall be replaced with units that meet or exceed Tier 4 final off-road engine emission rates for PM and NO_x. • By two years after the effective date of a new lease amendment between the Tenant and the LAHD, all 5-ton forklifts of model years 2011 or older shall be replaced with zero-emission units. • By three years after the effective date of a new lease amendment between the Tenant and the LAHD, all 18-ton diesel forklifts of model years 2007 and older shall be replaced with units that meet or are lower than Tier 4 final off-road engine emission rates for PM and NO_x.

Table ES-1. Mitigation and Lease Measures in the Approved Project and the Revised Project

2008 EIS/EIR Measure	Approved Project	Revised Project
		<p><u>Top-picks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By one year after the effective date of a new lease amendment between the Tenant and the LAHD, all diesel top-picks of model years 2006 and older shall be replaced with units that meet or are lower than Tier 4 final off-road engine emission rates for PM and NO_x. • By three years after the effective date of a new lease amendment between the Tenant and the LAHD, all diesel top-picks of model years 2007 and older shall be replaced with units that meet or are lower than Tier 4 final off-road engine emission rates for PM and NO_x. • By five years after the effective date of a new lease amendment between the Tenant and the LAHD, all diesel top-picks of model years 2014 and older shall be replaced with units that meet or are lower than Tier 4 final off-road engine emission rates for PM and NO_x. <p><u>Rubber-Tired Gantry Cranes (RTGs)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By three years after the effective date of a new lease amendment between the Tenant and the LAHD, all diesel RTG cranes of model years 2003 and older shall be replaced with diesel-electric hybrid units with diesel engines that meet or are lower than Tier 4 final off-road engine standards for PM and NO_x. • By five years after the effective date of a new lease amendment between the Tenant and the LAHD, all diesel RTG cranes of model years 2004 and older shall be replaced with diesel-electric hybrid units with diesel engines that meet or are lower than Tier 4 final off-road engine standards for PM and NO_x. • By seven years after the effective date of a new lease amendment between the Tenant and the LAHD, four RTG cranes of model years 2005 and older shall be replaced with all-electric units, and one diesel RTG crane of model year 2005 shall be replaced with a

Table ES-1. Mitigation and Lease Measures in the Approved Project and the Revised Project

2008 EIS/EIR Measure	Approved Project	Revised Project
		<p>diesel-electric hybrid unit with a diesel engine that meets or is lower than Tier 4 final off-road engine standards for PM and NO_x.</p> <p><u>Sweepers</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sweeper(s) shall be alternative fuel or the cleanest available by six years after the effective date of a new lease amendment between the Tenant and the LAHD. <p><u>Shuttle Buses</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gasoline shuttle buses shall be zero emissions by seven years after the effective date of a new lease amendment between the Tenant and the LAHD.
MM AQ-20	Heavy-duty trucks entering the Berth 97-109 Terminal shall be LNG fueled in the following percentages: 50% in 2012 and 2013, 70% 2014 through 2017, 100% in 2018 and thereafter.	Not included in the Revised Project because there is no feasible substitute or replacement measure for requiring a terminal specific drayage truck fleet.
LM AQ-23	If the Project exceeds project throughput assumptions/projections anticipated through the years 2010, 2015, 2030, or 2045, staff shall evaluate the effects of this on the emissions sources (ship calls, locomotive activity, backland development, and truck calls) relative to the EIS/EIR. If it is determined that these emissions sources exceed EIS/EIR assumptions, staff would evaluate actual air emissions for comparison with the EIS/EIR and if the criteria pollutant emissions exceed those in the EIS/EIR, then new or additional mitigations would be applied through MM AQ-22 Periodic Review of New Technology Regulations.	MM AQ-23 is not included in the Revised Project. Periodic reviews of throughput are unnecessary. Lease Measure AQ-1, below, would ensure a regular check-in process and evaluation of the cleanest available technology when equipment is purchased or replaced by the tenant.
MM TRANS-2 Alameda and Anaheim Streets	Provide an additional eastbound through-lane on Anaheim Street. This measure shall be implemented by 2015.	Provide an additional eastbound through-lane on Anaheim Street. This measure shall be implemented at the same time as the City's planned improvement project at this location, with design/construction commencing in the first quarter of 2019, subject to LADOT approval.

Table ES-1. Mitigation and Lease Measures in the Approved Project and the Revised Project

2008 EIS/EIR Measure	Approved Project	Revised Project
MM TRANS-3 John S. Gibson Boulevard and I-110 NB Ramps	Provide an additional southbound and westbound right-turn lane on John S. Gibson Boulevard and I-110 NB ramps. Reconfigure the eastbound approach to one eastbound through-left-turn lane, and one eastbound through-right-turn lane. Provide an additional westbound right-turn lane with westbound right-turn overlap phasing. This measure shall be implemented by 2015.	Provide an additional westbound right-turn lane with westbound right-turn overlap phasing and an additional southbound left-turn lane. LAHD shall monitor the intersection LOS annually beginning in 2019, and shall implement within three years after the intersection LOS is measured D or worse and the China Shipping terminal is found to contribute to the cumulative impact, with the concurrence of LADOT.
MM TRANS-4 Fries Avenue and Harry Bridges Boulevard	Provide an additional westbound through-lane on Harry Bridges Boulevard. Provide an additional northbound, eastbound, and westbound right-turn lane on Fries Avenue and Harry Bridges Boulevard. This measure shall be implemented by 2015.	Would not be implemented under the Revised Project because current data indicates it is not needed.
MM TRANS-6 Navy Way and Seaside Avenue	Provide an additional eastbound through-lane on Seaside Avenue. Reconfigure the westbound approach to one left-turn lane and three through-lanes. This measure shall be implemented by 2030.	Would not be implemented under the Revised Project because a future project will improve the intersection, which has been studied in the SEIR.

1

SEIR Measure	Approved Project	Revised Project
LM AQ-1 Cleanest Available Cargo Handling Equipment	Not included in Approved Project.	Subject to zero and near-zero emissions feasibility assessments that shall be carried out by LAHD, with input from Tenant as part of the CAAP process, Tenant shall replace cargo handling equipment with the cleanest available equipment anytime new or replacement equipment is purchased, with a first preference for zero-emission equipment, a second preference for near-zero equipment, and then for the cleanest available if zero or near-zero equipment is not feasible, provided that LAHD shall conduct engineering assessments to confirm that such equipment is capable of installation at the terminal. Starting one year after the effective date of a new lease amendment between the Tenant and the LAHD, tenant shall submit to the Port an equipment inventory and 10-

SEIR Measure	Approved Project	Revised Project
		<p>year procurement plan for new cargo-handling equipment, and infrastructure, and will update the procurement plan annually in order to assist with planning for transition of equipment to zero emissions in accordance with the forgoing paragraph.</p> <p>LAHD will include a summary of zero and near-zero emission equipment operating at the terminal each year as part of mitigation measure tracking.</p>
LM AQ-2 Priority Access for Drayage	Not included in Approved Project.	A priority access system shall be implemented at the terminal to provide preferential access to zero- and near-zero-emission trucks.
LM AQ-3 Demonstration of Zero-Emissions Equipment	Not included in Approved Project.	<p>Tenant shall conduct a one-year zero emission demonstration project with at least 10 units of zero-emission cargo handling equipment. Upon completion, tenant shall submit a report to LAHD that evaluates the feasibility of permanent use of the tested equipment. Tenant shall continue to test zero-emission equipment and provide feasibility assessments and progress reports in 2020 and 2025 to evaluate the status of zero- emission technologies and infrastructure as well as operational and financial considerations, with a goal of 100% zero-emission cargo handling equipment by 2030.</p>
MM GHG-1 GHG Credit Fund	Not included in Approved Project.	All lighting within the interior of buildings on the premises and outdoor high mast terminal lighting will be replaced with LED lighting or a technology with similar energy-saving capabilities within two years after the effective date of a new lease amendment between the Tenant and the LAHD or by no later than 2023.
LM GHG-1 GHG Credit Fund	Not included in Approved Project.	<p>LAHD shall establish a carbon offset fund, which may be accomplished through a Memorandum of Understanding with the California Air Resources Board or another appropriate entity. The fund shall be used for GHG-reducing projects and programs on Port of Los Angeles property. It shall be the responsibility of the Tenant to contribute to the fund. Tenant shall have the option to either: (i) make a one-time fund contribution of \$250,000, payable upon execution of a new lease amendment, or (ii) make a payment in 2030, at the time the peak impact would occur, in an amount calculated based on the market value of carbon credits at that time, and actual GHG emissions that exceed whatever GHG</p>

SEIR Measure	Approved Project	Revised Project
		threshold exists at that time as approved by the LAHD. If LAHD is unable to establish the fund within a reasonable period of time, Tenant shall instead purchase credits from an approved GHG offset registry.

1
2

ES.3 Environmental Impacts.

Based on the Initial Study in the NOP, the following issues have been determined to be potentially significant and are therefore evaluated in this Recirculated Draft SEIR:

- Air Quality and Meteorology
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Ground Transportation

Chapter 3, Environmental Analysis, of this Recirculated Draft SEIR evaluates those issues. The criteria for determining the significance of environmental impacts are described for each resource topic in Chapter 3, Environmental Analysis. Mitigation measures to reduce impacts to less than significant are proposed whenever feasible. Chapter 4, Cumulative Analysis, discusses the cumulative impacts of the Revised Project.

Summary descriptions of the impacts, new mitigation measures, and residual impacts for the Revised Project are provided in Table ES-2.

ES.3.1 Impacts Not Considered in the SEIR

The NOP (Appendix A) concluded that certain topics would be excluded from the SEIR because (a) the 2008 EIS/ EIR concluded that there were no significant impacts associated with those topics, or (b) the mitigation measures proposed in the 2008 EIS/EIR have been implemented and/or completed, or (c) the mitigation measures are in progress and would mitigate impacts of the Revised Project to a less-than-significant level, and/or (d) the level of significance is unchanged from that described in the 2008 EIS/EIR and any modification to the mitigation measures or assumed incremental increase in throughput is not expected to affect that finding. Accordingly, the SEIR does not re-analyze or recirculate biology, cultural resources, geology, groundwater and soils, hazardous materials, land use, marine transportation, public services, recreation, utilities, and water quality, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15163. In addition, as described in Section 1.3, although the NOP indicated that noise impacts would be re-evaluated, subsequent evaluation has determined that noise does not need to be re-evaluated.

Finally, re-evaluations of socioeconomics and environmental justice are not required, socioeconomics because the Revised Project would have no effect on employment, and environmental justice because CEQA does not require that analysis.

LAHD re-evaluated the scope of impacts to be covered in the Draft SEIR when, following the NOP review process, it was determined that the capacity of the CS Container Terminal had increased incrementally compared to the capacity identified in

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

1 the 2008 EIS/EIR. In light of this determination, LAHD conducted a “screening analysis”
2 to identify whether there were any impact areas analyzed in the 2008 EIS/EIR, but not
3 already being analyzed in the Draft SEIR (i.e., all except Air Quality, Greenhouse Gases,
4 and Ground Transportation), in which there would be the potential for a new or
5 substantially more severe significant impact due to the incremental increase in throughput
6 under the Revised Project. That analysis, which is presented in Appendix D to this
7 Recirculated Draft SEIR, confirms that the SEIR is not required to assess the following
8 impact areas: Aesthetics, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology, Hazards
9 and Hazardous Materials, Land Use, Marine Transportation, Noise, Recreation, Utilities;
10 Water Quality, Sediments, and Oceanography, or Socioeconomics.

11 **ES.3.2 Impacts of the Revised Project**

12 **ES.3.2.1 Unavoidable Significant Impacts**

13 Table ES-2 identifies unavoidable significant impacts associated with the Revised Project.
14 This Recirculated Draft SEIR has determined that implementation of the Revised Project
15 would result in unavoidable significant impacts on air quality, greenhouse gases, and
16 ground transportation.

17 **Air Quality**

18 The 2008 EIS/EIR determined that the Approved Project, even with implementation of
19 all mitigation measures, would have significant and unavoidable impacts relative to air
20 quality. Operation of the Revised Project relative to the 2008 Actual Baseline would
21 result in incremental peak daily emissions of CO in analysis years 2012, 2014, 2018 and
22 2023, of NO_x in analysis years 2014, 2018, 2023, 2030 and 2036, and of VOCs in
23 analysis years 2014, 2018, 2023, 2030, 2036 and 2045 that would exceed SCAQMD
24 significance thresholds. These exceedances would represent significant impacts. As
25 discussed in Section 3.1.4.4, no additional mitigation beyond the measures that constitute
26 the Revised Project are available to reduce emissions below the thresholds. Three lease
27 measures would likely reduce emissions, but as their effects cannot be quantified they
28 cannot be assumed to reduce impacts to less than significant. Accordingly, these impacts
29 would be significant and unavoidable.

30 **LM AQ-1: Cleanest Available Cargo Handling Equipment.** Subject to zero
31 and near-zero emissions feasibility assessments that shall be carried out by
32 LAHD, with input from Tenant as part of the CAAP process, Tenant shall
33 replace cargo handling equipment with the cleanest available equipment anytime
34 new or replacement equipment is purchased, with a first preference for zero-
35 emission equipment, a second preference for near-zero equipment, and then for
36 the cleanest available if zero or near-zero equipment is not feasible, provided that
37 LAHD shall conduct engineering assessments to confirm that such equipment is
38 capable of installation at the terminal.

39 Starting one year after the effective date of a new lease amendment between the
40 Tenant and the LAHD, tenant shall submit to the Port an equipment inventory
41 and 10-year procurement plan for new cargo-handling equipment, and
42 infrastructure, and will update the procurement plan annually in order to assist
43 with planning for transition of equipment to zero emissions in accordance with
44 the forgoing paragraph.

1 LAHD will include a summary of zero and near-zero emission equipment
2 operating at the terminal each year as part of mitigation measure tracking.

3 **LM AQ-2: Priority Access System:** A priority access system shall be
4 implemented at the terminal to provide preferential access to zero- and near-zero-
5 emission trucks.

6 **LM AQ-3: Demonstration of Zero Emissions Equipment .** Tenant shall
7 conduct a one-year zero emission demonstration project with at least ten units of
8 zero-emission cargo handling equipment. Upon completion of the one-year
9 demonstration, Tenant shall submit a report to LAHD that evaluates the
10 feasibility of permanent use of the tested equipment. Tenant shall continue to
11 test the zero-emission equipment and provide feasibility assessments and
12 progress reports in 2020 and 2025 to evaluate the status of zero-emission
13 equipment technologies and infrastructure as well as operational and financial
14 considerations, with a goal of 100% zero-emission cargo handling equipment by
15 2030.

16 Operation of the Revised Project would result in ambient off-site concentrations that
17 would exceed the federal 1-hour NO₂ standard in 2014 and 2018, and the state standards
18 for 1-hour NO₂ in 2014, annual NO₂ in 2014 and 2018, 24-hour PM₁₀ in 2014 through
19 2045, and annual PM₁₀ in 2014 through 2045. These exceedances would represent
20 significant impacts. No additional mitigation beyond the measures that constitute the
21 Revised Project are available to reduce emissions, and hence ambient NO₂ and PM₁₀
22 concentrations, below the thresholds, and the impact would remain significant and
23 unavoidable.

24 Operation of the Revised Project would result in incremental individual cancer risks,
25 relative to the Future (Floating) Baseline, that would exceed 10 in a million at residential,
26 sensitive, and occupational receptors in the immediate vicinity of the CS Terminal. The
27 maximum incremental individual residential cancer risk from the Revised Project is
28 predicted to be 24.3 in a million, and would occur on Knoll Hill. These exceedances
29 would constitute a significant impact. No additional mitigation beyond the measures that
30 constitute the Revised Project are available to reduce emissions of TACs, and hence
31 health risk impacts, below the thresholds. Accordingly, impacts of emissions of TAC
32 would remain significant and unavoidable.

33 **Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

34 The Revised Project would result in GHG emissions in excess of the SCAQMD 10,000
35 mty CO₂e threshold in every analysis year, even after the application of mitigation
36 measures AQ-9, AQ-10, and AQ-17. The 2008 EIS/EIR found that the Approved Project
37 would also have a significant and unavoidable impact relative to GHG and climate
38 change.

39 For the impacts related to GHG emissions, a new mitigation measure has been applied:

40 **MM GHG-1: LED Lighting:** All lighting within the interior of buildings on
41 the premises and outdoor high mast terminal lighting will be replaced with LED
42 lighting or a technology with similar energy-saving capabilities within two years
43 after the effective date of a new lease amendment between the Tenant and the
44 LAHD or by no later than 2023.

45 The effects of converting high-mast light poles to LED on electricity-consumption GHG
46 emissions is quantified; the effects of converting interior lighting to LED is not quantified.

1 No additional mitigation is available that could reduce the impacts to less than significant
2 levels. One lease measure would likely reduce emissions, but as its effects cannot be
3 quantified it cannot be assumed to reduce impacts to less than significant. Therefore,
4 impacts of GHG emissions are considered significant and unavoidable.

5 **LM GHG-1: GHG Credit Fund:** LAHD shall establish a carbon offset fund,
6 which may be accomplished through a Memorandum of Understanding with the
7 California Air Resources Board or another appropriate entity. The fund shall be
8 used for GHG-reducing projects and programs on Port of Los Angeles property.
9 It shall be the responsibility of the Tenant to contribute to the fund. Tenant shall
10 have the option to either: (i) make a one-time fund contribution of \$250,000,
11 payable upon execution of a new lease amendment, or (ii) make a payment in
12 2030, at the time the peak impact would occur, in an amount calculated based on
13 the market value of carbon credits at that time, and actual GHG emissions that
14 exceed whatever GHG threshold exists at that time as approved by the LAHD. If
15 LAHD is unable to establish the fund within a reasonable period of time, Tenant
16 shall instead purchase credits from an approved GHG offset registry.

17 While there are not currently any regulations under which the Project is required to
18 reduce GHG emissions, a number of statewide and local plans and policies encourage
19 such reductions. The Revised Project would be inconsistent with some state and local
20 plans and policies adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions and climate
21 change impacts.

22 **Ground Transportation**

23 The Revised Project would result in additional truck trips on Port-area streets compared
24 to the Approved Project. The analysis conducted for this Recirculated Draft SEIR
25 determined that the Revised Project would have a significant impact on operating
26 conditions at the intersection of Alameda and Anaheim streets (Study Location #3).
27 Application of MM TRANS-2 (addition of an eastbound lane on Anaheim Street) would
28 reduce the impact to less than significant. This mitigation measure was originally
29 included in the 2008 EIS/EIR, but was eliminated from the Revised Project on the basis
30 of available data indicating that it would not be needed. However, because the project-
31 specific analysis in this Recirculated Draft SEIR determined that the measure is needed,
32 MM TRANS-2 is re-imposed as a new measure but with a revised implementation
33 schedule and with coordination with another planned improvement at that intersection.

34 **MM TRANS-2 Alameda & Anaheim Streets:** Provide an additional eastbound
35 through-lane on Anaheim Street. This mitigation measure shall be implemented
36 at the same time as the City's planned improvement project at this location, with
37 design/construction commencing in the first quarter of 2019, subject to LADOT
38 approval.

39 Implementation of the mitigation measure would avoid identified impacts. However,
40 because LADOT approval is not guaranteed, the impact is significant and unavoidable. If
41 LADOT approves the implementation of this mitigation measure, then the impact would
42 be reduced to less than significant.

43 **ES.3.2.2 Summary of Less than Significant Impacts**

44 Table ES-2 identifies the resource areas where less than significant impacts were
45 determined. This Draft SEIR has determined that implementation of the Revised Project
46 would result in a less than significant impact on:

Air Quality

The Revised Project's peak daily emissions of all criteria pollutants except CO, NO_x, and VOCs would not exceed SCAQMD significance thresholds in any analysis year.

Accordingly, the Revised Project's impacts related to PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, and SO_x would be less than significant.

The Revised Project would not result in exceedances of ambient off-site concentrations of SO₂, CO, and PM_{2.5}, and impacts related to those air pollutants would be less than significant. The Revised Project would also not result in acute or chronic non-cancer health effects or cancer burden that would represent a significant impact.

The Revised Project would be consistent with the 2016 AQMP and would not obstruct its implementation.

Ground Transportation

Traffic generated by the Revised Project and elimination of mitigation measures included in the 2008 EIS/EIR would not cause changes in V/C ratios or levels of service (LOS) that would exceed the significance thresholds established by the cities of Los Angeles, Long Beach, and Carson at any study intersection except #3 (Alameda and Anaheim streets, see above). Accordingly, impacts on operating conditions at all study intersections other than #3 would be less than significant.

The Revised Project would result in additional truck trips on the surrounding freeway system, but those added trips would not cause an increase of 0.02 or more of the D/C ratio of any freeway link operating at LOS F or worse compared to either the CEQA 2014 Mitigated Baseline or the future baselines. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant.

The 2008 EIS/EIR predicted significant impacts on vehicle delay at two rail grade crossings in the area of the CS Terminal, Henry Ford Avenue and Avalon Boulevard. The Avalon Boulevard crossing was eliminated by the Wilmington Grade Separation and was therefore not part of the Draft SEIR's evaluation. The Henry Ford Avenue crossing would be affected by train traffic from the CS Terminal, but compared to the 2014 Mitigated Baseline, the Revised Project's trains would not cause additional vehicular delay that would cause total per-vehicle delay to exceed 55 seconds. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant.

ES.3.2.3 Cumulative Impacts

This Recirculated Draft SEIR defines cumulative impacts as the changes in the environment resulting from the incremental impact of the Revised Project when added to other closely related recent, current, and reasonably foreseeable future projects. This definition is consistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15355(b). Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time.

Sixty-eight related projects in the general area of the CS Terminal could contribute to impacts that could be cumulatively significant. The Revised Project was analyzed in conjunction with those related projects for its potential to contribute to significant cumulative impacts. The analysis was conducted for the future years considering the predicted activity levels for those years without the Revised Project (termed the future baseline). This approach differs from the project-specific analyses summarized above,

1 which assess impacts relative to the CEQA baselines of, for this project, 2008 (Air
2 Quality and Greenhouse Gases) and 2014 (Ground Transportation).

3 Cumulative impact evaluations for each resource are included in Chapter 4 of this
4 Recirculated Draft SEIR. The Revised Project would have a cumulatively considerable
5 contribution to significant cumulative impacts for air quality, greenhouse gases, and
6 ground transportation.

7 **Air Quality**

8 The Revised Project would make cumulatively considerable contributions to cumulative
9 impacts related to mass emissions of criteria pollutants. Specifically, emissions of CO,
10 NO_x, and VOCs would exceed SCAQMD criteria in one or more of the analysis years
11 (Section 3.1.4.4), and the related projects are assumed to represent a significant
12 cumulative impact with respect to emissions of criteria pollutants. No additional
13 feasible mitigation is available.

14 The Revised Project would make cumulatively considerable contributions to significant
15 cumulative impacts with regard to ambient concentrations of NO₂ and PM₁₀.
16 Specifically, ambient off-site concentrations of NO₂ would exceed federal and state one-
17 hour thresholds and the state annual average threshold in one or more analysis years and
18 PM₁₀ would exceed the state 24-hour and annual average thresholds (Section 3.1.4.4).
19 No additional mitigation beyond the measures imposed on the Revised Project are
20 available to reduce cumulative impacts.

21 The Revised Project would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a
22 significant cumulative impact with regard to cancer risk. Specifically, residential,
23 sensitive, and occupational receptors would experience cancer risk that would exceed 10
24 in a million, and the individual cancer risk for occupational receptors would exceed the
25 threshold relative to the future floating baseline. No additional mitigation beyond the
26 measures imposed on the Revised Project are available to reduce cumulative impacts.

27 The Revised Project would not increase non-cancer chronic or acute impacts, or the
28 cancer burden, above significance thresholds. As a result, without mitigation, the
29 Revised Project would not make a considerable contribution to significant cumulative
30 non-cancer chronic or acute health impacts or the cancer burden.

31 **Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

32 Operational emissions of GHGs by the Revised Project would exceed SCAQMD's
33 threshold in all analysis years. Impacts of the Revised Project would combine with
34 impacts from related projects, which would already be cumulatively significant. As a
35 result, without mitigation, impacts from Revised Project operation would make a
36 cumulatively considerable contribution to an existing significant cumulative impact
37 related to GHG and global climate change.

38 The Revised Project already includes all feasible mitigation measures whose effects can
39 be quantified. In addition, MM GHG-1 (LED Lighting) and LM GHG-1 (GHG Credit
40 Fund) have been added, but those measures would not reduce the impact to less than
41 significant.

42 **Ground Transportation**

43 The 2008 EIS/EIR analyzed the CS Terminal's effects on regional traffic at 24
44 intersections and 12 freeway segments (Section 3.3.4), predicted significant impacts

1 relative to the future baseline (i.e., cumulative impacts) at six intersections, and imposed
2 a number of mitigation measures.

3 Since that time, there has been less traffic than originally predicted, and a number of
4 traffic improvement projects, including many elements of the original mitigation
5 measures, have been completed. As a result, traffic conditions have improved to the
6 point that the analysis in the Recirculated Draft SEIR found a significant impact at only
7 two study intersection relative to a future baseline.

8 The intersection of Alameda and Anaheim Streets (Study Location #3) would experience
9 cumulative impacts during the P.M. peak hour in 2015 and the A.M. and P.M. peak hours
10 in 2030 and 2045. MM TRANS-2, which would be implemented for the project-specific
11 impact as described in Section ES.3.2.2, would mitigate those impacts. However,
12 because LADOT approval of MM TRANS-2 is not guaranteed, the revised Project would
13 make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact to
14 Study Location #3 (Alameda Street/Anaheim Street). If LADOT approves the
15 implementation of MM TRANS-2, then the contribution of the Revised Project will be
16 reduced to less than cumulatively considerable.

17 The John S. Gibson/I-110 northbound ramp intersection (study location #7, immediately
18 outside the CS Terminal truck gate) would experience LOS F during all three peak
19 periods during all analysis years (2015, 2030, 2045), and the CS Terminal's traffic would
20 contribute to that significant cumulative impact. Completion of the 2008 EIS/EIR's MM
21 TRANS-3, most elements of which have already been constructed, would partially
22 mitigate that impact, but an additional southbound lane is required to fully mitigate the
23 impact to less than significant. Accordingly, MM TRANS-3 is reimposed as a new
24 measure but with a revised implementation schedule:

25 **MM TRANS-3 John S. Gibson Boulevard at I-110 Northbound Ramps –**

26 Provide an additional westbound right-turn lane with westbound right-turn
27 overlap phasing and an additional southbound left-turn lane. LAHD shall
28 monitor the intersection LOS annually beginning in 2019 and shall implement
29 the mitigation within three years after the intersection level of service (LOS) is
30 measured as D or worse and the China Shipping terminal is found to contribute to
31 the cumulative impact, with the concurrence of LADOT.

32 The Revised Project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a
33 significant cumulative freeway congestion impact, nor would it make a cumulatively
34 considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact related to vehicular delay at
35 at-grade rail crossings.

Table ES-2: Summary of Potential Significant Impacts and Revised Project Mitigation

Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Impacts after Mitigation
3.1 Air Quality and Meteorology			
AQ-3: Would the Revised Project would result in operational emissions that exceed an SCAQMD threshold of significance in Table 3.1-6?	Impacts of CO, NO _x , and PM ₁₀ emissions would be significant in multiple analysis years.	Revised: MM AQ-9: AMP MM AQ-10: VSRP MM AQ-15: Yard Tractors MM AQ-17: Cargo-Handling Equipment	Significant and unavoidable.
AQ-4: Would Revised project operations result in off-site ambient air pollutant concentrations that exceeds a SCAQMD threshold of significance in Table 3.1-10?	The impacts of NO ₂ and PM ₁₀ emissions (24-hour and annual average) would be significant in multiple analysis years.	New: LM AQ-1: Cleanest Available Cargo Handling Equipment	Significant and unavoidable.
AQ-7: Would the Revised Project expose receptors to significant levels of TACs?	Operations would result in significant cancer risk impacts for residential, occupational, and sensitive receptors.	LM AQ-2: Priority Access for Drayage LM AQ-3: Demonstration of Zero Emissions Equipment	Significant and unavoidable.
3.2 Greenhouse Gases			
GHG-1: Would the Revised Project generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly that would exceed the SCAQMD 10,000 mty CO ₂ e threshold?	Significant	New: MM GHG-1: LED Lighting. LM GHG-1: GHG Credit Fund	Significant and unavoidable.
3.3 Ground Transportation			
TRANS – 2: Would vehicular traffic associated with the Revised Project increase an intersection’s V/C ratio in accordance with applicable guidelines?	The Revised Project would have a significant impact on the intersection of Alameda and Anaheim Streets.	Revised: MM TRANS-2: Alameda & Anaheim Streets.	Significant and unavoidable.
	The Revised Project would make cumulatively considerable contributions to significant cumulative impacts at the Alameda and Anaheim intersection and at the John S. Gibson/I-110 N/B Ramps intersection.	Revised: MM TRANS-2: Alameda and Anaheim Streets. MM TRANS-3: John S. Gibson Boulevard and I-110 N/B Ramps.	Significant and unavoidable.
TRANS – 4: Would the Revised Project result in an increase of 0.02 or more in the D/C ratio with a	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant.

Table ES-2: Summary of Potential Significant Impacts and Revised Project Mitigation

Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Impacts after Mitigation
resulting LOS F at a CMP freeway monitoring station?			
TRANS -5: Would the Revised Project cause delays in regional highway traffic due to an increase in rail activity?	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant.

1

1 **ES.4 Public Comment Issues Raised**

2 During the NOP scoping process, individuals and organizations provided comments on
3 the scope and content of the Draft SEIR. The NOP scoping period lasted from July 21,
4 2016 until August 19, 2016, and included one scoping meeting on August 3, 2016. The
5 LAHD released the Draft SEIR for public review and comment on June 16, 2017 and
6 held a public hearing on the Draft SEIR on July 18, 2017.

7 Tables 1-3 and 1-4 in Chapter 1 summarize the relevant comments on the NOP and the
8 2017 Draft SEIR and indicate where a particular comment would be addressed in the
9 Recirculated Draft SEIR. Key comments urged the LAHD to revise the CEQA baseline,
10 to apply all feasible mitigation, including measures that go beyond those in the 2008
11 EIS/EIR, to disclose the actual emissions and resultant impacts that occurred between
12 2008 and 2014, to implement all transportation mitigations, and to deploy the lowest-
13 emission technologies possible, per MM AQ-22 of the 2008 EIS/EIR.

14 **ES.5 Issues to be Resolved**

15 Section 15123(b)(3) of the state CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR contain issues to
16 be resolved; this includes whether or how to mitigate significant impacts. This section
17 lists the major issues to be resolved regarding the Revised Project. The major issues to
18 be resolved include decisions by the lead agency as to whether:

- 19 • This SEIR adequately describes the environmental impacts of the Revised
20 Project,
- 21 • The recommended mitigation and lease measures should be adopted or modified,
- 22 • Additional mitigation measures need to be applied to the Revised Project, or
- 23 • The Revised Project should or should not be approved for implementation.