

# Chapter 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose of the Revised Supplemental EIR

### 1.1.1 Overview

The Los Angeles Harbor Department (LAHD), an agency of the City of Los Angeles, also referred to as the Port of Los Angeles (Port), operates the Port under the legal mandates of the Port of Los Angeles Tidelands Trust (Los Angeles City Charter, Article VI, Section 601; California Tidelands Trust Act of 1911) and the California Coastal Act (PRC Division 20 Sections 30700 et seq.). The LAHD is chartered to develop and operate the Port to benefit maritime uses, and it functions as a landlord by leasing Port properties to more than 300 tenants. Among the LAHD's tenants is China Shipping (North America) Holding Co., Ltd. (China Shipping), which leases premises at Berths 97-109 to operate a marine container terminal (CS Container Terminal) under a lease agreement (Permit No. 999), as amended.

LAHD prepared this Draft Revised Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (Draft RSEIR) to supplement and update the Berths 97-109 [China Shipping] Container Terminal Project Supplemental Environmental Impact Report certified by the City of Los Angeles Board of Harbor Commissioners (Board) on October 8, 2019 (2019 SEIR; LAHD 2019). The 2019 SEIR supplemented and updated the Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Report certified by the Board in 2008 (2008 EIS/EIR; USACE and LAHD 2008). The 2008 EIS/EIR evaluated the environmental impacts of the construction and operation of the CS Container Terminal (Approved Project). The 2019 SEIR evaluated the continued operation of the CS Container Terminal under new and/or modified mitigation measures compared to the Approved Project and included updated operational parameters and cargo forecasts (2019 Revised Project).

After a period of litigation, the California Court of Appeal, Second District (Court of Appeal), ruled in *Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles* (2023) 98 Cal.App.5th 1176, that certain portions of the 2019 SEIR did not comply with CEQA. On May 24, 2024, the San Diego County Superior Court (Superior Court) issued a Peremptory Writ of Mandate (Writ). As described below (Section 1.1.2), the Writ generally commanded LAHD and the City to do the following:

- 1 • First, the Writ ordered LAHD and China Shipping to enter in an amendment to  
2 Permit No. 999 (Sixth Amendment) to implement and make enforceable the  
3 mitigation measures in the 2008 EIS/EIR, as modified by the 2019 SEIR and the  
4 Court of Appeal and Superior Court decisions (Adopted Mitigation Measures and  
5 Lease Measures).
- 6 • Second, the Writ directed the City to set aside the certification of the 2019 SEIR.
- 7 • Third, the Writ directed LAHD, within 18 months of the issuance of the Writ, to  
8 prepare, circulate, and certify a revised SEIR (this Draft RSEIR) with certain  
9 additional information, analyses, and/or disclosures, described in more detail in  
10 Section 1.1.2, to address the deficiencies identified by the Court of Appeal and  
11 Superior Court.
- 12 • Fourth, the Writ directed LAHD to timely ensure that any mitigation measures  
13 adopted in the revised SEIR are fully enforceable through permit conditions,  
14 agreements, or other legally binding instruments.

15 On June 27, 2024, Board adopted Resolution No. 24-10374 and Order No. 24-7371,  
16 which set aside the certification of the 2019 SEIR, and related matters, and approved the  
17 Sixth Amendment to Permit No. 999, implementing and making contractually  
18 enforceable against China Shipping the Adopted Mitigation Measures and Lease  
19 Measures, and requested the same actions from the City Council. On July 2, 2024, the  
20 City Council adopted the motion under Council File No. 09-1872-S3 to set aside the  
21 certification of the 2019 SEIR, and related matters, and approved the Sixth Amendment  
22 to Permit No. 999. On July 15, 2024, the City filed the Initial Return to the Writ with the  
23 Superior Court, confirming the City’s completion of the initial necessary actions to  
24 comply with the Writ, including the adoption of the above-described Resolution, Order,  
25 and Motion.

26 This Draft RSEIR was prepared in response to, and in compliance with, the Writ. As  
27 noted above, and described in more detail in Section 1.1.2, the Draft RSEIR provides the  
28 additional information, analyses, and/or disclosures required by the Writ to address the  
29 deficiencies identified by the Court of Appeal and Superior Court, and identifies changed  
30 or additional mitigation measures or lease measures (Proposed Mitigation Measures and  
31 Lease Measures) based on that analysis. The Adopted Mitigation Measures and Lease  
32 Measures and the Proposed Mitigation Measures and Lease Measures analyzed in this  
33 Draft RSEIR are collectively referred to as the “Revised Project.” The term “Revised  
34 Project” is used throughout this document to encompass the broadest set of modifications  
35 to the project components, mitigation measures, and lease measures.

36 The Revised Project requires approval from the Board and the Los Angeles City Council  
37 of any Proposed Mitigation Measures and Lease Measures recommended by this RSEIR  
38 in the form of an amendment to Permit No. 999. Prior to the issuance of any lease  
39 amendments or other project approvals, the Board must consider the Revised Project’s  
40 environmental effects. Those impacts are identified in three documents: the 2008  
41 EIS/EIR; the 2019 SEIR; and this Draft RSEIR. The Draft RSEIR incorporates by  
42 reference the information and analysis contained in the 2008 EIS/EIR and the 2019 SEIR.  
43 Except as identified in Section 1.1.2, the remainder of the 2019 SEIR was either not  
44 challenged, or was found by the Court of Appeal or Superior Court to be CEQA-  
45 compliant, and therefore remains valid, has not been revised, and is not being  
46 recirculated. After the Board has certified a “Final Revised SEIR” that includes the 2019  
47 SEIR and this Draft RSEIR, the Board would use the information herein in a proceeding  
48 to consider approval of the Revised Project.

## 1.1.2 Scope of the Revised Supplemental EIR

This document is a court-ordered Draft RSEIR, limited to providing the additional information, analysis, and disclosure related to the portions of the 2019 SEIR identified by the Court of Appeal and Superior Court to be non-compliant with CEQA.

The 2019 SEIR considered the 2019 Revised Project, which made changes to the continued operation of the CS Container Terminal by modifying 10 mitigation measures and one lease measure that were originally adopted based on the 2008 EIS/EIR. After a period of litigation challenging the 2019 SEIR, the Court of Appeal and the Superior Court identified certain deficiencies in the 2019 SEIR. As a result of the Court of Appeal and Superior Court decisions, certain mitigation measures in the 2019 Revised Project were set aside and mitigation measures in the Approved Project in the 2008 EIS/EIR were required to be implemented.

On May 24, 2024, the Superior Court issued the Writ that, inter alia, required LAHD and China Shipping to enter into the Sixth Amendment to implement and make enforceable the Adopted Mitigation Measures and Lease Measures, specifically identified as all measures identified in the 2008 FEIS/FEIR Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, as modified by the 2019 SEIR Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, except for those measures that are fully completed and thus moot (e.g., construction that has been completed) and the three measures identified below (which have been reinstated by the Court of Appeal or Superior Court):

- 2008 EIR MM AQ-9, Alternative Maritime Power.
- 2008 EIR MM AQ-10, Vessel Speed Reduction Program.
- 2008 EIR MM AQ-17, as it applies to a 1-year electric yard tractor pilot project only.

The Writ also directed LAHD to include in this Draft RSEIR the following additional information, analyses, and/or disclosures:

- LM GHG-1, GHG Credit Fund: The Court of Appeal set aside the adoption of LM GHG-1 in the 2019 SEIR. The Writ directed LAHD to analyze the GHG impacts of continued operation of the CS Container Terminal under the Adopted Mitigation Measures and Lease Measures, and to determine if any mitigation measures are available, feasible, and enforceable to mitigate such impacts. LM GHG-1, per the Writ, remains in place until revised and/or superseded by any mitigation measures adopted for GHG impacts in the Draft RSEIR.
- MM AQ-9, Alternative Maritime Power: The Superior Court rejected the revisions to 2019 MM AQ-9: Alternative Maritime Power (AMP) in the 2019 SEIR and, as a result, the 2008 MM AQ-9 was reinstated, as noted above. The Writ also ordered LAHD to analyze the air quality impacts of continued operation of the CS Container Terminal under the Adopted Mitigation Measures and Lease Measures, and to determine if any other mitigation measures for at-berth emissions (in addition to AMP) are available, feasible, and enforceable to mitigate such impacts.
- The 2019 SEIR Emissions Impact Analysis: The Superior Court set aside the 2019 SEIR because it did not analyze an accurate timeframe of operations under the 2019 Revised Project. The Writ orders LAHD to update the analysis of the impacts of the continued operation of the CS Container Terminal under the

1 Adopted Mitigation Measures and Lease Measures starting from the time of the  
2 adoption of the Sixth Amendment. This required a change to the project  
3 description in the 2019 SEIR, which included years between 2008 and 2019 as  
4 the “partial implementation period” to analyze the time period during which  
5 China Shipping did not comply with some of the original 2008 EIS/EIR  
6 mitigation measures. The Writ required LAHD to disclose the impacts of the  
7 “partial implementation period” time period to 2024, when the Sixth Amendment  
8 was adopted.

9 The Writ also ordered, for clarity, that the RSEIR list all mitigation measures and lease  
10 measures that apply to the CS Container Terminal, including those from the 2008  
11 EIS/EIR, the 2019 SEIR, and the Proposed Mitigation Measures and Lease Measures  
12 analyzed in this Draft RSEIR (see Table 1 of Appendix A-1 for the full list of mitigation  
13 measures and lease measures that apply to the CS Container Terminal).

14 The Writ did not require that the RSEIR re-evaluate the Adopted Mitigation Measures  
15 and Lease Measures, including whether new or additional mitigation should be adopted  
16 for those impacts, except as specifically identified in the Writ for GHG LM-1. As a  
17 result, except for GHG LM-1, the RSEIR does not analyze whether the Adopted  
18 Mitigation Measures and Lease Measures should be replaced or updated with any new or  
19 additional mitigation measures.

20 Accordingly, as described further in Section 2.5.1, the Revised Project analyzed in this  
21 RSEIR consists of the 2019 Revised Project with MM AQ-9 and MM AQ-10 replaced by  
22 MM AQ-9 and MM AQ-10 of the 2008 EIS/EIR, the pilot project component of MM  
23 AQ-17 re-instated, and a further evaluation of mitigation related to at-berth emissions and  
24 greenhouse gas emissions.

25 As described in Section 2.5.2 and Section 2.5.3, this RSEIR also includes analyses of the  
26 period of partial implementation from 2018 through 2023 (called the Additional Period of  
27 Non-Compliance” in this RSEIR) and the FEIR Mitigated Scenario, which describes  
28 impacts that would have occurred had all of the mitigation measures included in the 2008  
29 EIS/EIR been fully implemented throughout project operation (i.e., through 2045). Table  
30 1-1 lists the Adopted Mitigation Measures and Lease Measures and the Proposed  
31 Mitigation Measures and Lease Measures and summarizes their status with respect to the  
32 Revised Project and the other analyses in this RSEIR.

33 The Draft RSEIR incorporates by reference the information and analyses contained in the  
34 2008 EIS/EIR and the 2019 SEIR. The 2008 EIS/EIR is used in this Draft RSEIR as a  
35 comparison against which the Revised Project is evaluated. A full description of the  
36 baseline is presented in Section 2.6.

37

**Table 1-1. Mitigation Measures and Lease Measures Considered in this Draft RSEIR.**

<b>Measure</b>	<b>Status</b>
2008 EIR MM AQ-9. Alternative Maritime Power (AMP)	Included in this RSEIR
2008 SEIR MM AQ-10. Vessel Speed Reduction Program (VSRP)	Included in this RSEIR
2008 SEIR MM AQ-11: Low-Sulfur Fuel	Included in this RSEIR
2008 SEIR MM AQ-12: Slide Valve	Included in this RSEIR
2008 SEIR MM AQ-13: Reroute Cleaner Ships	Included in this RSEIR
2008 SEIR MM AQ-14: New Vessel Build	Included in this RSEIR
2019 SEIR MM AQ-15. Yard Tractors	Included in this RSEIR
2019 SEIR MM AQ-17. Cargo Handling Equipment (Replacement schedule and emissions standards for yard equipment)	Included in this RSEIR
2008 EIR MM AQ-17 (1-year electric yard tractor pilot project only)	Included in this RSEIR
2008 EIR MM AQ-19: Clean Truck Program	Included in this RSEIR
2008 EIR MM AQ-20: LNG Trucks	Included only in this RSEIR's analysis of the FEIR Mitigated Scenario
2008 EIR MM AQ-21: Truck Idling Reduction Measure	Included in this RSEIR
2019 SEIR LM AQ-1. Cleanest Available Cargo Handling Equipment.	Included in this RSEIR
2019 SEIR LM AQ-2. Priority Access for Drayage	Included in this RSEIR
2019 SEIR LM AQ-3. Demonstration of Zero-Emissions Equipment	Included in this RSEIR
2008 EIR LM AQ-22: Periodic Review of New Technology and Regulations	Included in this RSEIR
2008 EIR LM AQ-24: General Mitigation Measure	Included in this RSEIR
2019 SEIR MM GHG-1. LED Lighting	Included in this RSEIR
2019 SEIR LM GHG-1. GHG Credit Fund.	Included in this RSEIR but subject to revision/ replacement (see below)
2008 EIR MM AQ-26: Compact Fluorescent Light Bulbs	Included in this RSEIR
2008 EIR MM AQ-27: Energy Audit	Included in this RSEIR
2008 EIR MM AQ-29: Recycling	Included in this RSEIR
2025 RSEIR MM AQ-31 At-Berth Emissions	Proposed new measure in this RSEIR
2025 RSEIR MM/LM GHG-2	Proposed new measure in this RSEIR

### 1.1.3 Nature of the Revised Supplemental EIR

CEQA requires a lead agency, on the occasion of a subsequent discretionary approval that follows completion of an EIR for a project, to inquire whether substantial evidence indicates that “new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects” would result from either changed circumstances surrounding the project, or new information of substantial importance to the project that was not and could not have been known at the time of certification of the initial EIR (Guidelines Section 15162; see also Pub. Res. Code Section 21166). If the agency determines that substantial evidence supports such a conclusion, the agency must conduct subsequent or supplemental environmental review.

A Supplemental EIR, as its name implies, supplements an EIR that has already been certified for a project, to address project changes, changed circumstances, or new information that was not known, and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the prior document was certified. 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, the Supplemental EIR need only contain the information necessary to respond to the project changes, changed circumstances or new information that triggered the need for additional environmental review (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15163). A Supplemental EIR does not “re-open” a previously certified EIR or reanalyze the environmental impacts of a project as a whole; the analysis is limited to whether the project changes result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts.

Whether project changes will result in a new or substantially more severe significant impact is often not known until the supplemental analysis is completed. Therefore, the fact that a RSEIR is being prepared does not necessarily imply a conclusion that the changed project components will result in new or more severe significant impacts. The analysis for this RSEIR was conducted and is presented here for purposes of full disclosure where the changes to the mitigation measures appeared to have the potential to create new or more severe impacts.

## 1.2 Project Background

### 1.2.1 The Port of Los Angeles

The Port of Los Angeles (POLA) is the leading seaport in North America in terms of shipping container volume and cargo value, generating more than 830,000 regional jobs (this equates to 1 in 9 jobs in the five-county area) and \$35 billion in annual wages and tax revenues. Operating for more than a century, POLA has been a center for global trade, national cargo transportation and related industrial uses. Together with the Port of Long Beach, it handles up to 64% of all shipping on the West Coast, and about 35% of all shipping in the United States. In 2022, POLA handled almost 10 million TEUs (twenty-foot equivalent units, a standardized maritime industry measurement used when counting cargo containers of varying lengths) of containerized cargo through its terminals.

LAHD operates the Port under the legal mandates of the Port of Los Angeles Tidelands Trust (Los Angeles City Charter, Article VI, Section 601) and the California Coastal Act (PRC Division 20, Section 30700 et seq.), which identify the Port and its facilities as a

1 primary economic and coastal resource of the State of California and an essential element  
2 of the national maritime industry for the promotion of commerce, navigation, fisheries,  
3 and harbor operations. Activities should be water dependent, and LAHD must give  
4 highest priority to navigation, shipping, and necessary support and access facilities to  
5 accommodate the demands of foreign and domestic waterborne commerce. LAHD is  
6 chartered to develop and operate the Port to benefit maritime uses. It functions as a  
7 landlord by leasing Port properties to more than 300 tenants.

8 The United States and China are the two largest trading countries in the world, and the  
9 two countries exchange significant amounts of cargo annually. POLA, as the nation's  
10 leading seaport, is a critical hub for facilitating trade with Asia, and China in particular.

## 11 1.2.2 Overview of the CS Container Terminal

12 The CS Container Terminal is operated by the West Basin Container Terminal Company  
13 under a lease agreement (Permit No. 999) originally entered between China Shipping and  
14 LAHD. The premises assigned to China Shipping are located at 2050 John S. Gibson  
15 Boulevard, within an industrial area in the vicinity of the West Basin and Turning Basin in  
16 Los Angeles Harbor (Figure 1-1). The terminal occupies approximately 142 acres at  
17 Berths 97-109 under LAHD Permit No. 999, as amended.

18 The site is near the communities of San Pedro and Wilmington, approximately 20 miles  
19 south of downtown Los Angeles. The site is generally bounded on the north by the Berths  
20 121-131 container terminal; on the east by the West Basin and the Main Channel; on the  
21 south by the passenger cruise terminal and State Route 47; and on the west by the I-110  
22 Freeway and the community of San Pedro. Land uses in the vicinity support a variety of  
23 cargo handling operations, including container, liquid bulk, and dry bulk; commercial  
24 fishing and seafood processing; a power plant (Harbor Generating Station); Port  
25 administration and maintenance facilities; maritime support uses; and recreational and  
26 residential uses.

27 The CS Container Terminal integrates several different physical components and  
28 operational processes to load and unload oceangoing vessels and to move the cargo  
29 through the terminal to and from trucks and trains as cost-effectively as possible. The  
30 physical components consist of marine container vessels, berths/wharves (docks), cranes,  
31 backland storage areas (container yard), entrance and exit gates, rail facilities (usually),  
32 and maintenance and administrative buildings. The operational processes include  
33 shipping, stevedoring (loading/unloading ships), container storage and management, in-  
34 terminal drayage (hauling), on-dock rail operations, and trucking to offsite locations such  
35 as warehouses and rail yards.

36 The CS Container Terminal was constructed in three phases between 2001 and 2013, and  
37 began operation in 2004. It consists of two berths, ten wharf cranes for ship loading, and  
38 a container yard. The terminal shares a gate complex and an on-dock intermodal railyard  
39 with the adjacent Berths 121-131 container terminal. Containers moved by rail are drayed  
40 across a bridge to and from the intermodal railyard, which is inside the Berths 121-131  
41 terminal. For a fuller description of the existing terminal see Section 2.5.1 of the 2019  
42 SEIR (LAHD 2019).

## 1 1.2.3 Project History

2 The history of the Revised Project prior to the 2019 Final SEIR is presented in full in  
3 Section 1.2.3 of that document; this section presents a brief summary of that history and  
4 of events since 2018.

### 5 1.2.3.1 1997 EIS/EIR

6 The CS Container Terminal project was developed on vacant land in the West Basin of  
7 Los Angeles Harbor. In support of that development, the Port prepared and certified the  
8 West Basin Transportation Improvements Program (WBTIP) EIR (LAHD 1997), which  
9 programmatically assessed the proposed construction and operation of terminal and  
10 infrastructure improvements in the West Basin of the Port, including the current CS  
11 Container Terminal, the adjacent Berths 121-131 container terminal, and the TraPac  
12 Terminal at Berths 136-147.

13 In March, 2001, LAHD issued Permit No. 999 to China Shipping to operate a container  
14 terminal at Berths 97-109 and in October, 2001, the Port granted a coastal development  
15 permit to begin construction of Phase I of the CS Terminal Project. Opponents of the  
16 project immediately filed suit, and in October, 2002, the State of California Second  
17 District Court of Appeals ordered a partial halt to ongoing construction and operation and  
18 ordered the preparation of a project-specific EIR. Under court order, construction of  
19 Phase I was permitted to continue and was completed in 2003. LAHD settled the lawsuit  
20 in 2004 through an Amended Stipulated Judgment (ASJ) entered into with the project  
21 opponents. Operations at the CS Container Terminal officially began on June 21, 2004.

1

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

2

### 3 **1.2.3.2 2008 EIS/EIR and the Approved Project**

4 Under the ASJ, LAHD agreed to prepare a new, project-specific EIR for the three phases  
 5 of the CS Container Terminal project and agreed to several mitigation measures.  
 6 Consistent with the ASJ, the existing lease was to be amended after certification of the  
 7 new EIR. Despite choosing not to participate in the lawsuit or the ASJ, China Shipping  
 8 filed a claim with LAHD alleging damages from the delay caused by the litigation. The  
 9 settlement of these claims was memorialized in an amendment to Permit No. 999 in 2005  
 10 that incorporated the ASJ measures, settled China Shipping's claims against LAHD, and  
 11 committed to the delivery of Phases II and III of the CS Container Terminal project by  
 12 dates certain.

13 In 2008, the Board certified the Berths 97-109 [China Shipping] Container Terminal  
 14 Project Final EIS/EIR for the construction and operation of the CS Container Terminal  
 15 project (USACE and LAHD 2008). The 2008 EIS/EIR analyzed Phase I construction and  
 16 its subsequent operation in addition to the remaining construction and operation  
 17 associated with Phases II and III. Construction of Phase II and Phase III of the CS

1 Container Terminal was largely completed by 2013 (two terminal buildings have yet to  
2 be constructed), and operations are ongoing.

3 In certifying the 2008 EIS/EIR, LAHD adopted 52 mitigation measures applicable to the  
4 Approved Project. Some of those 52 measures were developed in the course of  
5 preparation of the 2008 EIS/EIR; others were incorporated into the document from the  
6 ASJ. Many of those measures had never been attempted anywhere in the world, but  
7 LAHD believed, at that time, that those measures, although far-reaching, could be  
8 accomplished by a terminal operator within a reasonable timeframe.

9 During the 2008 EIS/EIR process China Shipping did not submit any information or data  
10 to LAHD regarding the feasibility of any of the proposed mitigation measures and did not  
11 comment on the 2008 EIS/EIR. Because the ASJ required that Permit No. 999 be  
12 amended to include the new operational mitigation measures from the 2008 EIS/EIR,  
13 LAHD began lease amendment negotiations with China Shipping after certification of the  
14 2008 EIS/EIR. However, China Shipping did not agree to an amendment incorporating  
15 the 2008 EIS/EIR mitigation measures.

### 16 **1.2.3.3 2019 SEIR and the 2019 Revised Project**

17 After a period of negotiation with China Shipping regarding the lease amendment, LAHD  
18 identified certain mitigation measures from the 2008 EIS/EIR that had not yet been fully  
19 implemented for various reasons. On September 18, 2015, the LAHD issued a Notice of  
20 Preparation (NOP) and Initial Study (IS) to inform responsible and trustee agencies,  
21 public agencies, and the public that the LAHD was preparing the 2019 SEIR to evaluate  
22 minor changes to the continued operation of the CS Container Terminal by modifying 10  
23 mitigation measures and one lease measure that were originally adopted based on the  
24 2008 EIS/EIR (the 2019 Revised Project). The scope of the 2019 Revised Project is  
25 presented in full in Section 1.2.1.2 of the 2019 Final SEIR, incorporated herein by  
26 reference.

27 LAHD released the 2019 Draft SEIR in 2017. In June 2017, in response to comments,  
28 LAHD issued a recirculated Draft SEIR, with the CEQA baseline revised to 2008,  
29 alterations to mitigation measures to reflect changes in technology and implementation  
30 timing, and the inclusion of an analysis of years between 2008 and 2019 during which  
31 China Shipping was not complying with some of the mitigation measures in the 2008  
32 EIS/EIR. On September 5, 2019, LAHD released the 2019 Final SEIR. On October 8,  
33 2019, the Board held a public hearing and certified the 2019 SEIR and approved the 2019  
34 Revised Project. The Board directed the revised measures to be included in an  
35 amendment to Permit No. 999. LAHD and China Shipping did not enter into a lease  
36 amendment at that time.

37 After administratively appealing the certification of the 2019 SEIR and approval of the  
38 2019 Revised Project to the City Council, opponents of the 2019 Revised Project  
39 challenged the 2019 SEIR in court in 2020. The Court of Appeal and the Superior Court  
40 issued rulings, in 2022 and 2023, respectively, identifying certain deficiencies in the 2019  
41 SEIR. As a result of the Court of Appeal and Superior Court decisions, as discussed in  
42 Section 1.1.2, certain mitigation measures in the 2019 Revised Project were set aside and  
43 mitigation measures in the Approved Project in the 2008 EIS/EIR were required to be  
44 implemented. On May 24, 2024, the Superior Court issued the Writ that required LAHD  
45 to set aside certification of the 2019 SEIR, prepare a revised SEIR (this Draft RSEIR),  
46 and enter into an amendment to Permit No. 999 with China Shipping to implement and

1 enforce the Adopted Mitigation Measures and Lease Measures. In July 2024, the City  
2 filed the Initial Return to the Writ with the Superior Court, confirming decertification  
3 of the 2019 SEIR and approval of the Sixth Amendment to Permit No. 999,  
4 incorporating the Adopted Mitigation Measures and Lease Measures.

## 5 **1.2.4 Elements of the Revised Project Considered in** 6 **This Revised SEIR**

7 The Revised Project involves the continued operation of the CS Container Terminal  
8 under certain of the Adopted Mitigation Measures and Lease Measures and the Proposed  
9 Mitigation Measures and Lease Measures that result from the additional information,  
10 analyses, and/or disclosures of this Draft RSEIR (Table 1-1), as directed by the Writ. The  
11 evaluation discloses impacts from the beginning of full implementation of the Revised  
12 Project, assumed to be 2026, until the end of the lease period, assumed to be 2045. In  
13 these measures, the “effective date of a new lease amendment” in the 2019 SEIR was  
14 2019, whereas in this Draft RSEIR it is assumed to be July, 2024, when LAHD and  
15 China Shipping executed the Sixth Amendment to Permit No. 999, incorporating the  
16 Adopted Mitigation Measures and Lease Measures. This Revised SEIR also analyzes  
17 operation of the CS Terminal from 2018 to 2023 in order to disclose the impacts of the  
18 period during which some of the 2008 EIS/EIR’s air quality mitigation measures were  
19 not being fully implemented (the impacts from the period 2008 to 2018 were disclosed in  
20 the 2019 SEIR).

21 As discussed above, the Adopted Mitigation Measures and Lease Measures will not be  
22 re-evaluated in this Draft RSEIR, except for 2019 SEIR LM GHG-1, GHG Credit Fund.

## 23 **1.2.5 Regulatory and Methodology Changes**

24 The regulatory framework has changed since the 2019 SEIR. While these changes do not  
25 require the preparation of this Draft RSEIR, this document will apply these new  
26 regulations and standards in evaluating the impacts of the Revised Project. The key  
27 regulatory changes include, but are not limited to: 1) CARB’s at-berth regulation, which  
28 affects oceangoing vessels; 2) EPA’s Clean Trucks Plan and CARB’s Clean Truck Check  
29 (heavy-duty vehicle inspection and maintenance (HD I/M) and Advanced Clean Fleet and  
30 Advanced Clean Truck regulations, which affect onroad mobile sources such as drayage  
31 trucks; and 3) updated GHG emission standards for heavy-duty vehicles, which may  
32 affect cargo-handling equipment and onroad mobile sources.

33 In addition to these regulations, calculations in this Revised SEIR use the latest  
34 methodology presented in CARB’s EMFAC model, the latest Port of Los Angeles Air  
35 Emissions Inventory, CARB’s latest CHE and CHC models, and San Pedro Bay Ports  
36 Emission Inventory Methodology Report Version 4.

37

## 1.3 Lead, Responsible and Trustee Agencies

CEQA defines the role of “lead agency” as the public agency that has principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project. The CEQA lead agency will decide whether an EIR or negative declaration will be required and will cause the document to be prepared (Guidelines Section 15367).

Other agencies could have special roles with respect to the Revised Project, and if so, will use this Draft RSEIR as the basis for their decisions to issue any approvals and/or permits that might be required. Section 15381 of the State CEQA Guidelines defines a “responsible agency” as:

...a public agency that proposes to carry out or approve a project for which a lead agency is preparing or has prepared an EIR or negative declaration. For the purposes of CEQA, the term “responsible agency” includes all public agencies other than the lead agency that have discretionary approval power over the project.

Additionally, Section 15386 of the State CEQA Guidelines defines a “trustee agency” as “...a state agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by a project that are held in trust for the people of the State of California”.

Several lead, responsible, and trustee agencies could rely on the RSEIR (consisting of this RSEIR and 2019 SEIR) in a review capacity or as a basis for issuance of a permit or other approval for the Revised Project. Specifically, LAHD, as the lead agency and in compliance with the Writ, will use this document when considering approval of any Proposed Mitigation Measures and Lease Measures recommended by this RSEIR in the form of an amendment to Permit No. 999. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the City of Los Angeles Transportation Department (LADOT), and the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety may use the document when considering approvals for the implementation of any transportation mitigation measures in the Revised Project.

## 1.4 Scope of Analysis and Content of the SEIR

### 1.4.1 Notice of Preparation

The scope of this court-ordered Draft RSEIR was established based on the requirements of the Writ and is informed by the comments received during the Notice of Preparation (NOP) review process. The NOP was posted on August 22, 2024 (Appendix A-1) and the public review period was August 22 to September 20, 2024. Comments were received by letter from the California Air Resources Board, Los Angeles Unified School District, Los Angeles Department of Transportation, Native American Heritage Commission, and Natural Resources Defense Council et al., and are included in Appendix D. Some comments referenced issues that are not part of the Revised Project and are therefore not addressed in the Draft RSEIR. Comments relevant to the Revised Project have been taken into consideration in this Draft RSEIR.

1 Key comments urged the LAHD to apply all feasible mitigation, including measures that  
2 go beyond those in both the 2008 EIS/EIR and the 2019 SEIR, to disclose the actual  
3 emissions that occurred between 2008 and 2024, and to deploy the lowest-emission  
4 technologies possible, and to evaluate and mitigate impacts on schools.

## 5 **1.4.2 Scope of Analysis in this Draft RSEIR**

6 This Draft RSEIR supplements and makes adequate the information provided in the 2008  
7 EIS/EIR and the 2019 SEIR for the purposes of LAHD’s compliance with the Writ and  
8 the LAHD’s consideration of the proposed modifications to mitigation measures which  
9 constitute the Revised Project. The purpose of this RSEIR is to examine the potentially  
10 new significant environmental impacts or substantially more severe impacts of the  
11 Revised Project compared to the impacts of the Approved Project identified in the 2008  
12 EIS/EIR, as directed by the Writ (see Section 1.1.2).

13 In accordance with Sections 15126.2 and 15163 of the CEQA Guidelines, this Draft  
14 RSEIR identifies and focuses on the significant direct and indirect environmental effects  
15 on the physical environment of proposed changes to the CS Container Terminal Project,  
16 changed circumstances surrounding that project, and new information of substantial  
17 importance to that project. This Draft RSEIR analyzes whether continued operation of the  
18 CS Container Terminal under the Revised Project, with modified mitigation measures  
19 from the 2008 EIS/EIR, would result in new or substantially more severe significant  
20 effects on the environment, compared to the impacts disclosed in the 2008 EIS/EIR and  
21 the 2019 SEIR. Updates to the 2008 EIS/EIR and the 2019 SEIR are provided only when  
22 required by the Writ, when mitigation measures or lease measures have been modified or  
23 information updated, and when discussion of these changes is necessary to provide  
24 sufficient analysis of impacts. As such, the Draft RSEIR will re-evaluate certain resource  
25 areas as addressed in Chapter 3.0, Environmental Impact Analysis. These include:

- 26 • Air Quality, including public health
- 27 • Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change
- 28 • Cumulative Impacts (related to air quality and greenhouse gases).

29 This Draft RSEIR has been prepared by Ramboll under contract to LAHD and has been  
30 reviewed independently by LAHD staff. The scope of the document, methods of analysis  
31 and conclusions represent the independent judgments of the LAHD. Staff members from  
32 LAHD and Ramboll who helped prepare this Draft RSEIR are identified in Chapter 6,  
33 List of Preparers and Contributors.

## 34 **1.4.3 Content of This Draft SEIR**

35 This Draft RSEIR is organized into seven chapters; two chapters normally included in  
36 EIRs – Growth-Inducing Impacts and Significant Irreversible Changes – are not included  
37 in this Draft Revised SEIR because, since the CS Container Terminal was built and is  
38 operating essentially as considered in the 2008 EIS/EIR, these issues do not require  
39 additional analysis. The seven chapters are:

40 **Chapter 1, Introduction:** This chapter summarizes the background of the project and  
41 the purpose of the RSEIR, and explains the environmental review process.

1           **Chapter 2, Project Description:** This chapter provides a detailed description of the  
2 Revised Project, including the specific changes proposed to the mitigation measures and  
3 explanation for why such changes are sought.

4 Chapter 2 also discusses how the baselines used in this Draft RSEIR were developed and  
5 applied for the Revised Project. For this Draft RSEIR, it is proper to use the Approved  
6 Project, as fully mitigated, as the baseline conditions for evaluating the impacts of the  
7 Revised Project and to disclose the incremental change in environmental impacts  
8 between the Approved Project and the Revised Project.

9           **Chapter 3, Environmental Impact Analysis:** This chapter includes an assessment of the  
10 impacts of the Revised Project, mitigation for those impacts determined to be potentially  
11 significant, and a discussion of the changes in these impacts as compared to those  
12 identified in the analyses in the 2008 EIS/EIR. This chapter is divided into main sections  
13 for each of the resource areas, i.e., Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases).

14 The criteria for determining the significance of environmental impacts in this Draft  
15 RSEIR analysis are described in the section titled “Significance Criteria” under each  
16 resource topic in Chapter 3. The threshold of significance for a given environmental  
17 effect is the level at which the LAHD finds a potential effect of the Revised Project to be  
18 significant. “Threshold of significance” can be defined as a “quantitative or qualitative  
19 standard, or set of criteria, pursuant to which significance of a given environmental effect  
20 could be determined” (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.7 [a]).

21 The significance thresholds are used here to evaluate whether the incremental change  
22 from the Revised Project results in any new impact or substantially increases the severity  
23 of a prior impact. As described earlier, the Revised Project consists of the Adopted  
24 Mitigation Measures and Lease Measures and the Proposed Mitigation Measures and  
25 Lease Measures for the CS Container Terminal as compared to the Approved Project.  
26 For this Draft RSEIR, the impact significance for the Revised Project has been  
27 determined assuming that the Adopted Mitigation Measures and Lease Measures will  
28 continue to be implemented, except as modified by the Proposed Mitigation Measures  
29 and Lease Measures.

30 Based on this, potential impacts from the Revised Project can be categorized into four  
31 types

- 32           • *No Impact:* No environmental impacts would occur from the Revised Project.
- 33           • *Less-than-Significant Impact:* Environmental impacts from the Revised Project  
34 would not be significant, or if they would be, they would be significantly reduced  
35 with the feasible mitigation measures adopted from the Adopted Mitigation  
36 Measures and Lease Measures and the Proposed Mitigation Measures and  
37 Lease Measures.
- 38           • *Less-Than-Significant Impact with Additional Mitigation:* Environmental impacts  
39 from the Revised Project would be significant and adverse but could be  
40 significantly reduced with additional, newly proposed feasible mitigation  
41 measures identified in this Draft RSEIR.
- 42           • *Significant and Unavoidable Impact:* Environmental consequences of the  
43 Revised Project would be substantial and adverse and would remain so even with  
44 implementation of the feasible mitigation measures identified in this Draft  
45 RSEIR.

1           **Chapter 4, Cumulative Impacts Analysis:** This chapter describes the cumulative  
2 project scenario, updated with current information.

3           **Chapter 5, References:** This chapter identifies the materials and documents consulted in  
4 preparing this Draft RSEIR.

5           **Chapter 6, List of Preparers and Contributors:** This chapter lists the individuals  
6 involved in preparing this Draft RSEIR.

7           **Chapter 7, Glossary, Acronyms, and Abbreviations:** This chapter lists the full names  
8 for acronyms and abbreviations used throughout this document.

9           **Appendices:** The appendices present additional background information and technical  
10 detail for the RSEIR as whole and for specific resource areas.

## 11   **1.5           Alternatives to the Revised Project**

12           The Revised Project consists of modifications to mitigation measures for the previously  
13 approved CS Container Terminal project. It does not propose physical modifications of  
14 the CS Container Terminal but instead seeks to further achieve and support the purpose  
15 and objectives of the Approved Project.

16           According to the CEQA Guidelines, an SEIR is required when “[o]nly minor additions or  
17 changes would be necessary to make the previous EIR adequately apply to the project in  
18 the changed situation” (CEQA Guideline § 15163(a)(2)). As a result, this Draft RSEIR,  
19 like the 2019 SEIR, contains only the information necessary to make the 2008 EIS/EIR  
20 adequate for the Revised Project (CEQA Guideline § 15163(b)).

21           The 2008 EIS/EIR analyzed a reasonable range of alternatives to the Approved Project.  
22 Section 2.5 and Chapter 6 of the 2008 EIS/EIR provide extensive information on the  
23 development and screening of those project alternatives.

24           Preparation of this Draft RSEIR does not require revisiting the prior alternatives analysis;  
25 rather, the purpose of this Draft RSEIR is to consider whether the proposed changes to  
26 mitigation measures for the Approved Project result in new or substantially more severe  
27 significant impacts. The modifications to mitigation measures proposed under the  
28 Revised Project analyzed in this RSEIR do not concern or alter any analysis of or  
29 conclusions reached regarding alternatives analyzed in the 2008 EIS/EIR, the comparison  
30 of the Approved Project to the alternatives analyzed in the 2008 EIS/EIR, or the  
31 identification of the No Federal Action Alternative as the environmentally superior  
32 alternative in the 2008 EIS/EIR.

33           It should be noted that an SEIR is not required to consider alternatives to a component of  
34 the project. Rather, the alternatives analysis in the 2008 EIS/EIR appropriately  
35 considered alternatives to the project as a whole. The proposed modifications to the  
36 mitigation measures in the Revised Project do not change the Approved Project as a  
37 whole and do not require that an alternative be developed that specifically addresses  
38 those particular modifications.

## 1.6 Intended Uses of this Draft RSEIR

This court-ordered Draft RSEIR has been prepared in accordance with the Writ and applicable state environmental regulations, policies and laws to inform decision-makers about the potential environmental impacts of the Revised Project. As an informational document, an SEIR does not recommend approval or denial of a project. This Draft RSEIR is being provided to the public for review, comment, and participation in the planning process. After public review and comment, a Final Revised SEIR will be prepared, including responses to comments on the Draft RSEIR received from agencies, organizations, and individuals. The Final Revised SEIR will be distributed to provide the basis for decision-making by the CEQA lead agency, as well as other concerned agencies.

In compliance with the Writ, LAHD would certify the Final Revised SEIR, consisting of the RSEIR and the 2019 SEIR. The RSEIR would then be used by LAHD, as the lead agency under CEQA, in making a decision regarding the future operation of the Revised Project and in informing agencies considering permit applications and other actions required to lease and operate the Revised Project. LAHD's certification of the RSEIR, Notice of Completion, Findings of Fact, and Statement of Overriding Considerations (if necessary) would document their decision as to the adequacy of the RSEIR and inform subsequent decisions by LAHD with respect to the Revised Project.

The RSEIR itself is not a decision document and does not determine whether the Revised Project will be approved. As noted, LAHD, in compliance with the Writ, already approved the Sixth Amendment to Permit No. 999 to incorporate the Adopted Mitigation Measures and Lease Measures. If Proposed Mitigation Measures and Lease Measures are recommended as a result of the RSEIR, the Board will consider additional amendments to Permit No. 999 to incorporate the Proposed Mitigation Measures and Lease Measures, as appropriate.

## 1.7 Key Principles Guiding Preparation of this Draft RSEIR

### 1.7.1 Emphasis on Significant Environmental Effects or Substantial Increase in the Severity of Previously Identified Significant Effects

This Draft RSEIR focuses on the significant environmental effects of the Revised Project, including any new significant impacts or substantial increases in the severity of significant impacts identified in the 2008 EIS/EIR and the 2019 SEIR, and their relevance to the decision-making process. The following sections describe the general framework for analysis under CEQA. These summaries are not meant to capture the legal nuances that have developed through the passage and amendment of various statutes and regulations, and from corresponding judicial decisions; rather, the summaries are meant to communicate a general understanding of CEQA.

1 “Environmental impacts,” as defined by CEQA, include physical effects on the  
2 environment. The State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15360) define the environment as  
3 follows:

4 The physical conditions which exist within the area which will  
5 be affected by a proposed project, including land, air, water,  
6 minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or  
7 aesthetic significance.

8 This definition does not include strictly economic impacts (e.g., changes in property  
9 values) or social impacts (e.g., a particular group of persons moving into an area). The  
10 State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15131[a]) state that “economic or social effects of a  
11 project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment.” However,  
12 economic or social effects are relevant to physical effects in two situations. In the first,  
13 according to Section 15131(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines: “An EIR may trace a chain  
14 of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic  
15 or social changes...to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social  
16 changes.” In other words, if an economic or social impact leads to a physical impact, this  
17 ultimate physical impact would be evaluated in the EIR. In the second instance,  
18 according to Section 15131(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines: “Economic or social  
19 effects of a project may be used to determine the significance of physical changes caused  
20 by the project.”

21 In view of these legal precedents, LAHD is not required to treat economic, social, or  
22 psychological impacts as significant environmental impacts absent a related physical  
23 effect on the environment. Therefore, such impacts are discussed only to the extent  
24 necessary to determine the significance of the physical impacts of the Revised Project  
25 and alternatives.

## 26 **1.7.2 Forecasting**

27 In this Draft RSEIR, the LAHD and its consultants have made their best efforts to predict  
28 and evaluate the reasonable, foreseeable, direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental  
29 impacts of the Revised Project. CEQA does not require LAHD to engage in speculation  
30 about impacts that are not reasonably foreseeable (State CEQA Guideline Sections 15144  
31 and 15145), nor does CEQA require a worst-case analysis.

## 32 **1.7.3 Reliance on Environmental Thresholds and** 33 **Substantial Evidence**

34 The identification of impacts as “significant” or “less than significant” is one of the  
35 important functions of an EIR. While impacts determined to be “less than significant”  
36 need only be acknowledged as such, an EIR must identify mitigation measures for any  
37 impact identified as “significant.” In preparing this document, LAHD has based its  
38 conclusions about the significance of environmental impacts on identifiable thresholds  
39 and has supported these conclusions with substantial scientific evidence.

40 The criteria for determining the significance of environmental impacts in this analysis are  
41 described in each resource section in Chapter 3, Environmental Analysis. The “threshold  
42 of significance” under CEQA for a given environmental effect is the level at which  
43 LAHD finds a potential effect of the Revised Project or alternative to be significant.

1 “Threshold of significance” can be defined as a “quantitative or qualitative standard or  
2 set of criteria, pursuant to which significance of a given environmental effect may be  
3 determined” (State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.7(a)).

#### 4 **1.7.4 Reliance on Current Data, Models, and Analytical** 5 **Tools**

6 In preparing this Draft RSEIR, LAHD has used the most current data available to  
7 determine the 2008 baseline and future condition assumptions. In addition, substantial  
8 advances in air quality, health risk, and traffic modeling and other analytical tools have  
9 occurred since the 2008 EIS/EIR was prepared. The new models and analytical tools  
10 were used in the preparation of this document in order to ensure an accurate and up-to-  
11 date assessment of the impacts of the Revised Project. Furthermore, as described in more  
12 detail in Section 2.5, many of the models and analytical tools used in the previous  
13 analysis are no longer available or are no longer approved for use by the relevant  
14 resource agencies.

#### 15 **1.7.5 Disagreement Among Experts**

16 During preparation of the Draft RSEIR, it is possible that evidence that might raise  
17 disagreements will be presented during the public review of the Draft RSEIR. Such  
18 disagreements will be noted and will be considered by the decision-makers during the  
19 public hearing process. However, to be adequate under CEQA, the Draft RSEIR need not  
20 resolve all such disagreements (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15151).

21 Accordingly, conflict of evidence and expert opinions on an issue concerning the  
22 environmental impacts of the Revised Project—when LAHD is aware of these  
23 controversies—has been identified in this Draft RSEIR. The Draft RSEIR has  
24 summarized the conflicting opinions, where they occur, and has included sufficient  
25 information to allow the public and decision-makers to take intelligent account of the  
26 environmental consequences of their actions.

27 In rendering a decision on a project where there is a disagreement exists among experts,  
28 the decision-makers are not obligated to select the most conservative, environmentally  
29 protective or liberal viewpoint. Decision-makers might give more weight to the views of  
30 one expert than to those of another and need not resolve a dispute among experts. The  
31 decision-makers must consider the comments received and address any objections but  
32 need not follow said comments or objections so long as the decision-makers state the  
33 basis for their decision and the decision is supported by substantial evidence.

#### 34 **1.7.6 Duty to Mitigate**

35 According to Section 15126.4(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines, each significant impact  
36 identified in an EIR must include a discussion of feasible mitigation measures that would  
37 avoid or substantially reduce the significant environmental effect. To reduce significant  
38 effects, mitigation measures must avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce, eliminate, or  
39 compensate for a given impact of the proposed project. Mitigation measures must satisfy  
40 certain requirements to be considered adequate. Mitigation should be specific and  
41 enforceable, define feasible actions that would demonstrably improve significant

1 environmental conditions, and allow monitoring of their implementation. Mitigation  
2 measures that merely require further studies or consultation with regulatory agencies and  
3 are not tied to a specific action that would directly reduce impacts, or that defer  
4 mitigation until some future time, are not adequate.

5 Effective mitigation measures clearly explain objectives and indicate how a given  
6 measure should be implemented, who is responsible for its implementation, and where  
7 and when the mitigation would occur. Mitigation measures must be enforceable, meaning  
8 that the lead agency must ensure that the measures would be imposed through appropriate  
9 permit conditions, agreements, or other legally binding instruments.

10 Section 15041 of the State CEQA Guidelines grants public agencies the authority to  
11 require feasible changes (mitigation) that would substantially lessen or avoid a significant  
12 effect on the environment associated with activities involved in a project. Public  
13 agencies, however, do not have unlimited authority to impose mitigation. A public  
14 agency might exercise only those express or implied powers provided by law, aside from  
15 those provided by CEQA. However, where another law grants discretionary powers to a  
16 public agency, CEQA authorizes use of discretionary powers (State CEQA Guidelines  
17 Section 15040).

18 In addition to limitations imposed by CEQA, the U.S. Constitution limits the authority of  
19 regulatory agencies to impose conditions to those situations where a clear and direct  
20 connection (“nexus,” in legal terms) exists between a project impact and the mitigation  
21 measure. Finally, a proportional balance must exist between the impact caused by the  
22 project and the mitigation measure imposed upon the project applicant. A project  
23 applicant cannot be forced to pay more than its fair share of the mitigation, which should  
24 be roughly proportional to the impact(s) caused by the project.

## 25 **1.7.7 Incorporation by Reference**

26 CEQA encourages incorporation by reference (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15006(t))  
27 and establishes guidelines for incorporation by reference (State CEQA Guidelines  
28 Section 15150). Specifically, Section 15150 states, “Where an EIR or Negative  
29 Declaration uses incorporation by reference, the incorporated part of the referenced  
30 document shall be briefly summarized where possible or briefly described if the data or  
31 information cannot be summarized. The relationship between the incorporated part of the  
32 referenced document and the EIR shall be described”. In addition, a supplemental EIR  
33 may be circulated by itself without recirculating the previous EIR (in this case, the 2008  
34 EIS/EIR and the 2019 SEIR), and the decision-making body is to consider the previous  
35 EIR as revised by the SEIR (State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15163(D) and (e)).

36 This Draft RSEIR incorporates the 2008 EIS/EIR for the Approved Project (USACE and  
37 LAHD, 2008) and of the 2019 SEIR (LAHD 2019) by reference. The key findings of the  
38 2008 EIS/EIR and the 2019 SEIR, and their relationship to this document, are  
39 summarized in Section 1.2 of this RSEIR.

## 40 **1.8 Availability of the RSEIR**

41 The Draft RSEIR for the Revised Project is being distributed directly to agencies,  
42 organizations, and interested groups and persons for comment during the formal review  
43 period in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines §15087. A 45-day comment period

1 has been established, which begins on June 26, 2025, and ends on August 11, 2025. A  
2 print document is available review to interested parties at the Port of Los Angeles  
3 Environmental Management Division located at 425 South Palos Verdes Street, San  
4 Pedro, California 90731. Please contact the Environmental Management Division at  
5 (310) 732-3675 or email [ceqacomment@portla.org](mailto:ceqacomment@portla.org) to schedule an appointment for  
6 document review.

7 In addition to printed copies, electronic versions of the Draft RSEIR are available; due to  
8 the size of the document, the electronic version has been prepared as a series of PDF files  
9 to facilitate downloading and printing. The Draft RSEIR is available in its entirety as  
10 PDF files on the Port of Los Angeles website at:

11 <https://www.portoflosangeles.org/environment/environmental-documents>.

12 Interested parties may provide written comments on the Draft RSEIR, which must be  
13 postmarked by August 11, 2025. Please address comments to:

14 Lisa Wunder, Acting Director of Environmental Management  
15 Environmental Management Division  
16 Los Angeles Harbor Department  
17 425 S. Palos Verdes Street  
18 San Pedro, CA 90731

19 Comments may also be sent via email to [ceqacomment@portla.org](mailto:ceqacomment@portla.org). Comments sent via  
20 e-mail should include the project title in the subject line of the email.

21 CEQA allows that a supplement to an EIR may be circulated for public review by itself  
22 without recirculating the previous draft or final EIR. The 2008 EIS/EIR and the 2019  
23 SEIR are available on the Port of Los Angeles website at:

24 <https://www.portoflosangeles.org/environment/environmental-documents>.