

Errata

Final Program Environmental Impact Report Port of Los Angeles Master Plan Update

On July 26, 2013, the Los Angeles Harbor Department (Port) released a Final Program Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) for the Port of Los Angeles Master Plan Update. The following are additions to Appendix A, Port Master Plan, Attachment - Response to Comments:

INDIVIDUALS

Linda Alexander

- a. Requested that the proposed outer harbor cruise terminal not be considered until the existing cruise terminal at Berths 91-93 is maximized.**

Response: Additional language has been added to Planning Area 1 – San Pedro, Proposed Projects (see 5.3.3). Under the proposed project, the Outer Harbor Cruise Terminal would be initiated upon demand for additional cruise facilities.

- b. Requests tourist and visitor transportation between the waterfront, Cabrillo Beach and downtown San Pedro via street car or alternate light rail system.**

Response: A section, Visitor and Tourist Transportation, was added to the Plan (See 5.2.4). It identifies the existing Red Car Line, rubber-tire trolley, and potential water taxi as means for visitor transportation throughout the waterfront areas of the Port.

- c. Requests a Japanese History Museum no smaller than one acre on Terminal Island.**

Response: The Plan does not include a proposed project to construct a Japanese History Museum. There is an existing Japanese memorial, located at 1124 South Seaside Ave., in Fish Harbor.

Sue Castillo

- a. Requested that the proposed outer harbor cruise terminal not be considered until the existing cruise terminal at Berths 91-93 is maximized.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Individuals*, Linda Alexander, “a”.

- b. Requests tourist and visitor transportation between the waterfront, Cabrillo Beach and downtown San Pedro via street car or alternate light rail system.**

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Individuals*, Linda Alexander, “b”.

c. Requests a Japanese History Museum no smaller than one acre on Terminal Island.

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Individuals*, Linda Alexander, “c”.

Christine Esprabens

a. Requests that the goal to preserve historic resources should be on par with other identified goals in the Plan.

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations*, Los Angeles Conservancy, “a”.

b. Requests policies that allow for adaptive reuse of historic buildings, rather than their demise.

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations*, Los Angeles Conservancy, “d”.

c. Requests that historic, cultural and archaeological resources should be clearly identified within the Plan.

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations*, Los Angeles Conservancy, “a”.

d. Requests that the historic buildings, which represent the last vestige of Terminal Island’s WWI, WWII shipbuilding, tuna canning, and Japanese-American built environment, should be maintained and preserved.

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations*, Los Angeles Conservancy, “a”.

e. Opposed to the realignment Seaside Avenue through Southwest Marine since it will further demolish historic buildings.

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations*, Los Angeles Conservancy, “c”.

Denise and Stephen Smith

a. Requests that the goal to preserve historic resources should be on par with other identified goals in the Plan.

Response: Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations, Los Angeles Conservancy, "a"*.

b. Requests policies that allow for adaptive reuse of historic buildings, rather than their demise.

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations, Los Angeles Conservancy, "d"*.

c. Suggests that Terminal Island's historic buildings can be successfully adapted for new uses using creative re-use opportunities, including public-private partnerships.

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Individuals, Jay Ross, "c"*.

d. Requests that historic, cultural and archaeological resources should be clearly identified within the Plan.

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations, Los Angeles Conservancy, "a"*.

e. Requests that historic buildings, the last vestige of Terminal Island's WWI, WWII shipbuilding, tuna canning, and Japanese-American built environment, should be maintained and preserved.

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations, Los Angeles Conservancy, "a"*.

f. Opposed to the realignment Seaside Avenue through Southwest Marine since it will further demolish historic buildings.

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Organizations, Los Angeles Conservancy, "c"*.

Frank Anderson

a. Requested that the proposed outer harbor cruise terminal not be considered until the existing cruise terminal at Berths 91-93 is maximized.

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Individuals, Linda Alexander, "a"*.

b. Requests tourist and visitor transportation between the waterfront, Cabrillo Beach and downtown San Pedro via street car or alternate light rail system.

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Individuals*, Linda Alexander, “b”.

c. Requests a Japanese History Museum no smaller than one acre on Terminal Island.

Response: This comment was addressed above, in the response to *Individuals*, Linda Alexander, “c”.

The following are additions to the Port Master Plan Update that have been proposed by staff.

The proposed changes in recommended allowable land uses in the Fish Harbor area (Planning Area 4) would be modified to permit Maritime Support in addition to Commercial Fishing in the northern portion of the planning area (as shown in Figure 2.5-8 of the Draft PEIR). The change to the PEIR and the PMPU would include modifications to the relevant figures to depict the dual land uses. Maritime Support is a land use that is allowed under the Port Master Plan Update in Planning Areas 1, 2, and 3, and in other portions of Planning Area 4. It is also a permitted use for the entire Fish Harbor area under the current Port Master Plan (i.e., baseline conditions).

This change could result in an intensification of uses compared to what was originally proposed in that portion of Fish Harbor in comparison to the activities that would occur under the Commercial Fishing designation. The intensified activities could result in more air and greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and traffic than were considered for the Commercial Fishing use, although not more than would occur under the existing baseline, which does include Maritime Support uses. These impacts would contribute to the significant and unavoidable impacts identified in the Final PEIR. The impacts of Maritime Support activities were considered in the Final PEIR, both in other planning areas and in Planning Area 4, and therefore would not constitute new impacts under CEQA. Further, the Final PEIR imposes mitigation measures for air, greenhouse gases, noise, and traffic for these types of impacts (summarized in Table ES-7 of the Draft PEIR). The intensified activities would be subject to those same mitigation measures. In addition, the scale of potential maritime support activities in the portion of Fish Harbor under consideration would not result in substantial increases in air and greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and traffic, and thus would not contribute substantially either to direct impacts or to cumulative impacts.