

1  
2

## Section 3.11 Public Services

### 3 SECTION SUMMARY

4 This section addresses potential impacts on fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, and other  
5 public services that could result from increasing container-handling capacities at the Berths 121-131  
6 Terminal.

7 Section 3.11, Public Services, provides the following:

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

#### 13 Key Points of Section 3.11:

14 There is adequate existing fire and police protection resources to service the Proposed Project. No new or  
15 expanded services would be required that would result in a significant impact on the environment.  
16 Accordingly, the Proposed Project's impacts on public services would be less than significant.

## 3.11.1 Introduction

This section addresses potential impacts on fire protection and police protection that could result from increasing container-handling capacities at the Berths 121-131 Terminal.

## 3.11.2 Environmental Setting

### 3.11.2.1 Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services

The City of Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) provides fire protection and emergency services to the proposed Project area. The proposed Project site is located within the Harbor Industrial Division service district. Fire prevention, fire protection, and emergency medical services within the City of Los Angeles are operated under the Fire Protection and Prevention Plan, an Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan, and the Fire Code section of the Los Angeles Municipal Code. The Fire Protection and Prevention Plan serves as a guide for the construction, maintenance, and operation of fire protection facilities in the City (City of Los Angeles 2001). The Plan sets forth policies and standards for fire station distribution and location, fire suppression water-flow (or “fire flow”), fire hydrant standards and locations, firefighting equipment access, emergency ambulance services, and fire prevention activities. The City Fire Department also considers population, density, nature of onsite land uses, and traffic flow in evaluating the adequacy of fire protection services for a specific area or land use. The city-wide average response time for fire and emergency medical service (EMS) is approximately 8 to 10 minutes (City of Los Angeles 2001)

The closest fire station to the proposed Project site is Station 36, at 1005 North Gaffey Street, approximately 1,000 feet southwest of the Project site.. Other stations in the vicinity that would assist in response to the Project site include stations 38, 49, 111, and 112. Station No. 38 is located at 124 "I" Street, approximately 2 miles northeast of the Project site, and contains a task force station with a truck and engine company and paramedic ambulance. Station No. 49, approximately 1.5 mile east of the Project site at Berth 194, Station 112, located approximately 1 mile south of the Project site, at Berth 86, and Station 111, located approximately 3 miles to the south at Berth 256, operate fireboats as well as land equipment. Each station has a minimum of one engine and may have a second engine or truck. There is a minimum staffing level of four firefighters per engine and five firefighters per truck. Station 36 response times for EMS, non-EMS, and structure fires are 7 minutes or less (LAFD 2024).

Emergency access to the Berths 121-131 Terminal is the main gate on John S Gibson Boulevard at the I-110 on/off ramp. In the event that access is blocked by train activity, secondary access is provided by an entrance on Front Street at Knoll Drive.

### 3.11.2.2 Police Protection

Police protection for the proposed Project area is provided by the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) and the Los Angeles Harbor Department Police (Port Police). The Project site is located in the LAPD's Harbor Division Area, which includes a 27.5 square-mile area including Harbor City, Harbor Gateway, San Pedro, Wilmington, and Terminal Island.

1 The LAPD Harbor Community station is located at 2175 John S. Gibson Boulevard,  
2 across the street from the entrance to the Berths 121-131 Terminal and has a full staff.  
3 Officers employ radio-dispatched cruisers and traffic control motorcycles to patrol the  
4 Project vicinity. The LAPD provides support to the Port Police and responds to Port  
5 incidents under certain special circumstances.

6 The Los Angeles Port Police (LAHD 2024) are responsible for operations within the  
7 Harbor Department boundaries. The Port Police offices are located at 300 Centre Street in  
8 San Pedro, adjacent to the Harbor Administration Building and approximately 1 mile  
9 south of the Project site. The Port Police, comprised of 300 officers and support  
10 personnel, maintains 24-hour land and water patrols. Port Police response times are 2 to 3  
11 minutes by land and 4 to 6 minutes by water. Port Police security partners include LAPD,  
12 US Coast Guard, US Homeland Security, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, the  
13 Port of Long Beach Security Department, and the Long Beach Police Department.

14 In addition to City and Port Police protection, each tenant occupying a berth or berths in  
15 the Port maintains its own internal security staff.

### 16 **3.11.3 Applicable Regulations**

17 The Port is directed by internal standards and policies that guide the provision of service  
18 to its customers. Each agency charged with protecting the public (LAFD, LAPD, Port  
19 Police) maintains specific standards, such as response times and levels of service that  
20 must be adhered to during construction and operation of a project. There are no federal,  
21 state, or local regulations that would relate specifically to the Proposed Project; instead,  
22 the police and fire services are governed by city codes, and by federal mandates related to  
23 homeland security.

### 24 **3.11.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

#### 25 **3.11.4.1 Methodology**

26 The Proposed Project and alternatives were evaluated to determine if police and fire  
27 protection facilities were adequately staffed and located so they could respond to an  
28 emergency situation in a timely manner, without the provision of additional physical  
29 facilities. Both agencies were contacted to obtain information regarding their existing and  
30 projected service capacity, as well as the projected impacts that would result from  
31 implementation of the Proposed Project.

#### 32 **CEQA Baseline**

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

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

## NEPA Baseline

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

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

### 3.11.4.2 Thresholds of Significance

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

**PS-1:** Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services: fire protection, police protection.

The CEQA checklist includes schools, parks, and “other public facilities” in Impact PS-1, but the Initial Study for the Proposed Project concluded that there would be no impacts in those areas and they need not be considered in the EIR.

### 3.11.4.3 Impact Determination

#### Proposed Project

**Impact PS-1: Would the Proposed Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services: fire protection, police protection?**

#### Fire Protection

Construction of the Proposed Project would take place entirely within the terminal boundaries; accordingly, there would be no interference with access on local roadways or with emergency access to the terminal itself. Accordingly, fire department response times would not be adversely affected.

At full operation, the Proposed Project would involve substantially the same structures and types of activities as under baseline conditions. The increase in activity levels associated with the increased terminal capacity would not affect emergency access or the types of fire hazards at the terminal. The increased cargo throughput and work force could increase the likelihood of an incident requiring either EMS or fire services.

1 However, given that the increased employment at the site would not cause a substantial  
2 increase in local population and that the frequency of hazardous materials incidents is not  
3 expected to increase substantially (see Section 3.7), existing and projected fire protection  
4 resources in the Project vicinity are expected to be adequate to meet any increased  
5 demand.

### 6 **Police Protection**

7 Construction of the Proposed Project would result in increased construction traffic, but  
8 that increase would be counteracted by a decrease in terminal operational traffic, as a  
9 portion of the terminal would be inactive while under construction. Accordingly, the  
10 demand for police services is not expected to increase substantially during construction.

11 Once operational, the Berths 121-131 Terminal would generate more truck and personal  
12 vehicle traffic than under baseline conditions: truck traffic would increase from 319,000  
13 trips per year to 1,602,000 per year and worker vehicle trips would increase four-fold  
14 (Table 2-1). That increase could result in additional demand for response to vehicle  
15 accidents, traffic control, and other incidents. However, given that the increased  
16 employment at the site would not cause a substantial increase in local population and that  
17 the frequency of hazardous materials incidents is not expected to increase substantially  
18 (see Section 3.7), existing and projected police protection resources in the Project vicinity  
19 are expected to be adequate to meet any increased demand.

### 20 **CEQA Impact Determination**

21 Although terminal activity would increase as a result of the Proposed Project, fire and  
22 police resources are expected to be adequate to meet any increased demand for their  
23 services. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant.

#### 24 ***Mitigation Measures***

25 No mitigation is required.

#### 26 ***Residual Impacts***

27 Impacts would be less than significant.

### 28 **NEPA Impact Determination**

29 Although terminal activity would increase as a result of the Proposed Project, LAFD and  
30 LAPD have indicated that fire and police resources are expected to be adequate to meet  
31 any increased demand for their services. Accordingly, impacts would be less than  
32 significant.

#### 33 ***Mitigation Measures***

34 No mitigation is required.

#### 35 ***Residual Impacts***

36 Impacts would be less than significant.

### 37 **Alternative 1 – No Project**

38 Under Alternative 1 (see Section 2.9.1.1), none of the proposed construction activities  
39 would occur in water or in waterside or backland areas. LAHD would not implement any  
40 terminal improvements. No dredging would occur, no new wharf would be constructed,  
41 no new cranes would be added, and the expansion of the WBICTF on-dock rail yard  
42 would not take place. Under the No Project Alternative, the existing Berths 121-131

1 Terminal would continue to operate as an approximately 186-acre container terminal  
2 using its existing equipment and in its existing configuration.

3 **Impact PS-1: Would Alternative 1 result in substantial adverse**  
4 **physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically**  
5 **altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered**  
6 **governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause**  
7 **significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable**  
8 **service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for**  
9 **any of the public services: fire protection, police protection?**

#### 10 **Fire Protection**

11 At full operation, the No Project Alternative would involve substantially the same  
12 structures and types of activities as under baseline conditions. The increase in activity  
13 levels associated with the increased cargo throughput in the future (Table 2-3) would not  
14 affect emergency access or the types of fire hazards at the terminal. The increased cargo  
15 throughput and work force could increase the likelihood of an incident requiring either  
16 EMS or fire services. However, given that the increased employment at the site would not  
17 cause a substantial increase in local population and that the frequency of hazardous  
18 materials incidents is not expected to increase substantially (see Section 3.7), existing and  
19 projected fire protection resources in the vicinity of the Berths 121-131 Terminal are  
20 expected to be adequate to meet any increased demand.

#### 21 **Police Protection**

22 Operation of the No Project Alternative would generate more truck and personal vehicle  
23 traffic than under baseline conditions: truck traffic would increase from 319,000 trips per  
24 year to 1,302,000 per year and worker vehicle trips would approximately double (Table  
25 2-2). That increase could result in additional demand for response to vehicle accidents,  
26 traffic control, and other incidents. However, given that the increased employment at the  
27 site would not cause a substantial increase in local population and that the frequency of  
28 hazardous materials incidents is not expected to increase substantially (see Section 3.7),  
29 existing and projected police protection resources in the vicinity of the Berths 121-131  
30 Terminal are expected to be adequate to meet any increased demand.

#### 31 **CEQA Impact Determination**

32 Although terminal activity would increase as a result of Alternative 1, fire and police  
33 resources are expected to be adequate to meet any increased demand for their services.  
34 Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant.

#### 35 **Mitigation Measures**

36 No mitigation is required.

#### 37 **Residual Impacts**

38 Impacts would be less than significant.

#### 39 **NEPA Impact Determination**

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

#### 41 **Alternative 2 – No Federal Action**

42 Alternative 2 includes the activities that would occur absent a USACE permit and could  
43 include improvements that require a local permit. Without a USACE permit, no dredging,

1 dredged material disposal, pile installation, wharf construction, or wharf crane  
2 installation would occur. However, the expansion of the WBICTF railyard, with the  
3 addition of electrically powered RMG cranes, would occur. Accordingly, the No Federal  
4 Action Alternative is a project under CEQA.

5 **Impact PS-1: Would Alternative 2 result in substantial adverse**  
6 **physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically**  
7 **altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered**  
8 **governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause**  
9 **significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable**  
10 **service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for**  
11 **any of the public services: fire protection, police protection?**

### 12 **Fire Protection**

13 At full operation, the No Federal Action Alternative would involve substantially the same  
14 structures and types of activities as under baseline conditions. The increase in activity  
15 levels associated with the increased cargo throughput in the future (Table 2-3) would not  
16 affect emergency access or the types of fire hazards at the terminal. The increased cargo  
17 throughput and work force could increase the likelihood of an incident requiring either  
18 EMS or fire services. However, given that the increased employment at the site would not  
19 cause a substantial increase in local population and that the frequency of hazardous  
20 materials incidents is not expected to increase substantially (see Section 3.7), existing and  
21 projected fire protection resources in the vicinity of the Berths 121-131 Terminal are  
22 expected to be adequate to meet any increased demand.

### 23 **Police Protection**

24 Operation of the No Federal Action Alternative would generate more truck and personal  
25 vehicle traffic than under baseline conditions: truck traffic would increase from  
26 approximately 319,000 trips per year to 1,182,000 per year and worker vehicle trips  
27 would approximately double (Table 2-2). That increase could result in additional demand  
28 for response to vehicle accidents, traffic control, and other incidents. However, given that  
29 the increased employment at the site would not cause a substantial increase in local  
30 population and that the frequency of hazardous materials incidents is not expected to  
31 increase substantially (see Section 3.7), existing and projected police protection resources  
32 in the vicinity of the Berths 121-131 Terminal are expected to be adequate to meet any  
33 increased demand.

### 34 **CEQA Impact Determination**

35 Although terminal activity would increase as a result of Alternative 1, LAFD and LAPD  
36 have indicated that fire and police resources are expected to be adequate to meet any  
37 increased demand for their services. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant.

### 38 **Mitigation Measures**

39 No mitigation is required.

### 40 **Residual Impacts**

41 Impacts would be less than significant.

### 42 **NEPA Impact Determination**

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

1                    **Mitigation Measures**  
2                    No mitigation is required.

3                    **Residual Impacts**  
4                    No impacts would occur.

#### 5    **3.11.4.4 Summary of Impact Determinations**

6                    Table 3.11-1 summarizes the CEQA and NEPA impact determinations of the proposed  
7                    Project and alternatives related to utilities and service systems, as described in the  
8                    detailed discussion above. This table is meant to allow easy comparison between the  
9                    potential impacts of the Proposed Project and alternatives with respect to this resource.  
10                    Identified potential impacts may be based on federal, state, or City of Los Angeles  
11                    significance criteria, Port criteria, and the scientific judgment of the report preparers.

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

#### 17    **3.11.4.5 Mitigation Monitoring**

18                    No mitigation is required; accordingly, a mitigation monitoring program is not necessary  
19                    and is not included in the Draft EIS/EIR.

#### 20    **3.11.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts**

21                    No significant unavoidable impacts on public services would occur during construction  
22                    or operation of the Proposed Project or an alternative.

**Table 3.11-1: 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>PS-1:</b> Would the proposed Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services: fire protection, police protection.?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant		NEPA: Less than significant
Alternative 1 – No Project	<b>PS-1:</b> Would Alternative 1 result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services: fire protection, police protection.?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	NEPA: Not applicable
Alternative 2 – No Federal Action	<b>PS-1:</b> Would Alternative 2 result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services: fire protection, police protection.?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	CEQA: Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact		NEPA: No impact
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	NEPA: Not applicable