

1

Executive Summary

2 ES.1 Introduction

3 This joint Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report
4 (EIS/EIR) has been prepared to evaluate environmental impacts related to the
5 construction and operation of the Berths 121-131 Container Terminal Redevelopment
6 Project (hereafter referred to as the “Proposed Project”) and alternatives, as proposed by
7 the Los Angeles Harbor Department (LAHD). The project site (Figure ES-1) is located in
8 the West Basin/Wilmington planning area (Planning Area 2) of the Port of Los Angeles
9 Plan area within the City of Los Angeles.

10 This Draft EIS/EIR has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the
11 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and in conformance with the Council for
12 Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations for Implementing NEPA and the U.S. Army
13 Corps of Engineers (USACE) Procedures for Implementing NEPA. This document also
14 fulfills the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the
15 Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970
16 (State CEQA Guidelines). This Executive Summary has been prepared in accordance
17 with Section 15123(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, which states that the EIR should
18 contain a brief summary of the proposed actions and its consequences and should
19 identify: (1) each significant effect with proposed mitigation measures and alternatives
20 that would reduce or avoid that effect; (2) areas of controversy known to the lead
21 agency; and (3) issues to be resolved including the choice among alternatives and
22 whether or how to mitigate significant effects. In addition, this Executive Summary has
23 been prepared in accordance with 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 1502.12, which
24 states that the EIS contains a summary which adequately and accurately summarizes the
25 statement. Throughout the Executive Summary are references to various chapters and
26 sections in the Draft EIS/EIR where detailed information and analyses can be reviewed.

27 USACE is the federal lead agency responsible for preparing the EIS portion of this
28 document. LAHD is the state lead agency responsible for preparing the EIR portion of
29 this document, and is the project applicant for the Proposed Project. Both agencies have
30 determined that there is the potential for significant environmental impacts and, therefore,
31 a joint EIS/EIR has been prepared in the interest of efficiency and to avoid duplication of
32 effort.

1

Figure ES-1. Berths 121-131 Container Terminal Redevelopment Project Location



2
3

4 **ES.2 Purpose of this Draft EIS/EIR**

5 This Draft EIS/EIR will be used to inform decision-makers and the public about the
 6 potential significant environmental effects of the Proposed Project and alternatives. This
 7 Draft EIS/EIR is also being provided to the public for review, comment, and participation
 8 in the planning process. After public review and comment, a Final EIS/EIR will be
 9 prepared that will include responses to comments on the Draft EIS/EIR received from
 10 agencies, organizations, and individuals. The Final EIS/EIR will provide the basis for
 11 decision-making by the CEQA and NEPA lead agencies, as described below. Several
 12 other agencies (federal, state, regional, and local) have jurisdiction over some part of the

1 Proposed Project or a resource area affected by the Proposed Project, and are expected to
2 utilize this EIS/EIR as part of their approval or permit processes.

3 **ES.2.1 NEPA Introduction and USACE Purpose and Need**

4 This EIS/EIR is being prepared by USACE in compliance with NEPA regulations for
5 implementing NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1500–1508), which require
6 the evaluation of potential environmental impacts resulting from federal actions. The
7 primary federal action associated with the Proposed Project is the issuance of a
8 USACE/Department of the Army (DA) permit authorizing work and structures in
9 navigable waters of the United States and for the proposed disposal of dredge material at
10 an established ocean disposal site. USACE has jurisdictional authority over the Proposed
11 Project pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, Section 10 of the Rivers and
12 Harbors Act, and Section 103 of the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act,
13 and has determined an EIS is warranted due to potentially significant direct, indirect, or
14 cumulative impacts associated with the USACE permit action.

15 This document is not serving as a public notice of application for any permit at this time.
16 Rather, such public notice is being published separately from and concurrently with the
17 public review period for this Draft EIS/EIR. The scope of analysis for the federal action
18 and the USACE’s federal control and responsibility consists of permanent and temporary,
19 direct and indirect impacts to waters of the United States associated with wharf and piling
20 demolition, shoreline reconstruction, dredging, dredged material disposal, installation of
21 piles and construction of a new wharf, installation of up to ten new overwater gantry
22 cranes, and construction-related activities in uplands within 100 feet of the water’s edge
23 and which are directly traceable to the proposed in/over/under water work and structures.
24 Additional information on the role of USACE and its jurisdiction and responsibilities
25 with regard to this document and the Proposed Project and alternatives is presented in
26 Section 1.5.1 of Chapter 1, and Sections 2.7.2 and 2.8 in Chapter 2, Project Description
27 of this Draft EIS/EIR. Figure 2-3 in Chapter 2 shows the USACE permit area considered
28 in the federal scope of analysis.

29 As described in more detail in Section 1.1 of Draft EIS Chapter 1 (see Part 1), the
30 USACE purpose for the Proposed Project under NEPA is to improve maritime shipping
31 and commerce by improving container terminal infrastructure in, over, and under water
32 and on terminal backlands at the Berths 121-131 Terminal, while also maintaining
33 consistency with established Port environmental policies. The overall Proposed Project
34 purpose serves as the foundation of the USACE’s NEPA, Section 404, Section 10, and
35 Section 103 analyses.

36 **ES.2.2 CEQA Introduction**

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

43 The actions under consideration by LAHD involve physical changes to the environment
44 that would have potentially significant impacts, as determined in the Initial Study of the
45 Proposed Project (see Appendix A). In addition, comments provided by public agencies,

1 including responsible and trustee agencies, and the public in response to the Notice of
2 Intent/Notice of Preparation (NOI/NOP) have also indicated that the Proposed Project
3 may have significant impacts. Accordingly, an EIR is required. This Draft EIS/EIR
4 evaluates the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the Proposed Project in
5 accordance with the provisions set forth in the State CEQA Guidelines. It will be used to
6 address potentially significant environmental issues.

7 The primary intended uses of this Draft EIS/EIR by LAHD are 1) to inform agencies
8 considering permit applications and other actions required to construct, lease, and operate
9 the selected alternative, 2) to inform the public of the potential environmental
10 consequences of the Proposed Project and alternatives, and 3) to adopt mitigation
11 measures that, where possible, will reduce or eliminate significant environmental
12 impacts. LAHD's certification of the EIR, Notice of Completion, and Statement of
13 Overriding Considerations (if necessary) will document LAHD's decision as to the
14 adequacy of the EIR and will inform subsequent decisions by the LAHD whether to
15 approve and construct the Proposed Project or other selected alternative.

16 **ES.2.3 CEQA Project Objectives**

17 The LAHD's overall project objective is to optimize the container-handling efficiency
18 and capacity of the Berths 121-131 Terminal to accommodate the projected fleet mix of
19 larger container vessels that are anticipated to call at the terminal. To achieve the overall
20 objective, the following detailed objectives need to be met:

- 21 • optimize the use of existing land at the Berths 121-131 Terminal and associated
22 waterways in a manner that is consistent with the LAHD's public trust
23 obligations;
- 24 • provide sufficient depth to ensure the terminal's ability to accommodate the
25 number and size of container ships anticipated to call at the terminal in the
26 foreseeable future;
- 27 • improve the wharf facilities at the Berths 121-131 Terminal to accommodate
28 loading/unloading of those larger ships; and
- 29 • increase on-dock rail facilities to accommodate projected increases in the number
30 of containers through the Berths 121-131 Terminal.

31 **ES.2.4 Baselines**

32 **ES.2.4.1 CEQA Baseline**

33 Consistent with LAHD practice, the CEQA baseline for the Proposed Project consists of
34 conditions in calendar year 2019. Normally, the baseline year for a container terminal
35 project would be the first full calendar year preceding publication of the NOP (CEQA
36 Guidelines, Section 15125, subdivision (a)), which was April 2014 (i.e., calendar year
37 2013). Because a significant amount of time has passed since publication of the NOP, and
38 in view of the economic downturn in 2020 caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, calendar
39 year 2019 was deemed a more appropriate baseline and is used in this Draft EIS/EIR. In
40 that year, the Berths 121-131 Terminal encompassed 186 acres with two vessel berths
41 and five wharf cranes. The terminal handled 354,000 TEUs of containerized cargo; that
42 cargo was conveyed by 153 vessels calling at the terminal, 141 trains, and 160,000 truck
43 trips.

1 **ES.2.4.2 NEPA Baseline**

2 The NEPA baseline for determining significance of impacts is the set of conditions
3 defined by examining the full range of construction and operational activities the
4 applicant could implement and is likely to implement absent federal action, in this case
5 issuance of a permit from USACE.

6 For this Draft EIS/EIR, the NEPA baseline, or No Federal Action Alternative, would not
7 include any dredging, dredge material disposal, wharf demolition or construction, or new
8 cranes in, over, or under navigable waters of the United States, and would not involve
9 federal funding. Accordingly, no federal permit or other action would be required.
10 However, the backlands improvements associated with expansion of the WBICTF on-
11 dock railyard would occur, a new lease would be put in place that would include options
12 to extend the term to 2045, and cargo operations would continue up to the terminal's
13 maximum physical capacity of 1,332,000 TEUs per year.

14 **ES.3 Proposed Project**

15 **ES.3.1 Overview**

16 The Berths 121-131 Terminal is located on John S. Gibson Boulevard in the Port of Los
17 Angeles. The Project site lies on the western side of the Los Angeles West Basin and is
18 generally bounded by port facilities to the north, east, and south, and by the community
19 of San Pedro to the west. Land access is provided by a network of arterial routes and
20 freeways (I-110, I-710, I-405, and State Route [SR]-103/SR-47).

21 The Proposed Project (Figure ES-2) involves the construction and operation of terminal
22 improvements within the Berths 121-131 Terminal. The improvements would include
23 constructing a new wharf at Berths 126-129 with modern wharf cranes capable of loading
24 and unloading the largest containerships, deepening the berth to enable it to
25 accommodate those vessels, and expanding the existing on-dock railyard to enable it to
26 handle more intermodal cargo using fully electric loading cranes.

27 **ES.3.2 Project Construction**

28 Construction (described more fully in Section 2.6.1) would consist of:

- 29 • dredging up to approximately 310,000 cubic yards of sediments to deepen Berths
30 126-129 to -53 ft MLLW with a two-foot overdredge allowance for a total depth
31 of -55 ft MLLW;
- 32 • disposing of dredged sediments at approved upland sites (approximately 260,000
33 cy) and the approved LA-2 ocean disposal site (approximately 50,000 cy);
- 34 • demolishing the existing wharf at Berths 126-129, including removing piles and
35 reconstructing the existing rock dike, installing new concrete piles, and
36 constructing a new concrete, pile-supported wharf at Berth 126-129;
- 37 • relocating the five existing cranes to Berths 121-125 and installing up to ten new
38 100-ft- or 120-ft-gauge electrically powered wharf cranes on the new wharf at
39 Berths 126-129;
- 40 • expanding the WBICTF on-dock rail yard by adding three or four loading tracks
41 and installing up to seven electrically powered RMG cranes.

1 In addition, a new 30-year permit to 2055 would be granted to a selected future tenant. In
 2 support of the CAAP, the long-term permit would require the selected tenant to transition
 3 to zero emissions equipment beginning in 2035.

4 **Figure ES-2: Berths 121-131 Container Terminal Redevelopment Project**



5
 6 All construction would take place on and adjacent to the Berths 121-131 Terminal, which
 7 would continue to operate, although at reduced levels of activity, at Berths 121-125
 8 during construction. Construction would take approximately 24 months and is assumed
 9 for the purposes of this document to begin in 2026 (this assumption was reasonable at the
 10 time analyses commenced and results in a conservative estimate of impacts because the
 11 later construction were to begin the cleaner the construction equipment would be in terms
 12 of air pollutant emissions). The terminal is assumed to begin full operation in 2028 upon
 13 completion of construction.

14 **ES.3.1 Project Operation**

15 Operation of the Proposed Project is described in detail in Section 2.6.2. Implementation
 16 of the Proposed Project would increase the capacity of the terminal to a maximum of
 17 1,871,405 TEU in 2050 (although the Proposed Project would reach capacity in 2050, the
 18 horizon year in this Draft EIS/EIR is 2062 to accommodate the schedules of the
 19 alternatives and the exposure assumptions of the health risk analysis).

20 At maximum capacity the terminal would receive up to 156 vessel calls per year and
 21 would be able to handle the very large container vessels forecasted to arrive at the Port of
 22 Los Angeles (14,000 TEU or more) as well as a range of smaller vessels. Up to fifteen

1 wharf cranes (five at Berths 121-125, the ten new cranes at Berths 126-129) would load
2 and unload vessels. Cargo would be moved by approximately 834,000 truck trips and
3 1,059 train trips per year. Trains would be loaded and unloaded by electrically powered,
4 rail-mounted gantry cranes rather than the diesel-powered rubber-tired cranes currently
5 used, and trucks would continue to be loaded and unloaded by cargo-handling equipment
6 meeting applicable emissions standards and in compliance with state and local mandates
7 for equipment turnover.

8 **ES.4 Issues to be Resolved**

9 Section 15123(b)(3) of the state CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR contain issues to
10 be resolved; this includes whether or how to mitigate significant impacts. This section
11 discusses the major issues to be resolved regarding the Proposed Project. The major
12 issues to be resolved include decisions by the lead agency as to whether:

- 13 • This Draft EIS/EIR adequately describes the environmental impacts of the
14 Proposed Project,
- 15 • The recommended mitigation and lease measures should be adopted or modified,
- 16 • Additional mitigation measures need to be applied to the Proposed Project, or

17 The Proposed Project should or should not be approved for implementation.

18 **ES.5 Alternatives**

19 This Draft EIS/EIR must evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the Proposed
20 Project (Table ES-1) and briefly describe the rationale for selection and rejection of
21 alternatives, compare the merits of the alternatives, and determine an environmentally
22 preferred alternative (under NEPA) and an environmentally superior alternative (under
23 CEQA).

24 Including the Proposed Project, seven alternatives were considered during the preparation
25 of this Draft EIS/EIR (described in Chapter 5). Of these, three (Proposed Project, No
26 Project, and No Federal Action) have been carried forward for detailed co-equal analysis,
27 as required by NEPA, in Chapter 3, Environmental Analysis. Table ES-1 compares those
28 three alternatives. The Proposed Project corresponds to the Reduced Project Alternative
29 described in the NOI/NOP as the LAHD determined, subsequent to the release of the
30 NOP, that the originally proposed project was economically infeasible; accordingly, this
31 Draft EIS/EIR does not include a reduced project alternative.

Table ES-1: Summary of Alternatives

	CEQA Baseline (2019)	Proposed Project (2050)	Alt. 1: No Project (2062)	Alt. 2: No Federal Action (2062)
Annual Throughput (millions of TEUs)	0.354	1.871	1.332	1.332
Annual Ship Calls	153	156	208	208
Peak Day (24-hours) Ship Calls	2	3	3	3
Truck trips (one-way, millions)	0.319	1.668	1.302	1.182
Train trips (one-way)	141	1059	507	768
Operating Cranes	5	15	5	5
Total dredging material (cy)	0	310,000	0	0
Maximum Vessel Size (TEU)				
Berths 121–126	6,5001	6,500	6,500	6,500
Berths 126–129	8,0001	14,000+	8,000	8,000

Note 1: The largest vessels that called in 2019 were 2,000 TEUs and 4,000 TEU at berths 121-125 and 126-129, respectively, but the existing berths could handle the vessel sizes shown.

1 **ES.5.1 Alternative 1 – No Project**

2 State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) requires the analysis of a no-project
3 alternative. This analysis must discuss the existing conditions as well as what would be
4 reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the Proposed Project is not
5 approved. The No Project Alternative is only analyzed under CEQA; the corresponding
6 NEPA analysis considers the No Federal Action Alternative.

7 Under Alternative 1, LAHD would not implement any terminal improvements. None of
8 the proposed construction activities would occur in water or in waterside or backland
9 areas. No new cranes would be added, no dredging or would occur, the WBICTF on-dock
10 rail yard would not be expanded, and no backland modifications would occur. Under the
11 No Project Alternative, the existing Berths 121-131 Terminal would continue to operate
12 as an approximately 186-acre container terminal (Table ES-1). Based on the throughput
13 projections for the Port, the Berths 121-131 Terminal would be expected to operate at its
14 capacity of approximately 1,332,000 TEUs in 2062.

15 **ES.5.2 Alternative 2 – No Federal Action**

16 The No Federal Action Alternative required by NEPA includes only the construction and
17 operation of the proposed WBICTF on-dock railyard expansion and the addition of up to
18 seven RMG cranes at the railyard. No dredging, wharf construction, or wharf crane
19 installation would take place because those activities would require a federal permit.
20 Current operations as a marine container terminal would continue (Table ES-1).

21 The No Federal Action Alternative would increase the capacity of the WBICTF to handle
22 intermodal cargo but would not alter the Berths 121-131 Terminal's total capacity, which
23 would continue to be berth-constrained at 1,332,000 TEUs per year, which would be

1 attained in 2062. In this Draft EIS/EIR the No Federal Action Alternative is also analyzed
 2 under CEQA in order to consider the impacts of construction and operation of the
 3 landside element (the WBICTF expansion).

4 **ES.5.3 Alternatives Considered But Not Further Evaluated**

5 A number of alternatives were considered based on comments received on the NOP/NOI
 6 and during preparation of this Draft EIS/EIR, but were eliminated from further discussion
 7 and detailed, co-equal analysis (see Chapter 5). The alternatives that were considered but
 8 not carried into the EIS/EIR were:

- 9 • Expanded Project with Electrification (the project described in the NOP/NOI)
- 10 • Use of West Coast Ports Outside the Port Complex

11 Other Sites in the Port Complex.

12 **ES.6 Environmental Impacts.**

13 Based on the Initial Study in the NOI/NOP (Appendix A), the following issues have been
 14 determined to be potentially significant and are therefore evaluated in this Draft EIS/EIR:

- | | |
|--|---|
| • Aesthetics and Visual Resources | • Hazards and Hazardous Materials |
| • Air Quality and Meteorology | • Land Use and Planning |
| • Biological Resources | • Noise |
| • Cultural Resources/Tribal Cultural Resources | • Ground Transportation |
| • Energy | • Utilities and Service Systems |
| • Greenhouse Gas Emissions | • Public Services |
| | • Water Quality, Hydrology, and Sediments |
| | • Maritime Transportation |

15 Chapter 3, Environmental Analysis, evaluates those issues. The criteria for determining
 16 the significance of environmental impacts are described for each resource topic in
 17 Chapter 3, Environmental Analysis. Mitigation measures to reduce impacts to less than
 18 significant are proposed whenever feasible.

19 Chapter 4, Cumulative Analysis, discusses the cumulative impacts of the Proposed
 20 Project and the alternatives. Chapter 5 compares the alternatives, and Chapter 6 discusses
 21 socioeconomic impacts. Summary descriptions of the impacts, mitigation measures, and
 22 residual impacts for the Proposed Project and alternatives are provided in Table ES2. -2

23 **ES.6.1 Impacts Not Considered in This Draft EIS/EIR**

24 The scope of this Draft EIS/EIR was established based on the NOI issued by USACE and
 25 the NOP issued by LAHD on April 11, 2014, and comments by agencies and the public.
 26 The NOP concluded that certain topics would involve no significant impact and need not
 27 be evaluated in the Draft EIS/EIR. Accordingly, the Draft EIS/EIR does not analyze
 28 agriculture and forestry, geology and soils, mineral resources, population and housing,
 29 recreation, and wildfire. Although the issue area of public services was eliminated in the
 30 NOP, LAHD has since decided to include that issue in this Draft EIS/EIR.

ES.6.2 Impacts of the Proposed Project

Impacts and mitigation measures are described in Table ES-2.

ES.6.2.1 Unavoidable Significant Impacts

This Draft EIS/EIR has determined that implementation of the Proposed Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to:

- Air Quality and Meteorology:
- Priority pollutant emissions of NO_x from construction (CEQA and NEPA) and of CO from overlapping construction and operation (CEQA);
- Offsite ambient concentrations of NO₂ (federal 1-hr) from construction (CEQA and NEPA);
- Priority pollutant emissions of NO_x (CEQA and NEPA) and PM₁₀ (24-hr and annual average) from operation (CEQA and NEPA).

ES.6.2.2 Summary of Significant Impacts that Can Be Mitigated, Avoided, or Substantially Lessened

This Draft EIS/EIR has determined that implementation of the Proposed Project would result in significant impacts that can be mitigated related to:

- **Air Quality and Meteorology:**
 - Off-site ambient concentrations of PM₁₀ (annual and 24-hr average) and PM_{2.5} (24-hr) from construction (CEQA and NEPA);
 - Off-site ambient concentrations of PM₁₀ (24-hour and annual average) and PM_{2.5} (24-hour) from overlapping construction and operation (CEQA and NEPA);
 - Priority pollutant emissions of CO and VOC from operation (CEQA and NEPA);
 - Offsite ambient concentrations of NO₂ (federal 1-hr) from operation (NEPA).
- **Biological Resources:** underwater noise on marine mammals and fish (CEQA and NEPA).
- **Greenhouse Gases:** greenhouse gas emissions (CEQA).

ES.6.2.3 Summary of Less than Significant Impacts

This Draft EIS/EIR has determined that implementation of the Proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts or no impacts under CEQA and NEPA except where noted otherwise, related to:

- **Aesthetics and Visual Resources:** scenic vistas, scenic resources, scenic quality, light and glare (CEQA), and overall visual character (NEPA).
- **Air Quality:** odors, consistency with the AQMP, exposure of receptors to significant levels of TACs.
- **Biological Resources:** special-status species or their habitats special aquatic sites, Essential Fish Habitat, wildlife movements and migration, disruption of local biological communities.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- **Cultural Resources/Tribal Cultural Resources:** historical resources, archaeological resources, human remains, and tribal cultural resources.
 - **Energy:** wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, consistency with plans and programs.
 - **Hazards and Hazardous Materials:** use or management of potentially hazardous or explosive substances, emergency response plans, tsunami-induced flooding, and terrorist attack.
 - **Land Use:** consistency with applicable land use designations, environmental goals and policies in applicable plans (including the General Plan), nearby land uses, and secondary impacts.
 - **Noise:** excessive ambient noise levels, groundborne vibration, proximity to airports.
 - **Ground Transportation:** construction traffic, public transportation, freeway congestion, rail crossing impacts, emergency access.
 - **Public Services:** police protection, fire protection.
 - **Utilities:** wastewater, solid waste, water supply, stormwater, energy.
 - **Water Quality and Oceanography:** pollution or nuisance, flooding, surface water movement, erosion and sedimentation.
 - **Marine Transportation:** operation of vessel traffic in navigational areas.

1 **Table ES-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation for the Proposed Project and Alternatives**

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
3.1 Aesthetics and Visual Resources				
Proposed Project	AES-1: Would the Proposed Project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
	AES-2: Would the Proposed Project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a state scenic highway?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
	AES-3: In an urbanized area, would the Proposed Project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
	AES-4: Would the Proposed Project create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or night-time views in the area?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
	AES-5: Would the Proposed Project result in substantial negative changes to the overall visual character and quality of a landscape that has a significant effect on viewer response?	NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Alternative 1 – No Project	AES-1: Would Alternative 1 have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	CEQA: No impact	No mitigation is required.	No impact
	AES-2: Would Alternative 1 substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a state scenic highway?	CEQA: No impact	No mitigation is required.	No impact
	AES-3: In an urbanized area, would Alternative 1 conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	CEQA: No impact	No mitigation is required.	No impact
	AES-4: Would Alternative 1 create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or night-time views in the area?	CEQA: No impact	No mitigation is required.	No impact
	AES-5: Would Alternative 1 result in substantial negative changes to the overall	NEPA: Not Applicable	Mitigation not applicable.	Not Applicable

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	visual character and quality of a landscape that has a significant effect on viewer response?			
Alternative 2 – No Federal Action	AES-1: Would Alternative 2 have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
	AES-2: Would Alternative 2 substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a state scenic highway?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
	AES-3: In an urbanized area, would Alternative 2 conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
	AES-4: Would Alternative 2 create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or night-time views in the area?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
	AES-5: Would Alternative 2 result in substantial negative changes to the overall visual character and quality of a landscape that has a significant effect on viewer response?	NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required.	No impact
3.2 Air Quality and Meteorology				
Proposed Project	AQ-1: Would the Proposed Project result in construction-related emissions that exceed the SCAQMD threshold of significance?	CEQA: Significant impact. Impacts of construction would be significant for NO _x . Impacts of overlapping construction and operational emissions would be significant for CO in 2027	MM AQ-1: Harbor Craft Used During Construction. MM AQ-2: On-Road Trucks Used During Construction. MM AQ-3: Non-Road Construction Equipment. MM AQ-4: Cargo Ships Used During Construction. MM AQ-5: Dredging Non-Road Equipment. MM AQ-6: General Construction Mitigation. MM AQ-7: Renewable Diesel Fuel. MM AQ-8: VSRP. MM AQ-9: Yard Tractor Emissions Standards.	Significant and unavoidable. Impacts of construction would be significant and unavoidable for NO _x . Impacts of overlapping construction and operations would be significant and unavoidable for CO .

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
			MM AQ-10: Cargo-Handling Equipment Emissions Standards.	
		NEPA: Significant impact. Impacts of construction would be significant for NO _x . Impacts of overlapping construction and operational NO _x emissions would be less than significant.	MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-10	Significant and unavoidable. Impacts of construction would be significant and unavoidable for NO _x .
	AQ-2: Would Project construction result in off-site ambient air pollutant concentrations that exceed a SCAQMD threshold of significance?	CEQA: Significant impact. Maximum off-site ambient air pollutant concentrations would be significant for PM ₁₀ (24-hour and annual average) and PM _{2.5} (24-hour). Maximum off-site ambient air pollutant concentrations from overlapping construction and operations would be significant for NO ₂ (annual average and federal and state 1-hour average), PM ₁₀ (24-hour and annual average), and PM _{2.5} (24-hour).	MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-10	Significant and unavoidable. Impacts of overlapping construction and operations would be significant and unavoidable for NO ₂ (federal 1-hour average).
	NEPA: Significant impact. Maximum off-site ambient air pollutant concentrations would be significant for PM ₁₀ (24-hour and annual average) and PM _{2.5} (24-hour). Maximum off-site ambient air pollutant concentrations from overlapping construction and operations would be significant for NO ₂ (annual average and federal and state 1-hour average),	MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-10	Significant and unavoidable. Impacts of overlapping construction and operations would be significant and unavoidable for NO ₂ (federal 1-hour average).	

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
		PM ₁₀ (24-hour and annual average), and PM _{2.5} (24-hour).		
	AQ-3: Would the Proposed Project result in operational emissions that exceed an SCAQMD threshold of significance?	CEQA: Significant impact. Impacts would be significant for NO _x in 2028, for CO in all operational years, and for VOC in 2036 through 2062.	MM AQ-8 through MM AQ-10 LM AQ-1: Zero-Emission Cargo Handling Equipment (CHE) Transition. LM AQ-2: Priority Access for Drayage.	Significant and unavoidable. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable for NO _x in 2028
		NEPA: Significant impact. Impacts would be significant for VOC in 2036 and 2050; for CO in all operational years; and for NO _x in 2028 through 2055.	MM AQ-8 through MM AQ-10 LM AQ-1, LM AQ-2	Significant and unavoidable. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable for NO _x in 2028 through 2050.
	AQ-4: Would operation of the Proposed Project result in offsite ambient air pollutant concentrations that exceed a SCAQMD threshold of significance?	CEQA: Significant impact. Impacts would be significant for PM ₁₀ (24-hour and annual average).	MM AQ-8 through MM AQ-10 LM AQ-1 and LM AQ-2	Significant and unavoidable. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable for PM ₁₀ (24-hour and annual average).
		NEPA: Significant impact. Impacts would be significant for NO ₂ (federal 1-hour average) and PM ₁₀ (24-hour and annual average).	MM AQ-8 through MM AQ-10 LM AQ-1 and LM AQ-2	Significant and unavoidable. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable for PM ₁₀ (24-hour average).
	AQ-5: Would the Proposed Project create an objectional odor at the nearest sensitive receptor?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
	AQ-6: Would the Proposed Project expose receptors to significant levels of TACs?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required but MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-10 and LM AQ-1 and LM AQ-2 would further reduce health impacts	Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required but MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-10 and LM AQ-1 and LM AQ-2 would further reduce health impacts	Less than significant

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	AQ-7: Would the Proposed Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable AQMP?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant.
		NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
Alternative 1 – No Project	AQ-1: Would Alternative 1 result in construction-related emissions that exceed a SCAQMD threshold of significance?	CEQA: No impact	Mitigation is not applicable	No impact
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not applicable
	AQ-2: Would construction of Alternative 1 result in off-site ambient air pollutant concentrations that exceed a SCAQMD threshold of significance?	CEQA: No impact	Mitigation is not applicable	No impact
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not applicable
	AQ-3: Would Alternative 1 result in operational emissions that exceed an SCAQMD threshold of significance?	CEQA: Significant impact. Impacts would be significant for VOCs in 2055 and 2062 and for CO in all years of operations.	Mitigation is not applicable	Significant and unavoidable. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable for VOCs in 2055 and 2062 and for CO in all years of operations.
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not applicable
	AQ-4: Would operation of Alternative 1 result in offsite ambient air pollutant concentrations that exceed a SCAQMD threshold of significance?	CEQA: Significant impact. Impacts of concentrations of PM ₁₀ (24-hr and annual) would be significant in 2055 and 2062.	Mitigation is not applicable	Significant and unavoidable. Impacts of concentrations of PM ₁₀ (24-hr and annual) would be significant and unavoidable in 2055 and 2062.
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation is not applicable	Not applicable
	AQ-5: Would Alternative 1 create an objectional odor at the nearest sensitive receptor?	CEQA: Less than significant	Mitigation is not applicable	Less than significant
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation is not applicable	Not applicable
	AQ-6: Would Alternative 1 expose receptors to significant levels of TACs?	CEQA: Less than significant	Mitigation is not applicable	Less than significant
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation is not applicable	Not applicable
	AQ-7: Would Alternative 1 conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable AQMP?	CEQA: Less than significant	Mitigation is not applicable	Less than significant
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation is not applicable	Not applicable

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
Alternative 2 – No Federal Action	AQ-1: Would Alternative 2 result in construction-related emissions that exceed the SCAQMD threshold of significance?	CEQA: Significant impact. Overlapping construction and operational emissions would be significant for CO during 2026 and 2027.	MM AQ-2, MM AQ-3, MM AQ-6, MM AQ-7, MM AQ-8 LM AQ-1 and LM AQ-2	Significant and unavoidable. Overlapping construction and operational emissions would be significant for CO during 2026 and 2027.
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
	AQ-2: Would construction of Alternative 2 result in off-site ambient air pollutant concentrations that exceed a SCAQMD threshold of significance?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact.	No mitigation is required	No impact.
	AQ-3: Would Alternative 2 result in operational emissions that exceed an SCAQMD threshold of significance?	CEQA: Significant impact. Impacts would be significant for VOCs in 2055 and 2062, and for CO in all operational years.	MM AQ-8 through MM AQ-10 LM AQ-1 and LM AQ-2.	Significant and unavoidable. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable for CO in 2026 and 2027.
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact.
	AQ-4: Would operation of Alternative 2 result in offsite ambient air pollutant concentrations that exceed a SCAQMD threshold of significance?	CEQA: Significant impact. Impacts would be significant for PM ₁₀ (annual and 24-hr averages) in 2062.	MM AQ-8 through MM AQ-10 LM AQ-1 and LM AQ-2	Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
	AQ-5: Would Alternative 2 create an objectional odor at the nearest sensitive receptor?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
	AQ-6: Would Alternative 2 expose receptors to significant levels of TACs?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
	AQ-7: Would Alternative 2 conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable AQMP?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	
3.3 Biological Resources				

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
Proposed Project	BIO-1: Would the Proposed Project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	CEQA: Significant impact.	MM BIO-1: Avoid Marine Mammals	Less than significant
		NEPA: Significant impact.	MM BIO-1: Avoid Marine Mammals	Less than significant
	BIO-2: Would the Proposed Project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
	BIO-3: Would the Proposed Project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery?	CEQA: Less than significant impact	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Alternative 1 – No Project	BIO-1: Would Alternative have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	CEQA: Less than significant	Mitigation is not applicable	Less than significant
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not applicable
	BIO-2: Would Alternative 1 have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	CEQA: Significant impact.	No mitigation can be applied to the No Project Alternative	Significant and unavoidable
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not applicable
	BIO-3: Would Alternative 1 interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery?	CEQA: Less than significant	Mitigation is not applicable	Less than significant
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not applicable

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
Alternative 2 – No Federal Action	BIO-1: Would Alternative 2 have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	CEQA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
	BIO-2: Would Alternative 2 have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	CEQA: Significant impact	No feasible mitigation is available	Significant and unavoidable
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
	BIO-3: Would Alternative 2 interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
3.4 Cultural Resources				
Proposed Project	CR-1: Would the Proposed Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064?	CEQA: No impact	No mitigation is required.	No impact
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required.	No impact
	CR-2: Would the Proposed Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
	CR-3: Would the Proposed Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
	CR-4: Would the Proposed Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required; however, SC CR-1 would be applied as a standard condition of approval	Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<p>with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</p> <p>a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or</p> <p>b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?</p>			
	<p>CR-5: Would the Proposed Project result in the permanent loss of, or loss of access to, a significant paleontological resource?</p>	<p>CEQA: Less than significant</p>	<p>No mitigation is required</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
		<p>NEPA: Less than significant</p>	<p>No mitigation is required</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p>Alternative 1 – No Project</p>	<p>CR-1: Would Alternative 1 cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064?</p>	<p>CEQA: No impact</p>	<p>Mitigation not applicable</p>	<p>No impact</p>
		<p>NEPA: Not applicable</p>	<p>Mitigation not applicable</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>
	<p>CR-2: Would Alternative 1 cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?</p>	<p>CEQA: No impact</p>	<p>Mitigation not applicable</p>	<p>No impact</p>
		<p>NEPA: Not applicable</p>	<p>Mitigation not applicable</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>
	<p>CR-3: Would Alternative 1 disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</p>	<p>CEQA: No impact</p>	<p>Mitigation not applicable</p>	<p>No impact</p>
		<p>NEPA: Not applicable</p>	<p>Mitigation not applicable</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>
	<p>CR-4: Would the Proposed Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</p> <p>a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local</p>	<p>CEQA: No impact</p>	<p>Mitigation not applicable</p>	<p>No impact</p>
		<p>NEPA: Not applicable</p>	<p>Mitigation not applicable</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<p>register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?</p>			
	CR-5: Would the Proposed Project result in the permanent loss of, or loss of access to, a significant paleontological resource?	CEQA: No impact	No mitigation is required.	No impact
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not applicable
Alternative 2 – No Federal Action	CR-1: Would Alternative 2 cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064?	CEQA: No impact	No mitigation is required.	No impact
		NEPA: No impact	Mitigation not applicable	No impact
	CR-2: Would Alternative 2 cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
	CR-3: Would Alternative 2 disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
CR-4: Would Alternative 2 cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required; however, SC CR-1 would be applied as a standard condition of approval.	Less than significant	
<p>a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial</p>	NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact	

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?			
	CR-5: Would Alternative 2 result in the permanent loss of, or loss of access to, a significant paleontological resource?	CEQA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
3.5 Energy				
Proposed Project	EN-1: Would the Proposed Project result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
	EN-2: Would the Proposed Project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
Alternative 1 – No Project	EN-1: Would Alternative 1 result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	CEQA: Less than significant	Mitigation not applicable	Less than significant
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not applicable
	EN-2: Would Alternative 1 conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	CEQA: Less than significant	Mitigation not applicable	Less than significant
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not applicable
Alternative 2 – No Federal Action	EN-1: Would Alternative 2 result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
	EN-2: Would Alternative 2 conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
3.6 Greenhouse Gases				
Proposed Project	GHG-1: Would the Proposed Project generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly that would exceed the SCAQMD 10,000 mty CO _{2e} threshold?	CEQA: Significant impact. Operations would be significant for GHGs in 2027, 2036, and 2045.	MM GHG-1: LED Lighting. MM GHG-2: GHG Reduction Offsets MM AQ-2: On-Road Trucks Used during Construction. MM AQ-3: Non-Road Construction Equipment. MM AQ-4: Cargo Ships Used During Construction. MM AQ-5: Dredging Non-Road Equipment. MM AQ-6: General Construction Mitigation Measure. MM AQ-8: Vessel Speed Reduction Program (VSRP). MM AQ-10: Cargo-Handling Equipment Emissions Standards. LM AQ-1: Zero-Emission Cargo Handling Equipment (CHE) Transition. LM AQ-2: Priority Access for Drayage	Less than significant
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not applicable
Alternative 1 – No Project	GHG-1: Would Alternative 1 generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly that would exceed the SCAQMD 10,000 mty CO _{2e} threshold?	CEQA: Significant impact. Operations would be significant for GHGs in 2036 and 2045.	Mitigation measures are not applicable.	Significant and unavoidable. Operations would be significant and unavoidable for GHGs in 2036 and 2045.
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not applicable
Alternative 2 – No Federal Action	GHG-1: Would Alternative 2 generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly that would exceed the SCAQMD 10,000 mty CO _{2e} threshold?	CEQA: Significant impact. Operations would be significant for GHGs in 2036 and 2045.	MM GHG-1: LED Lighting. MM GHG-2: GHG Reduction Offsets. MM AQ-2: On-Road Trucks Used during Construction. MM AQ-3: Non-Road Construction Equipment.	Less than significant

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
			MM AQ-6: General Construction Mitigation Measure. MM AQ-8: Vessel Speed Reduction Program (VSRP). MM AQ-10: Cargo-Handling Equipment Emissions Standards. LM AQ-1: Zero-Emission Cargo Handling Equipment (CHE) Transition. LM AQ-2: Priority Access for Drayage	
		NEPA: Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

3.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Proposed Project	RISK-1: Would the Proposed Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
	RISK-2: Would the Proposed Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
	RISK-3: Would the Proposed Project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
	RISK-4: Would the Proposed Project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
	RISK-5: Would the Proposed Project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
Alternative 1 – No Project	RISK-1: Would Alternative 1 create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
		NEPA: Not Applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not Applicable
	RISK-2: Would Alternative 1 create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
		NEPA: Not Applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not Applicable
	RISK-3: Would Alternative 1 emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
		NEPA: Not Applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not Applicable
	RISK-4: Would Alternative 1 be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
		NEPA: Not Applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not Applicable
	RISK-5: Would the Proposed Project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
		NEPA: Not Applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not Applicable
Alternative 2—No Federal Action	RISK 1: Would Alternative 2 create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
	RISK 2: Would Alternative 2 create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
	RISK-3: Would Alternative 2 emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	RISK-4: Would Alternative 2 be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
	RISK-5: Would the Proposed Project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
3.8 Land Use				
Proposed Project	LU-1: Would the proposed physically divide an established community?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
	LU-2: Would the Proposed Project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
Alternative 1 – No Project	LU-1: Would Alternative 1 physically divide an established community?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not applicable
	LU-2: Would Alternative 1 cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not applicable
Alternative 2 – No Federal Action	LU-1: Would Alternative 2 physically divide an established community?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
	LU-2: Would Alternative 2 cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
3.9 Noise				
Proposed Project	NOI-1: Would the Proposed Project result in generation of a substantial temporary or	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
	NOI-2: Would the Proposed Project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
	NOI-3: For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Proposed Project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels r?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
Alternative 1 – No Project	NOI-1: Would Alternative 1 result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
		NEPA: Not Applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not Applicable
	NOI-2: Would Alternative 1 result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
		NEPA: Not Applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not Applicable
Alternative 2 – No Federal Action	NOI-1: Would construction of Alternative 2 result in daytime construction activities lasting more than 10 days in a 3-month period that would exceed existing ambient exterior noise levels by 5 dBA or more at noise-sensitive receptors?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact	Mitigation not applicable	No impact

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	NOI-2: Would construction of Alternative 2 result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact	Mitigation not applicable	No impact
	NOI-3: For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would Alternative 2 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	CEQA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
3.10 Ground Transportation				
Proposed Project	TRANS-1: Would the Proposed Project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	CEQA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
	TRANS-2: Would the Proposed Project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
	TRANS-3: Would to Proposed Project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	CEQA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
TRANS-4: Would the Proposed Project result in inadequate emergency access?	CEQA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact	
	NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact	
Alternative 1 – No Project	TRANS-1: Would Alternative 1 conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	CEQA: No impact	No mitigation is required.	No impact
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not applicable
	TRANS-2: Would Alternative 1 conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not applicable
	TRANS-3: Would Alternative 1 substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design	CEQA: No impact	No mitigation is required.	No impact
		NEPA: Not applicable	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			
	TRANS-4: Would Alternative 1 result in inadequate emergency access?	CEQA: No Impact NEPA: Not applicable	No mitigation is required. No mitigation is required.	No Impact Not applicable
Alternative 2 – No Federal Action	TRANS-1: Would Alternative 2 conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	CEQA: No Impact NEPA: No Impact	No mitigation is required. No mitigation is required.	No Impact No Impact
	TRANS-2: Would Alternative 2 conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation required.	Less than significant
	TRANS-3: Would Alternative 2 substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	CEQA: No impact	No mitigation is required.	No impact
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required.	No impact
	TRANS-4: Would Alternative 2 result in inadequate emergency access?	CEQA: No impact	No mitigation is required.	No impact
NEPA: No impact		No mitigation is required.	No impact	
3.11 Utilities and Service Systems				
Proposed Project	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?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
	UT-2: Would the Proposed Project have sufficient 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	Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
	UT-3: 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	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			
	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?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
	UT-5: 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	Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
	Alternative 1 – No Project	UT-1: 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.
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not applicable
UT-2: Would Alternative 1 have sufficient 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.	Less than significant
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not applicable
UT-3: 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.	Less than significant
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not applicable
UT-4: Would 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.	Less than significant
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not applicable
UT-5: Would Alternative 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.	Less than significant
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not applicable

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
Alternative 2 – No Federal Action	UT-1: 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	Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
	UT-2: Would Alternative 2 have sufficient 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	Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
	UT-3: Would Alternative 2 result in a determination by the wastewater 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	Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
	UT-4: Would 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	Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
	UT-5: 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	Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
3.12 Water Quality, Hydrology, and Sediments				
Proposed Project	WQ-1: Would the Proposed Project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
	WQ-3: Would the Proposed Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite; iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or iv) impede or redirect flood flows?			
	WQ-4: In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the Proposed Project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
	WQ-5: Would the Proposed Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
Alternative 1 – No Project	WQ-1: Would Alternative 1 violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not applicable
	WQ-3: Would Alternative 1 substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
	i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite; iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not applicable

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	WQ-4: In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would Alternative 1 risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not applicable
	WQ-5: Would Alternative 1 conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	CEQA: No impact	No mitigation is required.	No impact
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not applicable
Alternative 2 – No Federal Action	WQ-1: Would Alternative 2 violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
	WQ-3: Would Alternative 2 substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite; iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	CEQA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
	WQ-4: In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would Alternative 2 risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
	WQ-5: Would Alternative 2 conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	CEQA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
		NEPA: No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
3.13 Marine Transportation				
Proposed Project	VT-1: Would vessel traffic associated with construction or operation of the Proposed	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	Project substantially interfere with operation of designated vessel traffic lanes and/or impair the level of safety for vessels navigating the Main Channel, harbor, or Precautionary Area?	NEPA: Less than significant	Mitigation not applicable	Less than significant
Alternative 1 – No Project	VT-1: Would vessel traffic associated with construction or operation of Alternative 1 substantially interfere with operation of designated vessel traffic lanes and/or impair the level of safety for vessels navigating the Main Channel, harbor, or Precautionary Area?	CEQA: No impact	No mitigation is required.	No impact
		NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not applicable	Not applicable
Alternative 2 – No Federal Action	VT-1: Would vessel traffic associated with construction or operation of Alternative 2 substantially interfere with operation of designated vessel traffic lanes and/or impair the level of safety for vessels navigating the Main Channel, harbor, or Precautionary Area?	CEQA: Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
		NEPA: No impact	Mitigation not applicable	No impact

1

ES.6.2.4 Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would be required by LAHD for the Proposed Project; some of these measures would also be required for Alternative 2, as noted in Table ES-2. Mitigation cannot be applied to the No Project Alternative because there would be no discretionary actions that would allow the imposition of mitigation.

Air Quality and Meteorology

Construction Mitigation Measures

MM AQ-1: Harbor Craft Used During Construction. Tug assist boats used during construction must be equipped with U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Tier 3 engine standards or cleaner at all times during construction.

MM AQ-2: On-Road Trucks Used during Construction. On-road trucks shall comply with the following EPA standards according to their utility:

1. Trucks hauling materials such as debris or fill shall be fully covered while operating off Port property.
2. Idling shall be restricted to a maximum of 5 minutes when not in use.
3. Tier Specifications for all on-road trucks except Import Haulers and Earth Movers:
 - Until December 31, 2026: All on-road heavy-duty diesel trucks with a gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) of 19,500 pounds or greater used on site or to transport materials to and from the site shall comply with 2012 emission standards, or newer, where available.
 - Post January 1, 2027: All on-road heavy duty diesel trucks used on site or to transport materials to and from the site shall comply with 2015 emission standards, or newer, where available.
4. Import hauler trucks that are on-road heavy-duty diesel trucks with a GVWR of 19,500 pounds or greater used to move dirt to and from the construction site via public roadways at the Port of Los Angeles will comply with EPA 2004 on-road emission standards for PM₁₀ and NO_x (0.10 g/bhp-hr and 2.0 g/bhp-hr, respectively).
5. Earth mover trucks, that are heavy-duty diesel trucks with a GVWR of 19,500 pounds or greater used to move dirt within the construction site at the Port of Los Angeles will comply with EPA 2004 on-road emission standards for PM₁₀ and NO_x (0.10 g/bhp-hr and 2.0 g/bhp-hr, respectively).

A copy of each unit's certified U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) rating, Best Available Control Technology (BACT) documentation, and CARB or SCAQMD operating permit shall be provided at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment.

MM AQ-3: Non-Road Construction Equipment. (except vessels, harbor craft, on-road trucks, and dredging equipment). All non-road construction equipment greater than 50 hp must meet EPA Tier 4 emission standards, unless contractor can reasonably demonstrate that such equipment is unavailable to the satisfaction of LAHD.

MM AQ-4: Cargo Ships Used During Construction. All ships and barges used primarily to deliver construction-related materials or cranes shall comply with the expanded Vessel Speed Reduction Program (VSRP) of 12 knots between 40 nautical miles (nm) from Point Fermin and the Precautionary Area. Vessel speed is confirmed by

1 the Marine Exchange. Vessels experiencing a maritime emergency [1] that prevents
2 compliance with the expanded VSRP may be exempt from this measure.

3 [1] Maritime emergencies may include, but are not limited to, suspicious activity,
4 drone/plane activity, security breaches or attempts, United States Coast Guard
5 safety/security/protection zone violations, crimes on land and water, navigation rule
6 violations, vessels in distress, rescues, and fires and emergencies, as defined by the Port
7 of Los Angeles Mariners Guide.

8 **MM AQ-5: Dredging Non-Road Equipment.** The dredger must be electric. This
9 mitigation does not include barges, support vessels, trucks, or land-based construction
10 equipment.

11 **MM AQ-6: General Construction Mitigation Measure.** For any of the above
12 mitigation measures (MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-5), if a CARB-certified technology
13 becomes available that is as good as or better in terms of emissions performance than the
14 existing measure, the technology could replace the existing technology pending approval
15 by LAHD.

16 **MM AQ-7. Renewable Diesel Fuel for Construction Equipment and On-Road
17 Trucks.** Diesel-powered construction equipment and on-road trucks shall be fueled with
18 renewable diesel fuel during construction. The renewable diesel product that is used shall
19 comply with American Society for Testing and Materials (ATSM) fuel standards.

20 In the event of renewable diesel supply challenges or disruptions, ultra-low sulfur diesel
21 (ULSD) shall be used as a secondary fuel provided the contractor can demonstrate to the
22 LAHD substantial evidence of a supply disruption or event in a timely manner.

23 **Operational Mitigation Measures**

24 **MM AQ-8. Vessel Speed Reduction Program (VSRP).** During operations, 100
25 percent of vessels calling at Berths 121-131 shall comply with the expanded VSRP of
26 12 knots between 40 nm from Point Fermin and the Precautionary Area. Vessel speed
27 is confirmed by the Marine Exchange. Vessels experiencing a maritime emergency
28 [1] that prevents compliance with the expanded VSRP may be exempt from this
29 measure.

30 [1] Maritime emergencies may include, but are not limited to, suspicious activity,
31 drone/plane activity, security breaches or attempts, United States Coast Guard
32 safety/security/protection zone violations, crimes on land and water, navigation rule
33 violations, vessels in distress, rescues, and fires and emergencies, as defined by the Port
34 of Los Angeles Mariners Guide.

35 **MM AQ-9: Yard Tractor Emission Standards.**

36 1) No later than one year after the effective date of the permit, all yard tractors shall be
37 alternative-fuel units that are equivalent to or cleaner than a NOx emission rate of 0.02
38 g/bhp-hr and Tier 4 final off-road emission rates for other criteria pollutants.

39 2) By no later than 2035, all yard tractors shall be zero-emission units.

40 **MM AQ-10: Cargo-Handling Equipment Emission Standards.** All yard equipment at
41 the terminal, except for yard tractors, shall implement the following requirements:

42 Forklifts

43 1) No later than one year after the effective date of the permit, all 18-ton diesel
44 forklifts shall be equivalent to or cleaner than Tier 4 final off-road engine emission
45 rates for PM and NOx.

1) No later than one year after the effective date of the permit, all 5-ton forklifts shall be zero-emission units.

2) By no later than 2035, all heavy-duty (18-ton) forklifts shall be zero-emission units.

Toppicks

1) By no later than one year after the effective date of the permit, all diesel top-picks shall be equivalent to or cleaner than Tier 4 final off-road engine emission rates for PM and NOx. All diesel top-picks will be required to use renewable diesel fuel.

2) By no later than 2035, all toppicks shall be zero-emission units.

Rubber-Tired Gantry (RTG) Cranes

No later than one year after the effective date of the permit, all diesel RTGs shall be diesel-electric hybrid units with diesel engines that be equivalent to or cleaner than Tier 4 final off-road engine emission rates for PM and NOx. All diesel-hybrid RTGs will be required to use renewable diesel fuel.

Sweepers

1) No later than one year after the effective date of the permit, sweeper(s) shall be alternative fuel or the cleanest available technology. .

Shuttle Buses

1) By no later than 2030, shuttle buses shall be zero emissions.

Biological Resources

MM BIO-1: Protect marine mammals. Although it is expected that marine mammals will voluntarily move away from the area at the commencement of the vibratory or “soft start” of pile-driving activities, as a precautionary measure, pile-driving activities occurring as part of the pile installation will include establishment of a safety zone, by a qualified marine mammal professional, and the area surrounding the operations (including the safety zones) will be monitored for marine mammals by a qualified marine mammal observer¹. The pile driving site will move with each new pile; therefore, the safety zones will move accordingly.

Greenhouse Gases

MM GHG-1: LED Lighting. All lighting within the interior of buildings on the premises and outdoor high mast terminal lighting will be replaced with LED lighting or a technology with similar energy-saving capabilities by the first year after completion of construction of the Proposed Project or Alternative.

MM GHG-2: GHG Reduction Offsets. The Tenant and/or LAHD shall be required to purchase and retire carbon offsets related to activities that reduce, avoid, destroy, or sequester an amount of GHG emissions in an off-site location to offset the equivalent amount of GHG emissions generated by the Project in excess of the LAHD’s significance threshold of 10,000 metric tons. From the first year of the Permit amendment through the

¹ Marine mammal professional qualifications shall be identified based on criteria established by LAHD during the construction bid specification process. Upon selection as part of the construction award winning team, the qualified marine mammal professional shall develop site specific pile-driving safety zone requirements, which shall follow NOAA Fisheries Technical Guidance for Assessing the Effects of Anthropogenic Sound on Marine Mammal Hearing (NOAA 2024) in consultation with the acoustic threshold white paper prepared for this purpose by LAHD (LAHD 2017b). Final pile-driving safety zone requirements developed by the selected marine mammal professional shall be submitted to LAHD Construction and Environmental Management Divisions prior to commencement of pile-driving.

1 end of the term of the Permit, the Tenant and/or LAHD shall purchase and retire carbon
2 offsets each year in an amount that would be the equivalent of the Project's estimated
3 residual GHG emissions. The estimated residual emissions for each calendar year shall be
4 based upon the calculations in Appendix C of the Final EIR prepared for the Revised
5 Project except as adjusted in accordance with paragraph a) or b), below.

6 The LAHD is in the process of developing a Greenhouse Gas Program. The Program
7 shall be used for GHG-reducing projects and programs approved by the Port of Los
8 Angeles. If that Program is established during the term of the Permit, the Tenant and/or
9 LAHD shall have the option to offset the required amount of GHG emissions through a
10 funding contribution to the Greenhouse Gas Program rather than towards purchasing
11 carbon offsets from a CARB-recognized registry.

12 While the LAHD Greenhouse Gas Program is currently under development, the Tenant
13 and/or LAHD shall purchase and retire carbon offsets from a CARB-recognized offset
14 registry as follows:

15 **Carbon offsets:** The Tenant and/or LAHD shall purchase and retire carbon offsets from a
16 CARB-recognized registry to ensure that offsets will result in real, permanent, additional,
17 quantifiable, verifiable, and enforceable reductions. The carbon offsets shall be verifiable
18 and enforceable in accordance with the registry's applicable standards, practices, or
19 protocols.

20 The order of priority for purchasing (any one or more) carbon offsets shall be considered
21 as follows:

- 22 i. Originating within the local area;
- 23 ii. Originating within the South Coast Air Basin;
- 24 iii. Originating within the state of California; or
- 25 iv. If sufficient local and in-state offsets are not available, conforming national
26 offsets registered with a CARB-recognized registry.

27 **Adjustment of the Project's Required Offsets through Other Verified GHG**
28 **Emission Reductions:** The Tenant and/or LAHD may pursue the following
29 modifications to the Project's total estimated GHG emissions identified in this measure.
30 These modifications may be pursued in conjunction with or independent of each other on
31 an up to annual basis.

32 a. *Adjustment in GHG Emissions*

33 In the event of changes in activities, efficiency, reduced operations, regulations, or for
34 any other purpose, an adjustment of the required carbon offsets based may be requested
35 on an evaluation of actual GHG emissions rather than future projected GHG emission
36 calculations. If the actual GHG emissions minus the CEQA Baseline do not exceed the
37 significance threshold of 10,000 mty, no carbon offsets shall be required. To adjust the
38 required number of carbon offsets for purchase by the Tenant, the Tenant shall make a
39 request in writing to the LAHD for review and approval for the calendar year under
40 consideration and shall submit a report within 60 days that quantifies the actual
41 greenhouse gas emissions by an expert or an independent, qualified third-party. The
42 evaluation of actual greenhouse gas emissions must be performed using acceptable
43 industry standards and protocols for all sources that were included in the Project's GHG
44 emissions calculations under Impact GHG-1. LAHD review shall occur within 30 days of
45 receipt of the submitted report. Any expenses incurred by LAHD in processing the
46 Tenant's request, including retaining an independent third-party verifier to peer review

1 the report, shall be borne by the Tenant. Alternatively, LAHD may implement a review
2 for its own purpose, subject to the same quantification process described above, to adjust
3 GHG emissions at any time during the life of the Project.

4 or

5 *b) Implementation of Additional GHG Reduction Methods*

6 In addition, the Tenant may request a re-evaluation of required carbon offsets to be
7 purchased according to this paragraph. The Tenant may implement different and
8 additional GHG reduction methods that are equally or more effective if new technology
9 and/or other feasible measures become available during the term of the Permit. To adjust
10 the Tenant's required number of carbon offsets for purchase, the Tenant shall identify
11 such additional GHG reduction actions and must quantify the GHG emission reductions
12 from these GHG reduction actions by an independent, qualified third-party verifier. Once
13 the GHG reduction actions are found to be feasible and are reviewed and approved by
14 LAHD staff, the Tenant may request that LAHD reduce its required purchase of carbon
15 offsets by the equivalent amount of demonstrated reduction. Any expenses incurred by
16 LAHD in processing the Tenant's request, including retaining a third-party verifier, shall
17 be borne by the Tenant.

18 **ES.6.2.5 Lease Measures and Standard Conditions of Approval**

19 **Air Quality and Meteorology**

20 The following lease measures would be required by LAHD for the Proposed Project and
21 Alternative 2:

22 **LM AQ-1: Zero Emission Cargo Handling Equipment (CHE) Transition. 1) Annual**
23 **Equipment Procurement Planning.** Prior to the effective date of the new Permit, Tenant
24 shall submit to the Port an inventory of all existing terminal cargo handling equipment
25 covered by the Clean Air Action Plan ("CAAP") Feasibility Assessment ("Cargo
26 Handling Equipment"), including equipment on-site, off-site equipment that is relocated
27 for on-site use, and ordered equipment, including its useful life, as defined by i) the
28 Original Equipment Manufacturer specifications or ii) Applicable Law, if an Applicable
29 Law comes into effect that supersedes useful life defined by OEM. For avoidance of
30 doubt, Tenant shall be entitled to continue using Cargo Handling Equipment listed in the
31 inventory for its useful life, notwithstanding any new feasibility assessment, unless if a
32 piece of Cargo Handling Equipment has not yet reached the end of its useful life as
33 defined by OEM and an Applicable Law comes into effect that requires that same piece
34 of Cargo Handling Equipment to be replaced by Zero Emission equipment, the
35 Applicable Law would govern, and Tenant shall replace the Cargo Handling Equipment
36 prior to the end of the OEM's useful life.

37 Within one (1) year following the effective date of the Permit, and updated annually
38 thereafter, Tenant shall develop a replacement plan, for all existing Cargo Handling
39 Equipment, including the planned replacement year for each piece of equipment based on
40 the expected useful life of existing terminal equipment. If there is any deviation from the
41 equipment replacement plan for a given year that involves non-zero emissions equipment,
42 Tenant agrees to notify the Executive Director prior to the purchase of any new or
43 replacement terminal Cargo Handling Equipment that deviates from the equipment
44 replacement plan. Tenant agrees to meet and confer with the Executive Director or
45 his/her designee, upon request, regarding such deviation concerns within fourteen (14)
46 days of Tenant's original notice of the proposed deviation, unless the parties agree to
47 extend the time period. Tenant shall identify any Cargo Handling Equipment that is not

1 required to be replaced pursuant to current cargo handling equipment regulations in
2 accordance with Applicable Law.

3 Notwithstanding the foregoing, Tenant shall be required to purchase cleanest feasible
4 available technology as defined, by Applicable Law.

5 2) Zero Emission Equipment and Infrastructure Plan. Within one (1) year following the
6 effective date of the Permit, Tenant shall develop a plan to transition terminal Cargo
7 Handling Equipment to zero emissions that will achieve the following goal:

- 8 • Before January 1, 2030, terminal Cargo Handling Equipment must begin transitioning to
9 zero emissions, if feasible.

10 For equipment covered by the Clean Air Action Plan (CAAP) Feasibility Assessment, the
11 most recent CAAP Feasibility Assessment shall determine whether zero emissions Cargo
12 Handling Equipment is feasible from a financial, technical, and operational perspective,
13 and if not, the cleanest feasible alternative Cargo Handling Equipment. In the event the
14 Tenant performs its own feasibility assessment which differs from the CAAP Feasibility
15 Assessment, the Tenant may request a re-evaluation in writing to the Executive Director
16 or his/her designee and provide a written report detailing the evidence and supporting
17 documentation concerning feasibility and other relevant factors. The re-evaluation and
18 feasibility determination shall be subject to mutual agreement between the Board of
19 Harbor Commissioners and Tenant, which shall not be unreasonably withheld by Tenant.
20 Tenant is responsible for furnishing its own evidence and agrees to pay for any
21 reasonable and actual expenses incurred by the City in processing the Tenant's request
22 for a re-evaluation, including retaining an independent third-party verifier to peer review
23 the Tenant's report. Parties shall split the costs of an independent third-party verifier on a
24 50/50 basis, subject to the following conditions: i) Tenant participated by submitting
25 written comments on the then-most recent CAAP Feasibility Assessment; ii) new data
26 that has arisen since the time of the most-recent CAAP feasibility analysis to support
27 Tenant's assertion that zero emissions Cargo Handling Equipment is not feasible from a
28 financial, technical, and operational perspective; and iii) the City's portion of the
29 expenditure may not exceed \$150,000, in aggregate, over the term of the Agreement.
30 The parties shall appoint the independent third-party verifier within ninety (90) days of
31 Tenant's request for the reevaluation; if the parties cannot agree on the independent third
32 party within that timeframe, the Board shall make the appointment.

33 For all other terminal equipment not covered by the CAAP Feasibility Assessment, the
34 cleanest feasible equipment includes, but is not limited to equipment that is determined in
35 writing by the Executive Director and Tenant, to be feasible from a financial, technical,
36 and operational perspective. Tenant agrees to provide any updates to its plan to the
37 Executive Director or his/her designee consistent with the requirements of this measure.

38 Tenant shall submit an Application for Port Permit (APP) to the Executive Director prior
39 to implementing the plan and installing any necessary charging and/or fueling equipment
40 to support the operation of zero emission equipment, which shall be subject to all
41 necessary environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality
42 Act and/or the National Environmental Policy Act and agency permitting and approvals.

43 **LM AQ-2: Priority Access for Drayage.** A priority access system shall be implemented
44 at the B121-131 Terminal to provide preferential access to zero- and near-zero-emission
45 trucks.

Cultural Resources

SC CR-1: Stop Work in the Area if Prehistoric and/or Archaeological Resources are Encountered. In the unlikely event that any prehistoric artifact of historic period materials or bone, shell, or nonnative stone is encountered during construction, work shall be immediately stopped, the area secured, and work relocated to another area until the found materials can be assessed by a qualified archaeologist. Examples of such cultural materials might include historical trash pits containing bottles and/or ceramics; or structural remains or concentrations of grinding stone tools such as mortars, bowls, pestles, and manos; chipped stone tools such as projectile points or choppers; and flakes of stone not consistent with the immediate geology such as obsidian or fused shale. The contractor shall stop construction within 30 feet of the exposure of these finds until a qualified archaeologist can be retained by LAHD to evaluate the find (see 36 CFR 800.11.1 and 14 CCR 15064.5(f)). If the resources are found to be significant, they shall be avoided or shall be mitigated consistent with Section 106 of the NHPA or State Historic Preservation Officer Guidelines.

Utilities

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.

ES.6.2.6 Cumulative Impacts

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

A total of thirty-six projects in the general area of the Berths 121-131 Terminal could contribute to impacts that could be cumulatively significant. The Proposed Project and the alternatives were analyzed in conjunction with those related projects for their potential to contribute to significant cumulative impacts. The analysis was conducted for the future years considering the predicted activity levels for those years without the Proposed Project (termed the future baseline). This approach differs from the analyses summarized above, which assess impacts relative to the CEQA baseline of, for this project, 2019.

Cumulative impact evaluations for each resource are included in Chapter 4 of this Draft EIS/EIR. The Proposed Project would expand the capacity of an existing container terminal, and its operations would be consistent with other uses and container terminals in the proposed project area. After mitigation, the Proposed Project would make cumulatively considerable contributions to significant cumulative impacts in the following resource areas under both CEQA and NEPA:

- Air Quality and Meteorology;

1 Alternatives 1 (No Project) and 2 (No Federal Action) would make cumulatively
2 considerable contributions to significant cumulative impacts in the following resource
3 areas under CEQA (Alternative 1 is not applicable to NEPA and Alternative 2 would not
4 result in any impact under NEPA and would thus not contribute to cumulative impacts):

- 5 • Air Quality and Meteorology;
- 6 • Biological Resources;
- 7 • Greenhouse Gases (Alternative 1 only).

8 **Proposed Project Cumulatively Considerable Impacts**

9 ***Air Quality and Meteorology***

- 10 • After the implementation of mitigation, emissions from construction of the
11 Proposed Project would make cumulatively considerable and unavoidable
12 contributions to existing significant cumulative impacts for NO_x and CO
13 emissions under CEQA and for NO_x emissions under NEPA. Construction of the
14 Proposed Project would also make a cumulatively considerable and unavoidable
15 contribution to a significant cumulative impact for off-site ambient
16 concentrations of NO₂ under CEQA and NEPA.

17 After the implementation of mitigation, the Proposed Project's operational emissions
18 would make a cumulatively considerable and unavoidable contribution to an existing
19 significant cumulative impact for NO_x, under CEQA and NEPA. Proposed Project
20 operations would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to an existing
21 significant cumulative impact related to ambient offsite pollutant concentrations of PM₁₀
22 and NO₂.

23 After the implementation of mitigation, the Proposed Project would make a cumulatively
24 considerable and unavoidable contribution to an existing significant cumulative impact
25 for occupational and residential cancer risk under CEQA, for residential cancer risk under
26 NEPA, and for population cancer burden, and chronic and acute hazards under CEQA
27 and NEPA.

28 **Alternative 1 (No Project) Cumulatively Considerable Impacts**

29 Alternative 1 is only analyzed under CEQA; accordingly, the significance findings are
30 not applicable to NEPA.

31 ***Air Quality and Meteorology***

- 32 • Emissions from operation of Alternative 1 would make a cumulatively
33 considerable and unavoidable contribution to an existing significant cumulative
34 impact for CO and NO_x.

35 Operation of Alternative 1 would make a cumulatively considerable and unavoidable
36 contribution to a significant cumulative impact for cancer risk, population cancer burden,
37 and chronic and acute hazards risk.

38 ***Biological Resources***

- 39 • Operation of Alternative 1 would make a cumulatively considerable and
40 unavoidable contribution to a significant cumulative impact related to the
41 introduction of non-native species.

Greenhouse Gases

Greenhouse gas emissions from Alternative 1 would make a cumulatively considerable and unavoidable contribution to an existing significant cumulative impact related to GHG and global climate change.

Alternative 2 (No Federal Action) Cumulatively Considerable Impacts

Alternative 2 is identical to the NEPA baseline and therefore would have no impacts under NEPA. The following determinations of cumulative impact apply only to CEQA.

Air Quality and Meteorology

- After the implementation of mitigation, Construction and concurrent operation of Alternative 2 would make a cumulatively considerable and unavoidable contribution to a significant cumulative impact for CO emissions.
- After the implementation of mitigation, emissions from operation of Alternative 2 would make a cumulatively considerable and unavoidable contribution to a significant cumulative impact for CO.

After the implementation of mitigation, Operation of Alternative 2 would make a cumulatively considerable and unavoidable contribution to a significant cumulative impact for cancer risk, population cancer burden, and chronic and acute hazards risk.

Biological Resources

Operation of Alternative 2 would make a cumulatively considerable and unavoidable contribution to a significant cumulative impact related to the introduction of non-native species.

Less than Cumulatively Considerable or No Cumulatively Considerable Impacts

The Proposed Project and alternatives would not contribute to cumulatively considerable impacts under CEQA and NEPA for the following resource areas:

- Aesthetics and Visual Resources
- Air Quality (objectionable odors at nearby sensitive receptors; conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable AQMP)
- Biological Resources (loss of special-status species or their habitats; reduction of designated natural habitats; interference with wildlife movement; permanent loss of marine habitat)
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Land Use
- Noise
- Ground Transportation
- Public Services
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Water Quality, Sediments, and Oceanography
- Marine Transportation.

ES.6.2.7 Socioeconomic and Growth-Inducing Impacts

The effects of the Proposed Project and alternatives on population, housing, and employment are discussed in Chapter 6 (Socioeconomics). The Proposed Project would result in employment for construction activities (an estimated 1,792 direct and secondary jobs) and “Port Industry” operations over the long term, including associated jobs, output, and tax revenues related to cargo movement and handling. Long-term jobs associated with the Proposed Project would include those directly related to cargo movement and handling operations at the Port (7,349 at full operation), and those related to purchases of goods and services by Port Industry businesses and workers (13,349 at full operation).

The economic benefits would primarily occur within the Southern California region comprising Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura Counties. While the economic impacts of the Proposed Project would be beneficial, the increase in jobs attributable to the Proposed Project would be relatively small compared to current and projected future employment in the larger economic region.

The Proposed Project would not displace any housing or induce the construction of new housing, nor would it have a measurable effect on population distribution, local property values, or adjacent communities.

Alternative 1 would not generate any construction jobs, and Alternative 2 would generate approximately 1,290 direct and secondary construction jobs. Both alternatives would result in increased employment relative to the CEQA baseline, but the increase would represent a very small portion (less than 0.1%) of overall regional employment. Neither alternative would displace any housing or induce the construction of new housing, or have a measurable effect on population distribution, local property values, or adjacent communities.

ES.6.2.8 Significant Irreversible Changes to the Environment

Implementation of the Proposed Project would require the use of non-renewable resources, such as fossil fuels and non-renewable construction materials. Fossil fuels used during construction would include diesel and gasoline to power vehicles and construction equipment and electricity to provide lighting and power for construction activities. Most of these energy uses would represent irretrievable expenditures of non-renewable resources. To the extent electricity is provided by renewable sources (described in Section 3.12, Utilities and Service Systems), some energy use would not represent an irretrievable and irreversible commitment.

Non-recoverable materials and energy would be used during operation, but the amounts needed would be accommodated by existing supplies. As with construction, some of the electrical energy would be supplied by renewable sources. Although the increase in energy used would be limited, those energy supplies would nevertheless be unavailable for other uses. The minimal irreversible changes likely would be justified by the economic growth in trade and import/export of goods, as well as the increased efficiency in cargo handling at the Port, which the Proposed Project would provide. The impact of irreversible changes associated with the Proposed Project and alternatives is considered less than significant under both CEQA and NEPA.

ES.6.3 Environmentally Preferred and Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA requires identification of an environmentally superior alternative. Similarly, NEPA requires that the Record of Decision (ROD) specify the alternative(s) considered to be environmentally preferable. The environmentally superior and preferable alternatives were determined based on a ranking system that assigned numerical scores comparing the impacts under each resource area for each alternative relative to the Proposed Project for CEQA and the NEPA baseline for NEPA. Tables 6-2 and 6-3 in Chapter 6 present a comparison of the Proposed Project and each alternative by those resource areas with significant and unavoidable impacts under CEQA and NEPA.

Under the CEQA analysis, Alternative 1 (No Project) is identified as having the fewest impacts because no construction would occur and operational activity levels (except the number of oceangoing vessel calls) would be less than the Proposed Project's. However, CEQA requires that if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project alternative, another alternative be identified as environmentally superior. Accordingly, Alternative 2 (No Federal Action) is identified as environmentally superior because it would have fewer impacts related to air quality than the Proposed Project, and less severe impacts overall.

Alternative 1 is not considered under NEPA. Under the NEPA analysis, Alternative 2, which is the same as the NEPA baseline, would have no impacts compared to the NEPA baseline, whereas the Proposed Project would have significant and unavoidable impacts under NEPA in the area of air quality. Accordingly, Alternative 2 is the environmentally preferable alternative under NEPA.

Neither alternative would meet all of the project objectives set forth in Section 2.4. Both would keep the Berths 121-131 Terminal berth constrained because the terminal could not accommodate the larger vessels of the future world containership fleet. Accordingly, the alternatives would not meet the objectives of optimizing the use of existing land, providing sufficient berth depth to accommodate larger vessels, or improve wharf facilities. Alternative 2 would meet the objective of increasing the use of on-dock rail, but Alternative 1 would not.

ES.7 Public Comment

During the NOI/NOP scoping process, individuals and organizations provided comments on the scope and content of the Draft EIS/EIR. The scoping period lasted from April 11, 2014, until May 25, 2014, and included one scoping meeting on May 8, 2014.

Table 1-4 in Chapter 1 presents a summary of the relevant comments on the NOI/NOP and where a particular comment would be addressed in this Draft EIS/EIR. Key comments requested that the document discuss the Clean Truck Program and cargo vessel emissions profiles, that a traffic study be conducted, and that cultural resource consultation and mitigation be included.