

## Section 3.12

**Utilities and Service Systems****SECTION SUMMARY**

This section addresses potential impacts on utilities and service systems or infrastructure (water, wastewater, storm drains, solid waste, and energy) that could result from construction and operation of the Proposed Project. Energy supply and demand and the efficient use of energy associated with the Proposed Project are considered in Section 3.5 Energy.

Section 3.12, Utilities and Service Systems, provides the following:

1. A description of existing utilities serving the Port;
2. A discussion on the methodology used to determine whether the Proposed Project or an alternative would result in an impact on utilities;
3. An impact analysis of both the Proposed Project and alternatives; and
4. A description of mitigation measures proposed to reduce any potential impacts, as applicable.

**Key Points of Section 3.12:**

There is adequate existing water, wastewater, stormwater, solid waste, and energy infrastructure to service the Proposed Project through 2055. There is sufficient water supply, wastewater treatment capacity, and landfill capacity to accommodate the Proposed Project's water demand, wastewater generation, and solid waste generation. No utility infrastructure expansion or upgrades would be required that would result in a significant impact on the environment.

Construction of the Proposed Project would not have a significant impact on landfill capacity. However, implementation of the standard conditions identified below would further reduce the generation of solid wastes requiring disposal in landfills:

- SC UT-1: Recycling of Construction Materials.** Demolition and/or excess construction materials will be separated on site for reuse/recycling or proper disposal. During grading and construction, separate bins for recycling of construction materials will be provided on site.
- SC UT-2: Materials with Recycled Content.** Materials with recycled content will be used in project construction where feasible.

# 3.12.1 Introduction

This section addresses potential impacts on utilities and service systems (water conveyance and supply, wastewater conveyance, storm drain infrastructure, and solid waste disposal) that could result from implementing the Proposed Project and alternatives.

# 3.12.2 Environmental Setting

## 3.12.2.1 Water

The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) provides water service to the proposed project area. Table 3.12-1 provides an estimate of baseline water use at the terminal under CEQA and NEPA.

**Table 3.12-1: Water Demand at the Berth 121-131 Terminal**

	CEQA Baseline (2019)	NEPA Baseline (2050)
CEQA Baseline Water Use (afy)	10.9	---
Employees	420	548
NEPA Baseline Water Demand (afy)	---	14.7
Total LADWP Demand (afy)	495,685	565,751
% of LADWP Demand	0.0022	0.0026

Sources: WBCT water meter data, LADWP (2021).

Note: 1) To calculate NEPA Baseline water use, City's Bureau of Sanitation's wastewater generation factor of 24 gpd per employee was multiplied by 1.11 (to account for evaporation, outdoor use/storm drain conveyance, etc. associated with wastewater generation) and was applied to the incremental future employment of 128 workers, and that amount was added to the 2019 actual use (CEQA Baseline).

2) NEPA Baseline water demand calculation does not account for water efficiency requirement ordinance savings that would be applied by LADWP under water conservation commitments

3) Gallons converted to acre feet by 325,851 gallons/acre-foot.

4) Fiscal Year 2045-2055 water demand was used for the total "LADWP Demand," based on the 2020 UWMP (LADWP 2021) as this is the closest available forecast to the 2045 project horizon year; does not include active water conservation measures; CEQA baseline LADWP demand uses the FY 2019-2020 demand (LADWP 2021).

- cf           cubic feet
- afy         acre-feet per year
- gal         gallon
- gpd         gallons per day

LADWP is responsible for supplying, treating, and distributing water for domestic, industrial, agricultural, and firefighting purposes within the City, which includes the Port. Water sources utilized by LADWP include local sources, such as wells and recycled water (for non-potable uses), and imported sources, including the Los Angeles Aqueducts and purchases from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD). MWD obtains water from the Colorado River via the Colorado River Aqueduct, from northern California via the State Water Project's California Aqueduct, and from various groundwater sources. Water supply and conveyance structures include a series of 114 tanks and reservoirs and a network of pipelines, including 7,221 miles of distribution

1 mains. Distribution mains are located throughout the Project area. In Fiscal Year 2019–  
2 2020, LADWP supplied a total of 495,685 acre-feet of water (LADWP 2021).

3 In a continuing effort to ensure a reliable water supply for future years, LADWP has  
4 prepared the Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). The UWMP is updated every five  
5 years, as required by the California Water Code (Section 10621a), and serves as the City  
6 master plan for water supply and resources management. The plan provides the basic  
7 policy principles that will guide the LADWP decision-making process to secure an  
8 adequate sustainable water supply for the entire City, including the Port, through the year  
9 2045. The latest version, the 2020 UWMP, was adopted in May 2021 (LADWP 2021).

10 LADWP’s UWMP uses a service-area-wide method in developing City water demand  
11 projections. This methodology considered the growth in water use for the entire service  
12 area in developing long-term water projections for the City to 2035, including water use  
13 by Port tenants. The driving factors for this growth are demographics, weather, and water  
14 conservation. Demographic projections for LADWP’s service area are based on the 2020  
15 Regional Transportation Plan forecast generated by the Southern California Association  
16 of Governments (SCAG). Total LADWP demand for water is predicted to be  
17 approximately 565,000 acre-feet in 2045 (LADWP 2021). LADWP expects to be able to  
18 meet this demand by increasing local water supplies, recycling, and water conservation,  
19 which will substantially reduce its historical reliance on water purchased from MWD.

### 20 **3.12.2.2 Wastewater**

21 The City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation (LASAN)  
22 provides wastewater treatment and conveyance service for most of the City and numerous  
23 jurisdictions or agencies that contract with the City for wastewater conveyance and  
24 treatment. The City thus serves as a regional wastewater treatment and conveyance  
25 provider. LASAN maintains sewer lines, force mains, and pump stations throughout the  
26 proposed project area.

27 Wastewater is conveyed from the proposed project area to the Terminal Island Water  
28 Reclamation Plant (TIWRP), an advanced water treatment facility at 445 Ferry Street.  
29 The facility treats industrial wastewater generated on Terminal Island in addition to  
30 wastewater generated in the communities of Wilmington, San Pedro, and areas of Harbor  
31 City. The TIWRP treats all flow received to at least first-stage tertiary levels, providing  
32 pretreatment, primary sedimentation, secondary treatment, tertiary treatment (filtration),  
33 advanced treatment (microfiltration and reverse osmosis), sludge digestion, and drying. A  
34 portion of the wastewater influent is further treated in advanced water treatment facilities  
35 for reuse in irrigation and industrial water supplies in the Port area. The remaining treated  
36 effluent flows to the Outer Harbor at an outfall approximately 3,000 feet offshore via a  
37 60-inch-diameter pipeline. The TIWRP is designed to treat 30 million gallons per day  
38 (mgd) with an advanced treatment system that produces high-quality recycled water at  
39 4.5 mgd. Currently, the plant operates at approximately 50% capacity (LASAN 2021).

40 The City of Los Angeles projected that, by 2040, wastewater flows in the TIWRP service  
41 area will grow to 18 mgd (LASAN & LADWP 2018). Under that projection,  
42 approximately 12 mgd in daily capacity at TIWRP would remain unused, but the five-  
43 year review of the 2006 IRP (LASAN and LADWP 2012) suggested that wastewater  
44 flows were actually decreasing, likely as a result of conservation efforts and rising water  
45 rates, suggesting that even more unused capacity may be available in the future.

1 Data for wastewater generated at the terminal for the CEQA and NEPA baseline is  
 2 estimated by dividing the estimated baseline water use by a factor of 1.11 to account for  
 3 evaporation, outdoor use/storm drain conveyance, and other forms of water loss. Table  
 4 3.12-2 shows the amount of wastewater generated and the percentage it represents of the  
 5 TIWRP’s capacity.

**Table 3.12-2: Wastewater Generation at the Berths 121-131 Terminal**

	<b>CEQA Baseline (2019)</b>	<b>NEPA Baseline (2050)</b>
Total Wastewater (gpd) <sup>a</sup>	8,204	11,064
Total Wastewater (mgd)	0.0082	0.0111
Flow at TIWRP (mgd)	16	18
% of Flow at TIWRP	0.051	0.061
TIWRP Capacity (mgd)	30.0	30.0
% of TIWRP Capacity	0.026	0.037

Note:

<sup>a</sup> Water usage projections from Table 3.12-1 are used as the proxy for wastewater generation, because the amount of wastewater generated is a function of the amount of water used. Water demand (= use) is divided by 1.11 to account for evaporation, outdoor use/storm drain conveyance, etc.

mgd: million gallons per day

6 **3.12.2.3 Storm Drainage**

7 Storm drains are located in the proposed project area and maintained by the LAHD, the  
 8 City of Los Angeles, and Los Angeles County. Storm drainage in the West Basin area  
 9 consists of surface runoff catch basins throughout the area that collect stormwater and  
 10 discharge it into the flood control channel between the Berths 121-131 Terminal and the  
 11 Berths 97-109 Terminal to the south. Runoff along the waterfront of the terminal is  
 12 collected via an on-site storm drain system and discharged to the West Basin along the  
 13 wharf face. The storm drainage system in the proposed project’s vicinity is considered by  
 14 LAHD to be adequate to accommodate current demands.

15 **3.12.2.4 Solid Waste**

16 Existing operations at the Berths 121-131 Terminal generate solid waste consisting of  
 17 non-hazardous materials, such as paper products and other miscellaneous personal trash  
 18 disposed of by on-site staff, and hazardous materials, including oils and greases, paints,  
 19 and solvents. Solid waste generated by terminal operations complies with federal, state,  
 20 and local regulations and codes pertaining to non-hazardous and hazardous solid waste  
 21 disposal, including Chapter VI, Article 6, *Garbage, Refuse Collection* of the City of Los  
 22 Angeles Municipal Code; Part 13, Title 42, *Public Health and Welfare* of the California  
 23 Health and Safety Code; and Chapter 39 of the U.S. Solid Waste Disposal Code.

24 Table 3.12-3 shows the amount of waste in the CEQA baseline (2019) and the NEPA  
 25 baseline, as well as the relative percentage of Chiquita Canyon’s and Sunshine Canyon’s  
 26 permitted throughput.

**Table 3.12-3: Solid Waste Generation at the Berths 121-131 Terminal**

	<b>CEQA Baseline (2019)</b>	<b>NEPA Baseline (2050)</b>
Employees	420	548
Total Solid Waste (pounds/day)	180	236
<b>Total Solid Waste (tons/day)</b>	<b>0.090</b>	<b>0.118</b>
Chiquita Canyon Landfill Permitted Throughput (tons/day)	12,000	12,000
% Chiquita Canyon Landfill Permitted Throughput	0.00075	0.001
Sunshine Canyon Landfill Permitted Throughput (tons/day)	12,100	12,100
% Sunshine Canyon Landfill Permitted Throughput	0.00075	0.001

Source: LACDPW 2020

Notes: Generation factor of 0.43 pounds per employee per day from LAHD and USACE (2014) is appropriate for the Berths 121-131 Terminal project because both projects are container terminal redevelopments.

The percentages for each landfill represent a worst-case scenario, where all of the waste generated by the Proposed Project or alternative would go to a single landfill. However, it is more likely that solid waste would be disposed of at more than one landfill and that recycling would divert a portion from landfills.

1 Under the exclusive franchise system for solid waste recently established by the City of  
 2 Los Angeles (LASAN 2016), the terminal’s non-hazardous solid waste is hauled from the  
 3 terminal and disposed of by Athens Services (hazardous waste is considered in Section  
 4 3.6). Construction waste and contaminated soil would be hauled by the construction  
 5 contractor and/or private firms under subcontract.

6 Non-hazardous solid waste is disposed of at the Chiquita Canyon Sanitary Canyon  
 7 Landfill, Sunshine Landfill, or similar disposal facility approved by the Harbor  
 8 Department, depending on daily capacities and hours of operation. These and other solid  
 9 waste disposal facilities that could be used during construction and/or operation of the  
 10 Proposed Project or alternative are described below.

11 Chiquita Canyon Sanitary Landfill (Chiquita Canyon) is located at 29201 Henry Mayo  
 12 Drive in Castaic, CA, approximately 65 miles from the proposed project site. This facility  
 13 is owned and operated by Chiquita Canyon, Inc., and has a maximum permitted  
 14 throughput of 12,000 tons per day, a remaining capacity of 57 million tons, and an  
 15 estimated remaining operational life, at current actual disposal rates, of 28 years  
 16 (LACDPW 2020). The waste types accepted at this facility include mixed municipal,  
 17 green materials, construction and demolition debris, industrial, and inert.

18 Sunshine Canyon Landfill (Sunshine Canyon) is located at 14747 San Fernando Road in  
 19 Sylmar, CA, approximately 50 miles from the proposed project site. Sunshine Canyon is  
 20 owned and operated by Browning-Ferris Industries (BFI), which is owned by Allied  
 21 Waste and is a wholly owned subsidiary of Republic Services, Inc. Sunshine Canyon has  
 22 a maximum permitted throughput of 12,100 tons per day, a remaining capacity of  
 23 approximately 55 million tons, and an estimated remaining operational life, at current

1 actual disposal rates, of 18 years (LACDPW 2020). The waste types accepted at this  
2 facility include construction and demolition debris, green materials, industrial, inert, and  
3 mixed municipal.

4 LAHD's Construction and Maintenance divisions recycle asphalt and concrete demolition  
5 debris by crushing and stockpiling the crushed material to use on other Port projects.  
6 Additionally, LAHD recycles and diverts ferrous metals and inert materials through a  
7 variety of waste reduction/recycling programs targeting office activities, construction  
8 projects, and maintenance activities. LAHD's diversion rates vary from year to year  
9 largely due to fluctuations in construction project waste, which is heavily recycled. In  
10 2019, LAHD and its audited tenants' waste diversion rate was 48%; the Port and its  
11 audited tenants combined disposed of approximately 5,918 tons of waste and diverted  
12 5,438 tons.

### 13 **3.12.2.5 Electricity and Natural Gas**

14 Energy consumption by, and available supplies to, the Proposed Project are considered in  
15 Section 3.5, Energy. This section considers the adequacy of the local infrastructure  
16 supplying energy to the project site.

#### 17 **Electricity**

18 LADWP provides electrical services to the Port, including the proposed project area. The  
19 industrial power station closest to the Port has four main 138-kilovolt (kV) supply lines,  
20 two from the Harbor Generating Station and two from North Wilmington. A 34.5-kV line  
21 connects with the steam plant generator. Several other electrical power cables are  
22 distributed throughout the Harbor area, including power lines within the proposed project  
23 area. The Berth 121-131 Terminals facilities are designed to step down the incoming  
24 voltage from 34.5 kV (incoming power) to lower voltages for the cranes and general  
25 terminal uses, such as lights and buildings. In addition, Alternative Maritime Power  
26 (AMP) has already been installed on site and is currently in use at Berths 126–129.

#### 27 **Natural Gas**

28 The Southern California Gas Company (SCGC) provides natural gas in the proposed  
29 project area through existing pipeline infrastructure. Small amounts of liquified  
30 petroleum gas (LPG, used in terminal equipment) are supplied by tanker truck.

### 31 **3.12.3 Applicable Regulations**

32 The only regulations that apply to utilities with respect to the Proposed Project are state  
33 and local regulations. There are no applicable federal regulations.

#### 34 **3.12.3.1 State Regulations**

##### 35 **California Urban Water Management Planning Act**

36 The California Urban Water Management Planning Act requires urban water suppliers to  
37 initiate planning strategies that make every effort to ensure that the level of reliability in  
38 their water services is sufficient to meet the needs of their various categories of customers  
39 during normal, dry, and multiple dry-water years. This act also requires water suppliers to  
40 develop urban water management plans (UWMPs) every five years. Since the LADWP

1 would be the water supplier, the Proposed Project or alternative would be subject to the  
2 current UWMP.

### 3 **Senate Bill 610 Water Supply Assessment**

4 Senate Bill (SB) 610 (Chapter 643, Statutes of 2001) amended state law, effective  
5 January 1, 2002, to improve the link between information on water supply availability  
6 and certain land use decisions made by cities and counties. SB 610 seeks to promote  
7 more collaborative planning between local water suppliers and cities and counties. The  
8 statute requires detailed information regarding water availability to be provided to the  
9 city and county decision-makers prior to approval of specified large development  
10 projects. The statute also requires this detailed information be included in the  
11 administrative record that serves as the evidentiary basis for an approval action by the  
12 city or county on such projects. The measure recognizes local control and decision-  
13 making regarding the availability of water for projects and the approval of projects.

14 Under SB 610, water assessments must be furnished to local governments for inclusion in  
15 any environmental documentation for certain projects (as defined in Water Code  
16 10912[a]) subject to CEQA. Under California Water Code Section 10912[a] definitions  
17 of a “project,” the Proposed Project would qualify as:

- 18 • A proposed industrial, manufacturing, or processing plant, or industrial park  
19 planned to house more than 1,000 persons, occupying more than 40 acres of land,  
20 or having more than 650,000 square feet of floor area.

### 21 **California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act**

22 The California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991 (AB 1327) was  
23 enacted on October 11, 1991 and added Chapter 18 to Part 3 of Division 30 of the Public  
24 Resources Code. It required each jurisdiction to adopt an ordinance by September 1,  
25 1994, requiring any “development project” for which an application for a building permit  
26 is submitted to provide an adequate storage area for collection and removal of recyclable  
27 materials. AB 1327 regulations govern the transfer, receipt, storage, and loading of  
28 recyclable materials at the Port.

### 29 **California Integrated Waste Management Act**

30 The State of California requires that all jurisdictions achieve compliance with AB 939  
31 (Public Resources Code Sections 40000 et seq.), a state mandate that requires reaching  
32 50% diversion of solid waste from landfills by 2000. AB 939 further requires each city to  
33 conduct a Solid Waste Generation Study and to annually prepare a Source Reduction and  
34 Recycling Element to describe how it will reach its goals. AB 939 was designed to focus  
35 on source reduction, recycling and composting, and environmentally safe landfilling and  
36 transformation activities. This act required cities and counties to divert 25% of all solid  
37 waste from landfills and transformation facilities by 1995, and 50% by 2000.

38 The City of Los Angeles met the AB 939 mandate and exceeded the year 2000 goals. The  
39 City of Los Angeles has developed a "zero waste" goal to reduce, reuse, recycle, or  
40 convert the resources now going to disposal to achieve an overall diversion level of 90%  
41 or more by 2025 and to leave for disposal only a small amount of inert residual material.

## 3.12.3.2 Local Regulations and Plans

### LADWP Urban Water Management Plan

Consistent with the California Urban Water Management Planning Act, LADWP has prepared a UWMP to describe how water resources are used and to present strategies that will be used to meet the City’s current and future water needs. To meet the objectives of the Act, the LADWP UWMP focuses primarily on water supply reliability and water use efficiency measures. The Act requires water suppliers to develop water management plans every five years. LADWP most recently completed this five-year update in 2020 (LADWP 2021).

### City of Los Angeles Emergency Water Conservation Plan (Ordinance No. 181288)

This ordinance was adopted in August 2010 and amended Chapter XII, Article I of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) to clarify prohibited uses and modify certain water conservation requirements of the City of Los Angeles Emergency Water Conservation Plan (City of Los Angeles 2010). The purpose of the ordinance is to minimize the effect of a water shortage on the customers of the City of Los Angeles and to adopt provisions that will significantly reduce water consumption over an extended period of time. The revised Water Conservation Ordinance contains five water conservation “phases,” which correspond to severity of water shortage, with each increase in phase requiring more stringent conservation measures. Water conservation phases define outdoor watering restrictions, as appropriate, including sprinkler use restrictions and other prohibited water uses.

### Wastewater Facilities Plan/ Water Integrated Resources Plan

The City prepares a wastewater facilities plan approximately every 10 years to review the existing wastewater treatment system, project future wastewater service demands, and identify various facility improvements to meet future demands. Future wastewater demand projections are based, in part, on SCAG population projections.

LASAN and LADWP prepared the Water Integrated Resources Plan (Water IRP) for the wastewater program (LASAN and LADWP 2006). The plan projects wastewater flows and necessary treatment facilities and strategies, and is subject to periodic updates, the last one occurring in 2011 (LASAN and LADWP 2012).

### City of Los Angeles Low Impact Development Program (Ordinance 188125)

The latest update to the Low Impact Development (LID) Program, Ordinance 188125 became effective in April 2024. The ordinance amends and expands the existing Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan requirements (which have been in effect since 2002) and associated LID practices and principles. This ordinance requires all development/redevelopment to capture and manage 100% of the first 0.75-inch storm event on site. This may be achieved by implementing on-site infiltration, capture and use, and biofiltration/bio-treatment BMPs to the maximum extent feasible. The concept of LID is consistent with the recommendations and strategies identified in the IRP, Water

1 Quality Compliance Master Plan, all of the City’s watershed-specific total maximum  
2 daily load Implementation Plans, LADWP’s Water Supply Action Plan, and the Los  
3 Angeles River Revitalization Plan. The Ordinance includes off-site mitigation as a  
4 potential alternative to achieve compliance.

### 5 **Solid Waste Integrated Resources Plan**

6 Consistent with the RENEW LA Plan, the City developed the Solid Waste Integrated  
7 Resources Plan (SWIRP), which serves as the 20-year master plan for City solid waste  
8 and recycling programs (LASAN 2013). The SWIRP outlines City objectives to provide  
9 sustainability, resource conservation, source reduction, recycling, renewable energy,  
10 maximum material recovery, and public health and environmental protection for solid  
11 waste management planning through 2025.

### 12 **“Zero Waste LA” Franchise System Ordinance 182986**

13 This ordinance, adopted April 2014 (Council File 10-1797-S16), established a franchise  
14 system for solid waste services in the City of Los Angeles. The City is divided into 11  
15 franchise zones, including the Harbor (HB) Zone that includes all facilities in the Port of  
16 Los Angeles and is serviced by Athens Services (LASAN 2016). The franchise system’s  
17 goals include higher diversion rates, reduced air emissions from hauling and disposal  
18 equipment, and improved health and safety for solid waste workers.

### 19 **Industrial Waste Control Ordinance**

20 The Industrial Waste Management Division of LASAN was established to protect the  
21 local receiving waters by regulating industrial wastewater discharge to the City’s sewer  
22 system and by administering and enforcing the Industrial Waste Control Ordinance  
23 (Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 64.30) as well as federal EPA pretreatment  
24 regulations.

25 Industrial facilities and certain commercial facilities that plan to discharge industrial  
26 wastewater to the City’s sewage collection and treatment system are required to first  
27 obtain an industrial wastewater permit. Permits are issued when a determination has been  
28 made by the Board of Public Works for the City of Los Angeles that the wastewater to be  
29 discharged will not violate any provisions of the ordinance, the Board’s Rules and  
30 Regulations, the water quality objectives for receiving waters established by the State  
31 Water Resources Control Board, the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board,  
32 or applicable federal or state statutes, rules, or regulations.

### 33 **City of Los Angeles Sustainability Assessment and Plan 34 Formation**

35 In 2019, Mayor Garcetti published “L.A.’s Green New Deal” (Garcetti 2019) that  
36 presented an update to the 2015 Sustainable City pLAN. The update commits the city to  
37 more aggressive clean energy goals with the ultimate objective of making Los Angeles a  
38 carbon-neutral city. Relevant elements include adherence to the Paris Climate  
39 Agreement, specific GHG and carbon reduction targets (including for Port operations),  
40 commitments to renewable energy, green building goals, and cleaner transit and other  
41 mobility initiatives.

## Port Leasing Policy

The Port Leasing Policy requires that all new leases include applicable Port environmental requirements including, but not limited to: air emission controls; water, stormwater and sediment quality; trash management and recycling; lighting and noise control and facility appearance; hazardous material management requirements; facility restoration and decommissioning requirements; and CEQA mitigation measures and reporting requirements.

## 3.12.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

### 3.12.4.1 Methodology

Assessment of the Proposed Project and each alternative's impacts on utilities (water, wastewater, storm drainage, solid waste, and electrical and gas infrastructure) varies depending on the utility; however, the evaluations generally include a comparison of the project-generated demand against existing and anticipated resource supplies and/or conveyance capacity. Quantifications of demands and generations were included based on factors provided by the applicable agencies.

### Water Supply

Water supply or conveyance impacts are typically evaluated by estimating water consumption factors associated with the Proposed Project, or alternative, site land use(s) or, for non-residential development, unit demand factors per acre or gross square footage, as established by the City. The office and industrial areas for the Proposed Project and alternatives would be unchanged from the CEQA baseline conditions, but the increase in employment would cause an increase in water demand. Table 3.12-5 shows the water demand and the percentage of water supply this demand represents under baseline, Proposed Project, and alternative conditions. The projected demand was determined using the applicable LADWP and Department of Public Works factors and the estimated throughput.

### Wastewater

Assessment of impacts on sewers or wastewater treatment systems generally includes a comparison of the Proposed Project or alternatives' land use-based wastewater flow generation to the existing and projected wastewater treatment capacity of the TIWRP, which is 30 mgd. For purposes of this evaluation, water usage projections from Table 3.12-4 were used as the proxy for wastewater generation, because the amount of wastewater generated is a function of the amount of water used. Water demand is divided by 1.11 to account for evaporation, outdoor use/storm drain conveyance, and other forms of water loss. The impact analysis also projects water use based on the wastewater generation for each alternative, as well as the percentage that the generation amounts would contribute to the existing flow and future flow at the TIWRP (see Table 3.12-6).

**Table 3.12-5: Water Demand for the Proposed Project and Alternatives**

	<b>CEQA Baseline (2019)</b>	<b>Proposed Project (2055)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 No Project (2050)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 NEPA Baseline/ No Federal Action (2050)</b>
Employees	420	742	548	548
Water Use/Demand (afy)	10.9	19.2	14.7	14.7
Water Use/Demand (gpd)	9,107	17,141	12,282	12,282
Annual LADWP Demand (afy)	495,685	565,781	565,781	565,781
% of LADWP Demand	0.0022	0.0034	0.0026	0.0026

Notes: See Table 3.12-1 for data sources, assumptions, water rates, and conversion factors.

1

**Table 3.12-6: Wastewater Generation for the Proposed Project and Alternatives**

	<b>CEQA Baseline (2019)</b>	<b>Proposed Project (2055)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 No Project (2050)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 NEPA Baseline/ No Federal Action (2050)</b>
Employees	420	742	548	548
Total Wastewater (gpd)	8,204	17,808	11,064	11,064
Total Wastewater (mgd)	0.0082	0.0178	0.0111	0.0111
Existing TIWRP Flow (mgd)	16	--	--	--
% of Existing Flow at TIWRP	0.051	--	--	
TIWRP Capacity (mgd)	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0
% of TIWRP Capacity	0.027	0.059	0.037	0.037

Note: See Table 3.12-2 for assumptions and conversion factors

2

### Storm Drainage Facilities

3

Assessment of impacts on the storm drain system is based primarily on the determination of the contribution of the Proposed Project or an alternative to stormwater runoff compared to baseline conditions, or the diversion or disruption of surface water flows such that flooding would occur.

4

5

6

## Solid Waste

Impacts related to solid waste generally involve the estimation of the Proposed Project or alternative's land use-based solid waste generation compared to the capacity of the landfill(s) serving the proposed project area. Quantification of solid waste generation was based on actual terminal solid waste data from 2019 and extrapolated for future years (see Table 3.12-7).

**Table 3.12-7: Solid Waste Generation for the Proposed Project and Alternatives**

	CEQA Baseline (2019)	Proposed Project (2055)	Alternative 1 No Project (2050)	Alternative 2 No Federal Action (NEPA Baseline) (2050)
Employees	420	742	548	548
Total Solid Waste (lbs/day)	180	319	236	236
Total Solid Waste (tons/day)	0.090	0.160	0.118	0.118
Chiquita Canyon Landfill Permitted Capacity (tons/day)	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000
% Chiquita Canyon Capacity	0.0008	0.0027	0.001	0.001
Sunshine Canyon Landfill Permitted Capacity (tons/day)	12,100	12,100	12,100	12,100
% Sunshine Canyon Capacity	0.0008	0.0014	0.001	0.001

Notes: Generation factor of 0.43 lbs per person per day from LAHD and USACE (2014), applied to baseline and future scenarios.

The percentages reflect a worst-case scenario where all of the Proposed Project's or alternative's waste would go to a single landfill. It is more likely that solid waste would be disposed of at more than one landfill and that recycling measures would divert a portion of the waste from landfills.

## Electricity and Natural Gas

The determination of impacts on electricity and natural gas infrastructure depends on an estimation of the incremental demand generated by the Proposed Project or alternatives, compared to the capacity of existing conveyance infrastructure. This analysis is included in Impact UT-1. In addition, the impacts of Proposed Project and alternatives with respect to energy conservation, pursuant to Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines, are discussed in Section 3.5 of this Draft EIS/EIR.

## CEQA Baseline

For purposes of this Draft EIS/EIR, the evaluation of significance under CEQA is defined by comparing the Proposed Project or other alternative to the CEQA baseline. The CEQA baseline conditions are described in Section 2.7.1 and summarized in Table 2-1. The CEQA baseline consists of activities that occurred in calendar year 2019, including consumption of water and generation of wastewater and solid waste.

1 The CEQA baseline represents the setting at a fixed point in time. The CEQA baseline  
 2 differs from the No Project Alternative (Alternative 1) in that the No Project Alternative  
 3 addresses what is likely to happen at the proposed project site over time, starting from the  
 4 existing conditions. Therefore, the No Project Alternative allows for growth at the  
 5 proposed project site that could be expected to occur without additional approvals.

## 6 **NEPA Baseline**

7 For purposes of this Draft EIS/EIR, the evaluation of significance under NEPA is defined  
 8 by comparing the Proposed Project or other alternative to the NEPA baseline. The NEPA  
 9 baseline conditions are described in Section 2.7.2 and summarized in Table 2-1.

10 The NEPA baseline, for purposes of this Draft EIS/EIR, is the same as the No Federal  
 11 Action Alternative described in Section 2.7. Under the No Federal Action Alternative  
 12 (Alternative 2), no dredging, dredged material disposal, wharf or pile installation, or  
 13 crane installation would occur, but expansion of the WBICTF and installation of  
 14 electrically powered RMGs would occur.

### 15 **3.12.4.2 Thresholds of Significance**

16 The following significance criteria are based on the 2025 CEQA Appendix G  
 17 Environmental Checklist. The Proposed Project or an alternative would have a significant  
 18 impact on public utilities if it would:

19 **UT-1:** Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water,  
 20 wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or  
 21 telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could  
 22 cause significant environmental effects.

23 **UT-2:** Have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably  
 24 foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years.

25 **UT-3:** Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves  
 26 or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's  
 27 projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.

28 **UT-4:** Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the  
 29 capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid  
 30 waste reduction goals.

31 **UT-5:** Not comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes  
 32 and regulations related to solid waste.

33 The discussion under UT-4 assumes implementation of AB 939, because the City is  
 34 actively implementing measures to comply with AB 939 requirements, such as recycling  
 35 programs and other means of complying with the California Solid Waste Reuse and  
 36 Recycling Access Act to reduce the generation of solid waste and assist the City in  
 37 maintaining solid waste diversion goals pursuant to AB 939.

### 3.12.4.3 Impact Determination

#### Proposed Project

**Impact UT-1: Would the Proposed Project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

#### Water Supply Facilities

During construction, the Proposed Project would use water for various purposes, such as dust suppression, mixing and pouring paving materials, and other construction-related activities. Typically, most of the water use during construction would be associated with dust suppression during grading or trenching, which would be generally performed by water trucks that use non-potable water from off-site sources.

During operation, additional water requirements would be associated with a higher use of restroom and breakroom facilities by a greater number of employees, as well as water used from washing more machinery and containers on site. However, the existing water distribution infrastructure is adequate to serve the increased demand. Given its relatively low water demand, the Proposed Project could readily be accommodated with the anticipated water supplies identified in the UWMP.

#### Wastewater Treatment

The project site is currently connected to the sanitary sewer system. Wastewater generated from the project site would continue to be conveyed to, and treated by, the TIWRP. During construction, temporary portable facilities would be available for construction workers as required and there would be little or no increase in wastewater flows to the sanitary sewer system. Construction of the Proposed Project would not require modification or disruption of the sanitary sewer system other than possible minor reconfigurations associated with the expanded railyard.

Once operational, the Proposed Project would be fully connected to the sanitary sewer system, where wastewater would be conveyed to and processed by the TIWRP. The existing conveyance system is adequately sized for the additional wastewater flows from operation of the Proposed Project.

#### Storm Drainage

The Proposed Project would not increase runoff from the Berths 121-131 Terminal because all improvements would either occur on existing impervious (i.e., paved) space or would replace existing paved surfaces with new paving and structures, and no new terminal area would be added. Stormwater infrastructure would be left in its existing state or, in the area of the railyard expansion, reconstructed to current standards where necessary. No activities would take place that would increase stormwater runoff volumes.

#### Electrical Infrastructure

The Proposed Project would draw more electrical power than under baseline conditions in order to power larger and more numerous cranes, larger vessels connected to AMP, and increasing amounts of electric-powered terminal equipment. Construction would include the provision of additional power distribution facilities within the terminal, but,

1 as described in Section 3. 5 Energy Conservation, there is existing high-voltage  
2 electricity supply to the project area. No construction of additional electrical  
3 infrastructure outside the terminal area is required because, as a separate project, the  
4 LADWP and the Port are partnering in implementing the Electrical Infrastructure  
5 Improvement Program to support the future power demand at the Port, at an estimated  
6 cost of \$500 million.

### 7 **Natural Gas Infrastructure**

8 Under the Proposed Project, natural gas usage would not increase substantially from  
9 baseline conditions because there would be no expansion of building spaces that would  
10 require gas heating. Furthermore, the use of natural-gas-fueled vehicles and equipment  
11 (e.g., forklifts and hostlers) would not increase from baseline conditions and would be  
12 expected to decrease with the introduction of zero-emissions cargo-handling equipment  
13 in 2035. Accordingly, the existing gas supply infrastructure is adequate for the needs of  
14 the Proposed Project.

### 15 **Telecommunications Infrastructure**

16 As part of a heavily industrialized, modern port, the Berths 121-131 Terminal is already  
17 served by extensive telecommunications infrastructure. That infrastructure is continually  
18 modernized and expanded as required by changing industry requirements. Because the  
19 Proposed Project would not alter the nature of those requirements, the terminal would  
20 continue to be served by adequate telecommunications infrastructure.

### 21 **CEQA Impact Determination**

22 Because the TIWRP operates in compliance with the RWQCB's requirements and has  
23 sufficient capacity to accommodate the Proposed Project's wastewater generation,  
24 wastewater discharged into the sewer system from operation of the Proposed Project  
25 would not exceed the system's capacity. During its peak operational year in 2050 and  
26 thereafter, the Proposed Project would not increase water demand, or construct facilities,  
27 sufficient to constitute a "water-demand" project as defined by SB 610, nor would it  
28 result in a substantial increase in water demand that would exceed the water supplies  
29 available from existing entitlements and resources. In addition, the Proposed Project  
30 would not require construction of additional electrical or natural gas infrastructure  
31 outside the terminal area.

32 Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant.

### 33 **Mitigation Measures**

34 No mitigation is required.

### 35 **Residual Impacts**

36 Impacts would be less than significant.

### 37 **NEPA Impact Determination**

38 Because the TIWRP operates in compliance with the RWQCB's requirements and has  
39 sufficient capacity to accommodate the Proposed Project's wastewater generation,  
40 wastewater discharged into the sewer system from construction and operation of the  
41 Proposed Project would not exceed the system's capacity or the requirements of the  
42 RWQCB. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant.

### 43 **Mitigation Measures**

44 No mitigation is required.

1                   ***Residual Impacts***

2                   Impacts would be less than significant.

3                   **Impact UT-2: Would the Proposed Project have sufficient water**  
 4                   **supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable**  
 5                   **future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?**

6                   The increased water usage by the Proposed Project compared to baseline would represent  
 7                   a small fraction of the total LADWP demand (approximately 0.0039 percent; Table 3.12-  
 8                   5) and would be within LADWP’s ability to supply regardless of drought conditions.  
 9                   Furthermore, the Proposed Project would not constitute a water-demand “project” as  
 10                  defined by SB 610. Using LADWP generation rates, a water-demand “project” as  
 11                  described in Section 3.12.3.2.2 requires at least 127,650 gpd, whereas the Proposed  
 12                  Project’s anticipated additional demand (8,565 gpd) would be less than 7% of that  
 13                  amount. Consequently, a water supply assessment is not required.

14                  **CEQA Impact Determination**

15                  Because the Proposed Project would not substantially increase water demand, sufficient  
 16                  water supplies would be available, and impacts would be less than significant.

17                  ***Mitigation Measures***

18                  No mitigation is required.

19                  ***Residual Impacts***

20                  Impacts would be less than significant.

21                  **NEPA Impact Determination**

22                  The Proposed Project would not substantially increase water demand at the Project site.  
 23                  During its peak operational year in 2050, the Proposed Project would not increase water  
 24                  demand, or construct facilities, sufficient to constitute a “water-demand” project, nor  
 25                  would it result in a substantial increase in water demand that would exceed the water  
 26                  supplies available from existing entitlements and resources. Accordingly, impacts would  
 27                  be less than significant.

28                  ***Mitigation Measures***

29                  No mitigation is required.

30                  ***Residual Impacts***

31                  Impacts would be less than significant.

32                  **Impact UT-3: Would the Proposed Project result in a determination**  
 33                  **by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the**  
 34                  **project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected**  
 35                  **demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?**

36                  As shown in Table 3.12-6, the increased employment associated with operations would  
 37                  generate an increase in wastewater of up to 7,728 gpd over the CEQA baseline and 4,656  
 38                  gpd over the NEPA baseline. As described in Section 3.12.2.2, however, the TIWRP is  
 39                  projected to have at least 12 mgd of unused capacity in the future (LASAN and LADWP  
 40                  2018). As Table 3.12-6 shows, the small Project-related increase over the CEQA and  
 41                  NEPA baselines would not exceed the daily capacity of the TIWRP at the Proposed  
 42                  Project’s peak operational year.

**CEQA Impact Determination**

Because the Proposed Project would not generate wastewater volumes that would exceed the capacity of the TIWRP to treat, impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**Residual Impacts**

Impacts would be less than significant.

**NEPA Impact Determination**

Because the Proposed Project would not generate wastewater volumes that would exceed the capacity of the TIWRP to treat, impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**Residual Impacts**

Impacts would be less than significant.

**Impact UT-4: Would the Proposed Project generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?**

Construction and demolition activities could generate debris, including asphalt and concrete from paving and wharf demolition, reinforcing and structural steel, packaging wastes, and other solids, that would require disposal in a landfill. Construction debris is a major contributor to landfill solid waste, making up approximately 14% of the State of California's waste disposal demand (CalRecycle 2020). Asphalt and concrete are typically recycled for aggregate base or disposed of at inert landfills instead of sanitary landfills. LAHD's Asphalt and Concrete Recycling Program provides for the re-use/recycling of construction debris that otherwise would be disposed of at a landfill. The program is part of LAHD's sustainable design and construction policies and practices to protect the environment and consists of crushing salvaged concrete and asphalt concrete rubble into crushed miscellaneous base for reuse under new asphalt and concrete pavements throughout the Harbor. Typically, the Port recycles the majority of demolition debris (Section 3.12.2.4).

Terminal operations would primarily consist of container loading and storage activities, and no additional administrative facilities would be required to support proposed operations. Additionally, operation of the Proposed Project would be required to comply with applicable waste diversion requirements (Section 3.12-3). Because of the increase in activity levels and staffing, Project operations would result in a small increase in the generation of solid waste over the baseline (Table 3.12-7). This waste would require transportation to Sunshine Canyon (hazardous waste is considered in Section 3.7). The amount generated by the Proposed Project represents 0.0014% of the permitted capacity of 12,100 tons per day at Sunshine Canyon. The landfill would be able to accommodate these small increases through its closure date, estimated to be approximately 2037. It should be noted that the City is pursuing zero-waste solutions; if zero waste is achieved, substantial reductions in solid waste could occur over an extended time period.

## CEQA Impact Determination

Waste and uncontaminated debris generated by construction would be largely recycled within the Port; small amounts requiring disposal offsite could be accommodated by existing landfills and other disposal facilities. Accordingly, impacts of construction on solid waste handling and disposal facilities would be less than significant.

Operation would result in a small increase in solid waste generation over the CEQA baseline. That increase would represent an insubstantial fraction of existing and future landfill capacity, and in any case could be further reduced by Port and City waste reduction programs. Accordingly, impacts of operation on solid waste handling and disposal facilities would be less than significant.

### **Mitigation Measures**

Since significant impacts on landfill capacity would not occur, no mitigation is necessary.

However, the LAHD would impose standard conditions (SC) on its construction permits, which would be included in the construction contractor bid specifications, that would further reduce the amount of solid waste generated. SC UT-1 would be implemented to minimize the amount of solid waste generated during construction that would require transportation to a landfill. SC UT-2 is provided not to mitigate an identified environmental impact, but rather to support development of recycled material markets, to the extent feasible.

**SC UT-1 Recycling of Construction Materials.** Demolition and/or excess construction materials will be separated on site for reuse/recycling or proper disposal. During grading and construction, separate bins for recycling of construction materials will be provided on site.

**SC UT-2 Materials with Recycled Content.** Materials with recycled content will be used in project construction where feasible.

### **Residual Impacts**

Impacts would be less than significant.

## NEPA Impact Determination

Waste and debris generated by construction of the Proposed Project would be largely recycled within the Port; small amounts requiring disposal offsite could be accommodated by existing landfills and other disposal facilities. Although hazardous materials could be encountered and require disposal during construction activities, Class I landfills with adequate capacity are available for off-site disposal. Accordingly, impacts of project construction on solid waste handling and disposal facilities would be less than significant.

Operation of the Proposed Project would result in a small increase in solid waste generation over the NEPA baseline. That increase would represent an insubstantial fraction of existing and future landfill capacity, and in any case could be further reduced by Port and City waste reduction programs. Accordingly, impacts of operation of the Proposed Project on solid waste handling and disposal facilities would be less than significant.

### **Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

1                   ***Residual Impacts***

2                   Impacts would be less than significant.

3                   **Impact UT-5: Would the Proposed Project not comply with federal,**  
4                   **state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations**  
5                   **related to solid waste?**

6                   As a business operating in the City of Los Angeles, the Proposed Project would be  
7                   required to conform to the policies and programs of the City of Los Angeles' Solid Waste  
8                   Integrated Resource Plan (see Section 3.12.3). Furthermore, the nature of operations at  
9                   the Project site and the waste streams generated by those operations would not change  
10                  materially from baseline conditions, which include compliance with the applicable state  
11                  and local waste reduction and recycling goals and requirements described in Section  
12                  3.12.3.

13                  **CEQA Impact Determination**

14                  Because the Proposed Project would continue the Berths 121-131 Terminal' compliance  
15                  with state and local solid waste reduction and recycling statutes, regulations, and policies,  
16                  impacts would be less than significant.

17                  ***Mitigation Measures***

18                  No mitigation is required.

19                  ***Residual Impacts***

20                  Impacts would be less than significant.

21                  **NEPA Impact Determination**

22                  Because the Proposed Project would continue the Berths 121-131 Terminal' compliance  
23                  with state and local solid waste reduction and recycling statutes, regulations, and policies,  
24                  impacts would be less than significant.

25                  ***Mitigation Measures***

26                  No mitigation is required.

27                  ***Residual Impacts***

28                  Impacts would be less than significant.

29                  **Alternative 1 – No Project**

30                  Under Alternative 1 (see Section 2.8.1.1), no construction would occur in water or in  
31                  waterside or backland areas. LAHD would not implement any terminal improvements.  
32                  No dredging would occur, no new wharf would be constructed, no new cranes would be  
33                  added, and the expansion of the WBICTF on-dock rail yard would not take place.

34                  Under the No Project Alternative, the existing Berths 121-131 Terminal would continue  
35                  to operate as an approximately 186-acre container terminal using its existing equipment  
36                  and in its existing configuration.

37

1                   **Impact UT-1: Would Alternative 1 require or result in the relocation**  
2                   **or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or**  
3                   **storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or**  
4                   **telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of**  
5                   **which could cause significant environmental effects?**

6                   Existing utilities are adequate to serve the Berths 121-131 Terminal. No construction  
7                   would occur with the No Project Alternative; consequently, no construction-related utility  
8                   demands would occur.

9                   As shown in Tables 3.12-5 through 3.12-7, the increases in cargo throughput and  
10                  employment under Alternative 1 would result in insubstantial increases in water demand  
11                  or wastewater, storm water, or solid waste volumes. Because no additional AMP, RMG  
12                  cranes, or other uses requiring electricity would be installed (other than electric-powered  
13                  mobile equipment required in the future) or natural gas, the electricity and natural gas  
14                  demand of Alternative 1 would not increase substantially. Accordingly, there would be  
15                  no need for new or expanded facilities.

16                  **CEQA Impact Determination**

17                  Because no new infrastructure would be required under Alternative 1, impacts would be  
18                  less than significant.

19                  ***Mitigation Measures***

20                  No mitigation is required.

21                  ***Residual Impacts***

22                  Impacts would be less than significant.

23                  **NEPA Impact Determination**

24                  Analysis of the No Project Alternative is not required under NEPA.

25                  ***Mitigation Measures***

26                  Mitigation measures are not applicable.

27                  ***Residual Impacts***

28                  An impact determination is not applicable.

29                  **Impact UT-2: Would Alternative 1 result in a substantial increase in**  
30                  **water demand that would exceed the water supplies available from**  
31                  **existing entitlements and resources, and would not require new or**  
32                  **expanded facilities or entitlements?**

33                  No construction would occur with Alternative 1; consequently, no construction-related  
34                  impacts would occur.

35                  Alternative 1 would increase water demand at the Berths 121-131 Terminal by  
36                  approximately 3,405 gpd over the CEQA baseline as a result of the increased work force  
37                  at the terminal (Table 3.12-4). The increased demand would still amount to only 0.0007%  
38                  of LADWP's anticipated demand of 565,781 annual acre-feet demand in 2050, and only  
39                  2.6% of the water demand needed to constitute a "water-demand" project. That demand  
40                  could be accommodated by LADWP, as projected in the 2020 UWMP.

1                   **CEQA Impact Determination**  
2                   Because no construction would occur, Alternative 1 would have no construction-related  
3                   impacts on water supplies or facilities. Because Alternative 1 would not result in a  
4                   substantial increase in water demand that would exceed the water supplies available from  
5                   existing entitlements and resources, impacts would be less than significant.

6                   **Mitigation Measures**  
7                   No mitigation is required.

8                   **Residual Impacts**  
9                   Impacts would be less than significant.

10                  **NEPA Impact Determination**  
11                  Analysis of the No Project Alternative is not required under NEPA.

12                  **Mitigation Measures**  
13                  Mitigation measures are not applicable.

14                  **Residual Impacts**  
15                  An impact determination is not applicable.

16                  **Impact UT-3: Would Alternative 1 generate substantial surface runoff**  
17                  **that would exceed the capacity of existing municipal storm drain**  
18                  **systems?**

19                  No construction would occur with the No Project Alternative. Operation of Alternative 1  
20                  would not increase runoff from the Berths 121-131 Terminal because the site is largely  
21                  already impervious (i.e., paved), and the size of the terminal would remain unchanged.

22                  **CEQA Impact Determination**  
23                  Because the Berths 121-131 Terminal would not be physically changed with respect to  
24                  paving and area, the No Project Alternative would not increase runoff to the storm drain  
25                  system, and impacts would be less than significant.

26                  **Mitigation Measures**  
27                  No mitigation is required.

28                  **Residual Impacts**  
29                  Impacts would be less than significant.

30                  **NEPA Impact Determination**  
31                  Analysis of the No Project Alternative is not required under NEPA.

32                  **Mitigation Measures**  
33                  Mitigation measures are not applicable.

34                  **Residual Impacts**  
35                  An impact determination is not applicable.

1                   **Impact UT-4: Would Alternative 1 result in an increase in solid waste**  
2                   **generation due to project operations that would exceed the capacity**  
3                   **of existing solid waste handling and disposal facilities?**

4                   No construction would occur with the No Project Alternative; consequently, no  
5                   construction-related impacts would occur.

6                   Operation of the No Project Alternative would result in a small increase in the generation  
7                   of solid waste as the work force increases in response to increasing cargo throughput. As  
8                   shown in Table 3.12-7, by 2050 Alternative 1 would generate an additional 56 pounds  
9                   (0.028 tons) per day over the CEQA baseline. (A small percentage of this waste would be  
10                  considered hazardous waste and would be transported to an appropriate facility such as  
11                  Buttonwillow or the Kettleman Hills facility.) This amount represents 0.002% of the  
12                  permitted daily capacity of Chiquita Canyon and Sunshine Canyon landfills. Both  
13                  landfills would be able to accommodate the small increase in solid waste generated by  
14                  operation of the No Project Alternative through their closure dates.

15                  **CEQA Impact Determination**

16                  Because no construction would occur with the No Project Alternative, no construction-  
17                  related impacts would occur.

18                  Because operation of Alternative 1 would not exceed the capacity of solid waste handling  
19                  and disposal facilities, impacts on landfill capacity would be less than significant.

20                  **Mitigation Measures**

21                  No mitigation is required.

22                  **Residual Impacts**

23                  Impacts would be less than significant.

24                  **NEPA Impact Determination**

25                  Analysis of the No Project Alternative is not required under NEPA.

26                  **Mitigation Measures**

27                  Mitigation measures are not applicable.

28                  **Residual Impacts**

29                  An impact determination is not applicable.

30                  **Impact UT-5: Would Alternative 1 not comply with federal, state, and**  
31                  **local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to**  
32                  **solid waste?**

33                  As a business operating in the City of Los Angeles, the Berths 121-131 Terminal would  
34                  continue to be required to conform to the policies and programs of the City of Los  
35                  Angeles' Solid Waste Integrated Resource Plan and Industrial Waste Control Ordinance  
36                  (see Section 3.12.3). Furthermore, the nature of operations at the terminal and the waste  
37                  streams generated by those operations would not change materially from baseline  
38                  conditions, which include compliance with the applicable state and local waste reduction  
39                  and recycling goals and requirements described in Section 3.12.3.

## CEQA Impact Determination

Because Alternative 1 would continue the Berths 121-131 Terminal's compliance with state and local solid waste reduction and recycling statutes, regulations, and policies, impacts would be less than significant.

### *Mitigation Measures*

No mitigation is required.

### *Residual Impacts*

Impacts would be less than significant.

## NEPA Impact Determination

Analysis of the No Project Alternative is not required under NEPA.

### *Mitigation Measures*

Mitigation measures are not applicable.

### *Residual Impacts*

An impact determination is not applicable.

## Alternative 2 – No Federal Action

Alternative 2 is a NEPA-required no-action alternative for purposes of this Draft EIS/EIR. The No Federal Action Alternative is identical to the NEPA Baseline. This alternative includes the activities that would occur absent a USACE permit and could include improvements that require a local permit. Absent a USACE permit, no dredging, dredged material disposal, pile installation, wharf construction, or wharf crane installation would occur. However, because the expansion of the WBICTF railyard, with the addition of electrically powered RMG cranes, would occur, the No Federal Action Alternative is a project under CEQA and is, therefore, analyzed in accordance with CEQA in this section.

### **Impact UT-1: Would Alternative 2 result in a substantial increase in wastewater flows that would exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB or the capacity of existing treatment facilities?**

The project site is currently connected to the sanitary sewer system. Construction would be limited to grading, minor trenching, and rail construction. Consequently, no construction activities that could alter the volume or nature of wastewater would occur.

Operation of the No Federal Action Alternative would result in a continued increase in throughput and ship calls to 2050. Increased employee numbers associated with those operations (Table 2-1) would increase wastewater flow from the project site by 6,897 gpd relative to the CEQA baseline, but there would be no change relative to the NEPA baseline (Table 3.12-5). Wastewater generated from the project site would continue to be conveyed to, and treated by, the TIWRP, which has adequate capacity to handle the load. Furthermore, the existing conveyance system is adequately sized for the additional flow anticipated over the long term.

## CEQA Impact Determination

Since construction activities would not alter wastewater flows, construction-related impacts would be less than significant. The negligible increase in wastewater volumes

1 over the CEQA baseline would not exceed the daily capacity of the TIWRP or the  
2 capacity of the sanitary sewer system. Because no uses requiring large quantities of  
3 electricity or natural gas would be installed, there would be no need for additional or  
4 expanded electricity and natural gas infrastructure. Accordingly, impacts would be less  
5 than significant.

6 ***Mitigation Measures***

7 No mitigation is required.

8 ***Residual Impacts***

9 Impacts would be less than significant.

10 **NEPA Impact Determination**

11 Alternative 2 is identical to the NEPA Baseline; accordingly, Alternative 2 would result  
12 in no impact.

13 ***Mitigation Measures***

14 No mitigation is required.

15 ***Residual Impacts***

16 No impacts would occur.

17 **Impact UT-2: Would Alternative 2 result in a substantial increase in**  
18 **water demand that would exceed the water supplies available from**  
19 **existing entitlements and resources, and would not require new or**  
20 **expanded facilities or entitlements?**

21 Construction of the WBICTF expansion would require only minor amounts of water for  
22 dust control, concrete mixing, etc. Operation of Alternative 2 would increase water  
23 demand at the Berths 121-131 Terminal by approximately 3.8 acre-feet per year (3,405  
24 gpd) over the CEQA baseline as a result of the increased work force at the terminal, but  
25 would not differ from the NEPA baseline (Table 3.12-4). The water demand of  
26 Alternative 2 would amount to only 0.003% of LADWP's anticipated demand of 565,781  
27 acre-feet in 2050 and is less than 3% of the demand needed to constitute a "water-  
28 demand" project. That amount of water could be accommodated by LADWP as projected  
29 in the 2020 UWMP (LADWP 2021).

30 **CEQA Impact Determination**

31 Because construction of Alternative 2 would not increase water demand substantially,  
32 construction-related impacts on water supplies or infrastructure would be less than  
33 significant.

34 Because operation of Alternative 2 would not result in a substantial increase in water  
35 demand that would exceed the water supplies available from existing entitlements and  
36 resources, impacts would be less than significant.

37 ***Mitigation Measures***

38 No mitigation is required.

39 ***Residual Impacts***

40 Impacts would be less than significant.

**NEPA Impact Determination**

Alternative 2 is identical to the NEPA Baseline; accordingly, Alternative 2 would result in no impact.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**Residual Impacts**

No impacts would occur.

**Impact UT-3: Would Alternative 2 generate substantial surface runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing municipal storm drain systems?**

Construction of Alternative 2 would not change the amounts of impervious and pervious surface area at the project site or alter the configuration or capacity of the storm drain systems. Once operational, Alternative 2 would not increase runoff from the terminal because the site is largely already impervious (i.e., paved), and the size of the terminal would remain unchanged.

**CEQA Impact Determination**

Because the size of the Berths 121-131 Terminal and the nature of its surfaces and storm drain systems would not be physically changed, the No Federal Action Alternative would not increase runoff, and impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**Residual Impacts**

Impacts would be less than significant.

**NEPA Impact Determination**

Alternative 2 is identical to the NEPA Baseline; accordingly, Alternative 2 would result in no impact.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**Residual Impacts**

No impacts would occur.

**Impact UT-4: Would Alternative 2 result in an increase in solid waste generation due to project operations that would exceed the capacity of existing solid waste handling and disposal facilities?**

Construction of the No Federal Action Alternative would likely generate small amounts of construction debris that would be recycled or disposed of in regional landfills by the construction contractors. These amounts would be minimized by the permit requirements for reduction and recycling described in UT-4 for the Proposed Project. Construction-generated solid waste would not represent substantial contributions to the region's waste stream and would be within the capacity of regional landfills. As in the case of the Proposed Project, any hazardous waste encountered would be managed on a case-by-case basis through the various treatment and disposal options that are available.

1 Operation of Alternative 2 would result in a small increase in the generation of solid  
2 waste as the work force increases in response to increasing cargo throughput. As shown  
3 in Table 3.12-6, by 2050 Alternative 2 would generate an additional 56 pounds per day  
4 over the CEQA baseline but would not differ from the NEPA baseline. A small  
5 percentage of this waste would be considered hazardous waste and would be transported  
6 to an appropriate facility such as Buttonwillow or the Kettleman Hills facility. The  
7 additional solid waste would represent less than 0.0001% of the permitted daily capacity  
8 of the Chiquita Canyon and Sunshine Canyon landfills. Both landfills would be able to  
9 accommodate the small increase in solid waste generated by operation of the No Federal  
10 Action Alternative through their closure dates.

### 11 **CEQA Impact Determination**

12 Because solid waste generated by construction of the No Federal Action Alternative  
13 could be accommodated by regional landfills, construction-related impacts would be less  
14 than significant. Because operation of Alternative 2 would not exceed the capacity of  
15 solid waste handling and disposal facilities, operational impacts on landfill capacity  
16 would be less than significant.

### 17 **Mitigation Measures**

18 No mitigation is required; however, standard conditions SC UT-1 and SC UT-2 would be  
19 implemented to further reduce the amount of solid waste generated.

### 20 **Residual Impacts**

21 Impacts would be less than significant.

### 22 **NEPA Impact Determination**

23 Alternative 2 is identical to the NEPA Baseline; accordingly, Alternative 2 would result  
24 in no impact.

### 25 **Mitigation Measures**

26 No mitigation is required.

### 27 **Residual Impacts**

28 No impacts would occur.

### 29 **Impact UT-5: Would Alternative 2 not comply with federal, state, and** 30 **local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to** 31 **solid waste?**

32 As a business operating in the City of Los Angeles, the Berths 121-131 Terminal under  
33 Alternative 2 would continue to be required to conform to the policies and programs of  
34 the City of Los Angeles' Solid Waste Integrated Resource Plan and Industrial Waste  
35 Control Ordinance (see Section 3.12.3). Furthermore, the nature of operations at the  
36 terminal and the waste streams generated by those operations would not change  
37 materially from baseline conditions, which include compliance with the applicable state  
38 and local waste reduction and recycling goals and requirements described in Section  
39 3.12.3.

### 40 **CEQA Impact Determination**

41 Because Alternative 2 would continue the Berths 121-131 Terminal' compliance with  
42 state and local solid waste reduction and recycling statutes, regulations, and policies,  
43 impacts would be less than significant.

1                   **Mitigation Measures**

2                   No mitigation is required.

3                   **Residual Impacts**

4                   Impacts would be less than significant.

5                   **NEPA Impact Determination**

6                   Alternative 2 is identical to the NEPA Baseline; accordingly, Alternative 2 would result  
7                   in no impact.

8                   **Mitigation Measures**

9                   No mitigation is required.

10                  **Residual Impacts**

11                  No impacts would occur.

12   **3.12.4.4 Summary of Impact Determinations**

13                  Table 3.12-14 summarizes the CEQA and NEPA impact determinations of the Proposed  
14                  Project and alternatives related to utilities and service systems, as described in the  
15                  detailed discussion above. This table is meant to allow easy comparison between the  
16                  potential impacts of the Proposed Project and alternatives with respect to this resource.  
17                  Identified potential impacts may be based on federal, state, or City of Los Angeles  
18                  significance criteria, Port criteria, and the scientific judgment of the report preparers.

19                  For each impact threshold, the table describes the impact, notes the CEQA and NEPA  
20                  impact determinations, describes any applicable mitigation measures, and notes the  
21                  residual impacts (i.e., the impact remaining after mitigation). All impacts, whether  
22                  significant or not, are included in this table. Note that impact descriptions for each of the  
23                  alternatives are the same as for the Proposed Project, unless otherwise noted.

24   **3.12.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts**

25                  No significant unavoidable impacts on utilities or service systems would occur during  
26                  construction or operation of the Proposed Project or an alternative.

**Table 3.12-14: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Utilities Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives**

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Impacts after Mitigation
Proposed Project	<b>UT-1:</b> Would the Proposed Project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant		NEPA: Less than significant
	<b>UT-2:</b> Would the Proposed Project have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant		NEPA: Less than significant
	<b>UT-3:</b> Would the Proposed Project result in a determination by the waste water treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant		NEPA: Less than significant
	<b>UT-4:</b> Would implementation of the Proposed Project generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant		NEPA: Less than significant
	<b>UT-5:</b> Would the Proposed Project not comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant		NEPA: Less than significant

**Table 3.12-14: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Utilities Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives**

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Impacts after Mitigation
Alternative 1 – No Project	<b>UT-1:</b> Would Alternative 1 require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	NEPA: Not applicable
	<b>UT-2:</b> Would Alternative 1 have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	NEPA: Not applicable
	<b>UT-3:</b> Would Alternative 1 result in a determination by the waste water treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	NEPA: Not applicable
	<b>UT-4:</b> Would implementation of Alternative 1 generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	NEPA: Not applicable
	<b>UT-5:</b> Would Alternative 1 not comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	NEPA: Not applicable

**Table 3.12-14: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Utilities Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives**

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Impacts after Mitigation
Alternative 2 – No Federal Action	<b>UT-1:</b> Would Alternative 2 require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact		NEPA: No impact
	<b>UT-2:</b> Would Alternative 2 have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact		NEPA: No impact
	<b>UT-3:</b> Would Alternative 2 result in a determination by the waste water treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact		NEPA: No impact
	<b>UT-4:</b> Would implementation of Alternative 2 generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact		NEPA: No impact
	<b>UT-5:</b> Would Alternative 2 not comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact		NEPA: No impact

### 3.12.5.1 Mitigation Monitoring

Although no mitigation is required, a mitigation monitoring program to track implementation of standard conditions SC UT-1 and AS UT-2 is included in the Draft EIS/EIR. These standard conditions are applicable to the Proposed Project and the No Federal Action Alternative but not to the No Project Alternative.

Standard Condition	<b>SC UT-1: Recycling of Construction Materials.</b> Demolition and/or excess construction materials will be separated on site for reuse/recycling or proper disposal. During grading and construction, separate bins for recycling of construction materials will be provided on site.
Timing	During construction.
Methodology	LAHD will include MM BIO-1 in the contract specifications for construction. LAHD will monitor implementation of mitigation measures during construction.
Responsible Parties	LAHD.
Residual Impacts	Less than significant.
Standard Condition	<b>SC UT-2: Materials with Recycled Content.</b> Materials with recycled content will be used in project construction where feasible.
Timing	During construction.
Methodology	LAHD will include MM BIO-1 in the contract specifications for construction. LAHD will monitor implementation of mitigation measures during construction.
Responsible Parties	LAHD.