Final

Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project Environmental Impact Report and Application Summary Report

CAL IF

SCH#2009081079

Port of Long Beach



January 2018

This Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared by the City of Long Beach
(COLB), acting by and through the Board of Harbor Commissioners (BHC) (Port of Long Beach
[POLB or Port]), relating to the potential environmental impacts associated with implementation
of the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project (hereinafter "Project," "proposed
Project," or "12th Street Alternative"). This Final EIR fulfills the requirements of the California
Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Codes [PRC] 21000 *et seq.*)
and CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations [CCR] 15000 *et seq.*).

- 8 This Final EIR contains two chapters that are added to the Draft EIR:
- Chapter 10 (Modifications to the Draft EIR) presents corrections, updates, and clarifications to the Draft EIR. Text changes to the Draft EIR have been organized by Draft EIR chapters and sections. Modifications to the Draft EIR have been made to correct, update, and clarify information in the Draft EIR based on public and agency comments received during the public review period. Many of the revisions to the Draft EIR are related to refinements of the 12th and 10th Street alternatives based on public comments received and further engineering analysis.
- Chapter 11 (Responses to Comments) describes the public review process for the Draft
 EIR undertaken pursuant to CEQA, and it includes comments received on the Draft EIR
 and responses to those comments. This chapter is organized as follows:
- 19 Section 11.1 (page 11-1) Master Responses (responses to common comments)
- 20 Section 11.2.3.1 (page 11-16) Responses to Comments from Government Agencies
- 21 Section 11.2.3.10 (page 11-64) Responses to Comments from Community Groups
- 22 Section 11.2.3.17 (page 11-107) Responses to Comments from Industry and
 23 Businesses
- 24 Section 11.2.3.38 (page 11-236) Responses to Comments from Individuals
- 25 Section 11.2.4 (page 11-260) Responses to Testimony Received at Public Meetings
- 26 Section 11.2.5 (page 11-310) Responses to Comments on Speaker Cards

27 The revisions presented in this Final EIR were reviewed to determine whether recirculation of the Draft EIR was necessary in accordance with CEQA Guidelines and Statutes. The 28 modifications would not result in any new significant environmental impacts or a substantial 29 30 increase in the severity of an existing environmental effect. The changes are consistent with the findings contained in Chapter 3 (Environmental Setting and Project Impacts) of the Draft 31 32 EIR. There would be no new or increased significant effects on the environment due to the 33 proposed refinements to the proposed Project and alternatives; no new alternatives have been 34 identified that would reduce significant effects of the proposed Project. Therefore, recirculation of the Draft EIR is not warranted. 35

1 TABLE OF CONTENTS

2	СНАР	TER 10 M0	DIFICATIO	NS TO THE DRAFT EIR	10-1
3	10.1	DESIGN	MODIFICAT	IONS AFFECTING THE PROJECT DESCRIPTION	10-1
4	10.2	CHANGE	S TO THE C	RAFT EIR	10-4
5		10.2.1	Changes to	o the Draft EIR Executive Summary	10-5
6		10.2.2	Changes to	Draft EIR Chapter 1 – Introduction and Project	
7			Descriptior	۱	10-5
8		10.2.3	Changes to	Draft EIR Chapter 2 – Related Projects and	
9			Relationsh	ip to Local and Regional Plans	10-7
10		10.2.4	Changes to	Draft EIR Chapter 3 (Sections 3.1 through 3.14)	10-7
11		10.2.5	Changes to	D Draft EIR Chapter 4 – Alternatives Comparison	10-10
12		10.2.6	Changes to	D Draft EIR Chapter 8 – List of Preparers and	10 11
13		10 2 7		S Draft EIP Chanter Q - Poteronces	10-11
14	40.0				10-11
15	10.3		DREVISED	TABLES	10-13
16	10.4	REVISED	FIGURES.		10-21
17	CHAP	TER 11 RE	SPONSES	TO COMMENTS	11-1
18	11.1	PUBLIC C	COMMENT F	PROCESS	11-1
19	11.2	COMMEN	ITS ON THE	DRAFT EIR	11-1
20		11.2.1	Written Co	mments	11-1
21		11.2.2	Master Res	sponses to Key Topics Identified in Comments	
22		44.0.0	Received		
23		11.2.3	Responses	Colifernia Air Resources Roard (CAPR)	11 16
24 25			11.2.3.1	California Department of Toxic Substances Control	11-10
25			11.2.0.2	(DTSC)	11-27
27			11.2.3.3	California Department of Transportation (CADOT)	11-32
28			11.2.3.4	California Transportation Commission (CATC)	11-34
29			11.2.3.5	South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD)11-36
30			11.2.3.6	City of Inglewood (COI)	11-57
31			11.2.3.7	Los Angeles Department of Water & Power (LADWP)11-58
32			11.2.3.8	Los Angeles County Public Works (LACPW)	11-60
33			11.2.3.9	Long Beach Board of Health and Human Service	
34			44.0.0.40	(LBBHHS)	11-61
35			11.2.3.10	Church of the Good Snepherd, Arcadia, CA (CGS)	11-64
30			11.2.3.11	Cabrieleno Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation	11-05
38			11.2.3.12	(GBMI)	11-89
39			11.2.3.13	Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)	11-93
40			11.2.3.14	Sierra Club, Angeles Chapter (SCAC)	11-95
41			11.2.3.15	Sierra Club, Long Beach Area Group (SCLB)	11-102
42			11.2.3.16	Wilmington Neighborhood Council (WNC)	11-103
43			11.2.3.17	Allied Packing and Rubber, Inc. (APR)	11-107
44			11.2.3.18	Berns Bros., Inc. (BBI)	11-114
45			11.2.3.19	Berth 55 Landing of Long Beach, Inc. (B55)	11-117
46			11.2.3.20	Chemoil Terminals Corporation (CTC)	11-122
47			11.2.3.21	Golden Star Restaurants (GSR)	11-127

1		11.2.3.22	Harbor Trucking Association (HTA)	11-133
2		11.2.3.23	HJ Baker (HJB)	11-134
3		11.2.3.24	LAN Logistics, Inc. (LLI)	11-137
4		11.2.3.25	Magnolia Industrial Group, Inc. (MIG)	11-154
5		11.2.3.26	Marisa Foods (MF)	11-158
6		11.2.3.27	Pacific Maritime Shipping Association (PMSA)	11-162
7		11.2.3.28	Phillips Steel Company (PSC)	11-163
8		11.2.3.29	Southern California Edison (SCE)	11-184
9		11.2.3.30	Spun Products, MLZ, Inc. (SP)	11-188
10		11.2.3.31	SRM Corporation (SRM)	11-190
11		11.2.3.32	Superior Electrical Advertising (SEA)	11-198
12		11.2.3.33	Teamsters Local Union No. 848 (T848)	11-217
13		11.2.3.34	Tesoro SoCal Pipeline Company, LLC (TSPC)	11-219
14		11.2.3.35	Trans Harbor, Inc., Trans Harbor Investments, Inc.	
15			(TH)	11-224
16		11.2.3.36	Westside Project Area Council (WPAC)	11-225
17		11.2.3.37	Wilmington Chamber of Commerce (WCC)	11-231
18		11.2.3.38	Wilson Trust (WT)	11-236
19		11.2.3.39	Lynette Ferenczy (LF)	11-243
20		11.2.3.40	Thomas Gillilan (TG)	11-246
21		11.2.3.41	Kat Janowicz (KJ)	11-247
22		11.2.3.42	David Kelly (DK)	11-248
23		11.2.3.43	Mike Laquatra (ML)	11-249
24		11.2.3.44	Russ McCurdy (RM)	11-251
25		11.2.3.45	Colleen McDonald (CM)	11-252
26		11.2.3.46	Robert Rodine (RR)	11-255
27		11.2.3.47	Staci Schwartz (SS)	11-257
28		11.2.3.48	Adam Wolven (AW)	11-258
29	11.2.4	Testimony	Received at Public Meetings	11-260
30	11.2.5	Additional	Written Comments Received	11-310

1 LIST OF TABLES

~	Table 40. A Chapters to Detential Dreparty Associations from Design Medifications	40.4
2	Table 10-A Changes to Potential Property Acquisitions from Design Modifications	10-1
3	Table 10-1 Revisions and Corrections to Executive Summary of the Draft EIR	10-5
4	Table 10-2 Revisions and Corrections to Chapter 1 of the Draft EIR	10-5
5	Table 10-3 Revisions and Corrections to Chapter 2 of the Draft EIR	10-7
0 7	Table 10-4 Revisions and Corrections to Chapter 3 of the Draft EIR	10 10
/ 0	Table 10-5 Revisions and Corrections to Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR	10 11
8	Table 10-6 Revisions and Corrections to Chapter 6 of the Draft EIR	10-11
9	Table 10-7 Revisions and Conections to Chapter 9 of the Drait EIR	10-11
10	Table 10-8 New and Revised Tables	10-13
11	Construction of the Proposed Project with Mitigation	10 14
12	Deviced Table 2.2.59 Maximum Health Impacts Estimated for Operation of the No.	10-14
13	Revised Table 3.2-36 Maximum Realin Impacts Estimated for Operation of the No	10.15
14 4 E	Project Alternative	10-15
15	Revised Table 3.6-1 Potential Property Acquisitions for the 10 th Street Alternative	10-10
16	Revised Table 3.6-2 Potential Property Acquisitions for the 10 th Street Alternative	10-17
1/	Revised Table 3.6-3 Potential Project Acquisitions for the 9" Street Alternative	10-18
18	New Table 3.9-1 Potentially Contaminated Sites in the Footprint of the Proposed	10.40
19		10-18
20	Table 10-9 Revised Figures	10-21
21	Table 11.2-1 Written Comments Received on the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support	
22		11-2
23	Table 11.2-2 Travel Time Difference (Weekday) from Berth 66 to Long Beach City	
24	Hall, in Minutes	11-13
25	Table 11.2-3 Open Contaminated Sites in the Proposed Project Area	11-30
26	Table 11.2-4 Updated Paved Road Dust Emission Factors	11-43
27	Table 11.2-5 Updated NO ₂ and CO Background Concentrations	11-44
28	Table 11.2-6 Updated Maximum Pollutant Concentrations of NO ₂ and CO during	
29	Operation of the Proposed Project without Mitigation	11-45
30	Table 11.2-7 Updated Maximum Pollutant Concentrations of PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} during	
31	Operation of the Proposed Project without Mitigation	11-51
32	Table 11.2-8 Updated Maximum Health Impacts Estimated for Construction and	
33	Operation of the Proposed Project without Mitigation	11-52
34	Table 11.2-9 Updated Maximum Health Impacts Estimated for Construction and	
35	Operation of the Proposed Project with Mitigation	11-53
36	Table 11.2-10 Modeled Air Pollutant Impacts near 1335 W. 11th Street (Mitigated	
37	Proposed Project)	11-113
38	Table 11.2-11 Modeled Air Pollutant Impacts near Golden Star Restaurant No. 1	
39	(Mitigated Proposed Project)	11-130
40	Table 11.2-12 Modeled Air Pollutant Impacts near Phillips Steel – 1368 W. Anaheim	
41	Street (Mitigated Proposed Project)	11-178
42	Table 11.2-13 Modeled Air Pollutant Impacts near Phillips Steel – 1545 W. Anaheim	
43	Street (Mitigated Proposed Project)	11-179
44	Table 11.2-14 Modeled Air Pollutant Impacts near the Multi-Service Center	
45	(Mitigated Proposed Project)	11-181
46	Table 11.2-15 Modeled Air Pollutant Impacts near Queens Wharf (Mitigated	
47	Proposed Project)	11-194

1 2	Table 11.2-16 Modeled Air Pollutant Impacts near Superior Electrical Advertising (Mitigated Proposed Project)	7
3	Table 11.2-17 Comparison of Earthquake and Project-Related Ground-Shaking	_
4 5	Table 11.2-18 Testimony Received at Public meetings for the Pier B On-Dock Rail	C
6	Support Facility Draft EIR	0
7	Table 11.2-19 Modeled Air Pollutant Impacts near Century Villages at Cabrillo	7
8 9	Table 11.2-20 Modeled Air Pollutant Impacts near 1335 W. Cowles Street (Mitigated	1
10	Proposed Project11-30	5
11 10	Table 11.2-21 Modeled Air Pollutant Impacts near 2000 W. Cowles Street (Mitigated	6
12	F10p03eu F10je0t11-30	J

1 LIST OF FIGURES

2 3	Figure 10.1-1 Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility, 12 th Street Alternative (Proposed Project) with Refinements	10-2
4 5	Figure 10.1-2 Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility, 10 th Street Alternative with	10-3
6	Revised Figure FS-1 and Revised Figure 1.7-2 Project Vicinity Man	0_23
7	Revised Figure 1.7-3 Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project Location Man with	0 20
8	Approximate Project Boundaries	0-24
g	Revised Figure 1 8-1 Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility 12 th Street Alternative	021
10	(Proposed Project)	0-25
11	Revised Figure 1.8-8 Estimated Phase 3 Construction for the Pier B On-Dock Rail	0 20
12	Support Facility 12 th Street Alternative (Proposed Project)	0-27
13	Revised Figure 1.8-9 Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility, 10th Street Alternative1	0-29
14	Revised Figure 1.8-11 Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility, 9th Street Alternative1	0-31
15	Revised Figure 2.1-1 Map of Related Projects	0-33
16	Revised Figure 3.3-3 Project Area Floodplains1	0-35
17	Revised Figure 3.5-6 Roadway Network Changes (10th Street Alternative)1	0-36
18	Revised Figure 3.6-1 The Proposed Project's Relationship to City of Long Beach and	
19	City of Los Angeles Boundaries	0-37
20	Revised Figure 3.6-5 Potential Acquisitions for the Proposed Project (12 th Street	
21	Alternative)1	0-39
22	Revised Figure 3.6-6 Potential Acquisitions for the Proposed Project (10th Street	
23	Alternative)	0-41
24	Revised Figure 3.6-7 Potential Acquisitions for the Proposed Project (9th Street	
25	Alternative)1	0-43
26	Revised Figure 3.7-1 Location of Public Services for the Pier B On-Dock Rail	
27	Support Facility Project1	0-45
28	Revised Figure 3.8-3 Noise Measurements/Receptor Location1	0-46
29	Revised Figure 3.9-1 Oil Production Facilities within the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support	
30	Facility Project Site	0-47
31	Revised Figure 3.9-2 Hazardous Materials or Waste Facilities in the Vicinity of the	
32	Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project Site	0-48
33	Revised Figure 3.10-2 Distribution of Minority Population in the Proposed Project	
34	Area of Influence	0-49
35	Revised Figure 3.10-3 Distribution of Low-Income Population in the Proposed Project	
36	Area of Influence	0-50
37	Figure 11.2-1 Updated Area of Exceedance of the 1-Hour Federal NO ₂ Threshold	
38	during Operation in 2020 – Proposed Project without Mitigation	1-46
39	Figure 11.2-2 Updated Area of Exceedance of the 1-Hour Federal NO ₂ Threshold	
40	during Operation in 2025 – Proposed Project without Mitigation	1-47
41	Figure 11.2-3 Updated Area of Exceedance of the 1-Hour Federal NO ₂ Inreshold	4 40
42	during Operation in 2035 – Proposed Project without Mitigation	1-48
43	Figure 11.2-4 Opdated Area of Exceedance of the Annual NO ₂ Infeshold during	1 40
44 45	Deration in 2020 – Proposed Project Without Witigation	1-49
40 46	Figure 11.2-5 Opualed Area of Exceedance of the Annual NO ₂ Threshold during	1 E0
40	Operation in 2025 – Proposed Project without witigation	1-20

1

This page intentionally left blank.

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

2	Acronym	Definition
3	µg/m³	micrograms per cubic meter
4	AB	Assembly Bill
5	ACTA	Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority
6	ADMRT	Air Dispersion Modeling and Risk Tool
7	AREMA	American Railway Engineering and Maintenance of Way Association
8	ASR	Application Summary Report
9	BHC	Board of Harbor Commissioners
10	BNSF	Burlington Northern Santa Fe
11	CAAP	Clean Air Action Plan
12	CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
13	Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
14	CARB	California Air Resources Board
15	CCA	California Coastal Act
16	CCR	California Code of Regulations
17	CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
18	CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
19	CGP	Community Grants Program
20	CNG	compressed natural gas
21	CO	carbon monoxide
22	COLA	City of Los Angeles
23	COLB	City of Long Beach
24	CPUC	California Public Utilities Commission
25	dB	decibel
26	dBA	A-weighted decibel
27	DOGGR	Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources
28	DPM	diesel particulate matter
29	DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
30	EIR	Environmental Impact Report
31	EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
32	EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
33	FAH	Fraction of Time at Home
34	FRA	Federal Railroad Administration

1	FTA	Federal Transit Administration
2	GCCOG	Gateway Cities Council of Governments
3	GHG	greenhouse gas
4	g/m²	grams per square meter
5	GVWR	gross vehicle weight rating
6	HARP	Hotspots Analysis and Reporting Program
7	HDC	High Desert Corridor
8	HRA	health risk assessment
9	HTA	Harbor Trucking Association
10	HVAC	heating, ventilation, and air conditioning
11	Hz	hertz
12	I	Interstate
13	ICTF	Intermodal Container Transfer Facility
14	JCCC	Joint Command and Control Center
15	L.A.	Los Angeles
16	LABOS	Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation
17	LACDPW	Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
18	LACFCD	Los Angeles County Flood Control District
19	LADWP	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
20	LBCT	Long Beach Container Terminal
21	LBWD	Long Beach Water Department
22	LLC	Limited Liability Corporation
23	LNG	liquefied natural gas
24	LOS	Level of Service
25	MHHW	mean high high water
26	MLLW	mean low low water
27	MSC	Multi-Service Center
28	MSL	mean sea level
29	MT CO ₂ e	metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent
30	Mwh	megawatt-hours
31	NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
32	NAFTA	North American Free Trade Agreement
33	NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission

Port of Long Beach

1	NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
2	NO ₂	nitrogen dioxide
3	NOP	Notice of Preparation
4	NO _X	nitrogen oxides
5	NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
6	OEHHA	Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
7	O&M	operation and maintenance
8	PCE	passenger car equivalent
9	PHL	Pacific Harbor Line
10	PM	particulate matter
11	PM ₁₀	particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter
12	PM _{2.5}	particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter
13	PMP	Port Master Plan
14	POLA	Port of Los Angeles
15	POLB	Port of Long Beach
16	Port	Port of Long Beach
17	PortTAM	Port Travel Analyses Model
18	ppm	parts per million
19	PRC	Public Resources Code
20	PTC	Palmdale Transportation Center
21	ROW	right-of-way
22	RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
23	RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
24	SCAB	South Coast Air Basin
25	SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments
26	SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
27	SCE	Southern California Edison
28	SCH	State Clearinghouse
29	SCIG	Southern California International Gateway
30	SCRAM	Support Center for Regulatory Atmospheric Modeling
31	SCRRA	Southern California Regional Rail Authority
32	sL	silt loading
33	SPBP	San Pedro Bay Ports

Acronyms and Abbreviations

1	SR	State Route
2	ТАР	Technology Advancement Program
3	TEU	twenty-foot equivalent units
4	TMP	Transportation Management Plan
5	TPP	Trans-Pacific Partnership
6	TSPC	Tesoro SoCal Pipeline Company
7	ULSD	ultra-low sulfur diesel
8	UP	Union Pacific
9	UPRR	Union Pacific Railroad
10	UPS	United Parcel Service
11	US	United States
12	U.S.C.	United States Code
13	VdB	vibration decibels
14	VeRail	VeRail Technologies
15	VOC	volatile organic compounds
16	WDR	waste discharge requirements

CHAPTER 10 MODIFICATIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR

This chapter identifies certain engineering refinements to the proposed Project and the alternatives that have occurred since release of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed On-Dock Rail Support Facility. This chapter also identifies modifications to the Draft EIR, including corrections and revisions to text, revised and new tables, and revised figures.

8 10.1 DESIGN MODIFICATIONS AFFECTING THE PROJECT DESCRIPTION

- 9 Four alternatives were evaluated in the Draft EIR (December 2016):
- The 12th Street Alternative (proposed Project);
- 11 The 10th Street Alternative;
- 12 The 9th Street Alternative; and
- 13 The No Project Alternative.

Г

Based on public comments received following release of the Draft EIR, the Port refined the boundaries of the 12th Street Alternative (proposed Project) and the 10th Street Alternative to reduce the number of property acquisitions that would be required for the proposed Project or the 10th Street Alternative if either is approved and implemented. As shown in Table 10-A, design modifications have resulted in a reduction in the number of potential acquisitions that would be required for the proposed Project and the 10th Street Alternative.

TABLE 10-A CHANGES TO POTENTIAL PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS FROM DESIGN MODIFICATIONS				
Description	Proposed Project (12 th Street Alternative)	10 th Street Alternative	9 th Street Alternative	
Original Number of "Properties" (Draft EIR)	94	70	56	
Original Number of Legal Parcels	208	179	145	
Number of Parcels after Design Modifications (Final EIR) ¹	184	148	111	
Reduction in Number of Parcels243134				
¹ Design modifications by the POLB resulted in refinement of Project boundaries and reduction of the number of legal parcels within the footprint for each alternative.				

In addition, the West Yard Layover and Fueling Area proposed in the Draft EIR has been eliminated in the 12th Street Alternative (proposed Project), 10th Street Alternative, and 9th Street Alternative. As a result of these changes, the proposed Project has been reduced in size by approximately 11 acres and the 10th Street Alternative has been reduced by approximately 7 acres. Comparisons of the revised boundaries for the proposed Project and for the 10th Street Alternative, to the boundaries shown in the Draft EIR in December 2016, are provided on Figures 10.1-1 and 10.1-2, below.



2 Figure 10.1-1

1

3 Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility, 12th Street Alternative (Proposed Project) with Refinements



1

2 Figure 10.1-2

3 Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility, 10th Street Alternative with Refinements

1 The revisions presented in this Final EIR were reviewed to determine whether recirculation of the Draft EIR was necessary in accordance with the State CEQA [California Environmental 2 Quality Act] Guidelines and Statutes. The modifications would not result in any new significant 3 4 environmental impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of an existing environmental effect. The changes are consistent with the findings contained in Chapter 3 (Environmental 5 Setting and Project Impacts) of the Draft EIR. No new alternatives have been identified that 6 7 would reduce significant effects of the proposed Project. The air quality and health impacts of the proposed modifications were re-evaluated, and would not result in any change to the 8 impact findings in the Draft EIR (the analysis is described in response to South Coast Air 9 Quality Management District comment AQMD-5 in Chapter 11). Therefore, recirculation of the 10 Draft EIR is not warranted, consistent with Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21092.1 11 12 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5.

13 **10.2 CHANGES TO THE DRAFT EIR**

This chapter identifies modifications to the Draft EIR for the proposed On-Dock Rail Support Facility at the Port of Long Beach. Text changes to the Draft EIR, as organized by the Draft EIR chapters and sections, have been made to correct, update, and clarify information in the Draft EIR, based on comments received and further engineering analysis. Many of the revisions to the Draft EIR are related to refinement of the proposed Project and 10th Street Alternative boundaries. Revisions have also been made to reflect changes in the proposed Project since release of the Draft EIR in December 2016.

As provided in Section 15088(d) of State CEQA Guidelines, responses to comments may take the form of a revision to a Draft EIR; the modifications presented in this chapter collectively represent revisions to the Draft EIR. The modifications, corrections, and updates affect the following chapters of the Draft EIR:

- Executive Summary
- Chapter 1 Introduction and Project Description
- Chapter 2 Related Projects and Relationship to Local and Regional Plans
- Chapter 3 Environmental Setting and Project Impacts (Sections 3.1 through 3.14)
- Chapter 4 Alternatives Comparison
- Chapter 8 List of Preparers and Contributors
- Chapter 9 References
- The numbering format from the Draft EIR is used herein. Only those sections that have revisions, corrections, or clarifications are included.
- 34 The following changes to the content of the Draft EIR are incorporated into the Final EIR for
- the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility.

Port of Long Beach

1 10.2.1 Changes to the Draft EIR Executive Summary

TABLE 10-1 REVISIONS AND CORRECTIONS TO EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE DRAFT EIR			
Draft EIR Draft EIR Line Des		Description	
ES.3	ES-4	1	Figure ES-1 is revised to correct street names (Anaheim Street and 7 th Street). Revised Figure ES-1 is provided on page 10-23 of this chapter.
ES.10ES-43 and ES-44Table ES.10-1, in the Aesthetics and Visu revised to delete VIS-1, VIS-4, VIS-5, and VIS-3 are changed to VIS-1 and VIS-2, re 		Table ES.10-1, in the Aesthetics and Visual Resources category, is revised to delete VIS-1, VIS-4, VIS-5, and VIS-6. Impacts VIS-2 and VIS-3 are changed to VIS-1 and VIS-2, respectively, to correctly align with VIS-1 and VIS-2 in Section 3.13.2.3. These changes address an error in this table.	

2 **10.2.2** Changes to Draft EIR Chapter 1 – Introduction and Project Description

	TABLE 10-2 REVISIONS AND CORRECTIONS TO CHAPTER 1 OF THE DRAFT EIR			
Draft EIR Section	Draft EIR Page	Line	Description	
1.2.6	1-5	27	"(see Figure 1.6-3)" is changed to "(see Figure 1.5-3)". This was an error in the text of the Draft EIR.	
1.3.1	1-7	29	"(see Figure 1.6-1)" is changed to "(see Figure 1.5-1)". This was an error in the text of the Draft EIR.	
1.7.2	1-18	32	"(Figure 1.6-2)" is changed to "(Figure 1.5-2)". This was an error in the text of the Draft EIR.	
1.7.2	1-20	-	Figure 1.7-2 is revised to correct street names (Anaheim Street and 7 th Street). This revised figure is provided on page 10-23 of this chapter.	
1.7.2	1-21	-	Figure 1.7-3 is revised to reflect the refinement of the Project boundaries for the proposed Project (12 th Street Alternative). This revised figure is provided on page 10-24 of this chapter.	
1.8.1	1-23	25-26	"(see Section 1.6.2)" is changed to "(see Section 1.6)". This was an error in the text of the Draft EIR.	
1.8.1	1-24	-	Table 1.8-1 is revised to show the acreage for the 12th and 10th Streetalternatives as follows:For the 12th Street Alternative "182 acres" is revised to "171 acres".For the 10th Street Alternative "162 acres" is revised to "155 acres".These acreages were revised to reflect the refinement of the boundariesof the 12th and 10th Street alternatives.	
1.8.2	1-27	-	Figure 1.8-1 is revised to remove the West Yard Layover and Fueling Area. The West Yard Layover and Fueling Area proposed in the Draft EIR has been eliminated from the 12 th Street Alternative. This revised figure is provided on page 10-25 of this chapter.	
1.8.2	1-30	-	Figure 1.8-3 is deleted because the individual depictions of roadway network changes for each alternative appear in larger size as Figures 3.5-5, 3.5-6, and 3.5-7 of the Draft EIR.	

	TABLE 10-2 (CONT'D) REVISIONS AND CORRECTIONS TO CHAPTER 1 OF THE DRAFT EIR				
Draft EIR Section	Draft EIR Page	Line	Description		
1.8.2	1-31	11 -12	The text in the paragraph entitled <u>Potential Property Acquisition</u> has been revised to reflect the updated number of legal parcels affected by the Project. The Draft EIR intermixed use of the term "property" and "parcel," generally referring to property as contiguous legal parcels under common ownership or common tenancy. As a result, the number of legal parcels affected by the Project was not clear. For example, a business may be operating at a particular location that involves five legal parcels, but the business was identified as occupying one "property" instead of five legal "parcels." The engineering refinements to the Project provide more clarity on which legal parcels may be affected by the Project; therefore, the text is being revised to be more precise. In each case, the number of legal parcels is greater than the number of "property as been added to the Project; rather, the Project affects less acreage, but the change in terminology is being made to provide additional information to the public and the decision-makers. To illustrate the change, Table 10-A (page 10-1) has been provided to show the "properties" identified in the Draft EIR. The text "could potentially affect 94 properties (parcels) within the Project area. Thirty-six (36) of these properties are privately owned." is revised to: "could potentially affect 184 parcels of land within the Project area. Thirty-nine (39) of these parcels are privately owned."		
1.8.2	1-33	-	Figure 1.8-5 has been revised to update information in Phase 3 as follows: The Construction Activity Item 10 under Phase 3 "Construct west yard locomotive layover/fueling area" is revised to "West Yard Track Work". This revision was made to reflect removal of the West Yard Layover and Fueling Area from the proposed Project (12 th Street Alternative).		
1.8.2	1-36	-	Figure 1.8-8 has been revised to remove the West Yard Layover and Fueling Area from the proposed Project (12 th Street Alternative). This revised figure is provided on page 10-27 of this chapter.		
1.8.3	1-41	-	Figure 1.8-9 is revised to remove the West Yard Layover and Fueling Area. The West Yard Layover and Fueling Area proposed in the Draft EIR has been eliminated for the 10 th Street Alternative. This revised figure is provided on page 10-29 of this chapter.		
1.8.3	1-43	2 - 3	The text "would be similar, bet fewer in number, to those described under the proposed Project." is revised to: "could potentially affect 148 parcels of land within the Project area. Twenty-six (26) of these parcels are privately owned." This text has been revised as a result of the reduction of the boundaries of the 10 th Street Alternative.		
1.8.4	1-44	-	Figure 1.8-10 has been revised to correct information in Phase 3 as follows: The Construction Activity Item 8 under Phase 3 "Construct West Yard Layover and Fueling Area" is revised to "West Yard Track Work." This revision was made to reflect removal of the West Yard Layover and Fueling Area from the 10 th Street Alternative.		

Port of Long Beach

	TABLE 10-2 (CONT'D) REVISIONS AND CORRECTIONS TO CHAPTER 1 OF THE DRAFT EIR				
Draft EIR Section	Draft EIR Page	Line	Description		
1.8.4	1-45	-	Figure 1.8-11 has been revised to remove the West Yard Layover and Fueling Area. The West Yard Layover and Fueling Area proposed in the Draft EIR has been eliminated for the 9 th Street Alternative. This revised figure is provided on page 10-31 of this chapter.		
1.8.4	1-47	20 - 21	The text "would be similar, but fewer in number, to those described under the proposed Project." is revised to: "could potentially affect 111 parcels of land within the Project area. Twenty-seven (27) of these parcels are privately owned." This text has been revised to correct the number of potential property acquisitions that could occur under the 9 th Street Alternative.		

1 **10.2.3** Changes to Draft EIR Chapter 2 – Related Projects and Relationship to Local 2 and Regional Plans

TABLE 10-3 REVISIONS AND CORRECTIONS TO CHAPTER 2 OF THE DRAFT EIR				
Draft EIR Section	Draft EIR Page	Line	Description	
2.1.2	2-3	-	The following project is added to Table 2.1-1 as a new Number 5: Project Title: Southern California Edison (SCE) Transmission Tower Replacement Project Description: Replacement of transmission lines and towers to provide vertical clearance for large ships in Cerritos Channel; underground utilities in proximity to the towers would be removed, modified, or abandoned. Project Timeframe: Final EIR certified. Relevant Potential Cumulative Environmental Factors: Air Quality, Biological Resources, Noise, Transportation, and Traffic. All other projects are renumbered.	
2.1.2	2-9	-	Figure 2.1-1 has been revised to show the new Number 5 project, all other projects are renumbered for a total of 38 projects (instead of 37). This revised figure is provided on page 10-33 of this chapter.	

3 **10.2.4** Changes to Draft EIR Chapter 3 (Sections 3.1 through 3.14)

	TABLE 10-4 REVISIONS AND CORRECTIONS TO CHAPTER 3 OF THE DRAFT EIR				
Draft EIR Draft EIR Section Description					
Section 3.1	Geology, Soils	, and Seisr	nic Conditions		
3.1.1.2	3.1-5	7	"Los angeles County" is changed to "Los Angeles County" to correct this error in the text of the Draft EIR.		
3.1.2.3	3.1-13	21	"+10 to +25 feet" is changed to "+7.8 feet" to correct this error in the text of the Draft EIR.		

	TABLE 10-4 (CONT'D) REVISIONS AND CORRECTIONS TO CHAPTER 3 OF THE DRAFT EIR				
Draft EIR Section	Draft EIR Page	Line	Description		
Section 3.2	Air Quality and	Health Ris	sk		
3.2.1.3	3.2-5	19	"POLB, 2012" is changed to "POLB, 2012a" to correct this error in the text of the Draft EIR.		
3.2.3.4	3.2-31	-	Additional air quality analyses were conducted pursuant to the request of the AQMD, and the Port used that opportunity to evaluate the air quality impacts of the proposed Project (12 th Street Alternative) with its reduced footprint and removal of the West Yard Layover and Fueling Area. While none of the significance findings from the additional analyses have changed from the findings in the Draft EIR, these additional tables can be viewed in the Response to Comment AQMD-5 in Chapter 11.		
3.2.3.4	3.2-58	-	Table 3.2-24 has been revised in response to Comment CARB-10, and is provided on page 10-14 of this chapter. Table 3.2-24 was revised to add columns of information that had been in the Appendix, and to insert a footnote that had been inadvertently omitted.		
3.2.3.6	3.2-86	5	"Table 3.2-424" is changed to "Table 3.2-42" to correct this error in the text of the Draft EIR.		
3.2.3.7	3.2-109	-	Table 3.2-58 has been revised in response to Comment CARB-10, and is provided on page 10-15 of this chapter. The Table was changed to add columns of information that had been in the Appendix, and to insert a footnote that had been inadvertently omitted.		
Section 3.3	Hydrology and	Water Qua	ality		
3.3.1.3	3.3-9	1	Figure 3.3-3 is revised to show refinement of the Project footprint. This revised figure is provided on page 10-35 of this chapter.		
Section 3.5	Ground Trans	portation			
3.5.2.4	3.5-35	-	Figure 3.5-6 is revised to reflect refinements to the Project footprint for the 10 th Street Alternative. This figure is provided on page 10-36 of this chapter.		
3.5.2.1	3.5-42	15	Section heading 3.5.2.1 is changed to 3.5.2.6 to correct this error in the text of the Draft EIR.		
Section 3.6	Land Use				
3.6.1.3	3.6-2	1	Figure 3.6-1 is revised to reflect refinement of the Project boundaries (12 th Street Alternative). This revised figure is provided on page 10-37 of this chapter.		
3.6.4.1	3.6-17	41	The language on page 3.6-17 starting on Line 41 through page 3.6-18 Line 3 which states, "of the 94 properties identified as potentially affected by property acquisitions to implement the proposed Project, 58 are in public ownership. The remaining 36 parcels are in various forms of private or institutional ownership (the number of businesses that could be affected is substantially less than 36, as one business often occupies more than one parcel). Of the 58 publicly owned parcels, the COLB or POLB is the full or part owner of 49." is hereby replaced with: "The proposed Project could potentially affect 184 parcels of land within the Project area. Thirty-nine (39) of these parcels are privately owned." This text has been revised as a result of the reduction of the boundaries of the proposed Project.		

r

TABLE 10-4 (CONT'D) REVISIONS AND CORRECTIONS TO CHAPTER 3 OF THE DRAFT EIR				
Draft EIR Section	Draft EIR Page	Line	Description	
Section 3.6	Land Use (Co	nťd)		
3.6.4.1	3.6-18		Table 3.6-1 has been revised to reflect the number of parcels (instead of sites) for the proposed Project (12 th Street Alternative). These numbers have been revised due to reduction of the footprint of the proposed Project (12 th Street Alternative). Revised Table 3.6-1 is provided on page 10-16 of this chapter.	
3.6.4.1	3.6-19		Figure 3.6-5 has been revised to depict parcels (instead of properties) for the proposed Project (12 th Street Alternative); this revised figure is provided on page 10-39 of this chapter.	
3.6.4.2	3.6-22	12	The language on page 3.6-22 starting on Line 12 through Line 16 which states "could potentially affect 70 properties within the proposed Project area (Figure 3.6-6). Twenty-six (26) of those 70 properties are privately owned (Table 3.6-2)." is hereby replaced with: "could potentially affect 148 parcels of land within the Project area (Figure 3.6-6). Twenty-seven (27) of these 148 parcels are privately owned (Table 3.6-2)."	
3.6.4.2	3.6-22		Table 3.6-2 has been revised to reflect the number of parcels (instead of sites) for the 10 th Street Alternative. These numbers have been revised due to reduction of the footprint of the 10 th Street Alternative. Revised Table 3.6-2 is provided on page 10-17 of this chapter.	
3.6.4.2	3.6-23		Figure 3.6-6 has been revised to depict parcels (instead of properties) for the proposed Project (10 th Street Alternative); this revised figure is provided on page 10-41 of this chapter.	
3.6.4.3	3.6-25	10 - 12	The language on page 3.6-25 starting on Line 10 through Line 12 which states, "would potentially affect 56 properties within the proposed Project area (Figure 3.6-7). Eighteen (18) of those 56 parcels are privately owned (Table 3.6-3)." is hereby revised to: "could potentially affect 111 parcels of land within the Project area. Twenty-seven (27) of these parcels are privately owned." This text has been revised to depict the number of parcels potentially affected by the 9 th Street Alternative.	
3.6.4.3	3.6-25		Table 3.6-3 has been revised to reflect the number of parcels (instead of sites) for the 9 th Street Alternative. These numbers have been revised due to reduction of the footprint of the 9 th Street Alternative. Revised Table 3.6-3 is provided on page 10-18 of this chapter.	
3.6.4.3	3.6-27		Figure 3.6-7 has been revised to reflect the number of parcels (instead of properties) for the 9 th Street Alternative. Revised Figure 3.6-7 is provided on page 10-43 of this chapter.	
Section 3.7	Public Service	s and Safe	ty	
3.7.1.2	3.7-2	-	Figure 3.7-1 is revised to depict refinement of the Project footprint; this revised figure is provided on page 10-45 of this chapter.	
Section 3.8	Noise	1		
3.8.1.4	3.8-7	-	Figure 3.8-3 is revised to depict refinement of the Project footprint; this revised figure is provided on page 10-46 of this chapter.	

TABLE 10-4 (CONT'D) REVISIONS AND CORRECTIONS TO CHAPTER 3 OF THE DRAFT EIR				
Draft EIR Section	Draft EIR Page	Line	Description	
Section 3.9	Hazards and H	lazardous	Materials	
3.9.1.2	3.9-3	-	Figure 3.9-1 is revised to depict refinement of the Project footprint; this revised figure is provided on page 10-47 of this chapter.	
3.9.1.2	3.9-5	21	As requested by DTSC, the following text is hereby added to the end of this paragraph: "Table 3.9-1 provides a list of 37 potentially contaminated sites within the footprint of the proposed Project. These sites are already remediated or currently being remediated or overseen by regulatory agencies. Of the 37 sites in the Project footprint, 33 are closed (remediation is complete). Of the four open sites, two have ongoing activities related to various phases of investigation/remediation including site assessment and interim remedial action, one site is under evaluation by EPA, and one is a historical waste discharge requirements (WDR) site."	
3.9.1.2	3.9-6		New Table 3.9-1 is added to the end of this chapter, as requested by DTSC; this table is provided on page 10-18 of this chapter.	
3.9.2.3	3.9-15	1	Figure 3.9-2 is revised to depict refinement of the Project footprint; this revised figure is provided on page 10-48 of this chapter.	
Section 3.10 Population and Housing				
3.10.4.2	3.10-9 and 3.10-10	1	Figures 3.10-2 and 3.10-3 are revised to depict refinement of the Project footprint. These revised figures are provided on pages 10-49 and 10-50 of this chapter.	

10.2.5 Changes to Draft EIR Chapter 4 – Alternatives Comparison

	TABLE 10-5 REVISIONS AND CORRECTIONS TO CHAPTER 4 OF THE DRAFT EIR				
Draft EIR Section	Draft EIR Page	Line	Description		
4.1	4-2		On Table 4.1-1, the total area of the proposed Project (12 th Street Alternative) is changed from "182" aces to "171" acres. This update reflects the refinement of the Project boundaries for the proposed Project (12 th Street Alternative).		
4.1	4-2		On Table 4.1-1, the total area of the 10 th Street Alternative is changed from "162" aces to "155" acres. This update reflects the refinement of the Project boundaries for the 10 th Street Alternative.		
4.5	4-3	27	The heading "Environmentally Preferred Alternative" is changed to "Environmentally Superior Alternative". This was an error in the Draft EIR.		
4.5	4-4	7	"Environmentally Preferred Alternative" is changed to "Environmentally Superior Alternative". This was an error in the Draft EIR.		
4.5	4-4	14	"Environmentally Preferred Alternative" is changed to "Environmentally Superior Alternative". This was an error in the Draft EIR.		

1

1 **10.2.6** Changes to Draft EIR Chapter 8 – List of Preparers and Contributors

TABLE 10-6 REVISIONS AND CORRECTIONS TO CHAPTER 8 OF THE DRAFT EIR			
Draft EIR Section	Draft EIR Page	Line	Description
8.1	8-1		 The following are added: David R. Albers – Deputy City Attorney, Harbor Division Hayden Beckman – Environmental Specialist Assistant Sunny Zia, P.E. – Senior Engineer
8.4.2	8-2		 The following are added: Dan Conaty – QA/QC and Technical Advisor Tony K. Hui – Land Use, GIS Sowmya Venkatasubraman – Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste

2 **10.2.7** Changes to Draft EIR Chapter 9 – References

TABLE 10-7 REVISIONS AND CORRECTIONS TO CHAPTER 9 OF THE DRAFT EIR				
Draft EIR Section	Draft EIR Page	Line	Description	
9	9-2	1	"Caltrans. 2016" is revised to "Caltrans. 2016a".	
9	9-2	4	 The following new references are added: Caltrans. 2016b. High Desert Corridor Project. Final Environmental Impact Report/ Environmental Impact Statement and Section 4(f) (De Minimis Findings). Available online: <u>http://www.dot.ca.gov/d7/env-docs/docs/hdc/ HDC%20FEDVol%201062016 FINAL.pdf</u>. Volume 1 of 3. June. Caltrans and Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro). 2017. I-710 Corridor Project Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Section 4(f) Evaluation. July. 	
9	9-4	7	The following new reference is added: CARB. 2016c. <i>Technology Assessment of Freight Locomotives</i> . Available at <i>Technology Assessment of Freight Locomotives</i> . November. Online: <u>https://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/tech/techreport/final_rail_tech_assessment_1</u> <u>1282016.pdf</u> . Accessed November 2017.	
9	9-6	5	 The following new references are added: COLB. 2011a. Waste Management Plan Information and Instruction Sheet. Information Bulletin BU-033. Department of Development Services Building and Safety Bureau. November 16, 2011. COLB. 2011b. Pipeline License HD-7832 dated November 16, 2011 between the City of Long Beach Board of Harbor Commissioners and Chemoil Corporation. Pursuant to Ordinance No. HD-2111 adopted by BHC on October 11, 2011. First Amendment to Pipeline License HD-7832 as approved on April 25, 2013. 	
9	9-6	17	The following new reference is added: COLB. 2017. <i>City of Long Beach General Plan. Land Use Element.</i> Online: at <u>http://www.lbds.info/civica/filebank/ blobdload.asp?BlobID=5484</u> . 185 pages. Draft. February.	

Г

٦

TABLE 10-7 (CONT'D.) REVISIONS AND CORRECTIONS TO CHAPTER 9 OF THE DRAFT EIR					
Draft EIR Section	Draft EIR Page	Line	Description		
9	9-6	26	The following new reference is added: DOGGR. 2017. <i>Well Review Program, Introduction and Application</i> . Resources Agency of California, Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources. <u>http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/doggr/</u> . Accessed October 17, 2017.		
9	9-6	26	The following new reference is added: DoN/COLB. 1998. Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/ Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Disposal and Reuse of Long Beach Complex, Long Beach, California. Department of the Navy and City of Long Beach. SCH 97071071. April.		
9	9-7	22	The following new reference is added: EPA. 2017. Revisions to the Guideline on Air Quality Models: Enhancements to the AERMOD Dispersion Modeling System and Incorporation of Approaches to Address Ozone and Fine Particulate Matter. 40 CFR Part 51. January 17. Available at <u>https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/</u> <u>2017/01/17/2016-31747/revisions-to-the-guideline-on-air-quality-models- enhancements-to-the-aermod-dispersion-modeling</u> .		
9	9-7	26	 The following new references are added: FRA. 2012. U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Railroad Administration. <i>Guidance on the Quiet Zone Creation Process</i>. Available at: <u>https://www.fra.dot.gov/eLib/details/L03055</u>. — 2017. <i>Hazardous Materials Transportation</i>. Available at: <u>https://www.fra.dot.gov/Page/P0151</u>. 		
9	9-9	40	The following new reference is added: Metro. 2015. <i>High Desert Corridor. Rail Component Fact Sheet.</i> Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority. Available at <u>media.metro.net/projects_studies/hdc/ images/factsheet_hdc_hsr_2015-08.pdf</u> . Summer 2015.		
9	9-10	4	The following new reference is added: Moser, A.P. 2001. Buried Pipe Design. Second Edition. McGraw-Hill.		
9	9-12	3	"POLB. 2012" is revised to "POLB. 2012a".		
9	9-12	5	The following new reference is added: POLB. 2012b. <i>Port of Long Beach Wharf Design Criteria</i> . POLB WDC Version 3.0. Available at <u>http://www.polb.com/civica/filebank/</u> <u>blobdload.asp?BlobID=9481</u> . February 29.		
9	9-12	22	The following new reference is added: POLB. 2016d. Fireboat Station Number 20 Final Mitigated Negative Declaration. SCH 2016041048. July.		
9	9-13	17	The following reference is deleted: Starcrest Consulting Group. 2012. Personal communication with Archana Agrawal. May 25.		
9	9-14	9	The following new reference is added: SCAQMD. 2017. <i>Final 2016 Air Quality Management Plan</i> . Adopted March 3, 2017. Online: <u>http://www.aqmd.gov/home/library/clean-air-plans/air-quality-mgt-plan/final-2016-aqmp</u> . Accessed in November 2017.		

Port of Long Beach

TABLE 10-7 (CONT'D.) REVISIONS AND CORRECTIONS TO CHAPTER 9 OF THE DRAFT EIR				
Draft EIR Section	Draft EIR Page	Line	Description	
9	9-14	11	The following new reference is added: Seed, H.B. and D.P. Carter. 1988. <i>Liquefaction Potential of Sand Deposits</i> <i>under Low Levels of Excitation</i> . Earthquake Engineering Research Center, University of California, Berkeley. 329 pages. August.	
9	9-14	22	The following reference is added: Starcrest Consulting Group. 2012. Personal communication with Archana Agrawal. May 25.	

1 10.3 NEW AND REVISED TABLES

2 The new and revised tables described above are included in this section. These tables are 3 added to the Draft EIR for the proposed On-Dock Rail Support Facility.

TABLE 10-8 NEW AND REVISED TABLES							
Table	Draft EIR Page	Draft EIR Section	Reason for Revision or Addition	See Revised Table on Page			
3.2-24	3.2-58	3.2.3.4	This table was revised in response to Comment CARB-10 to provide additional information.	10-14			
3.2-58	3.2-109	3.2.3.7	This table was revised in response to Comment CARB-10 to provide additional information.	10-15			
3.6-1	3.6-18	3.6.4.1	This table was revised to update the number of parcels of land within the refined boundaries of the proposed Project (12 th Street Alternative)	10-16			
3.6-2	3.6-18	3.6.4.2	This table was revised to update the number of parcels of land within the refined boundaries of the 10 th Street Alternative	10-17			
3.6-3	3.6-18	3.6.4.3	This table was revised to update the number of parcels of land within the number of parcels for boundaries of the 9 th Street Alternative.	10-18			
3.9-1	3.9-3	3.9.1.2	This new table was prepared in response to Comment DTSC- 4 to identify past and current sites of potential contamination,	10-18			

REVISED TABLE 3.2-24 MAXIMUM HEALTH IMPACTS ESTIMATED FOR CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT WITH MITIGATION

Health Category	Receptor Type	Project Absolute ^{3,5}	CEQA Baseline ^{4,5}	Project Increment ^{2,5}	Significance Threshold ¹	Significant?
Individual	Residential	30.3 × 10 ⁻⁶	21.6 × 10 ⁻⁶	8.7 × 10 ⁻⁶		No
Cancer	Occupational	12.0 × 10 ⁻⁶	2.9 × 10 ⁻⁶	9.1 × 10 ⁻⁶	10 × 10 ⁻⁶	No
Risk	Sensitive	15.2 × 10 ⁻⁶	13.4 × 10 ⁻⁶	1.8 × 10 ⁻⁶		No
Chronic Hazard	Residential	0.01	0.008	0.002		No
	Occupational	0.06	0.02	0.04	1.0	No
Index	Sensitive	0.02	0.01	0.008		No
8-Hour	Residential	0.03	0.02	0.007		No
Chronic	Occupational	0.2	0.06	0.1	1.0	No
Index	Sensitive	0.06	0.03	0.03		No
Acute	Residential	0.08	0.01	0.07		No
Hazard	Occupational	0.1	0.01	0.1	1.0	No
Index	Sensitive	0.1	0.01	0.1		No
Population Cancer Burden				0.27	0.5	No

Notes:

1. The significance thresholds apply only to the Project Increment.

2. The Project Increment equals the Project Absolute minus the CEQA Baseline.

3. The Project Absolute represents the predicted health impacts from construction and operation of the proposed Project prior to subtracting the CEQA Baseline.

4. The CEQA Baseline value represents the predicted health impacts from CEQA Baseline operation.

5. The values shown for the Project Absolute, CEQA Baseline, and Project Increment all correspond to the maximum Project Increment receptor location.

REVISED TABLE 3.2-58 MAXIMUM HEALTH IMPACTS ESTIMATED FOR OPERATION OF THE NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE								
Health Category	Receptor Type	No Project Absolute ³	CEQA Baseline ⁴	No Project Increment ^{2,5}	Significance Threshold ¹	Significant?		
Individual	Residential	16.9 × 10 ⁻⁶	21.6 × 10 ⁻⁶	-4.7 × 10 ⁻⁶		No		
Cancer	Occupational	2.8 × 10⁻ ⁶	3.6 × 10 ⁻⁶	-0.8 × 10 ⁻⁶	10 × 10⁻ ⁶	No		
Risk	Sensitive	9.1 × 10 ⁻⁶	13.4 × 10 ⁻⁶	-4.3 × 10⁻ ⁶		No		
Chronic	Residential	0.005	0.008	-0.002		No		
Hazard	Occupational	0.02	0.04	-0.02	1.0	No		
Index	Sensitive	0.006	0.01	-0.004		No		
8-Hour	Residential	0.02	0.02	-0.007		No		
Chronic Hazard	Occupational	0.06	0.1	-0.06	1.0	No		
Index	Sensitive	0.02	0.03	-0.01		No		
Acute	Residential	0.007	0.01	-0.005		No		
Hazard	Occupational	0.02	0.03	-0.01	1.0	No		
Index	Sensitive	0.006	0.01	-0.005		No		
Population C	ancer Burden			0.0	0.5	No		

Notes:

1. The significance thresholds apply only to the No Project Increment.

2. The No Project Increment equals the No Project Absolute minus the CEQA Baseline.

3. The No Project Absolute represents the predicted health impacts from operation of the No Project Alternative prior to subtracting the CEQA Baseline.

4. The CEQA Baseline value represents the predicted health impacts from CEQA Baseline operation.

5. A negative value for the No Project Increment denotes a health risk reduction relative to the CEQA Baseline at all modeled receptors. The negative increment would approach a maximum value of zero as one moves farther away from the Project site. To provide a more meaningful result than zero far from the Project site, each negative No Project Increment shown in the table corresponds to the receptor location of the maximum No Project Absolute value.

	REVISED TABLE 3.6-1 POTENTIAL PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT						
Ownership	Number of Parcels ^{1,2}	Number of Potential Parcel Acquisitions	Existing Uses				
Ports and COLB	139	0	Railroad tracks, vacant properties, clean energy facilities, railroad yards, utility ROWs, equipment storage, auto storage, manufacturing, container or chassis storage, boat repair, bobtail lots, sandblasting, oil production, petrochemical storage, small commercial, auto sales, oil pipelines, meteorological station, paper and metal shop, miscellaneous storage, warehouse, industrial, metal fabricators, packing and rubber uses, restaurant, and sport fishing				
COLA	3	0	Railroad tracks, vacant sites				
LACFCD	2	0	Pump station				
Private	40	39	Vacant sites, auto wrecking, sandblasting, rubbish services, chassis/container storage, refinery, ship or boat repair, metal fabrication, bobtail lots, auto parts, reefer storage, trucking businesses, body shops, logistics, paper and metal shops, petroleum pipelines, transport, packing and rubber, and miscellaneous storage				
Total	184	39					
¹ This colun	nn identifies th	e number of parcel	s within the boundaries of the proposed Project (12th Street				

¹ This column identifies the number of parcels within the boundaries of the proposed Project (12th Street Alternative). The number of parcels is based on information from the Los Angeles County Office of the Assessor Property Assessment Information System available at <a href="http://maps.assessor.lacounty.gov/GVH_2_2/Index.html?configBase=http://maps.assessor.lacounty.gov/Geocortex/Essentials/REST/sites/PAIS/viewers/PAIS_hv/virtualdirectory/Resources/Config/Default

² The Draft EIR intermixed use of the terms "property" and "parcel." To address this discrepancy, only parcel totals are tabulated for the Final EIR. Also, the revised numbers in this table reflect the modified boundaries for this alternative.

The Draft EIR reported the number of "sites" on Table 3.6-1; "sites" reflected properties or parcels that may have been under common ownership, or groupings of businesses. The use of "parcels" in the Revised Table 3.6-1 above is provided in the interest of identifying parcels

using publicly available information. Please refer to Table 10-A on page 10-1 for a comparison
 of the original number of sites or properties to the number of parcels associated with the

6 refined proposed Project (12th Street Alternative).

	REVISED TABLE 3.6-2 POTENTIAL PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS FOR THE 10 TH STREET ALTERNATIVE					
Ownership	Number of Parcels ^{1,2}	Number of Potential Parcel Acquisitions	Existing Uses			
Ports and COLB	116	0	Railroad tracks, vacant properties, railroad yards, utility ROWs, cogeneration facilities, equipment storage, auto storage, manufacturing, container or chassis storage, boat repair, bobtail lots, sandblasting, oil production, small commercial, auto sales, oil pipelines, miscellaneous storage, warehouse, industrial, packing and rubber uses, restaurant, and sport fishing			
COLA	3	0	Railroad tracks, vacant sites			
LACFCD	2	0	Pump station			
Private	27	26	Vacant sites, auto wrecking, sandblasting, rubbish services, chassis/container storage, refinery, ship or boat repair, metal fabrication, bobtail lots, auto parts, trucking businesses, body shops, logistics, petroleum pipelines, and miscellaneous storage			
Total	148	26				
¹ This colum of parcels	 ¹ This column identifies the number of parcels within the boundaries of the 10th Street Alternative. The number of parcels is based on information from the Los Angeles County Office of the Assessor Property Assessment 					

of parcels is based on information from the Los Angeles County Office of the Assessor Property Assessment Information System available at http://maps.assessor.lacounty.gov/GVH_2_2/Index.html?configBase= http://maps.assessor.lacounty.gov/Geocortex/Essentials/REST/sites/PAIS/viewers/PAIS_hv/virtualdirectory /Resources/Config/Default.

² The Draft EIR intermixed use of the terms "property" and "parcel." To address this discrepancy, only parcel totals are tabulated for the Final EIR. Also, the revised numbers in this table reflect the modified boundaries for this alternative.

1 The Draft EIR reported the number of "sites" on Table 3.6-2; "sites" reflected properties or 2 parcels that may have been under common ownership, or groupings of businesses. The use 3 of "parcels" in the Revised Table 3.6-2 above is provided in the interest of identifying parcels

4 using publicly available information. Please refer to Table 10-A on page 10-1 for a comparison

5 of the original number of sites or properties to the number of parcels associated with the

6 refined 10th Street Alternative.

	REVISED TABLE 3.6-3 POTENTIAL PROJECT ACQUISITIONS FOR THE 9 TH STREET ALTERNATIVE						
Ownership	Number of Parcels ^{1, 2}	Number of Potential Parcel Acquisitions	Existing Uses				
Ports and COLB	79	0	Railroad tracks, vacant properties, railroad yards, utility ROWs, cogeneration facilities, equipment storage, auto storage, manufacturing, container or chassis storage, oil equipment storage, petrochemical storage, boat repair, bobtail lots, sandblasting, oil production, small commercial, auto sales, oil pipelines, miscellaneous storage, warehouse, and other industrial activities				
COLA	3	0	Railroad tracks, vacant sites				
LACFCD	2	0	Pump station				
Private	27	26	Vacant sites, auto wrecking, sandblasting, rubbish services, chassis/container storage, refinery, ship or boat repair, metal fabrication, bobtail lots, auto parts, trucking businesses, body shops, logistics, petroleum pipelines, and miscellaneous storage				
Total	111	26					

¹ The number of parcels is based on information from the Los Angeles County Office of the Assessor Property Assessment Information System available at http://maps.assessor.lacounty.gov/GVH_2_2/Index.html? configBase=http://maps.assessor.lacounty.gov/Geocortex/Essentials/REST/sites/PAIS/viewers/PAIS_hv/vir tualdirectory/Resources/Config/Default.

² The Draft EIR intermixed use of the terms "property" and "parcel." To address this discrepancy, only parcel totals are tabulated for the Final EIR. Also, the revised numbers in this table reflect the modified boundaries for this alternative.

1 The Draft EIR reported the number of "sites" on Table 3.6-3; "sites" reflected properties or

parcels that may have been under common ownership, or groupings of businesses. The use
of "parcels" in the Revised Table 3.6-3 above is provided in the interest of identifying parcels

- 4 using publicly available information. Please refer to Table 10-A on page 10-1 for a comparison
- 5 of the original number of sites or properties to the number of parcels associated with the 6 9th Street Alternative.

	NEW TABLE 3.9-1 POTENTIALLY CONTAMINATED SITES IN THE FOOTPRINT OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT							
No.	Site Name and Address	Status	Type of Project	Overseeing Agency				
1	Chico's Auto Wrecking 914/926 N Farragut Avenue Wilmington, CA 90744	NFA (Closed) – No Action Required as of 4/24/2009	Evaluation	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)				
2	ACTA Parcel LBX-878 Anaheim Street Wilmington, CA 90744	Open – Site assessment as of 8/25/2005	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)				
3	McDonough Property 1018 North McDonough Avenue Wilmington, CA 90744	EPA as of 6/30/1999	Evaluation	EPA				

	NE POTENTIALLY CONTAMINATED S	W TABLE 3.9-1 (CON ITES IN THE FOOTPF	T'D.) RINT OF THE PROP	OSED PROJECT
No.	Site Name and Address	Status	Type of Project	Overseeing Agency
4	Proctor & Gamble Mfg. Co. 1601 7 th Street W. Long Beach, CA 90813	Completed – Case closed as of 11/19/1996	LUST Cleanup Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)
5	Russell Truck Company 1430 11 th Street W. Long Beach, CA 90813	Completed – Case closed as of 9/13/1996	LUST Cleanup Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)
6	Port of Long Beach 1540 W 9 th Street Long Beach, CA	Completed – Case closed as of 3/17/2008	LUST Cleanup Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)
7	Trans Harbor 1130 Santa Fe Avenue Long Beach, CA 90813	Completed – Case closed as of 3/30/1989	LUST Cleanup Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)
8	Long Beach Iron Works Inc. 2100 Anaheim Street W. Long Beach, CA 90813	Completed – Case closed as of 11/6/1987	LUST Cleanup Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)
9	ACTA Parcel LBX-846 Foote Avenue Wilmington, CA	Completed – Case closed as of 2/18/2005	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)
10	ACTA South - Parcel MY-834 1025, 1027 and 1033 N Cushing Avenue Wilmington, CA 90744	Completed – Case closed as of 3/26/2004	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)
11	Alameda Corridor South End Parcel LBX-830 N/NE Corner of McDonough and Southern Avenue Wilmington, CA 90744	Completed – Case closed as of 8/20/2003	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)
12	ACTA South - Parcel LBX-826 1001 McDonough Wilmington, CA 90744	Completed – Case closed as of 1/13/2003	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)
13	ACTA South - Parcel SE-383 & SE-496 Northeast Corner of E. Grand Street Wilmington, CA 90744	Completed – Case closed as of 5/14/2003	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)
14	ACTA South - Parcel SE-382 Northeast Corner of E. Grand Street Wilmington, CA 90744	Completed – Case closed as of 5/15/2003	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)
15	ACTA Parcel LBX-848 1017 Foote Avenue Wilmington, CA	Completed – Case closed as of 8/20/2004	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)
16	ACTA South - Parcel LBX837 1017 Foote Avenue Wilmington, CA 90744	Completed – Case closed as of 9/13/2003	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)
17	ACTA South - Parcel MY-836 1015 North Cushing Avenue Wilmington, CA 90744	Completed – Case closed as of 2/3/2003	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)
18	ACTA South - Parcel MY-835 1015 Cushing Avenue Wilmington, CA 90744	Completed – Case closed as of 1/24/2003	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)

Г

	NE POTENTIALLY CONTAMINATED S	W TABLE 3.9-1 (CON ITES IN THE FOOTPF	T'D.) RINT OF THE PROP	OSED PROJECT
No.	Site Name and Address	Status	Type of Project	Overseeing Agency
19	ACTA Parcel LBX-880 Southern Pacific Drive Wilmington, CA	Completed – Case closed as of 6/25/2004	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)
20	ACTA Parcel MY-1518 934 N. Farragut Avenue Wilmington, CA	Completed – Case closed as of 3/15/2005	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)
21	ACTA Parcel MY-869 938 Farragut Avenue N Wilmington, CA 90744	Completed – Case closed as of 2/24/2003	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)
22	Long Beach Leads Extension Parcels LBX/MY-851 & LBX/SE- 853 914 Farragut Avenue N Wilmington, CA 90744	Historical – WDR as of 10/19/2011 (WDR terminated 10/1/2014)	WDR Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)
23	ACTA Parcel MY-1502 1037 North Foote Avenue Wilmington, CA	Completed – Case closed as of 2/29/2008	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)
24	ACTA South – Parcel MY-1504 1041 Foote Avenue North Wilmington, CA 90744	Completed – Case closed as of 2/24/2003	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)
25	ACTA Parcel MY-1506 1029 Foote Avenue Wilmington, CA	Completed – Case closed as of 12/2/2004	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)
26	ACTA Parcel MY-1507 1021 Foote Avenue Wilmington, CA	Completed – Case closed as of 12/2/2004	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)
27	ACTA South – Parcel MY-1508 1020 Foote Avenue North Wilmington, CA 90744	Completed – Case closed as of 2/24/2003	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)
28	ACTA South – Parcel MY-832 1037 Cushing Avenue Wilmington, CA 90744	Completed – Case closed as of 1/24/2003	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)
29	ACTA South – Parcel MY-832 1041 Cushing Avenue Wilmington, CA 90744	Completed – Case closed as of 1/24/2003	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)
30	ACTA Parcel MY-1501 1040-1044 Cushing Avenue Wilmington, VA	Completed – Case closed as of 1/5/2005	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)
31	Alameda Corridor South End Parcel LBX-830 N/NE Corner of McDonough & Southern Avenue Wilmington, CA 90744	Completed – Case closed as of 8/20/2003	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)
32	ACTA South – Parcel LBX-829 1020 McDonough Wilmington, CA 90744	Completed – Case closed as of 1/23/2003	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)

г

NEW TABLE 3.9-1 (CONT'D.) POTENTIALLY CONTAMINATED SITES IN THE FOOTPRINT OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT						
Site Name and Address	Status	Type of Project	Overseeing Agency			
ACTA South – Parcel LBX-828 1022 McDonough Wilmington, CA 90744	Completed – Case closed as of 1/23/2003	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)			
ACTA South – Parcel LBX-827 1026 McDonough Wilmington, CA 90744	Completed – Case closed as of 1/23/2003	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)			
ACTA South – Parcel LBX-825 1027 McDonough Wilmington, CA 90744	Open – Assessment & Interim Remedial Action as of 7/15/2014	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)			
ACTA South – Parcel SE/LBX-820 1027 McDonough Avenue Wilmington, CA 90744	Completed – Case closed as of 1/8/2003	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)			
ACTA South – Parcel SE-823 Grand Street & McDonough Avenue Wilmington, CA 90744	Completed – Case closed as of 1/10/2003	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)			
DTSC Chatsworth Department of Toxic Substances Control, Chatsworth Regional Office Los Angeles RWQCB California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region LUST Leaking Underground Storage Tank MGP manufactured gas plant						
	NEW POTENTIALLY CONTAMINATED SI Site Name and Address ACTA South – Parcel LBX-828 1022 McDonough Wilmington, CA 90744 ACTA South – Parcel LBX-827 ACTA South – Parcel LBX-827 1026 McDonough Wilmington, CA 90744 ACTA South – Parcel LBX-825 ACTA South – Parcel LBX-825 1027 McDonough Wilmington, CA 90744 ACTA South – Parcel SE/LBX-820 ACTA South – Parcel SE/LBX-820 1027 McDonough Avenue Wilmington, CA 90744 ACTA South – Parcel SE-823 Grand Street & McDonough Avenue Wilmington, CA 90744 Chatsworth Department of T ngeles RWQCB California Region Leaking Underground Storage Tan manufactured gas plant United States Environmental Prote Yates Environmental Prote	NEW TABLE 3.9-1 (CONTPOTENTIALLY CONTAMINATED SITES IN THE FOOTPRSite Name and AddressStatusACTA South – Parcel LBX-828 1022 McDonoughCompleted – Case closed as of 1/23/2003ACTA South – Parcel LBX-827 1026 McDonoughCompleted – Case closed as of 1/23/2003ACTA South – Parcel LBX-827 1026 McDonoughCompleted – Case closed as of 1/23/2003ACTA South – Parcel LBX-825 1027 McDonoughOpen – Assessment & Interim Remedial Action as of 7/15/2014ACTA South – Parcel SE/LBX-820 1027 McDonough AvenueCompleted – Case closed as of 1/23/2003ACTA South – Parcel SE/LBX-820 1027 McDonough AvenueCompleted – Case closed as of 1/16/2014ACTA South – Parcel SE/LBX-820 1027 McDonough AvenueCompleted – Case closed as of 1/10/2003ACTA South – Parcel SE-823 Grand Street & McDonough AvenueCompleted – Case closed as of 1/10/2003ACTA South – Parcel SE-823 Grand Street & McDonough AvenueCompleted – Case closed as of 1/10/2003Chatsworth Department of Toxic Substances Contr ngeles RWQCBDepartment of Toxic Substances Contr manufactured gas plant United States Environmental Protection Agency	NEW TABLE 3.9-1 (CONT'D.)POTENTIALLY CONTAMINATED SITES IN THE FOOTPRINT OF THE PROPOSite Name and AddressStatusType of ProjectACTA South – Parcel LBX-828 1022 McDonoughCompleted – Case closed as of 1/23/2003Cleanup Program SiteACTA South – Parcel LBX-827 1026 McDonoughCompleted – Case closed as of 1/23/2003Cleanup Program SiteACTA South – Parcel LBX-827 1026 McDonoughCompleted – Case closed as of 1/23/2003Cleanup Program SiteACTA South – Parcel LBX-825 1027 McDonoughOpen – Assessment & Interim Remedial Action as of 7/15/2014Cleanup Program SiteACTA South – Parcel SE/LBX-820 1027 McDonough Avenue Wilmington, CA 90744Completed – Case closed as of 1/8/2003Cleanup Program SiteACTA South – Parcel SE/LBX-820 1027 McDonough Avenue Wilmington, CA 90744Completed – Case closed as of 1/8/2003Cleanup Program SiteACTA South – Parcel SE-B23 Grand Street & McDonough Avenue Wilmington, CA 90744Completed – Case closed as of 1/8/2003Cleanup Program SiteACTA South – Parcel SE-823 Grand Street & McDonough Avenue Wilmington, CA 90744Completed – Case closed as of 1/10/2003Cleanup Program SiteACTA South – Parcel SE-823 Grand Street & McDonough Avenue Wilmington, CA 90744Completed – Case closed as of 1/10/2003Cleanup Program SiteACTA South – Darcel SE-823 Grand Street & McDonough Avenue Wilmington, CA 90744Completed – Case closed as of 1/10/2003Cleanup Program SiteCh			

1 10.4 REVISED FIGURES

- 2 The following revised figures are added to the Draft EIR for the proposed On-Dock Rail
- 3 Support Facility:

TABLE 10-9 REVISED FIGURES						
Figure	Found on Draft EIR Page	Draft EIR Section	Reason for Revision or Addition	See Revised Figure on Page		
ES-1	ES-4	ES.3	This figure was revised to correct street names (Anaheim Street and 7 th Street)	10-23		
1.7-2	1-20	1.7.2	This figure was revised to correct street names (Anaheim Street and 7 th Street).	10-23		
1.7-3	1-21	1.7.2	This figure was revised to depict refinement of boundaries of the proposed Project (12 th Street Alternative).	10-24		
1.8-1	1-27	1.8.2	This figure was revised to remove the West Yard Layover and Fueling Area for the proposed Project (12 th Street Alternative).	10-25		
1.8-8	1-36	1.8.2	This figure was revised to correct information in Phase 3 of construction of the proposed Project (12 th Street Alternative).	10-27		

	TABLE 10-9 (CONT'D.) REVISED FIGURES						
Figure	Found on Draft EIR Page	Draft EIR Section	Reason for Revision or Addition	See Revised Figure on Page			
1.8-9	1-41	1.8.3	This figure was revised to remove the West Yard Layover and Fueling Area for the 10 th Street Alternative.	10-29			
1.8-11	1-45	1.8.4	This figure was revised to remove the West Yard Layover and Fueling Area for the 9 th Street Alternative.	10-31			
2.1-1	2-9	2.1.2	This figure was revised to show the new Number 5 project, all other projects were renumbered for a total of 38 projects (instead of 37).	10-33			
3.3-3	3.3-9	3.3.1.3	This figure was revised to depict refinement of the Project footprint for the proposed Project (12 th Street Alternative).	10-35			
3.5-6	3.5-35	3.5.2.4	This figure was revised to depict refinement of the Project footprint for the proposed Project (10 th Street Alternative).	10-36			
3.6-1	3.6-2	3.6.1.3	This figure was revised to depict refinement of the Project footprint for the proposed Project (12 th Street Alternative).	10-37			
3.6-5	3.6-19	3.6.4.1	This figure was revised to depict refinement of the boundaries of the proposed Project (12 th Street Alternative) using a background showing parcels.	10-39			
3.6-6	3.6-23	3.6.4.2	This figure was revised to depict refinement of the boundaries of the 10 th Street Alternative using a background showing parcels.	10-41			
3.6-7	3.6-27	3.6.4.3	This figure was revised to depict refinement of the boundaries of the 9 th Street Alternative using a background showing parcels.	10-43			
3.7-1	3.7-2	3.7.1.2	This figure was revised to depict refinement of the proposed Project boundaries.	10-45			
3.8-3	3.8-7	3.8.1.4	This figure was revised to depict refinement of the proposed Project boundaries.	10-46			
3.9-1	3.9-3	3.9.1.2	This figure was revised to depict refinement of the proposed Project boundaries.	10-47			
3.9-2	3.9-15	3.9.2.3	This figure was revised to depict refinement of the proposed Project boundaries.	10-48			
3.10-2	3.10-9	3.10.4.2	This figure was revised to depict refinement of the proposed Project boundaries.	10-49			
3.10-3	3.10-10	3.10.4.2	This figure was revised to depict refinement of the proposed Project boundaries.	10-50			

Port of Long Beach



- 1
- Revised Figure ES-1 and Revised Figure 1.7-2 Project Vicinity Map 2
- 3



- 1
- 2 Revised Figure 1.7-3
- 3 Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project Location Map with Approximate Project Boundaries
Port of Long Beach



2 Revised Figure 1.8-1

1

3 Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility, 12th Street Alternative (Proposed Project)

Chapter 10 Modifications to the Draft EIR

Chapter 10 Modifications to the Draft EIR

1

This page intentionally left blank.

Port of Long Beach



- 1
- 2 Revised Figure 1.8-8
- 3 Estimated Phase 3 Construction for the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility, 12th Street Alternative (Proposed Project)

This page intentionally left blank.

Port of Long Beach



2 Revised Figure 1.8-9

1

3 Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility, 10th Street Alternative

Chapter 10 Modifications to the Draft EIR

Chapter 10 Modifications to the Draft EIR

1

This page intentionally left blank.

Port of Long Beach

Port of Long Beach



2 Revised Figure 1.8-11

1

3 Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility, 9th Street Alternative

Chapter 10 Modifications to the Draft EIR

Chapter 10 Modifications to the Draft EIR

1

This page intentionally left blank.

Port of Long Beach



- Port of Long Beach (10) Shoreline Gateway Project, City of Long Beach
- (11) Long Beach Civic Center, City of Long Beach
- 24 Berths 70-71 Westway Decommissioning, Port of Los Angeles

(23) San Pedro Waterfront, Port of Los Angeles

- 36 Shell Oil Products U.S. Carson Revitalization Project Specific Plan (CRPSP), City of Carson
- Chevron Products Company El Segundo Refinery Product Reliability and Optimization,

12) 1235 Long Beach Blvd. Mixed-Use Project, City of Long Beach (2) Wilmington Water From Master Plan (Avalon Blvd. Corridor Project), Port of Los Angeles 13) 2010 E. Ocean Blvd. Project, City of Long Beach (2) Wilmington Water From Master Plan (Avalon Blvd. Corridor Project), Port of Los Angeles 14) Shoemaker Bridge Replacement, City of Long Beach (2) City Dock Marine Research Center, Port of Los Angeles	City of El Segundo (38) Tesoro Los Angeles Refinery Integration and Compliance, SCAQMD Project Footprint
--	---

2 Source: Parsons

1

- 3 Revised Figure 2.1-1
- Map of Related Projects 4

Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project

10-33

This page intentionally left blank.

January 2018

10-34



- 1
- 2 Revised Figure 3.3-3
- 3 Project Area Floodplains



- 2 Revised Figure 3.5-6
- 3 Roadway Network Changes (10th Street Alternative)



- 1
- 2 Revised Figure 3.6-1
- 3 The Proposed Project's Relationship to City of Long Beach and City of Los Angeles Boundaries

This page intentionally left blank.



2 Revised Figure 3.6-5

3 Potential Acquisitions for the Proposed Project (12th Street Alternative)

Chapter 10 Modifications to the Draft EIR

1

This page intentionally left blank.

Port of Long Beach



Revised Figure 3.6-6 Potential Acquisitions for the Proposed Project (10th Street Alternative) 3

Chapter 10 Modifications to the Draft EIR

1

This page intentionally left blank.

Port of Long Beach



2 Revised Figure 3.6-7

3 Potential Acquisitions for the Proposed Project (9th Street Alternative)

Chapter 10 Modifications to the Draft EIR

1

This page intentionally left blank.

Port of Long Beach



2 Revised Figure 3.7-1

3 Location of Public Services for the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project



2 Revised Figure 3.8-3

1

3 Noise Measurements/Receptor Location



- 1
- 2 Source: modified from DYA, 2011; DOGGR, 2017
- 3 Revised Figure 3.9-1
- 4 Oil Production Facilities within the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project Site



- 1
- 2 Source: modified from DYA, 2011
- 3 Revised Figure 3.9-2
- 4 Hazardous Materials or Waste Facilities in the Vicinity of the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project Site

January 2018



- Source: ESRI, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, i-cubed, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo,
 and the GIS user Community.
- 4 Revised Figure 3.10-2
- 5 Distribution of Minority Population in the Proposed Project Area of Influence



- Source: ESRI, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, i-cubed, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo,
 and the GIS user Community.
- 4 Revised Figure 3.10-3
- 5 Distribution of Low-Income Population in the Proposed Project Area of Influence

1 CHAPTER 11 2 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

This section provides responses to comments received on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility, which was released to the public on December 16, 2016. Responses to letters and e-mail messages received and oral testimony at public and hearings are included in this section.

7 11.1 PUBLIC COMMENT PROCESS

Following the December 16, 2016, release of the Draft EIR, the Port held three public hearings
to provide the public with an opportunity to comment on and present evidence relating to the
proposed Project and the Draft EIR. The public meetings for the Draft Pier B On-Dock Support
Facility Project were held on the following dates at the locations indicated:

- 12 January 11, 2017, at Silverado Park, 1545 W. 31st Street, Long Beach
- January 18, 2017, at Port of Long Beach Administration Offices, 4801 Airport Plaza Drive,
 Long Beach
- February 15, 2017, at Tepechi Birrireria Restaurant, 1430 Santa Fe Avenue, Long Beach

16 The Draft EIR for the proposed Project was also made available for review at several locations

17 accessible to the general public, including the Port's website at *www.polb.com/ceqa*, the Port

18 of Long Beach Interim Administration Offices, Long Beach City Clerk Office, Long Beach Main

19 Library, San Pedro Regional Branch Library, and Wilmington Branch Library.

20 11.2 COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

21 **11.2.1 Written Comments**

The public review period for the Draft EIR concluded on March 13, 2017. The Port of Long Beach (POLB) received written comment letters or e-mail messages from 48 governmental agencies, organizations, and members of the public. In addition, a petition circulated by the Westside Project Area Council was submitted during the public comment period.

Table 11.2-1 presents a list of the State Government, Regional Agencies, Local Agencies, Community Groups, Industry and Business Groups, and Individuals who submitted written comments. Each commenter is assigned a letter code based on the name of the commenter or affiliation (e.g., California Air Resources Board is given the letter code "CARB"). An abbreviation for the business name is used if the business is represented by a law firm. The individual comments are annotated in the margin of each letter using the commenter's code and consecutive numbering (e.g., CARB-1, CARB-2).

TABLE 11.2-1 WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE PIER B ON-DOCK RAIL SUPPORT FACILITY DRAFT EIR

No.	Individual/Organization	Comment Codes	Date	
	State Governmen	t		
1	California Air Resources Board	CARB-1 to CARB-16	3/13/2017	
2	California Department of Toxic Substances Control	DTSC-1 to DTSC-5	2/14/2017	
3	California Department of Transportation	CADOT-1 and CADOT-2	2/14/2017	
4	California Transportation Commission	CATC-1 to CATC-3	2/7/2017	
	Regional Governme	ent		
5	South Coast Air Quality Management District	AQMD-1 to AQMD-10	3/13/2017	
Local Government				
6	City of Inglewood	COI-1	3/6/2017	
7	Los Angeles Department of Water & Power	LADWP-1 and LADWP -2	1/25/2017	
8	Los Angeles County Public Works	LACPW-1 and LACPW-2	1/25/2017	
9	Long Beach Board of Health and Human Services	LBBHHS-1 to LBBHHS-3	1/25/2017	
	Community Group	S		
10	Church of the Good Shepherd, Arcadia, CA	CGS-1	12/22/2017	
11	Citizens Coalition for a Safe Community	CCSC-1 to CCSC-41	3/13/17	
12	Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation	GBMI-1 to GBMI-4	(undated)	
13	Natural Resources Defense Council	NRDC-1 and NRDC-2	1/2/2017	
14	Sierra Club, Angeles Chapter	SCAC-1 to SCAC-11	3/13/2017	
15	Sierra Club, Long Beach Area Group	SCLB-1 to SCLB-3	1/18/2017	
16	Wilmington Neighborhood Council	WNC-1 and WNC-2	3/13/2017	
Industry and Business Groups				
17	Allied Packing and Rubber, Inc.	APR-1 to APR-10	1/20/2017 2/14/2017 3/13/2017	
18	Berns Bros., Inc.	BBI-1 to BBI-3	3/13/2017	
19	Berth 55 Landing of Long Beach, Inc.	B55-1 to B55-5	3/13/2017	
20	Chemoil Terminals Corporation	CTC-1 to CTC-7	2/8/2017	
21	Golden Star Restaurants	GSR-1 to GCR-7	3/13/2017	
22	Harbor Trucking Association	HTA-1	3/13/2017	
23	HJ Baker	HJB-1 to HJB-3	3/7/2017	
24	LAN Logistics, Inc.	LLI-1 to LLI -30	3/13/2017	
25	Magnolia Industrial Group, Inc.	MIG-1 to MIG-9	3/13/2017	
26	Marisa Foods	MF-1 to MF-7	3/13/2017	
27	Pacific Maritime Shipping Association	PMSA-1	3/13/2017	
28	Phillips Steel Company	PSC-1 to PSC-11	3/3/2017	
29	Southern California Edison	SCE-1 to SCE-4	3/13/2017	

TABLE 11.2-1 (CONT'D) WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE PIER B ON-DOCK RAIL SUPPORT FACILITY DRAFT EIR				
No.	Individual/Organization	Comment Codes	Date	
30	Spun Products, MLZ, Inc.	SP-1 to SP-5	3/10/2017	
31	SRM Corporation	SRM-1 to SRM-9	3/13/2017	
32	Superior Electrical Advertising	SEA-1 to SEA-21	2/28/2017	
33	Teamsters Local Union No. 848	T848-1	2/14/2017	
34	Tesoro SoCal Pipeline Company, LLC	TSPC-1 to TSPC-9	3/13/2017	
35	Trans Harbor, Inc., Trans Harbor Investments, Inc.	TH-1 and TH-2	2/1/2017	
36	Westside Project Area Council	WPAC-1 to WPAC-15	2/14/2017	
37	Wilmington Chamber of Commerce	WCC-1 to WCC-12	3/13/2017	
Individuals				
38	Wilson Trust	WT-1 to WT-11	3/13/2017	
39	Lynette Ferenczy	LF-1 to LF-6	2/13/2017	
40	Thomas Gillilan	TG-1	1/9/2017	
41	Kat Janowicz	KJ-1	1/18/2017	
42	David Kelly	DK-1	1/30/2017	
43	Mike Laquatra	ML-1 to ML-4	2/13/2017	
44	Russ McCurdy	RM-1 and RM-2	2/13/2017	
45	Colleen McDonald	CM-1 to CM-6	3/13/2017	
46	Robert Rodine	RR-1 and RR-2	1/12/2017	
47	Staci Schwartz	SS-1	1/4/2017	
48	Adam Wolven	AW-1 to AW-4	3/13/2017	

1 **11.2.2** Master Responses to Key Topics Identified in Comments Received

The following section provides responses to issues that were frequently brought up in the comments on the Draft EIR. To avoid redundancies and repetitions, comprehensive responses to these most frequently raised issues are presented in this section as Master Responses. The Master Responses address the following key topics identified in the comments received on the Draft EIR:

- 7 Property Acquisition, Compensation, and Relocation
- 8 Electrification of Alameda Corridor and Zero Emission Locomotives
- 9 Noise and Vibration Associated with Trains
- 10 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Notification
- 11 Community Grants Program (CGP)
- 12 Street Closures, Access to Downtown Long Beach, and Public Services Access

1 *Master Response – Property Acquisition, Compensation, and Relocation*

The CEQA EIR process is only the initial step in the planning process. Final Project design and construction, or "moving of dirt" for the Project would not occur unless and until the Final EIR is certified, the Project is approved by the Board of Harbor Commissioners (BHC), and all of the other necessary steps to acquire the necessary property area are taken. Preparation and approval of relocation plans and the property acquisition process would be conducted in accordance with all applicable statutes and regulations, including California property acquisition laws and requirements.

9 The Port cannot even begin to consider whether or not it wishes to undertake property 10 acquisitions for the Project until it clears these preliminary hurdles: (1) the Port completes the CEQA environmental review process by certifying the Final EIR for the Project; (2) the Port 11 approves the Project (including selection of one of the alternatives under consideration) and 12 13 the other necessary steps required prior considering whether to acquire property; and (3) the 14 Port has funding available to purchase property for the Project. In cases involving publicly 15 owned properties, the Port also would need to enter into interagency cooperation agreements. These actions are described in Section 3.6 of the Draft EIR. 16

17 Only after the three preliminary steps described above have been completed would the Port 18 begin the processes necessary to consider whether or not to move forward to acquire property 19 for the Project. If property is proposed for acquisition, the owner would receive a written notice 20 of the acquiring agency's interest. The acquiring agency would hire a professional appraiser 21 to determine the property's value. The owner would be given an opportunity to accompany 22 the appraiser on his or her inspection and advise the appraiser of property fixtures or other features the owner believes are important to determining a fair value. The appraiser would 23 24 deliver a written appraisal report to the acquiring agency. The value expressed would be the 25 "fair market value." If less than the entire property is being considered for acquisition, the 26 appraiser would determine not only the value of what is being sought, but also any damage 27 to the remainder of the property from the "severance" of the "part taken."

28 Once the appraisal is completed, the acquiring agency would provide the owner with a written 29 offer to purchase for the full amount of the appraisal. The offer would include a summary of 30 the pertinent data relied on by the appraiser to determine value, including the value date, 31 description of the property taken and any remainder, improvements included, and the 32 comparable sales, income and expense presumptions, and capitalization rates, etc. the appraiser used to prepare the report. If the owner disagrees with the appraisal and wishes to 33 hire a different appraiser, the owner can do so, and may apply to the acquiring agency for 34 35 reimbursement of its cost, up to \$5,000.

The Port would make every reasonable effort to acquire the property by negotiated purchase. It would review any appraisal or other information the owners present and would negotiate in good faith to reach a fair price, based on the market and indications of value from the appraisal(s). Most acquisitions for public projects occur by agreed negotiated sale.

40 Qualifying displaced businesses would also receive relocation assistance in accordance with 41 applicable relocation regulations. This could include help in finding a relocation site,

42 reimbursement for moving expenses, and reimbursements for other transition costs.

Only if negotiations fail would the Port consider using eminent domain to acquire the property
 within its jurisdiction. To do so, the BHC would first formally authorize the action through a

45 "resolution of necessity." This type of resolution may only be adopted after a duly noticed

Port of Long Beach

1 public hearing and after findings have been made that the public interest requires the project,

2 the project is planned in a manner to create the greatest public good and least private injury,

and the property is necessary for the project. The owner would receive written notice of the

4 hearing and have an opportunity to be heard.

5 If the resolution passes by a vote of at least two-thirds of the members of the governing body, 6 the Port, as an acquiring agency, could file an eminent domain lawsuit in superior court to 7 acquire the property. It would name as parties all record owners of the property, including 8 lienholders. The court would determine whether the acquiring agency has the right to acquire 9 the property and, if so, determine its value (called "just compensation"). The owner would be 10 entitled to a jury determination of just compensation. If the acquiring agency is entitled to 11 acquire the property by eminent domain, title to the property would pass by court order after 12 the "just compensation" is paid.

For those affected properties owned by the Port and leased to tenants, the individual terms and conditions of each tenant's agreement with the Port would govern. Discussion and negotiation between the affected businesses and the Port would take place long before any scheduled construction of the proposed Project, with sufficient lead time for the affected business to plan for relocation or other arrangements to minimize adverse economic effects. This process typically occurs during the final design phase, when more detailed engineering is available.

19 Property relocation plans would be developed on an individual parcel basis to address 20 potential displacement issues, or identify potential relocation resources and describe 21 relocations planning procedures. Due to the extent of time required for planning and 22 engineering studies, development of construction plans, right-of-way (ROW) mapping, or 23 decisions regarding possible acquisitions of privately held interests, it is difficult to predict 24 future availability of relocation sites, if businesses will relocate into existing structures, or if 25 relocations will require new construction. The Port would work closely with its individual 26 tenants in advance of scheduled construction in accordance with Title 25. California Code of 27 Regulations (CCR) Section 6038, or any federal counterpart regulation as necessary.

Should it be ultimately determined that is necessary to acquire private property or property interests, private property owners would be compensated in accordance with applicable State or federal eminent domain and relocation laws and regulations. Under such laws, property owners of acquired property would be compensated at fair market value for their property, based on its highest and best use.

33 *Master Response – Electrification of Alameda Corridor and Zero Emission Locomotives*

A number of comments expressed views that electrification of the Alameda Corridor should
 be considered in the EIR and that electric or zero emission locomotives should be used as
 mitigation for the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project.

Electrification of the Alameda Corridor is outside the scope of the proposed Project. The application of zero emission technologies to rail locomotive operations within and beyond Port boundaries is extremely complex. Zero emission technologies for rail operations face implementation challenges due to the need for additional infrastructure and limitations to the Port's authority as it pertains to rail operations, specifically line haul rail operations. Federal law specifically precludes government agencies such as the State and the Port from imposing requirements that interfere with private rail operations (see, e.g., 49 United States Code

1 [U.S.C.] § 10101 et seq.). Moreover, the Alameda Corridor Use and Operating Agreement 2 specifically prohibits the Ports from unilaterally mandating rail electrification. Specifically, in 3 Section 2.2(c), the Agreement provides "Neither POLA [Port of Los Angeles], POLB, nor 4 ACTA [Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority] will require the Railroads to operate 5 Through Trains powered by electric locomotives on the Rail Corridor unless the Railroads 6 voluntarily agree thereto, provided however, if electrification is otherwise required, such 7 requirements shall not be a basis on which any party may terminate this Agreement, but if 8 legally permissible, a Railroad may satisfy the requirement to use electric powered 9 locomotives by using locomotives powered by an alternative energy source acceptable to the 10 appropriate government entities" (page 15). As a result, any steps towards electrification in the future would have to be jointly agreed upon by the railroads. To date, the railroads have 11 not agreed to electrification. The Port does not have the authority to implement emission 12 13 control measures on line haul engines operated by Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) and Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), which are separate entities not under control of the Port. 14 15 Furthermore, electrification of the rail system or use of zero emission locomotives would need 16 to be implemented on a larger scale, rather than in connection with a single rail yard, such as 17 the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility.

Under CEQA, an EIR must describe feasible mitigation measures that could minimize the project's significant impacts. Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(a)(1), an EIR need not identify and discuss or analyze in detail mitigation measures that are infeasible. According to the CEQA Guidelines Section 15364, "feasible" means "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors."

24 While zero emissions technologies are promising, no zero emission switching locomotives 25 have yet been proven to be feasible in port operations nor have yet been fully commercialized. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) prepared Technology Assessment: Freight 26 27 Locomotives (CARB, 2016c), which considered potential advanced locomotive technologies 28 that could, at some point, operate on the existing rail network with emissions below the current 29 national Tier 4 emission levels. The Technology Assessment outlined the numerous technological, costs, legal, and logistical constraints that render zero emission rail operations 30 31 infeasible. As previously mentioned, electrification of the rail system or use of zero emission 32 locomotives would need to be implemented on a larger scale. In the Technical Assessment, 33 CARB acknowledges several significant challenges associated with freight electrification, 34 which includes capital costs upwards of \$50 million or more per route-mile, further indicating 35 that with up to 500 miles of total major rail route in and around the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), the total capital costs could be up to \$25 billion or more. In addition, CARB also found 36 37 that a basin-specific rail electrification system has the potential to create delays in operations. 38 As an example, CARB states that an all-electric operation in the SCAB would need to change 39 locomotives at an exchange point to connect to the North America diesel-electric freight rail 40 system for the remainder of the trip. Another significant challenge is the need to build a substantial electricity-generating system. According to CARB, UPRR and BNSF generate up 41 42 to 400,000 locomotive megawatt-hours (MWh) or more of electricity in the SCAB. By 2050, 43 up to one million MWh would be needed by UPRR and BNSF to operate in the SCAB. A 44 significant level of electric power infrastructure would be needed to meet the electricity 45 demands of heavy hauling freight rail operations in the SCAB and in the rest of California.

46 Therefore, based on the assessment, CARB recommended dual paths for locomotive 47 technology deployment. One path would be to seek significant criteria and toxic pollutant

Port of Long Beach

1 reductions beyond Tier 4 in the near to mid-term with after-treatment technologies, augmented

2 with on-board batteries. The second path would be to develop zero-emission track mile or

3 zero-emission locomotive technologies needed in the mid- to long-term (2025 -2050). As 4 such, it is considered infeasible to require that zero emission locomotives be used as

5 mitigation for the proposed Project.

6 The current Pacific Harbor Line (PHL) operating agreement is set to expire at the end of 2024.

7 If the proposed Project is approved, the Port would negotiate with the short-haul switching 8 operator to incorporate into subsequent operating agreements requirements to participate in

9 demonstration of and/or implement a new technology if one is determined to be feasible in

10 terms of cost, and technical and operational feasibility.

11 PHL, which provides short-haul rail transportation services for the POLB and the POLA, will primarily operate the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility. PHL has been a partner 12 13 with the Ports in demonstrating several technologies, including liquefied natural gas (LNG)-14 powered and hybrid-electric locomotives. PHL has been recognized as one of the cleanest locomotive fleets in North America as a result of converting its fleet to clean diesel locomotives 15 that achieve "Tier 3-plus" ultra-low emission standards. The Tier 3-plus engines emit 85 16 17 percent less diesel particulate matter (DPM) and 38 percent less nitrogen oxides (NO_x) 18 emissions compared to the Tier 2 locomotive engines they replaced. To upgrade the 19 locomotives, the Port extended PHL's operating agreement term for PHL to commit to use the 20 ultra-low emission locomotives in the San Pedro Bay Ports (SPBP) through 2024. In March 21 2017, PHL began a demonstration of a locomotive developed by Progress Rail that is 22 expected to meet United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Tier 4 emission 23 standards.

24 Through the Ports' Technology Advancement Program (TAP), PHL is partnering with VeRail 25 Technologies (VeRail) in the development and demonstration of a locomotive that combines 26 near-zero emission engines with on-board high-capacity storage for compressed natural gas 27 (CNG) and backup diesel-fueled generator sets (gen-sets) that would only be used for peak 28 power needs and as a safety backup. The VeRail near-zero emissions locomotive would be 29 the first locomotive to meet the CARB Tier 4-plus and near-zero emission levels for switcher 30 locomotives. The CARB Tier 4-plus standards achieve a 70-percent reduction below current 31 EPA switcher locomotive engine standards for NO_x and particulate matter (PM). The VeRail 32 locomotive will be required to conduct extensive emissions testing, as well as validation and 33 durability testing to ensure the locomotive's design. The locomotive will be demonstrated in PHL's day-to-day operations for a period of 1 year to further validate its in-use performance, 34 35 durability, and reliability.

Recently, VeRail began exploring the design of utilizing batteries instead of the diesel generator-sets that would allow the locomotive to operate in full zero-emissions. Based on VeRail's estimates, the batteries could power the switching locomotive in zero emissions mode for more than 8 hours before requiring a recharge. Should the batteries last for less than a full shift, the locomotive could operate as a fully functional near-zero natural gas locomotive.

As a special condition of the proposed Project, the Port would conduct a periodic technology
review every 5 years following the project approval date. New air quality technological
advancements are subject to consideration by the Port on the basis of operational feasibility,
technical feasibility, and cost effectiveness/financial feasibility.

1 Master Response – Noise and Vibration Associated with Trains

2 A number of comments were received concerning train horns (or whistles) and rail yard 3 operational noise. The noise and vibration analyses in the Draft EIR were performed consistent with industry standards and in accordance with CEQA requirements. The area of influence 4 5 evaluated for the noise analysis included areas adjacent to the Project boundaries in both the 6 City of Long Beach (COLB) and the City of Los Angeles (COLA), as well as the Alameda 7 Corridor, focusing on sensitive receptors that might be affected by noise from the proposed 8 Project (e.g., nearby residential units or schools). Section 3.8.2.2 of the Draft EIR describes 9 the methods used to assess noise and vibration from the proposed Project. Vibration impacts were analyzed based on assessment procedures stated in the Federal Transit Administration 10 11 (FTA) Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Guidelines (FTA, 2006) rather than the COLB 12 criteria because the FTA criteria are more stringent and specific to rail projects such as the 13 Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project. Based on the analysis, no vibration impacts 14 associated with construction or operation of the proposed Project have been identified.

The Draft EIR findings indicate that there are no significant noise or vibration impactsassociated with construction or operation of the proposed Project.

17 Sources of noise would include construction activities, increased train transport of cargo, and 18 proposed changes in vehicular traffic on local streets in the vicinity of the Project. With the 19 closing of the 9th Street at-grade crossing as part of the Project, there would be no at-grade 20 crossings at the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility. Major operational noise sources 21 associated with the proposed Project would include train movements within the rail yard (i.e., 22 low-speed light engine locomotive moves, wheel/rail noise from container car sets, coupler 23 engaging/de-coupling), vehicular traffic traveling on adjacent streets, and additional trains 24 from the proposed Project after they leave the Pier B Rail Yard.

As a safety measure, the sounding of locomotive horns is mandated by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) in advance of all public highway-rail crossings and when railroad workers are within the rail ROW for construction and maintenance activities. As part of the proposed Project, the 9th Street at-grade crossing would be closed to accommodate expansion of the rail yard at the eastern edge of the Project.

Therefore, the locomotive horn sounding that currently occurs at the 9th Street at-grade 30 31 crossing would be eliminated with the Project. Trains leaving the Pier B Rail Yard destined for 32 the Alameda Corridor travel on tracks that do not have intervening at-grade crossings. 33 Therefore, no horn soundings at such crossings would occur from the yard to the Alameda 34 Corridor. As a further safety measure, federal regulations also require the locomotive 35 engineers to sound the horn to warn railroad maintenance employees or contractors working 36 on the tracks of an approaching train or locomotive. If a railroad or individual engineer fails to 37 sound the locomotive horn, they are potentially subject to enforcement action by the FRA.

38 *Master Response – CEQA Notification*

39 Several comments were received concerning a perceived lack of notification and an40 unreasonably short public review period.

Section 15105 of State CEQA Guidelines requires that the review period for a Draft EIR
 submitted to the State Clearinghouse shall not be less than 45 days; the POLB exceeded this

43 requirement by initially establishing a 60-day public review period. The Notice of Completion,

	Chapter 11
Port of Long Beach	Responses to Comments

- 1 Availability, Comment Period, and Public Meeting for the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility
- 2 Project Draft EIR/Application Summary Report was released to the public on December 16,
- 3 2016, with a 60-day public review period originally scheduled to end on February 13, 2017.
- 4 The Draft EIR for the proposed Project was made available for public review at various 5 libraries in the Cities of Long Beach, San Pedro, and Wilmington and is available in electronic
- 6 format on the Port's website at *www.polb.com/ceqa*.

7 On January 26, 2017, after learning that certain persons did not receive the initial notice, the 8 Port released an Amended Notice of Completion, Availability, Comment Period, and Public 9 Meeting for the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project Draft EIR/Application Summary Report. The POLB further exceeded the requirement by subsequently extending this review 10 11 to 90 days; the public review period ended on March 13, 2017. The notices were also 12 published in the local newspaper, The Press-Telegram, on December 15, 2016, and January 8, January 27, and February 12, 2017. The Port held three public meetings to gather public 13 14 comment on the Draft EIR on January 11, January 18, and February 15, 2017.

15 *Master Response – Community Grants Program*

16 Several commenters indicated that mitigation grant funding for air quality and global climate 17 change impacts is, in their opinion, insufficient.

18 The Draft EIR evaluated the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project's 19 cumulative impacts, as well as its contribution to impacts on air quality; and has included all 20 feasible environmental control measures to reduce air quality impacts. Although the Port 21 makes every effort to lessen the impact of cumulative air pollution and greenhouse gas (GHG) 22 emissions, not all impacts can be addressed with onsite mitigation measures alone. The Port 23 acknowledges that the Project has cumulative air guality and GHG emissions impacts; therefore, the Port has included measures to provide funding for projects that will help to 24 25 reduce air quality impacts to vulnerable groups within the vicinity of the Port and reduce GHG 26 emissions that contribute to global climate change.

27 In 2009, the Port launched its original Mitigation Grants Program to address the cumulative 28 air and health impacts arising from new development projects, such as the Middle Harbor Redevelopment Project and the Gerald Desmond Bridge Replacement Project. Since 29 30 establishing the program in 2009, the two projects just listed have allocated \$17.4 million to 31 the program and have funded nearly 120 community-based mitigation projects such as air 32 filters, new windows and doors, asthma education programs, energy-efficiency projects, and 33 tree planting. Additional development projects have contributed more than \$788,000 towards 34 the mitigation programs.

35 In March 2017, the Long Beach BHC approved the updated CGP that allocated an initial \$46.4 36 million funding amount for a CGP implementation period covering the next 12 to 15 years. 37 Three specific programs: Community Health, Facility Improvements, and Community 38 Infrastructure, each with their own set of detailed guidelines, provide the framework for project 39 investments. The CGP is intended to provide long-term funding for community-based mitigation projects that alleviate or reduce impacts from port-related activities. Additional 40 funding will be provided from Port development projects that result in significant adverse 41 impacts. Projects with adverse impacts are required to mitigate those impacts, and may be 42 43 required to contribute funding in accordance with the methodologies and formulas identified 44 in POLB's CGP and Investment Plan (POLB, 2016b).

0 -----

1 The Port has established criteria for eligible projects and programs and the types of 2 organizations and facilities that can apply, in accordance with the public trust doctrine and 3 guidance from the California State Lands Commission. While the entire COLB is eligible for grant funding, there are two geographic zones: a "Priority Zone" and an "Eligibility Zone." The 4 5 Port developed a priority funding zone to direct CGP investments to the areas most affected 6 by Port-related operations. The Eligibility Zone is the area in which significant Port impacts 7 have been identified, and at minimum, mitigation projects must take place within. The Priority 8 Zone is a subset of the Eligibility Zone, and experiences the highest community impact from 9 Port-related operations. The Port intends to invest a majority of mitigation dollars in the Priority 10 Zone; as such, projects in this zone will receive the highest consideration during the evaluation process. Both zones also include parts of Wilmington, Carson, Compton, and Paramount. A 11 12 Community Grants Advisory Committee appointed by the Mayor of Long Beach assists select 13 projects for funding. Before any grant funding is awarded, however, the Port must conduct a 14 thorough staff review of all applications and present them to the BHC for approval.

15 The Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project would contribute funds to the CGP as 16 mitigation for cumulative impacts associated with air quality and GHG emissions. Funding will 17 be prioritized to mitigation projects that benefit sensitive populations, which include children, 18 pregnant women, the elderly, the chronically ill, and those with respiratory or other 19 cardiopulmonary conditions.

20 To determine the funding level associated with significant air quality impacts, the Port used 21 the methodology for Air Quality and Health Risk described in the CGP and Investment Plan, 22 in which the Port identified a regional metric that assigns costs to NO_X and particulate matter 23 emissions based on tons per year. South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), 24 in its Rule 301, uses this metric. Additionally, when developing cost-effectiveness calculations 25 or offsite mitigation programs, many air quality agencies give higher weight to particulate matter emissions due to that pollutant's link to health risks. In the State's Carl Moyer Air Quality 26 27 Standards Attainment Program, particulate matter is weighted 20 times the nitrogen dioxide 28 (NO₂) level. Combining these two approaches, the Port developed the following formula to 29 calculate a one-time mitigation amount for criteria pollutants and health risk:

- 30 (Project NO_x emissions x \$825.56/ton) + 20 x (Project emissions of particulate matter
 31 under 10 microns [PM₁₀] x \$1,094.31/ton) = Mitigation Amount
- For the proposed Project, the total calculated amount of the Port's contribution for criteria pollutant and health risk is \$149,757.

For GHG emissions, the Port based its calculation formula on SCAQMD's Rule 2702, which instituted a GHG program for development projects seeking offsite mitigation or for companies seeking to voluntarily reduce their carbon footprint. SCAQMD uses these dollars to fund mitigation projects that reduce or avoid GHG emissions. Rule 2702 established the participation fee for GHG mitigation at \$15 per metric ton carbon dioxide equivalent (MT CO₂e). The following formula is used to calculate a one-time mitigation amount for GHG emissions:

41 Project CO₂e emissions x \$15 per metric ton = GHG Emissions Mitigation
42 Funding Amount

For the proposed Project, the total calculated amount of the Port's contribution for GHGemissions is approximately \$1.4 million.
1 Although it is not known which projects would be ultimately proposed and selected for funding,

2 the level of proposed funding would provide a means to help reduce cumulative impacts

- 3 associated with the proposed Project for sensitive individuals through the support of
- 4 community health programs, facility improvements, and community infrastructure programs.

5 Master Response – Street Closures, Access to Downtown Long Beach, and Public 6 Services Access

Street Closures. The Draft EIR provided a discussion of roadway network changes. Streets that would be partially or permanently closed as a result of the proposed Project and alternatives are depicted in Figures 3.5-5, 3.5-6, and 3.5-7 (see also Tables 3.5-9, 3.5-14, and 3.5-16). Also refer to Figure 1.8-8, which depicts a new street that would parallel the proposed Project on the north (a realigned 12th Street) and provide new connections for Santa Fe Avenue, Canal Avenue, Harbor Avenue, and Fashion Avenue. The No Project Alternative would not require closing of any existing streets (Figure 3.5-8).

Information presented in the Draft EIR reflects a level of design corresponding to preliminary engineering. This is deemed sufficient for purposes of understanding the differences among alternatives and for properly assessing their environmental impacts. During final design, the Port would work with adjacent property owners and businesses to provide adequate access for individual businesses. The level of description presented in the Draft EIR permits a reasonable comparative assessment of the merits and impacts needing to be considered by the BHC in its deliberations in deciding whether and how to proceed with the proposed Project.

The following roadway closures are anticipated in the COLB as a result of the 12th Street Alternative:

23 <u>9th Street</u>

The Project would result in permanent closure south of 9th Street south of Anaheim Street to Pico Avenue/Pier B Street. Conceptual design depicts the southern leg of the 9th Street/ Anaheim Street intersection remaining intact and being connected to a realigned 12th Street. Closure of 9th Street would also include elimination of the 9th Street at-grade railroad crossing just north of the intersection of 9th Street/Pier B Street/Pico Avenue, as well as closure of the ramp from 9th Street to the Shoemaker Bridge. The goal of the State of California is to remove at-grade crossings due to safety concerns.

31 <u>10th Street</u>

The Project would result in closure of the entirety of 10th Street from 9th Street to Pico Avenue/
 Pier B Street, including closure of the ramp from the Shoemaker Bridge to 10th Street.

34 <u>11th Street</u>

The Project would result in closure of 11th Street between Canal Avenue and Harbor Avenue.
 However, the conceptual design depicts 11th Street merging into Harbor Avenue such that

37 access along 11th Street would be maintained between Harbor and Fashion avenues.

38 <u>12th Street</u>

The Project would result in reconfiguration of 12th Street adjacent to the proposed Project from Jackson Avenue to Canal Avenue. The section of 12th Street between Canal Avenue and

41 Harbor Avenue is used as a container storage yard and is not functioning as a connecting

roadway. From Jackson Avenue to Canal Avenue, 12th Street is comprised of two roadways (12th Street North and 12th Street South) separated by a median used for parking. Preliminary design plans would allow the properties that abut 12th Street North between Jackson Avenue and Canal Avenue to have continued access to 12th Street North on the back side of their properties. 12th Street South between Jackson Avenue and Canal Avenue would be closed to traffic and become part of the proposed Project.12th Street North and South would remain open from Harbor Avenue to east of Fashion Avenue where it meets the freeway access road.

8 <u>W. Edison Avenue</u>

9 The Project would result in closure of a portion of W. Edison Avenue located between 9th Street 10 to the north and its southern terminus at the existing railroad tracks north of Pier B Street, 11 approximately 205 linear feet of roadway. In 2012, this roadway was closed to through traffic, 12 and access is allowed only for emergency vehicles (no public access). The existing emergency 13 access at this location would be removed (there is no public access at this location).

14 Jackson Avenue

The Project would result in closure of Jackson Avenue from its southern terminus to 12th Street.
 Conceptual design depicts a new t-intersection of Jackson Avenue at a realigned 12th Street.

17 <u>Santa Fe Avenue</u>

18 The Project would result in closure of Santa Fe Avenue from south of 12th Street to its southern 19 terminus. Conceptual design depicts a new t-intersection of Santa Fe Avenue at a realigned

20 12th Street.

21 Canal Avenue

22 The Project would result in closure of Canal Avenue from south of 12th Street to its southern

terminus. Conceptual design depicts a new t-intersection of Canal Avenue at a realigned 12th
 Street.

25 <u>Caspian Avenue</u>

26 The Project would result in closure of Caspian Avenue between 10th and 11th Streets.

27 <u>Harbor Avenue</u>

28 The Project would result in closure of Harbor Avenue from south of 12th Street to its southern

29 terminus at 10th Street. Conceptual design depicts a new t-intersection of Harbor Avenue at a

30 realigned 12th Street. A road knuckle would be provided at the terminus of Harbor Avenue at

31 11th Street.

32 Fashion Avenue

The Project would result in closure of Fashion Avenue from south of 12th Street to its southern

terminus. Conceptual design depicts a new t-intersection of Fashion Avenue at a realigned
 12th Street. A cul-de-sac would be provided at the terminus of Fashion Avenue at 10th Street.

35 12th Street. A cul-de-sac would be provided at the terminus of Pashion Avenue at 10th Street.
 36 Shoemaker Bridge Ramps (9th and 10th Streets). The Shoemaker ramps would be removed

37 as part of the proposed Project, realigned as part of the 10th Street Alternative, and unchanged

38 for the 9th Street Alternative and No Project Alternative. The Shoemaker ramps include (1) an

39 on-ramp to southbound Shoemaker Bridge at 9th Street in the North Harbor District that

40 provides access to downtown Long Beach; and (2) an off-ramp from northbound Shoemaker

41 Bridge at 10th Street, which feeds into 9th Street in the North Harbor District.

1 It is possible that the Shoemaker ramps would be removed by the California Department of 2 Transportation (Caltrans) as part of Interstate (I)-710 Corridor Project improvements, or by 3 the COLB as part of the replacement of Shoemaker Bridge. The Shoemaker Bridge 4 Replacement Project has been identified as an Early Action Project that could occur prior to 5 approval of the I-710 Corridor Project. Either of these projects could occur in advance of the proposed improvements to the Pier B Rail Yard. 6 7 Removal of the Shoemaker ramps at 9th and 10th Streets, associated with the 12th Street 8 Alternative only, would eliminate an access point between downtown Long Beach and the 9 North Harbor District. All analyzed intersections currently operate at Level of Service (LOS) D 10 or better. Removal of the ramps would not result in significant impacts at the analyzed 11 intersections or on the analyzed roadway segments. The model estimates that, in 2035, the 12 total daily traffic volumes on the two ramps will be 8,606, including 3,457 on the 9th Street ramp and 5,149 on the 10th Street ramp. Based on time-of-day travel patterns, approximately 13 14 10 percent of the total daily volume occurs during the PM peak period, which results in 15 approximately 346 trips per day on the 9th Street ramp and 515 trips per day on the 10th Street ramp that would be shifted to alternative routes under the Project condition. Based on 16 17 origin/destination patterns, removal of the ramps would result in up to 0.1 to 0.3 mile of additional travel distance for persons traveling from the Port to downtown Long Beach. 18 According to traffic modeling conducted for this Project and real-time traffic conditions 19

obtained from Google Maps, removal of the ramps would result in up to 4 minutes of additional
 travel time (see Table 11.2-2).

	TRA FROM BERTH	VEL 55 T	T TIME O LO	ABLI DIFF NG B	E 11.2- EREN EACH	2. CE (W CITY	EEKD/ HALL,	AY) IN M	INUTI	ES		
Travel	Deute	A.M.			Р.М.							
Time	Route	7:00	7:30	8:00	11:30	12:00	00 12:30 1:00 4:30 5:00 5:30 5 5 5 5 5 5	6:00				
Minimum	Shoemaker/Broadway (2.3 miles; current route)	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	Pico/Ocean (1.8 miles; project condition)	5	5	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	5
	Difference	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Shoemaker/Broadway (2.3 miles; current route)	8	9	9	10	12	12	10	10	10	9	9
Maximum	Pico/Ocean (1.8 miles; project condition)	10	12	12	12	14	14	12	12	14	5:30 5 6 1 9 12 3	12
	Difference	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	5:00 5:30 5 5 5 5 6 6 1 1 10 9 14 12 4 3	3	

Note: Travel times shown in the table reflect the typical number of minutes (minimum and maximum) based on a number of different sources, including real-time traveler information collected and utilized by Google. These data reflect current roadway closures and construction zones on June 6, 2017. Real-time data come from smart phones when drivers enable "My Location" on Google Maps. Smart phones collect the real-time travel speeds, relay that data to Google, and Google uses that data to predict travel times.

22 Source: Google Maps, June 6, 2017.

Access to Downtown Long Beach. The proposed Project would result in closure of the 9th and 10th Streets ramps to the Shoemaker Bridge connecting to downtown Long Beach. The 9th Street and 10th Street Alternatives would not require closure of the 9th and 10th Streets ramps. However, both the I-710 Corridor Project Draft EIR/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) (Caltrans, 2017) and the proposed improvements to the Shoemaker Bridge could result in closure of these ramps.

The traffic impact analysis indicates that, with the Project, access between downtown Long
Beach and the Westside would be maintained via the existing transportation system which
provides sufficient interconnections such that no single roadway has an overwhelming volume

10 of traffic. Levels of service along the existing routes were analyzed. The Project would not

11 result in significant impacts to traffic access or operations.

Access to the Port of Long Beach. The proposed Project would result in portions of roads being permanently closed, as shown in Figure 3.5-5 of the Draft EIR. The proposed Project would result in permanent closure of portions of 9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th streets and W. Edison, Jackson, Santa Fe, Canal, Caspian, Harbor, and Fashion avenues. Access to the POLB from Anaheim Street would continue to be available on the west via Anaheim Street to Pier B Street and via I-710 on the east.

18 Public Services Access. None of the Project alternatives would result in a significant impact 19 to emergency response times due to the presence of emergency responders located north, 20 south, east, and west of the existing Pier B Rail Yard. As shown in Figure 3.7-1 of the Draft 21 EIR, one COLA, four Port-based, and three COLB fire stations are near the Project site. The 22 Port-based fire departments also operate fire boats capable of extinguishing landside fires 23 from the water. Similar to the joint agency fire response capabilities, the POLB's Harbor Patrol 24 based out of the Joint Command and Control Center (JCCC) at 1249 Pier F Avenue is 25 supported by the COLB's West and South Police Department Divisions, as well as Los Angeles and federal partner agencies. The JCCC houses representatives from all partner 26 27 agencies, including police, fire, and federal agencies, allowing for a quick and uniform 28 response to emergencies within the Port.

The Port is planning to relocate Fireboat Station 20 from its interim location at Berth D-34 to a permanent location. This relocation would reduce travel time to its service area and contribute to improved emergency response times. During construction and operation, the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility would experience emergency response times within 8 minutes, which reflects the response time to 80 percent of all responses for the year 2014 (*Fireboat Station Number 20. Port of Long Beach. Final Mitigated Negative Declaration.* State Clearinghouse (SCH) # 2016041048. July [POLB, 2016d]).

36 The Port would develop a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) as a Special Condition 37 (please see Section 6.3.3.1 of the Draft EIR). The TMP would include a number of parameters to minimize construction impacts on the community, such as hours when construction can 38 occur, allowable timeframes for temporary closures, construction traffic routes, and 39 40 requirements for maintaining access to businesses. The Port would work directly with 41 emergency responders and businesses to identify and incorporate measures into the TMP 42 that minimize impacts on business operations to the extent possible. Furthermore, the TMP 43 would require construction contractors to coordinate with public service providers (schools, 44 parks, the Multi-Service Center [MSC], and emergency service providers) during construction 45 of all roadway modifications to establish alternative access. The TMP would be developed

with input from all public service providers affected by the proposed Project, and response
routes during construction would be identified by the Port.

3 **11.2.3 Responses to Written Comments**

- 4 This section provides responses to comments contained in the 48 comment letters or e-mail
- 5 messages on the Draft EIR (as listed in Table 11.2-1). Each comment letter or e-mail message
- 6 has been reprinted herein, and is followed by responses to bracketed comments using the
- 7 commenter's codes and comment number shown on the letter.



	Mary D. Nichols, Chair	
Matthew Rodriguez	1001 Street • P.O. Box 2815 Sacramento, California, 95812 • www.arb.ca.gov	Edward C. Drawn In
Secretary for	Saciamento, Camornia 55612 • www.aib.ca.gov	Governor
Environmental Protection		
March 13, 2017		
Ms. Heather Tom	ley	
Director of Environ Port of Long Beau	nmental Planning	
4801 Airport Plaza	a Drive	
Long Beach, Calif	ornia 90815	
Dear Ms. Tomley:		
California's 2016 of on-dock rail to i	would support more efficient assembly of outbound city of on-dock rail operations to meet the Port's goa ers handled by on-dock rail. Sustainable Freight Action Plan (State Plan) suppor mprove system efficiencies and port competitivenes	trains and help al of 30 to 35
also highlights the disproportionately and near-zero em supportive infrastr of the State Plan Discussion Draft. Port strengthen th that are projected nitrogen oxides (N operations.	a need to reduce or eliminate the health impacts on or affected by freight operations and to accelerate the ission equipment powered by renewable energy sour oucture. The efficiency, competitiveness, and environ are echoed in the San Pedro Bay Ports 2017 Clean For the Project to achieve these objectives, we recor- e proposed mitigation measures to directly address to account for over two-thirds of the harmful diesel IOx) emissions from mitigated Project construction (communities transition to zero urces, including onmental objectives Air Action Plan ommend that the the locomotives particulate and (Phase 3) and
The Port has been support operation with strong suppo Action Plan includ located on port pr requirements and emissions equival	n a worldwide leader in reducing harmful emissions s, and would continue that role under the 2017 Clea rt for zero and near-zero emission technologies. Th ed measure RL3 for New and Redeveloped Near-D operties. The measure described both minimum pe a goal to achieve a line-haul and switcher locomotiv ent to 95 percent Tier 4 compliant engines through	from maritime and in Air Action Plan ie prior Ports lock Rail Yards informance ve fleet with environmental
The energy challenge fa For a list of simple	cing California is real. Every Californian needs to take immediate action to re ways you can reduce demand and cut your energy costs, see our website: ht	duce energy consumption. ttp://www.arb.ca.gov.
	California Environmental Protection Agency	
	Stated as Recented Bases	

January 2018



Ms. Heather Tomley March 13, 2017 Page 3 Recommendation While ARB supports the Port's inclusion of a mandatory 5-year technology review as a Special Condition of the proposed Project, the Port should aggressively deploy the lowest emission technologies possible. This deployment should include those technologies that are "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time" (Public Resources Code §21061.1), such as zero and near-CARB-6 zero emission technologies that are expected early in the life of the Project. With these technologies, ARB staff believes that the proposed Project's air quality, health, and greenhouse gas impacts can feasibly be further mitigated. ARB staff recommends that the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) include the following additional mitigation. **Mitigation Measures** 1) The Port should add a mitigation measure designed to ensure that line-haul locomotives servicing Pier B meet Tier 4 emission standards prior to the start of the proposed Project operations. This could be accomplished through the Port's new contract with PHL and PHL's agreements with BNSF and UP. Furthermore, ARB recommends that the Port require or incentivize PHL to use Tier 4 or even lower-CARB-7 emitting technologies in its own fleet, such as hybrid-electric switch locomotives with all electric capability, or electric rail car movers where operationally feasible. ARB's Technology Assessment: Freight Locomotives is available at https://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/tech/techreport/freight locomotives tech report.pdf. 2) The Port should plan to eliminate or reduce, to the maximum amount feasible, the operation of transport refrigeration units powered by fossil-fueled engines to cool refrigerated shipping containers. ARB recommends that the Port consider requirements that refrigerated shipping containers on rail cars be plugged in to a CARB-8 containerized hydrogen fuel cell generator carried on an adjacent rail car. These fuel cell generators are being demonstrated at the Port of Honolulu. ARB's Technology Assessment for Transport Refrigerators is available at https://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/tech/techreport/tru 07292015.pdf. While ARB recognizes that moving activities such as brake testing and refueling to Pier B as part of the proposed Project may increase on-dock capacity at the terminals, the Port should ensure these activities are performed in a location that CARB-9 least impacts the nearby community located just north of Pier B. The locomotive lavover refueling station and new in-ground air supply system for brake testing should be located to minimize exposure to the adjacent community.

Ms Ma Pa	s. Heather Tomley arch 13, 2017 ge 4
Re	commendations to Improve the Discussion of the Health Risk Analysis
a)	The Port should clarify the health impacts presented in Tables 3.2-24 and 3.2-58 as well as what the footnotes are referencing. ARB suggests providing additional information on how the health impacts are presented. For example, adding the "Proposed Project" and "CEQA Baseline" values to the tables would make the information more transparent.
b)	Page A2-6, Table A.2-2: Table A.2-2 presents the modeling parameters used in the air dispersion analysis. For clarity purposes, the Port should explain why different modeling parameters are used for locomotives moving during the day versus night.
c)	Page A3-20, Lines 20-27: According to the text, non-inhalation pathways for multipathway pollutants were evaluated. However, it is not clear if a derived analysis was used in the risk calculations. The text also states that risks from non-inhalation pathways were negligible. The Port should clarify and present the non-inhalation pathways.
d)	Page A3-22, Table A3-4: "The exposure assumptions for sensitive receptors are not explicitly provided by OEHHA (2015). Therefore, they were developed by the Port by adapting conservative parameters from the OEHHA HRA Guidelines (2015)." The Port should include how the exposure assumptions were derived or what start ages were used.
e)	Page A3-23, Table A3-4: The table shows a list of parameters used in the risk calculations. The Port should clarify how any adjustment factors were applied to the ground level concentrations.
f)	Page 3.2-80: The particulate matter (PM) mortality and morbidity discussion references ARB's 2008 PM 2.5 Mortality Report. This document has been superseded by ARB's 2010 PM 2.5 Mortality Report, which can be found at https://www.arb.ca.gov/research/health/pm-mort/pm-report_2010.pdf.

Ms. Heather Tomley March 13, 2017 Page 5 Closing ARB recognizes the role the proposed Project can have in supporting a more efficient and economically competitive Port, but we urge you to augment the mitigation measures to provide community benefits as well. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the DEIR. ARB is available to provide further assistance, as needed. Please include ARB on your State Clearinghouse list of selected State agencies that will CARB-16 receive the Final EIR as part of the comment period. If you have questions, please contact me at (916) 322-8277 or have your staff contact Robbie Morris, Air Pollution Specialist, at (916) 327-0006 or via email at robbie.morris@arb.ca.gov. Sincerely, Elizabeth Yura, Chief Emission Assessment Branch Transportation and Toxics Division State Clearinghouse CC: P.O. Box 3044 Sacramento, California 95812-3044 **Connell Dunning** Transportation Team Supervisor U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX 75 Hawthorne Street, ENF-4-2 San Francisco, California 94105 Dr. Jillian Wong Planning and Rules Manager South Coast Air Quality Management District 21865 Copley Drive Diamond Bar, California 91765 Robbie Morris Air Pollution Specialist Exposure Reduction Section Transportation and Toxics Division

1 Responses to California Air Resources Board

2 **Response to Comment CARB-1:** The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your review of the

3 Draft EIR. The comment summarizes the need and objectives of the proposed Pier B On-

4 Dock Rail Support Facility. No further response is necessary.

5 **Response to Comment CARB-2:** The Port acknowledges that California's 2016 Sustainable 6 Freight Action Plan (State Plan) supports the increase of on-dock rail and agrees that the 7 proposed Project would improve efficiencies and the Port's competitiveness. The location of 8 the proposed Project within the industrialized portion of the Port also would help to reduce its 9 impacts on the communities affected by rail operations. The Port agrees that the San Pedro 10 Bay Ports 2017 Clean Air Action Plan (CAAP) Discussion Draft shares many of the objectives 11 of the State Plan. Regarding the suggestion that the mitigation relating to locomotives be 12 strengthened, feasible mitigation has been applied in all instances in which it is available and 13 effective. The Port is not aware of additional feasible mitigation measures that would further 14 reduce emissions from locomotives. Please see Master Response – Electrification of Alameda 15 Corridor and Zero Emission Locomotives.

16 **Response to Comment CARB-3:** The commenter references the San Pedro Bay Ports 2010 17 CAAP Update that included Measure RL3 for New and Redeveloped Near-Dock Rail Yards 18 located on Port properties. As the title of the CAAP measure indicates, Measure RL3 states 19 that in concert with the San Pedro Bay Ports' regulatory agency partners and in concert with 20 CARB's stated goals, the Ports will support achievement of the goal of accelerating the natural 21 turnover of the line-haul locomotive fleet, resulting in a statewide fleet comprised of at least 22 95 percent Tier 4 line-haul locomotive engines, implement idling restrictions, use of ultra low 23 sulfur diesel (ULSD) or alternative fuels, use of clean cargo-handling equipment and heavy-24 duty trucks, and evaluation of new cleaner technologies. The commenter incorrectly identifies 25 switcher locomotives as part of Measure RL3. Furthermore, Measure RL3 was not intended 26 to apply to on-dock rail support facilities such as the proposed Project.

27 It would be infeasible for the Port to require that the Class 1 line-haul locomotive operators 28 meet the 95 percent goal of Tier 4 locomotives at the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support 29 Facility due to the principle of federal pre-emption. The California Supreme Court recently 30 confirmed this in Friends of the Eel River v. North Coast Railroad Authority (2017) 3 Cal.5th 31 677. In addition, the 1998 and 2005 Railroad Agreements between CARB, BNSF, and UPRR 32 indicate that the railroads "... are federally regulated and that aspects of state and local 33 authority to regulate railroads are pre-empted." As a result, the parties entered into mutual 34 agreements to achieve emissions reductions by locomotives: Memorandum of Mutual 35 Understandings and Agreements (CARB, 1998); and ARB/Railyard Statewide Agreement 36 (CARB, 2005b). The Class 1 line-haul operators operate a nationwide fleet of thousands of 37 locomotives, most of them dedicated to a long-haul, interstate network.

38 In addition, it would be infeasible to require the Class 1 railroads to geographically redistribute 39 their locomotives to provide a higher percentage of Tier 4 locomotives for a single project's 40 rail yard. Locomotives stay connected to hundreds of trains going to and from California to 41 many different destinations throughout of the United States. This operating procedure requires 42 that many hundreds, if not thousands, of locomotives enter and leave California each day. For 43 a national rail carrier to switch out locomotives going into a specific yard would require additional large switching yards, be prohibitively expensive for both the railroad and its 44 45 customers, and disrupt the national transportation system. The suggested measure would 46 need to be implemented nationally rather than in connection with the operation of a single ondock rail support facility. In addition, see Master Response – Electrification of Alameda
 Corridor and Zero Emission Locomotives.

3 **Response to Comment CARB-4:** The comment provides a description of the proposed 4 Project. As to the location, the comment states that the "proposed Project site is located 5 primarily in the City of Long Beach within the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach and a 6 portion within the Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan area in the City of Los Angeles." 7 To clarify, the proposed Project is not actually located in the POLA, rather the portion of the proposed Project that extends into the Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan area is in the 8 9 Los Angeles Harbor District (see Figure 1.7-2 of the Final EIR). The comment is correct that the closest sensitive receptor is the Long Beach MSC located at 1301 W. 12th Street in Long 10 11 Beach.

12 **Response to Comment CARB-5:** Feasible mitigation has been applied in all instances in 13 which it is available and effective. The Port is not aware of any additional feasible mitigation 14 measures.

15 Response to Comment CARB-6: This comment is a general introduction to three mitigation 16 measures that are detailed in Comments CARB-7, CARB-8, and CARB-9. Please see 17 responses to those comments.

18 Response to Comment CARB-7: The commenter recommends that the Port add a mitigation 19 measure designed to ensure that line-haul locomotives servicing Pier B meet Tier 4 emission 20 standards prior to the start of the proposed Project operations. As indicated in the response 21 to Comment CARB-3, it would be infeasible to require Class 1 line-haul locomotives to meet 22 Tier 4 standards due to issues associated with federal pre-emption. Please see response to 23 Comment CARB-3 for additional information.

24 The commenter also recommends that the Port require or incentivize PHL to use Tier 4 or 25 even lower-emitting technologies in its own fleet, such as hybrid-electric switch locomotives 26 with all electric capability, or electric rail car movers where operationally feasible, and provides 27 reference to CARB's Technology Assessment: Freight Locomotives ("Technology Assessment") (Reference: Technology Assessment: Freight Locomotives. CARB. November 28 29 2016). The Technology Assessment for freight locomotives considers potential advanced 30 locomotive technologies that could operate on the existing rail network. The assessment 31 identified potential technologies that could achieve emission levels that are significantly lower 32 than the Tier 4 standards in the future, such as: after-treatment controls; after-treatment 33 controls augmented with on-board batteries; fuel-cell powered locomotives; battery-powered 34 locomotives or battery tender car; and fully electric locomotive charged by an overhead 35 catenary system. As acknowledged by the Technology Assessment, while several of the 36 technologies evaluated have been shown to be feasible from a technological standpoint, they 37 would still require full-scale demonstrations before the technologies can be fully 38 commercialized.

39 PHL, which would be the primary operator of the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support 40 Facility, has been recognized as having one of the cleanest locomotive fleets in North America 41 as a result of converting its fleet to clean diesel locomotives that achieve "Tier 3-plus" ultra-42 low emission standards. In March 2017, PHL began a demonstration of a locomotive 43 developed by Progress Rail that is expected to meet EPA Tier 4 emission standards.

Through the Ports' Technology Advancement Program, PHL is partnering with VeRail in the development and demonstration of a locomotive that combines near-zero emission engines 1 with on-board high-capacity storage for CNG and backup diesel-fueled generator sets (gen-2 sets) that would only be used for peak power needs and as a safety backup. The VeRail near-3 zero emissions locomotive would be the first locomotive to meet the CARB Tier 4-plus and near-zero emission levels for switcher locomotives. The CARB Tier 4-plus standards achieve 4 5 a 70-percent reduction below current EPA switcher locomotive engine standards for NO_x and 6 PM. The VeRail locomotive will be required to conduct extensive emissions testing, as well as validation and durability testing to ensure the locomotive's function. The locomotive will be 7 8 demonstrated in PHL's day-to-day operations for a period of 1 year to further validate its in-9 use performance, durability, and reliability.

Recently, VeRail began exploring a design using batteries, instead of the diesel generatorsets, that would allow a locomotive to operate in full zero-emissions. Based on VeRail's estimates, the batteries could power the switching locomotive in zero emissions mode for more than 8 hours before requiring a recharge. Should the batteries last for less than a full shift, the locomotive could operate as a fully functional near-zero natural gas locomotive.

15 The comment suggests that the Port could use its new contract with PHL and PHL's contracts 16 with BNSF and UPRR to implement a Tier 4 requirement The Port is allowed to install new 17 rail infrastructure in the Port under the existing operating agreement with PHL. Under the existing operating agreement, the Port would coordinate with PHL to keep it informed about 18 19 the proposed Project so that it could incorporate the new infrastructure into its operations once 20 it was completed. Development of new infrastructure does not trigger renegotiation of the 21 existing operating agreement, which will remain in effect until December 31, 2024. Therefore, 22 no new requirements for Tier 4 locomotives can be negotiated into a new agreement prior to 23 successful testing of Tier 4 locomotives and the beginning of 2025. Furthermore, through 24 PHL's agreements with UPRR and BNSF, PHL acts as a subcontractor for the Class I rail 25 lines, conducting operations on their behalf in the Port. Under that relationship, PHL is not 26 able to impose Tier 4 requirements on UPRR or BNSF through their contracts.

As a special condition of the Project, the Port would conduct a review of new air quality technological advancements every 5 years following the Project approval date. Technologies would be evaluated based on operational feasibility, technical feasibility, cost effectiveness, and financial feasibility for application in the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility. If a technology was determined to be feasible in terms of financial, technical, and operational capability, the Port would work with PHL to implement such technologies.

Response to Comment CARB-8: CARB recommends that POLB require refrigerated rail cars dwelling in the Pier B Rail Yard be equipped with hydrogen-powered fuel cells rather than fossil-fuel-powered refrigeration units. The refrigerated rail cars used at POLB travel throughout California and nationally, and they are supported by a national network of suppliers and maintenance personnel and facilities. Implementing a new refrigeration technology solely at POLB would be infeasible.

39 The comment cites a demonstration project at Port of Honolulu that uses fuel cells. That 40 demonstration is described on pages III-19 to III-21 of the referenced assessment. That demonstration involved using cells on a captive fleet of barges that transport containers to the 41 islands in Hawaii. The assessment states that the units "may find a role as powerpacks for 42 43 cluster of refrigerated containers on intermodal railcars" (page III-21). However, the assessment goes on to state that the company that will design and build the prototype "has 44 45 expressed some uncertainty about the potential commercial deployment of powerpacks, but 46 believe they will produce 10 to 20 in the next 5 years and maybe more if other ports see the

1 value. At these relatively small production numbers, the cost reductions due to economies of 2 scale may be fairly small." The assessment notes that "[a]t this time, the capital costs of [fuel 3 cells] for refrigerated transport are somewhat uncertain" (page III-22). The "Economics" 4 portion of the assessment notes that the cost of the fuel cells is as much as 100 percent 5 greater than diesel engine units (page III-22). The conclusion in the assessment describes the "Kev Performance Parameter Issues and Deployment Challenges" as follows: "As 6 7 mentioned previously, private fleets that return to base each day and install H2 fueling infrastructure at their home base would be good candidates for the short- to mid-term. Until 8 9 publicly accessible H2 fueling infrastructure that is configured for Class 8 semi-trailers is 10 installed along major transportation corridors, long-haul applications may not be viable" (page 11 III-28). As explained above, the refrigerated rail cars that would use the proposed Project are not a private fleet that returns to a home base each day. Rather, they are dispatched 12 13 throughout the nation.

Given that "[m]itigation measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other legally binding instruments," it is not possible to adopt the recommended measure at this time. Moreover, since the Port would conduct a periodic technology review every 5 years following the adoption date, the Port would have the opportunity to reassess the feasibility of this technology when it is further developed.

19 **Response to Comment CARB-9:** The proposed locomotive facilities cannot practically be 20 relocated farther south. The northern locomotive facility would be between East I Street and 21 Anaheim Street. This area is commercial/industrial in nature. The proposed west locomotive layover refueling station has been removed from the 12th Street Alternative and the 10th Street 22 23 Alternative. Compressed air would be supplied by in-ground air compressors, which are 24 proposed in three locations; one near Pier D Street; one near the Terminal Island Freeway; 25 and one near the proposed administrative office. All three locations are generally located in 26 the southern portion of the Project area.

27 There are two types of air systems used in the Port—portable and in-ground. For the proposed 28 Project, train airbrake testing would be performed using compressed air supplied by in-ground 29 air compressors. Compared to portable air compressors, it is generally preferable to use in-30 ground air brake systems powered by an enclosed air compressor and electricity for train 31 airbrake testing and inspections because of the safety and efficiencies that this type of system 32 provides (Reference: Port of Long Beach Air Compressor Systems. STV Incorporated/ 33 Patterson & Associates, Inc. August 2005). This operation does not require moving a portable 34 air compressor typically powered by an independent, power-constrained internal combustion 35 engine on a trailer or mounted on a highway truck. The use of the in-ground air compression 36 system thereby reduces the impacts to nearby communities as it eliminates the need for 37 combustion engines and the emissions associated with the mobile unit used to transport the 38 compressor and the emissions from the engines to power the air compressor itself.

39 **Response to Comment CARB-10:** The comment requests clarification of the impacts presented in Tables 3.2-24 and 3.2-58, as well as the associated footnotes in the tables. The 40 41 health risk assessment (HRA) results tables in Impact AQ-6 of Section 3.2 present only the 42 Project increments, which are used to determine significance. Additional details, including 43 results for the "Project Absolute" and "CEQA Baseline," are provided in Tables A3-6 through A3-12 of Appendix A3. The reference to Footnote 1 was inadvertently left off the column title 44 45 "Project Increment" for Table 3.2-24. In addition, the footnote reference has been added to Table 3.2-58, on the heading "No Project Increment." To allow the reader to compare the 46

1 Project increment with the CEQA baseline and the proposed Project without having to refer

2 to Appendix A, revised Table 3.2-24 and revised Table 3.2-58 are included in Chapter 3 of

3 this Final EIR.

4 Response to Comment CARB-11: In the Draft EIR, locomotives in motion were modeled in 5 AERMOD as volume sources. AERMOD does not have a plume rise algorithm for volume 6 sources like it does for point sources. This means that when AERMOD applies the atmospheric conditions to the volume source emissions to predict their downwind dispersion, 7 8 AERMOD assumes the emission plumes have zero upward momentum and neutral 9 buoyancy. Therefore, because locomotives release their exhaust with upward momentum and 10 thermal buoyancy, it was necessary to manually adjust the volume source release heights to equal the final plume heights instead of the locomotive exhaust stack heights. This same 11 12 approach was also done by CARB in the Roseville Railyard Study (October 14, 2004), and 13 the final plume heights used in the Draft EIR were derived from that study. As discussed in 14 the first paragraph of Appendix A, page A2-7 of the Draft EIR, CARB accounted for the 15 differences in atmospheric stability between daytime and nighttime to calculate different 16 daytime and nighttime locomotive final plume heights. As a result, different AERMOD volume 17 source heights were used in the Draft EIR for daytime versus nighttime. Without this adjustment, the pollutant concentrations predicted by AERMOD for locomotives would have 18 19 been overstated because the modeled exhaust plumes would have been too low.

20 **Response to Comment CARB-12:** The HRA used high end (95th percentile) exposure 21 parameters for all exposure pathways, which is a more conservative approach than the 22 derived method. The contributions from all analyzed exposure pathways were included in the 23 risk assessment results presented in the Draft EIR. For example, the individual cancer risk at 24 the maximum residential receptor for the proposed Project without mitigation (Appendix A, 25 Table A3-6, "Project Absolute") is comprised of the following contributions: inhalation 99.992 26 percent; soil ingestion 0.0007 percent; dermal adsorption 0.00004 percent; mother's milk 27 ingestion 0.000001 percent; and homegrown produce ingestion 0.007 percent.

28 **Response to Comment CARB-13:** The following rationale was used for the derivation of the 29 exposure parameters for cancer risk in Appendix A, Table A3-4, for sensitive receptors: (1) 30 Elder care receptors conservatively assumed an exposure frequency of 24 hours per day, 365 31 days per year because of potential mobility issues that could prevent time away. A 32 conservative 95th percentile residential breathing rate was assumed. The exposure duration 33 of 30 years represents the time of residency for 90 to 95 percent of Californians at a single 34 location and should provide adequate public health protection against individual risk (Office 35 of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment [OEHHA], 2015). A start age of ≥16 was used 36 for elder care. (2) Hospital receptors assumed an exposure frequency of 24 hours per day, 37 365 days per year because of potential mobility issues that could prevent time away. A 38 conservative 95th percentile residential breathing rate was assumed. The exposure duration 39 of 9 years is a central tendency value for a resident as indicated in Air Toxics Hot Spots 40 Program Risk Assessment Guidelines. Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk 41 Assessments prepared by OEHHA in February 2015 (OEHHA, 2015). This exposure duration 42 was used in the analysis as a conservative exposure duration for a hospital patient. A 43 conservative start age of 3rd trimester was used for hospital receptors. (3) Grade school 44 receptors used the default occupational exposure frequency of 8 hours per day (as suggested 45 by OEHHA [2015]), 250 days per year as a reasonable assumption. Similar to occupational 46 receptors, a 95th percentile moderate intensity 8-hour breathing rate was assumed. The 47 exposure duration of 12 years covers grades 1-12. A start age of 6 (1st grade) was used. (4)

1 Child-care receptors used the default occupational exposure frequency of 8 hours per day, 2 250 days per year as a reasonable assumption. Similar to occupational receptors, a 95th 3 percentile moderate intensity 8-hour breathing rate was assumed. The exposure duration of 4 6 years is suggested by OEHHA (2015) and covers ages zero through 5. A start age of zero 5 (newborn) was used for child care. (5) Recreational receptors used a reasonable worst-case exposure frequency of 2 hours per day, 250 days per year. Similar to occupational receptors, 6 7 a 95th percentile moderate intensity 8-hour breathing rate was assumed, scaled to 2 hours per 8 day by a factor of 2/8 (applied to the Hotspots Analysis and Reporting Program [HARP] 2 9 cancer risk results). The exposure duration of 30 years represents the time of residency for 10 90 to 95 percent of Californians at a single location and should provide adequate public health 11 protection against individual risk (OEHHA, 2015). A conservative start age of zero was used 12 for recreation. 13 Response to Comment CARB-14: For occupational exposures, no adjustments were made

to the ground-level concentrations in the HRA because the proposed on-dock rail facility would operate 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. For residential exposures, a "Fraction of Time at Home" (FAH) factor of 0.73 was used for the age group \geq 16, as recommended by OEHHA (2015). An FAH of 1 was used for ages <16 because of the potential for a school to be within the 1-in-a-million cancer risk isopleth. For recreational exposures, the cancer risk results produced by HARP2 were multiplied by 2/8 to scale the breathing rate from 8 to 2 hours per day.

21 **Response to Comment CARB-15:** The comment references page 3.2-80 of the Draft EIR 22 and the PM mortality and morbidity discussion. However, no such discussion appears on that 23 page. The Port assumes that the commenter meant to reference page 3.2-60. The 2010 24 CARB report, Estimate of Premature Deaths Associated with Fine Particle Pollution (PM2.5) 25 in California Using a U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Methodology, is referenced on 26 Draft EIR page 3.2-60, in the same paragraph that references the 2008 CARB report mentioned in the comment. Also see reference CARB 2010c on page 9-3 of the Draft EIR 27 28 references chapter. The EPA methodology used in the 2010 CARB report is largely consistent 29 with past studies that estimate a 6 to 13 percent increased risk of premature death per 10 microgram per cubic meter (µg/m³) long-term exposure of particulate matter less than 2.5 30 microns in diameter (PM_{2.5}). This is comparable to the 2008 CARB report that assumes a 10 31 percent increased risk of premature death per 10 µg/m³ long-term exposure of PM_{2.5}. 32

Response to Comment CARB-16: Thank you for your comment. CARB will be provided with
 a copy of the Final EIR.

1 **11.2.3.2** California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)

Department of Toxic Substances Control Barbara A. Lee, Director Matthew Rodriguez 5796 Corporate Avenue Edmund G. Brown Jr. Secretary for Environmental Protection Governor Cypress, California 90630 February 14, 2017 Ms. Heather Tomley Director of Environmental Planning Port of Long Beach 4801 Airport Plaza Drive Long Beach, California 90815 DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) FOR PIER B ON-DOCK RAIL SUPPORT FACILITY PROJECT (SCH# 2009081079) Dear Ms. Tomley: The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has reviewed the subject EIR. The following project description is stated in the EIR: "The proposed project would be the expansion of an existing rail support facility located at Pier B in the Port of Long Beach. The project would result in additional railcar storage and staging capacity, including additional rail tracks for locomotive refueling, railcar repair, and to DTSC-1 accommodate the assembly of cargo trains up to 10,000 feet long. The project would require realignment of Pier B Street and closure of an existing grade crossing at 9th Street. The full build out alternative of the project would require removal of existing ramps to and from the Shoemaker Bridge." Based on the review of the submitted document DTSC has the following comments: 1. If the project plans include discharging wastewater to a storm drain, you may be DTSC-2 required to obtain an NPDES permit from the overseeing Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). 2. The EIR states the following: a. "The area of influence for hazards associated with releases of hazardous materials (e.g., spills and leaks) and existing soil, groundwater, and sediment contamination would include the Project site, adjacent harbor DTSC-3 waters, major roadways, and rail lines in the Port area." b. "Historically, the proposed Project area has been used extensively for various Port activities. A significant portion of the proposed Project area

Chapter 11 Responses to Comments

Port of Long Beach



Ms. Heather Tomley February 14, 2017 Page 3 3. If during construction/demolition of the project, soil and/or groundwater contamination is suspected, construction/demolition in the area should cease and appropriate health and safety procedures should be implemented. If it is determined that contaminated soil and/or groundwater exist, the EIR should DTSC-5 identify how any required investigation and/or remediation will be conducted, and the appropriate government agency to provide regulatory oversight. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact me at (714) 484-5476 or email at Johnson.Abraham@dtsc.ca.gov. Sincerely, Johnson P. Abraham Project Manager Brownfields Restoration and School Evaluation Branch Brownfields and Environmental Restoration Program - Cypress kl/sh/ja Mr. Allyson Teramoto (via e-mail) CC: Port of Long Beach Allyson.Teramoto@polb.com Governor's Office of Planning and Research (via e-mail) State Clearinghouse P.O. Box 3044 Sacramento, California 95812-3044 State.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov Mr. Guenther W. Moskat, Chief (via e-mail) Planning and Environmental Analysis Section **CEQA** Tracking Center Department of Toxic Substances Control Guenther.Moskat@dtsc.ca.gov Mr. Dave Kereazis (via e-mail) Office of Planning & Environmental Analysis Department of Toxic Substances Control Dave.Kereazis@dtsc.ca.gov Mr. Shahir Haddad, Chief (via e-mail) Schools Evaluation and Brownfields Cleanup Brownfields and Environmental Restoration Program - Cypress Shahir.Haddad@dtsc.ca.gov CEQA# 2009081079

٦

1 Responses to California Department of Toxic Substances Control

2 Response to Comment DTSC-1: Thank you for your review of the Draft EIR. The comment 3 summarizes the proposed Project for the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility. No further

4 response is necessary.

Response to Comment DTSC-2: As discussed in Section 3.9 of the Draft EIR, a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) would be required for discharge of wastewater to a storm drain and has identified this permit requirement in Table 1.10-1; this information is also referenced in Draft EIR. Quality Control Board (Human and Human and Human

9 Draft EIR Section 3.3 (Hydrology and Water Quality).

Response to Comment DTSC-3: This comment references several statements in Section
 3.9 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials) in the Draft EIR. No further response is necessary.

12 **Response to Comment DTSC-4:** Based on a review of Department of Toxic Substances 13 Control (DTSC) and RWQCB databases, the Project footprint for the 12th Street Alternative 14 includes 37 potentially contaminated sites that are either closed, under investigation, or under 15 active remediation. As requested, a list of these 37 sites has been added to Section 3.9.1.2 of the Final EIR (see new Table 3.9-1). Of the 37 sites in the Project footprint, 33 are closed 16 (remediation is complete). Of the four open sites, two have ongoing activities related to various 17 18 phases of investigation/remediation including site assessment and interim remedial action, 19 one site is under evaluation by EPA, and one is a historical waste discharge requirements (WDR) site. Table 11.2-3 provides information on the four open and potentially contaminated 20 21 sites in the proposed Project area being remediated or subject to oversight by regulatory agencies. No construction would occur on the subject site unless and until the sites were 22 acquired for the Project. No decision has been made regarding such acquisitions. If the Port 23 24 determines in the future that it does wish to pursue acquisition of one or more of the properties, 25 POLB would. coordinate with landowners of properties under investigation or active remediation as part of the due diligence associated with the acquisition process. This would 26 27 ensure that construction of the proposed Project would not adversely affect the public or the environment, or interfere with ongoing remediation and investigation at known contaminated 28 29 areas.

	TABLE 11.2-3 OPEN CONTAMINATED SITES IN THE PROPOSED PROJECT AREA									
	Site Name	Address	Status	Project Type	Overseeing Agency					
1	ACTA Parcel LBX-878	Anaheim Street Wilmington, CA 90744	Open – Site assessment as of 8/25/2005	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)					
2	McDonough Property	1018 N. McDonough Avenue Wilmington, CA 90744	EPA as of 6/30/1999	Evaluation	EPA					
3	Long Beach Leads Extension Parcels LBX/MY- 851 and LBX/SE- 853	914 Farragut Ave N, Wilmington, CA 90744	Historical – WDR as of 10/29/2011 (WDR terminated 10/1/2014)	WDR Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)					

Г

	TABLE 11.2-3 (CONT'D) OPEN CONTAMINATED SITES IN THE PROPOSED PROJECT AREA								
	Site Name	Address	Status	Project Type	Overseeing Agency				
4	ACTA South – Parcel LBX-825	1027 McDonough Ave, Wilmington CA 90744	Open – Assessment & Interim Remedial Action as of 7/15/2014	Cleanup Program Site	Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4)				

1 Source: DTSC Envirostor and State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker databases, December 11, 2017.

Response to Comment DTSC-5: Thank you for your comment concerning the possibility of encountering soil and/or groundwater contamination during construction. As discussed in Draft EIR Section 6.3.5, a Special Condition would be imposed on contractors working on the proposed Project to address encountering of contamination. Section 6.3.5 details the procedures for stopping work in the affected area, sampling, and testing so that proper storage, discharge, or disposal can be accomplished. Regulatory oversight would be sought from the DTSC.

1 **11.2.3.3 California Department of Transportation (CADOT)**

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		EDMUND G, BROW	N.Ir. Governer
100 S. MAIN STREET, MS 16 LOS ANGELES, CA 90012		5 C	A CONTRACTOR
FAX (213) 897-6536 FAX (213) 897-1337 www.dot.ca.gov			Serious drought. Help save water!
February 14, 2017			
Ms. Heather Tomley			
4801 Airport Plaza Drive Long Beach, CA 90802			
I	RE:	Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility SCH#2009081079	
		G1S#07-LA-2016-00393ME-MND	
Dear Ms. Tomley:			_
Thank you for including the California Departm review process for the above referenced project. The located in the North and Northeast Harbor Plannin (Project) would enhance rail operations and the car B Rail Yard. Based on the information receiver following comments:	nent o The pr ng Di pacity ed in	of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmenta roject involves the expansion of the Pier B railyar stricts. The On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project and efficiency of rail facilities at the existing Pie the Mitigated Negative Declaration we have the	
The project presents three alternatives: a 12th Stree Alternative.	et Alt	ernative, 10th Street Alternative and 9th Street]
 The 12th Street Alternative requires Shoer The 10th Street Alternative requires Shoer maintain a connection between Anaheim 3 The 9th Street Alternative maintains Shoer Street and downtown via the North Harbo 	maker maker Street maker	Bridge ramps at I-710 be removed. Bridge ramps at I-710 be reconfigured to and downtown via Harbor Avenue. Bridge ramps as a connection between Anaheim	CADOTA
We recommend the "9th Street Alternative" becaus safety in the vicinity compared to the "12th Street"	se it h ' and "	as the least impacts on traffic flow and public '10th Street'' Alternatives.	-CADUI-2
In the spirit of mutual cooperation, Caltrans staf engineers for this project, if needed. If you have a project coordinator Ms. Miya Edmonson, at (213)	ff is a ny qu 897-6:	vailable to work with your planners and traffic estions regarding these comments, please contact 536 and refer to GTS# LA-2016-00393ME.	
Sincerely,			
Diama wath			
DIANNA WATSON IGR/CEQA Branch Chief			
cc: Scott Morgan, State Clearinghouse		а -	
"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrate to enhance California's e	ed and e economy	fficient transportation system and livebility''	
		RECEIVED FFR	2 7 7 7017

1 *Responses to California Department of Transportation*

Response to Comment CADOT-1: Thank you for your comment. The comment summarizes the overall Project proposed for the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility. However, this comment also indicates that comments are based on "the information received in the Mitigated Negative Declaration." To clarify, the document prepared for the proposed Project is a Draft EIR and not a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Response to Comment CADOT-2: The comment summarizes the 12th Street, 10th Street, 7 and 9th Street alternatives presented in the Draft EIR as they each relate to the Shoemaker 8 Bridge ramps. Caltrans recommends the 9th Street Alternative because, in its opinion, "it has 9 10 the least impacts on traffic flows and public safety in the vicinity compared to the 12th Street and 10th Street Alternatives." It should be noted that, as is shown in Tables 3.5-13, 3.5-15, 11 12 and 3.5-17 of Draft EIR Section 3.5 (Ground Transportation), significant impacts were not 13 identified for any of the three build alternatives at the 18 street intersections, 2 I-710 freeway 14 segments, and 4 Pacific Coast Highway segments analyzed, as compared with the CEQA baseline. As to public safety, the 12th Street, 10th Street, and 9th Street alternatives would 15 16 result in removal of the at-grade rail crossing at 9th Street and Pico Avenue; this public safety 17 improvement would be the same for each alternative.

18 Your recommendation is noted and is hereby made part of the Final EIR; therefore, it is before

19 the decision makers for their consideration prior to taking any action on the proposed Project.

1 **11.2.3.4 California Transportation Commission (CATC)**

508 ALVARADO, Chzir		
IRAN INMAN, Vico Chair VICNICE, BURKE JUCETTA DUNN JAMES EARP JAMES C., GHIELMETTI CARL GUARDINO DHRISTINE KEHDE IMES MADAFER JOSEPH TAVAGLICNE SENATOR JIM BEALL, EX Officio SSEMELY MEMBER, UM FRAZIER, EX Officio	STATE OF CALIFORNIA	EDMUND G. BROWN Jr.,
O & LICO		
CALIFO	KINIA IRANSPORTATION COM 1120 N STREET, MS-52 SACRAMENTO, CA 94514 P. O. BOX 942873 SACRAMENTO, CA 94273-0001 (919) 654-4245 FAX (916) 653-2134 http://www.cate.ca.gov	MMISSION
February 7, 2017		
Ms. Heather A. Tomley Director of Environmental I Port of Long Beach 4801 Airport Plaza Drive Long Beach, CA 90815 RE: Draft Environmenta	Planning I Impact Report for the Pier B On-Dock F	Rail Support Facility Project
Dear Ms. Tomley.		
The California Transportation Draft Environmental Impact The project will construct act tracks for locomotive fueling trains up to 10,000 feet in le	on Commission (Commission), as a Resp t Report (EIR) for the Pier B On-Dock Ra dditional railcar storage and staging capac g and railcar repair to accommodate more ength.	onsible Agency, received the ail Support Facility Project. city, including additional rail e efficient assembly of cargo
The Commission has no con studied, the impacts evaluate notified as soon as the envir project design, right of way of The Commission will conside future consideration of fundi	nments with respect to the project purpose ed, and the evaluation methods used. The onmental process is finalized since project or construction until the final environment der the environmental impacts and whether ing.	e and need, the alternatives e Commission should be et funds cannot be allocated for atal document is complete. er to approve the project for
Upon completion of the Cali action to approve the project and/or implementing agency in the final environmental do Commission and included in	ifornia Environmental Quality Act process t for future consideration of funding, the C to provide written assurance whether the ocument is or is not consistent with the pro- the appropriate Regional Transportation	s, prior to the Commission's Commission expects the lead selected alternative identified oject programmed by the Plan. ² In HERISPAC OF such 17 FEB 13 PM1:24

1

Ms. Tomley Draft EIR for the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project February 7, 2017 Page 2 assurance of consistency, it may be assumed that the project is not consistent and Commission staff CATC-3 will base its recommendations to the Commission on that fact. The Commission may deny funding (Cont'd) to a project which is no longer eligible for funding due to scope modifications or other reasons. If you have any questions, please contact Jose Oseguera, Assistant Deputy Director, at (916) 653-2094. Sincerely, Brausen usan SUSAN BRANSEN Executive Director Phil Stolarski, Acting Chief (Division of Environmental Analysis), California Department of Transportation

2 Responses to California Transportation Commission

Response to Comment CATC-1: Thank you for your review of the Draft EIR and comments;
 This comment summarizes the proposed Project for the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility
 and is noted. No further response is necessary.

Response to Comment CATC-2: Upon completion of the environmental review process, as
 a Responsible Agency, the Port will notify the California Transportation Commission.

8 Response to Comment CATC-3: The proposed Project (and each of its alternatives) is 9 consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). As requested by the commenter, 10 upon completion of the CEQA process, the Port of Long Beach will provide written 11 confirmation to the California Transportation Commission that the selected alternative 12 identified in the final environmental document (pending approval by the Long Beach BHC) is 13 consistent with the project programmed by the Commission in the appropriate RTP.

1 **11.2.3.5 South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD)**

South Coast Air Quality Management District 21865 Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765-4178 QMD (909) 396-2000 • www.aqmd.gov SENT VIA EMAIL & USPS: March 13, 2017 heather.tomlev@polb.com Ms. Heather A. Tomley Director of Environmental Planning Port of Long Beach 4801 Airport Plaza Drive Long Beach, CA 90815 Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project (SCH No. 2009081079) The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) staff appreciates the opportunity to comment on the above-mentioned document. The following comments are meant as guidance for the Lead Agency and should be incorporated into the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR). The proposed project would modernize and increase on-dock rail capacity at Pier B. This is an important strategy for transitioning to an environmentally sustainable freight transport system by promoting the shift to containers moved by rail at on-dock facilities, which is preferable to the use of trucks to move containers to near- or off-dock facilities. In the project description, the Lead Agency proposes to redevelop and expand the existing Pier B On-Dock Rail Yard area providing 'for additional railcar storage and staging capacity, including rail tracks for locomotive fueling and railcar repair to accommodate more efficient assembly of cargo trains up to 10,000 feet long1". The proposed project2 also includes "realignment of Pier B Street, closure of the AQMD-1 existing 9th Street grade crossing, and removal of existing ramps to and from the Shoemaker Bridge.3" Finally, utility and other infrastructure work are also included to support the proposed redevelopment construction. The proposed project seeks to relieve existing train congestion that currently can block through rail traffic while trains are being assembled/disassembled. The proposed changes in the Pier B Rail Yard will also allow for longer-length trains, which will then require fewer trips by local light-duty switching locomotives to assemble/disassemble the different trains. The proposed project will be constructed in three phases⁴ over an approximate 86-month period with overlap between construction Phases 1 and 2. The Pier B Rail Yard will continue to operate during construction, so overlapping construction and operation emissions were evaluated in the DEIR minus the baseline emissions from existing operations. At full operational capacity in 2035,5 approximately 17 trains would depart the yard each day, an increase of 10 trains from the existing configuration.6 Construction related traffic will include approximately 3,172 daily trips.7 ¹ POLB Project Description from the January 26, 2017 Amended Notice of Completion. ² DEIR Chapter 1, Project Description, Page 1-1 The Proposed Project is the 12th Street Alternative. 3 Ibid, See Footnote No. 1 ⁴ DEIR, Section 3.2 Air Quality and Health Risk. At the time of analysis: Years 1-4 correspond to Phase 1 and 2 (Years Including Fall 2016 - 2019) and Years 5-8 correspond to Phase 3 (Years 2020 - 2023). ⁵DEIR, Project Description, page 1-23. ⁶ DEIR, Project Description, Table 1.8-1 page 1-24 for the 12th Street Alternative (Proposed Project). ⁷ DEIR, Traffic Impact Analysis Report (Cambridge Systematics, December 2016), page B-40, 3.2 Construction Trips, Table

11: Construction Trips (Two-Way) including autos and trucks.

Ms. Heather Tomley 2 March 13, 2017 Based on the DEIR analyses, the proposed project will cause significant impacts after mitigation for the overlapping construction and operation activities during construction Phases 1 and 2 in 2016 - 2019, as well as construction Phase 3 in Year 2020 - 2023. The proposed project's regional emissions impacts⁸ under CEQA will remain significant after mitigation for CO and NOx for all construction phases and VOC9 during Phase 3. Construction and operation impacts will also cause exceedances of the significance thresholds for the localized impacts¹⁰ from NO₂ during all construction phases. The proposed project's AQMD-2 mitigated maximum cancer risk (MICR) is 8.7 in 1 million for residential receptors and the mitigated cancer burden of 0.27 are below significance thresholds. However, after a review of the DEIR's air quality and health risk analyses and supporting technical documents, SCAQMD staff has concerns about the air quality analysis and health risk assessment in the DEIR, which have likely led to an under-estimation of the project's impacts. First, the DEIR improperly credits the proposed project with emission reductions in air quality and health risks that will occur independent of the proposed project due to adopted state and federal rules and regulations. Second, the modeling performed for this project used improper parameters and outdated meteorological data. These have likely led to an under-estimation of the project's air quality and health risk impacts in the DEIR and additional mitigation should be included to reduce impacts. Additional details are included in the attachment. The attachment also includes a discussion of recommended changes -AQMD-3 to an existing mitigation measure for air quality which the Lead Agency should implement. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21092.5, the SCAQMD staff requests that the Lead Agency provide SCAQMD with written responses to all comments contained herein prior to the certification of the Final EIR. Further, staff is available to work with the Lead Agency to address these issues and any other questions that may arise. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact me at jwong1@aqmd.gov or Lijin Sun, Program Supervisor, CEQA IGR, at lsun@aqmd.gov. Sincerely, Jillian Wong Jillian Wong, Ph.D. Planning and Rules Manager Planning, Rule Development & Area Sources Attachment SN:JW:LS/JC/MS/GM LAC161216-06 Control Number 8 DEIR, Regional: Section 3.2 Air Quality and Health Risk, Overlapping emissions and the use of operational thresholds discussion on page 3.2-35 (unmitigated) and 3.2-36 (mitigated). Emissions: Table 3.2-10 Peak Daily Criteria Pollutant Emissions - Construction and Operation Overlap Mitigated Proposed Project. Phases 1 & 2, Significant for CO and NOx; Phase 3 Significant for VOC, CO and NOx, see discussion page 3.2-35. 9 DEIR, Air Quality Section, Page 3.2-35, Paragraph four includes comparing overlapping VOC emissions with SCAQMD operational threshold of significance. ¹⁰Ibid, Localized Construction With Mitigation: Table 3.2-15 and Table 3.2-17 (NO₂ for 1-hour federal and state, and annual) for Construction Phases 1 & 2. Table 3.2-17, page 3.2-44 for Localized Construction With Mitigation (NO2 for 1-hour federal, state, and annual) for Construction With Mitigation for Construction Phase 3.

Ms. Heather Tomley 3 March 13, 2017 ATTACHMENT **CEQA Baseline** 1. The DEIR should include a realistic baseline which accurately reflects the improvements in air quality and health risks that will occur, independent of the proposed project. The Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the proposed project was released in 2009. The Lead Agency chose a CEQA baseline year of 2012 for determination of air quality impacts from criteria pollutants and health risks. For analysis of Air Quality Impacts and Health Risk Assessment (HRA), this baseline is held constant (i.e. using emission rates from 2012) and compared to future years under the proposed project (i.e. using emission rates from future years). This approach using a comparison between the proposed project's impacts in future years (using emission rates from those years) and a 2012 baseline (using emission rates from 2012) improperly credits the proposed project with emission reductions in air quality and health risks that will occur independent of the proposed project due to adopted state and federal rules and regulations, since these rules and regulations are expected to improve air quality and lower health risks, even in the absence of the proposed project. Therefore, the SCAQMD staff believes that the proposed project may have underestimated the true impacts attributable to the proposed project's AQMD-4 activities. In Neighbors for Smart Rail v. Exposition Metro Line Construction (2013) 57 Cal.4th 439, the California Supreme Court held that using a future baseline is proper in some cases. The purpose of CEQA is to disclose environmental impacts from the proposed project to the public and decision makers in order to provide the public and decision makers with the actual changes to the environment from the activities involved in the proposed project. By taking credit for future emission reductions from existing air quality rules and regulations, the proposed project's air quality and health risk impacts are underestimated. Therefore, the SCAQMD staff recommends that the Lead Agency revise the air quality and health risk analyses to include a comparison between the build-out year with the proposed project (using the emission rates from the build-out year) and the build-out year without the proposed project (also using the same emission rates from the build-out year) and use this analysis to determine the level of significance for the proposed project. By using a consistent emission rate for the analysis, the air quality and health risk impacts of the project will be accurately disclosed (i.e. impacts based on the change in activity due to the proposed project). Air Dispersion Modeling Parameters 2. Some of the receptors were placed within the volume source exclusion zone, which means that concentration results might be erroneous. The SCAQMD staff recommends that the Lead Agency AQMD-5 remodel volume sources according to the SCAQMD's Health Risk Assessment Guidance11 and U.S. EPA's Guidance12. One option would be to model each lane of traffic with smaller individual volume sources to reduce the exclusion zone radius. 3. The Lead Agency used differing Locomotive Moving - Day and Night release heights in their source - AQMD-6 parameters (Day - 5.6 meters and Night - 14.6 meters). Section A2.3 Dispersion Model Selection 11 "Health Risk Assessment Guidance for Analyzing Cancer Risk from Mobile Source Diesel Idling Emissions for CEQA Air Quality Analysis" accessed at: http://www.aqmd.gov/home/regulations/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook/mobile-sourceoxics-analysis. 12U.S. EPA. Transportation Conformity Guidance for Quantitative Hot-spot Analyses in PM2.5 and PM10 Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas. Appendix J. Section J.3.3. Page J-4. December 2010. Accessed at: https://www3.epa.gov/ttn/naaqs/aqmguide/collection/cp2/20101201_otaq_epa-420_b-10-040_transport_conform_hotspot analysis appx.pdf

Ms	. Heather Tomley	4	March 13, 2017	
	and Inputs states that the "amount differences in atmospheric conditio within AERMOD. By using hi underestimated health risks. The L for daytime and nighttime and re-ev	of plume rise differs betwee ons." Changes in atmospheric igher nighttime release heig ead Agency should revise the valuate the health risks.	n daytime and nighttime because of conditions are already accounted for ghts, the Lead Agency has likely HRA to use the same release heights	AQMD-6 (Cont'd)
4.	Appendix A2 of the DEIR states the used for dispersion modeling for bo Agency used AERMET version 12 lines 10-15 of Page 3.2-51 state tha monitoring station over the last thro meteorological data, the most recen Therefore, the SCAQMD staff reco the latest five years of available da available at the time of analysis) to also affect the air dispersion mod AERMOD-ready meteorological data is	at 2006-2007 meteorological a oth criteria pollutants and toxid 345 to process the Superblock at background concentration d ee years (2013-2015). The U. t five-year data be used for the mmends that the Lead Agency ata and use AERMET version o process the data. Updates a deling results. Alternatively data which could be used by s available for download at SO	data from the Superblock station was c air contaminants (TACs). The Lead c meteorological data. Additionally, lata is collected from the Superblock S. EPA recommends that for on-site purposes of air dispersion modeling. y update the meteorological data with n 16216 (or the most recent version and improvements to AERMET may the SCAQMD staff has prepared the Lead Agency in its air quality CAQMD's website ¹³ .	- AQMD-7
5.	The SCAQMD has developed the l performing localized air quality and data may be used with the concurr the DEIR does not appear to have b staff recommends that the Lead Ag for validation to ensure that the accordance with SCAQMD proced meteorological data collected at the	localized significance method ilyses. According to this meth- ence from SCAQMD. Howe been reviewed or validated by gency provide SCAQMD with meteorological data was pr dures. Alternatively, the Lea e Long Beach station ¹⁴ .	ology to assist the Lead Agencies in odology, site-specific meteorological ever, the meteorological data used in the SCAQMD staff. The SCAQMD the meteorological data information roperly collected and processed in id Agency could use the SCAQMD	- AQMD-8
Me	orbidity and Mortality Methodolo	gy		
6.	On page 3.2-60 of the DEIR, the Le when a mortality and morbidity and measure of the number of deaths in Morbidity refers to the number of in (the incidence rate) or the number y size of the population. The DEIR identified by air dispersion modelin site 24-hour PM2.5 concentrations	ead Agency describes the met alysis would be conducted for n a population, scaled to the s ndividuals who have contracted who currently have that diseas R determined that mortality a ng where the incremental oper- that exceed the SCAQMD sig	hodology that was used to determine the proposed Project. Mortality is a ize of that population, per unit time. d a disease during a given time period se (the prevalence rate), scaled to the nd morbidity significance would be ational emissions would result in off- gnificance criterion of 2.5 µg/m ³ .	- AQMD-
	The SCAQMD staff does not agree µg/m ³ for determining mortality and µg/m ³ was designed to determine th made consistent to existing perm significance threshold of 2.5 µg/m ³	with using a screening thresh d morbidity. The SCAQMD's he significance of localized in hitting requirements under S was not intended to be used a	old of an incremental increase of 2.5 s PM2.5 significance threshold of 2.5 npacts on nearby receptors, and was CAQMD Rule 1303. The PM2.5 as a screening tool to further analyze	
11.0				
http	our Coast Air Quarty Management Distri- ment (<u>www.aqmd.gov/home/library/air-quality</u>) bid.	-data-studies/meteorological-data/d	ata-for-aermod	

	5	March 13, 2017	
mortality and morbidity impacts. PM mortality analysis to use the	The SCAQMD staff recomme methods described in CARB's	ends that the Lead Agency revise the 2008 guidance document ¹⁵ .	- AQMD-9 (Cont'd)
Cechnology Review			
¹ <u>Cennology Review</u> ² . The DEIR includes Mitigation M new, feasible lower-emission tec Lead Agency should take this of possible. This deployment should in a successful manner within a ras zero and near-zero emission te As such, for a phased project whe as this, the SCAQMD staff reequipment fleet mixtures, and bes to ensure that the biennial techn recommends that the Lead Agence biennial technology review. Fur and would substantially reduce technology, a subsequent EIR sh SCAQMD staff recommended re MM AQ-3: POLB will imple Technology Review as a mar new emission control technol shall conduct a review of new be evaluated based on opera financial feasibility for applic feasible in terms of financial, technology, subject to the 15162(a)(3)(C). ³ Methodology for Estimating Premature Definition of the state of t	easure (MM) AQ-3, which requiphologies every five years. To portunity to aggressively depled include those technologies that easonable period of time" (Put chnologies that are expected to the tree there will be an overlap between the will be an overlap between the state and the set of the lease or determore, when a new emission air emissions, but the Lead Agatel be prepared (CEQA Guide visions to the MM AQ-3 are be ement a Special Condition (see the datory condition in a lease or or ogies, every \$ 2 years following a requirements as set forth in the Pier B Rail Yard. technical, and operational feasibility, technical feasibility, technical feasibility and operational feasibility are the set forth in the Pier B Rail Yard. Technical, and operational feasibility are the set forth in the technical and operational feasibility are the set forth in the technical and operational feasibility are the set forth in the technical and operational feasibility are the set forth in the technical and operational feasibility technical feasibility are the set forth in the technical and operational feasibility are the set forth in the technical and operational feasibility are the set forth in the technical and operational feasibility are the set forth in the technical and operational feasibility are the set forth in the technical and the technical and technica	aires a review and implementation of he SCAQMD staff believes that the oy the lowest emission technologies t are "capable of being accomplished blic Resources Code §21061.1), such be available in the life of the project. veen construction and operation such ency assess equipment availability, wices every two years. Additionally, aring operation, the SCAQMD staff velopment agreements to include the a control technology is found feasible Agency declines to implement such lines Section 15162(a)(3)(C)). The dow: Section 6.3.2) for Periodie Biennial development agreement. To promote g the Project approval date, the Port nements. These technologies would asibility, and cost effectiveness and If a technology is determined to be ibility, the Port shall implement such in the CEQA Guidelines Section	- AQMD-10

1 Responses to South Coast Air Quality Management District

2 Response to Comment AQMD-1: Thank you for your review of the Draft EIR and your

comments. The comment described the proposed Project for the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support
 Facility and is noted. No further response is necessary.

5 Response to Comment AQMD-2: The comment's statement on the impacts associated with 6 the proposed Project is correct, except that the overlapping construction and operational 7 emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOC) during Phase 3 would be less than significant 8 with mitigation. As documented on page 3.2-35 of the Draft EIR, the Port uses the construction 9 significance threshold for emissions that occur during the construction period. As noted on 10 page 3.2-35, if the operational thresholds are used, the VOC emissions under certain 11 scenarios would be significant. Regarding the concern that proposed Project impacts may be 12 understated, please see the responses to Comments AQMD-4 through AQMD-9 for individual 13 technical issues.

Response to Comment AQMD-3: Please see responses to Comments AQMD-4 through
 AQMD-9 for individual technical issues to which this comment refers.

16 **Response to Comment AQMD-4:** The baseline used in the Draft EIR is appropriate under CEQA. As discussed in Section 3.2.3 (Impacts and Mitigation Measures) of the Draft EIR, the 17 18 CEQA baseline is a fixed point, year 2012, in this study. Since 2012, the line haul locomotive fleet has gradually become cleaner due to the normal retirement of older, higher emissions 19 20 locomotives and their replacement with newer, cleaner locomotives. To account for the 21 reduction in the emission factors since 2012, the baseline emissions were calculated using 22 2012 activity levels and 2014 emission factors. This adjustment to the baseline emissions is 23 conservative because it results in lower baseline emissions, which in turn results in higher 24 incremental emissions for the proposed Project and alternatives. Moreover, analysis of emissions based on a future condition ("floating") baseline was included in the Draft EIR for 25 26 informational purposes. Specifically, as discussed in Section 3.2.3.4, Operational Impact 27 AQ-3, on pages 3.2-47 through 3.2-48, although not required by CEQA nor used to evaluate 28 the significance of Project-related impacts, a comparison of future proposed Project emissions 29 to the future No Project Alternative emissions in common analysis years is shown in Table 30 3.2-20 for informational purposes. Because the No Project Alternative assumes no growth at 31 the Pier B Rail Yard (the existing rail yard was already operating at capacity), it is equivalent 32 to a future baseline. The effects of existing regulations on future emissions factors are 33 incorporated into No Project Alternative emissions, just as they are the proposed Project 34 emissions. As a result, the No Project Alternative is equivalent to a floating baseline. 35 Therefore, the emissions shown in Table 3.2-20 show how the proposed Project would 36 compare to a future-conditions (floating) baseline instead of an existing-conditions baseline. 37 Additionally, as explained on page 3.2-55 of the Draft EIR, the cancer risk impacts in Impact 38 AQ-6 were evaluated relative to a future baseline because the cancer risk exposure periods 39 for baseline (up to 70 years) do not fit within the baseline year.

40 **Response to Comment AQMD-5:** The volume source exclusion zone is defined as the 41 distance within $(2.15 \times \sigma_y + 1 \text{ meter})$ from the center of each modeled volume source, where 42 σ_y is known as the lateral dispersion coefficient (EPA, *Transportation Conformity Guidance for* 43 *Quantitative Hot-spot Analyses in PM2.5 and PM10 Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas.* 44 Appendix J. EPA-420-B-15-084. November 2015). AERMOD will calculate a zero 45 concentration from a volume source at a receptor that is located within the exclusion zone for 46 that source because the dispersion algorithm is invalid at very close source-receptor

1 distances. Point sources, which were used to model idling locomotives in the Draft EIR, do 2 not have exclusion zones and therefore produce valid results at all receptors. As shown in 3 Table A2-2 of Appendix A2, the σ_v values for the volume sources modeled in the Draft EIR 4 ranged from 2.5 to 55.8 meters, depending on the source, which means that the exclusion 5 zones ranged from about 6 to 121 meters from each volume source. Because some of the rail 6 lines on the Project site would lie relatively close to the site boundary, many of the modeled 7 receptors located along the site boundary were within the exclusion zones of several of the nearly six thousand modeled volume sources in the Draft EIR analysis. Receptors located 8 9 outside all volume source exclusion zones, which are generally those away from the site 10 boundary, modeled roadways, and modeled rail lines, are not affected by the exclusion zones.

11 As recommended by the commenter, to determine the effect of the volume source exclusion 12 zones on pollutant concentrations modeled in the Draft EIR, the Port updated the model runs 13 for the proposed Project for operational criteria pollutant concentrations and health risk values. 14 These model runs were selected for updating because they had less-than-significant impacts 15 that were closest to the thresholds in the Draft EIR. The updated AERMOD runs had reduced volume source sizes and reduced volume source spacing along rail lines and roadways to 16 17 eliminate exclusion zones in all areas where maximum impacts could potentially occur. The 18 selected sizes and spacing of the updated volume sources depended on their distance to the 19 nearest receptors; however, most updated volume sources were between 3 and 6 meters 20 wide, resulting in σ_v values of 1.4 to 2.8 meters. Sources with emissions that are spread out 21 over large areas, such as TRUs in the Pier B storage yard and certain construction zones, 22 were modeled as area sources, which have no exclusion zones. The release heights, vertical 23 dispersion coefficients, and stack release parameters (temperature, exit velocity, and 24 diameter) listed in Table A2-2 of Appendix A2 of the Draft EIR remained unchanged in the 25 updated AERMOD runs.

The updated AERMOD runs also accounted for the refined site boundary and elimination of the west yard layover tracks and fueling facility associated with the proposed Project, as discussed in the Final EIR. The refined site boundary would tend to increase maximum pollutant concentrations by having site boundary receptors closer to the on-site sources. The elimination of the west yard layover tracks and fueling facility would tend to reduce maximum pollutant concentrations by reducing on-site locomotive idling and refueling emissions. Other refinements in the updated modeling include:

33 The current versions of AERMOD (v. 16216r) and HARP2 (v. 17052) were used. Based 34 on a review of the model changes since the Draft EIR analysis, no appreciable effects on 35 modeled pollutant concentrations or health risk values are expected from this update (EPA, Support Center for Regulatory Atmospheric Modeling [SCRAM], AERMOD 36 37 Modeling System, Test Cases, https://www.epa.gov/scram/air-guality-dispersion-38 modeling-preferred-and-recommended-models#aermod, website accessed 4/26/17: 39 and CARB, Air Dispersion Modeling and Risk Tool [ADMRT], 40 https://www.arb.ca.gov/toxics/harp/ admrt.htm, website accessed 3/20/17).

 The paved road dust emission factors for automobiles and trucks (originally shown in Table A1.2-37 of Appendix A1 of the Draft EIR) were updated using California-specific and, where available, Los Angeles County-specific roadway silt loading data from the CARB Emission Inventory Chapter 7.9 (November 2016) instead of the very conservative national factors from EPA AP-42 Section 13.2.1 (January 2011). The updated paved road dust emission factors are lower than those used in the Draft EIR.

 The NO₂ and carbon monoxide (CO) background concentrations (originally shown in Table A2-3 of Appendix A2 of the Draft EIR) were updated using Superblock Station monitoring data from 2014-2016 instead of 2013-2015. The updated background concentrations are generally lower than those in the Draft EIR.

5 Tables 11.2-4 and 11.2-5 show the paved road dust emission factors and background 6 concentrations, respectively, used in the updated AERMOD analysis for the proposed Project.

TABLE 11.2-4 UPDATED PAVED ROAD DUST EMISSION FACTORS										
CARB Roadway Category	(sL) Silt Loading (g/m²)	PM₁₀ Particle Size Multiplier (g/mi)	PM _{2.5} Particle Size Multiplier (g/mi)	Average Vehicle Weight (tons)	Uncontrolled PM₁₀ Emission Factor (g/mi)	Uncontrolled PM _{2.5} Emission Factor (g/mi)				
Onsite Trucks	0.135	1.00	0.15	25.0	4.310	0.647				
Onsite Autos	0.135	1.00	0.15	2.4	0.395	0.059				
Local	0.135	1.00	0.15	2.4	0.395	0.059				
Collector	0.013	1.00	0.15	2.4	0.047	0.007				
Major	0.013	1.00	0.15	2.4	0.047	0.007				
Freeway	0.015	1.00	0.15	2.4	0.053	0.008				

Notes:

1. Source: CARB Emission Inventory Chapter 7.9: Miscellaneous Process Methodology. Entrained Road Travel, Paved Road Dust. <u>https://www.arb.ca.gov/ei/areasrc/fullpdf/full7-9_2016.pdf. November 2016</u>.

2. Emission factors exclude engine exhaust, tire wear, and brake wear.

3. The equation is: Emission Factor = (Particle Size Multiplier) x (sL)^0.91 x (Vehicle Weight) ^1.02

4. The silt loading value of 0.135 gram per square meter (g/m²) for local roadways was assumed to be representative of onsite conditions because of the relatively low number of onsite truck and automobile trips.

5. The average vehicle weight for onsite trucks is based on a modern tanker truck that holds 9,000 gallons of diesel fuel (approximately 31.7 tons of fuel) and has a Gross Vehicle Weight Rating (GVWR) of 80,000 pounds (40 tons) (GVWR includes the weight of cargo). Therefore, a loaded fuel truck would weigh 40 tons and an empty fuel truck would weigh 8.3 tons. The average weight is therefore assumed to be approximately 25 tons. Trucks and autos would generally take different routes onsite.

6. This table updates Table A1.2-37 of Appendix A1 of the Draft EIR.

TABLE 11.2-5UPDATED NO2 AND CO BACKGROUND CONCENTRATIONS									
		Monitore	d Concentra	Background Concentration ^c					
Pollutant	Averaging Period	2014	2015	2016	(ppm)	(µg/m³) ^d			
	1-Hour State	0.116	0.096	0.115	0.116	219			
NO ₂	1-Hour Federal ^b	n/a	n/a	0.088	0.088	166			
	Annual	0.027	0.022	0.022	0.027	50.9			
со	1-Hour	3.2	3.4	3.2	3.4	3,903			
	8-Hour	2.5	2.7	2.5	2.7	3,099			

Notes:

^a Each reported value represents the highest recorded concentration during the year unless otherwise noted.

^b The 2016 1-hour federal NO₂ concentration represents the 3-year average (2014-2016) of the 98th percentile of the annual distribution of daily maximum 1-hour average concentrations. Because the 2016 value is a 3-year average, the individual year concentrations in 2014 and 2015 are not shown.

^c The background concentration for all pollutants except the 1-hour federal NO₂ concentration is the maximum of the concentrations for the 3 reported years.

^d The concentration in micrograms per cubic meter (μ g/m³) is calculated as follows: μ g/m³ = parts per million (ppm) x MW / 0.0244. The molecular weights (MW) are 28.01 for CO and 46.0055 for NO₂.

^e Source: Air Quality Monitoring Program at the Port of Long Beach. Annual Summary Reports. Calendar Years 2014, 2015, and 2016. San Pedro Bay Ports Clean Air Action Plan - Air Monitoring - Reports. http://caap.airsis.com/Reports.aspx. Website accessed 8/27/2015, 8/9/2016, and 8/23/2017.

^f This table updates Table A2-3 of Appendix A2 of the Draft EIR.

1 Table 11.2-6 shows the updated maximum NO₂ and CO concentrations associated with 2 operation of the proposed Project without mitigation. This table updates the results shown in 3 Table 3.2-21 of the Draft EIR. None of the significance findings in the updated table has 4 changed from the Draft EIR. The five significant impacts are exceedance of the 1-hour 5 (federal) NO₂ standard in 2020, 2025, and 2035; and exceedance of the annual NO₂ standard 6 in 2020 and 2025. All three of the significant 1-hour NO₂ concentrations are higher than in the 7 Draft EIR at the maximum receptor locations, while the two significant annual NO₂ 8 concentrations are less than or equal to the Draft EIR.

9 Figures 11.2-1, 11.2-2, and 11.2-3 show the updated areas where operation of the unmitigated 10 proposed Project would exceed the 1-hour (federal) NO₂ significance threshold in 2020, 2025, 11 and 2035, respectively. These three figures update the results shown in Figures A2-32, A2-33. and A2-34 of Appendix A2 of the Draft EIR. In each case, the updated area of significant 12 13 impact is smaller than in the Draft EIR. The updated figures also show that the maximum 14 receptor locations are on vacant land along the proposed Project southern boundary, north of 15 Anaheim Way and east of the Terminal Island Freeway. By comparison, the maximum 16 receptor locations in the Draft EIR are on occupied commercial/industrial land, along the 17 proposed Project southern boundary, near McDonough Avenue, as seen in Figure A2-31 of Appendix A2 of the Draft EIR. Therefore, because the updated areas of significant 1-hour 18 19 (federal) NO₂ impact are smaller than in the Draft EIR, and the updated maximum receptor 20 locations have moved from occupied to vacant land, the Port's air quality expert for the 21 proposed Project has concluded that the updated 1-hour (federal) NO₂ significant impacts are 22 not substantially greater than in the Draft EIR.

TABLE 11.2-6UPDATED MAXIMUM POLLUTANT CONCENTRATIONS OF NO2 AND CODURING OPERATION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT WITHOUT MITIGATION

Pollutant	Averaging Time	Project Increment (µg/m ³)	Background Concentration (µg/m ³)	Total Concentration (µg/m³)	Significance Threshold (µg/m³)	Significant?			
Year 2020									
	1-Hour (state)	80	219	299	339	No			
NO ₂	1-Hour (federal)	73	166	239	188	Yes			
	Annual	10.1	50.9	61.0	57	Yes			
<u> </u>	1-Hour	90	3,903	3,993	23,000	No			
00	8-Hour	8-Hour 54 3	3,099	3,153	10,000	No			
	Year 2025								
	1-Hour (state)	64	219	283	339	No			
NO ₂	1-Hour (federal)	62	166	228	188	Yes			
	Annual	6.8	50.9	tion (μg/m³) Threshold (μg/m³) S 2020 299 339 339 239 188 339 339 239 188 339 339 3,993 23,000 3,153 10,000 3,153 10,000 2025 283 339 228 188 57.7 57 3,994 23,000 3,158 10,000 2035 2035 283 339 23,000 3,158 10,000 2035 2285 188 56.8 57 57 57 2305 283 339 23,000 3,158 10,000 2035	Yes				
<u> </u>	1-Hour	91	3,903	3,994	23,000	No			
00	8-Hour	59	3,099	3,158	Threshold (μg/m³) 339 188 57 23,000 10,000 339 188 57 23,000 10,000 339 188 57 23,000 10,000 339 188 57 23,000 10,000 23,000 10,000	No			
			Year 2035						
	1-Hour (state)	64	219	283	339	No			
NO ₂	1-Hour (federal)	59	166	225	188	Yes			
	Annual	5.9	50.9	56.8	57	No			
<u> </u>	1-Hour	122	3,903	4,025	23,000	No			
	8-Hour	78	3,099	3,177	10,000	No			

Notes:

1. For NO_2 and CO, the significance thresholds apply to the total concentration.

2. The Project increment equals the model-predicted change in ambient concentration associated with proposed Project operational emission sources relative to CEQA baseline emission sources. The background concentration represents the highest monitored concentration at the Superblock monitoring station over the last 3 years (2014-2016) of available data. The total concentration equals the Project increment plus background concentration.

3. This table presents the highest modeled Project increments. The increments at all other modeled receptors would be less than the displayed values.

4. The state 1-hour NO₂ concentration is the highest modeled concentration. The federal 1-hour NO₂ concentration is the 98^{th} percentile of the daily maximum 1-hour concentrations.

5. Exceedances of the significance thresholds are shown in bold.

6. This table updates Table 3.2-21 of the Draft EIR.

1 Figures 11.2-4 and 11.2-5 show the updated areas where operation of the unmitigated proposed

2 Project would exceed the annual NO₂ significance threshold in 2020 and 2025, respectively.

3 These two figures update the results shown in Figures A2-35 and A2-36 of Appendix A2 of

4 the Draft EIR. In each case, the updated area of significant impact is smaller than in the Draft

5 EIR. Therefore, because the updated areas of significant annual NO₂ impact are smaller than

6 in the Draft EIR, and the updated impacts at the maximum receptors are less than or equal to

- 7 the Draft EIR, the Port's air quality expert for this proposed Project has concluded that the
- 8 updated annual NO₂ significant impacts are not substantially greater than in the Draft EIR.



Figure 11.2-1

- 2 3 Updated Area of Exceedance of the 1-Hour Federal NO₂ Threshold during Operation in
- 2020 Proposed Project without Mitigation 4


- 3 Updated Area of Exceedance of the 1-Hour Federal NO₂ Threshold during Operation in
- 4 2025 Proposed Project without Mitigation



- 2 3 Updated Area of Exceedance of the 1-Hour Federal NO₂ Threshold during Operation in
- 2035 Proposed Project without Mitigation 4



- 3 Updated Area of Exceedance of the Annual NO₂ Threshold during Operation in 2020 -
- 4 Proposed Project without Mitigation



- 2 3 Updated Area of Exceedance of the Annual NO₂ Threshold during Operation in 2025 -
- 4 Proposed Project without Mitigation

Port of Long Beach

1 Table 11.2-7 shows the updated maximum PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations associated with

2 operation of the proposed Project without mitigation. This table updates the results shown in

3 Table 3.2-22 of the Draft EIR. None of the significance findings in the table has changed from

4 the Draft EIR. All significance findings remain less than significant.

UPDATED I DURING OP	MAXIMUM POLLU ERATION OF THE	TABLE 11.2-7 TANT CONCENTI PROPOSED PRO	RATIONS OF PM₁ DJECT WITHOUT	₀ AND PM₂.₅ MITIGATION
Pollutant	Averaging Time	Project Increment (µg/m ³)	Significance Threshold (μg/m³)	Significant?
		Year 2020		
DM	24-Hour	0.5	2.5	No
PM10	Annual	0.3	1.0	No
PM _{2.5}	24-Hour	0.3	2.5	No
	•	Year 2025		
DM	24-Hour	0.9	2.5	No
PM ₁₀	Annual	0.5	1.0	No
PM _{2.5}	24-Hour	0.3	2.5	No
	•	Year 2035		
DM	24-Hour	0.9	2.5	No
F 1V110	Annual	0.4	1.0	No
PM _{2.5}	24-Hour	0.3	2.5	No
NL /	-	•		

Notes:

1. For PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$, the significance thresholds apply to the Project increment.

2. The Project increment equals the model-predicted change in ambient concentration associated with proposed Project operational emission sources relative to CEQA baseline emission sources.

3. This table presents the highest modeled Project increments. The increments at all other modeled receptors would be less than the displayed values.

4. This table updates Table 3.2-22 of the Draft EIR.

5 Table 11.2-8 shows the updated maximum health impacts associated with construction and operation of the proposed Project without mitigation. This table updates the results shown in Table 3.2-23 of the Draft EIR. None of the significance findings in the table has changed from the Draft EIR. The two significant impacts are individual cancer risk at residential and sensitive receptors. In both cases, the updated significant individual cancer risks are less than in the Draft EIR. Therefore, the Port's air quality expert for this proposed Project has concluded that

11 the updated significant health impacts are not substantially greater than in the Draft EIR.

TABLE 11.2-8 UPDATED MAXIMUM HEALTH IMPACTS ESTIMATED FOR CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT WITHOUT MITIGATION

Health Category	Receptor Type	Project Increment	Significance Threshold	Significant?
	Residential	16.1 × 10-6		Yes
Individual Cancer Risk	Occupational	9.2 × 10-6	10 × 10 ⁻⁶	No
	Sensitive	12.0 × 10-6		Yes
	Residential	0.007		No
Chronic Hazard Index	Occupational	0.2	1.0	No
	Sensitive	0.01		No
	Residential	0.02		No
8-Hour Chronic Hazard Index	Occupational	0.6	1.0	No
	Sensitive	0.03		No
	Residential	0.09		No
Acute Hazard Index	Occupational	0.6	1.0	No
	Sensitive	0.08		No

Notes:

1. The Project Increment equals the proposed Project minus the CEQA baseline.

2. Exceedances of the significance thresholds are shown in bold.

3. This table updates Table 3.2-23 of the Draft EIR.

1 Table 11.2-9 shows the updated maximum health impacts associated with construction and

2 operation of the proposed Project with mitigation. This table updates the results shown in

3 Table 3.2-24 of the Draft EIR. None of the significance findings in the table has changed from

4 the Draft EIR. All significance findings remain less than significant after mitigation.

UPDATED MA	AXIMUM HEALTH	TABLE 11.2-9 IMPACTS ESTIMAT PROPOSED PROJE	ED FOR CONST	RUCTION AND
Health Category	Receptor Type	Project Increment	Significance Threshold	Significant?
	Residential	6.7 × 10-6		No
Individual Cancer Risk	Occupational	7.8 × 10-6	10 × 10 ⁻⁶	No
	Sensitive	1.3 × 10-6		No
	Residential	0.001		No
Chronic Hazard Index	Occupational	0.04	1.0	No
	Sensitive	0.002		No
	Residential	0.004		No
8-Hour Chronic Hazard Index	Occupational	0.1	1.0	No
	Sensitive	0.007		No
	Residential	0.09		No
Acute Hazard Index	Occupational	0.4	1.0	No
	Sensitive	0.1		No
Notes:				

1. The Project Increment equals the proposed Project minus the CEQA baseline.

2. This table updates Table 3.2-24 of the Draft EIR.

Based on the updated criteria pollutant modeling and HRA results presented and discussed here, the Port's air quality expert for the proposed Project has concluded that the elimination of volume source exclusions zones is not expected to change the significance findings or

4 substantially increase the significant impacts in the Draft EIR for any project alternative.

Response to Comment AQMD-6: Please see response to Comment CARB-11. Volume
 sources do not have a plume rise algorithm, so manual adjustments were made to the volume
 source heights to account for plume rise.

8 **Response to Comment AQMD-7:** The meteorological data used in the air dispersion modeling analyses were recorded from September 2006 through August 2007, the first 9 10 complete 12-month period recorded at all six of the site-specific monitoring stations operated 11 by the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles. ENVIRON evaluated the climatological representativeness of the data collected during September 2006 to August of 2007 in 12 13 comparison to more recent data collected during years 2009 to 2012. ENVIRON evaluated 14 the completeness of the average wind speed data by quarter and visually examined the wind pattern based on wind roses. The evaluation showed that the average wind speed and wind 15 pattern of the original data period is very similar to that of the 2009 to 2012 data period across 16 17 the ports' meteorological stations. Therefore, ENVIRON concluded that the original data 18 period is representative (ENVIRON, transmittal from Min Hou, May 28, 2013).

Additionally, the use of 1 year of meteorological data is consistent with EPA guidelines, which state that "at least 1 year of site-specific" data are required (USEPA, *Revisions to the* Guideline on Air Quality Models: Enhancements to the AERMOD Dispersion Modeling System
 and Incorporation of Approaches to Address Ozone and Fine Particulate Matter. 40 CFR
 [Code of Federal Regulations] Part 51. January 17, 2017).

4 The Project air dispersion modeling analyses in the Draft EIR were performed with the most 5 recent version of AERMOD at the time of the analysis (version 15181, released June 30, 6 2015), but the meteorological data used in the analyses were processed with AERMET 7 version 12345 (released December 11, 2012). At the time of the analysis, EPA had updated 8 AERMET three times since version 12345: (1) version 13350 (released December 16, 2013); 9 (2) version 14134 (released May 14, 2014); and (3) version 15181 (released June 30, 2015). Since the time of the analysis, AERMET version 16216 (the current version, released August 10 11 3, 2016) has also been released. Because updated versions of AERMET usually do not have 12 any appreciable effect on Port-related AERMOD results, the Port typically re-processes its 13 meteorological data with the latest AERMET version only when warranted. The following 14 paragraphs provide a justification for the use of AERMET 12345 on the meteorological data.

15 As part of its ongoing documentation of AERMOD and AERMET, EPA performs sensitivity 16 analyses that compare model updates to past model versions to enable users to understand 17 the effects of new model updates. Sensitivity analyses that directly compare AERMET 18 versions 12345 and 15181 are not available; however, analyses are available showing that 19 there are not significant differences between consecutive versions of AERMET. For example, 20 the use of AERMOD version 13350 to simulate the same source types as those in the Project 21 analyses (volume or point sources in flat terrain) with AERMET versions 12345 and 13350 22 resulted in differences in impacts of no greater than 0.5 percent and in some cases no 23 differences at all between these two versions of AERMET (EPA Support Center for Regulatory 24 Atmospheric Modeling [SCRAM] website http://www.epa.gov/ttn/scram/dispersion prefrec. 25 htm#aermod).

Additional analyses from the EPA SCRAM site also show that use of AERMOD version 14134 to simulate the same source types with AERMET versions 13350 and 14134 resulted in no differences in impacts. Furthermore, the use of AERMOD version 15181 to simulate the same source types with AERMET versions 14134 and 15181 resulted in no differences in impacts.

These analyses show that since impacts from (1) AERMET version 12345 are nearly equal to version 13350, (2) AERMET version 13350 are equal to version 14134, and (3) AERMET version 14134 are equal to version 15181, then (4) AERMET version 12345 are nearly equal to 15181. Therefore, use of AERMET version 15181 instead of version 12345 in the Project dispersion modeling analyses would not produce a substantial difference in impacts compared to those presented in the Draft EIR.

The Superblock monitoring station was the preferred site for meteorological data for the Draft EIR because it is part of the Port's site-specific monitoring network and is located just 0.1 mile north of the existing Pier B Rail Yard. The Port appreciates the offer to use AERMOD-ready meteorological data processed by SCAQMD. However, because these data were collected several miles from the Port area, they are not as representative of conditions within the Project region as the Port's data.

42 **Response to Comment AQMD-8:** The SCAQMD reviewed and approved the meteorological 43 data set selection and AERMET processing methodology for the 2006–2007 meteorological 44 data that were used in the Draft EIR. The review and approval took place in 2007 during 45 development of the Bay-Wide Regional Human Health Risk Assessment, which was part of

Port of Long Beach

the technical analysis supporting the San Pedro Bay CAAP. The protocol that was reviewed and approved by the SCAQMD is titled "Protocol Bay-Wide Regional Human Health Risk

- 3 Assessment for Diesel Exhaust Particulate Matter (DPM)" (December 14, 2009) and is located
- 4 in Appendix B3 of the CAAP 2010 Update.

5 The 2006–2007 meteorological data from the Superblock station (and other Port Complex 6 stations) were first processed in 2008 in accordance with the SCAQMD-approved modeling protocol, except that necessary updates to the methodology were made as recommended by 7 the 2008 EPA AERMOD Implementation Guide. These necessary updates focused on 8 9 methodology used to determine surface characteristics (i.e., Bowen ratio, Albedo, and Surface 10 Roughness). A more recent AERMOD Implementation Guide was published in March 2009, 11 but no changes were made to the meteorological data processing procedure. The 12 meteorological data were then used in multiple Port EIRs prepared by the Ports of Long Beach 13 and Los Angeles. The processed AERMOD-ready datasets were also sent to SCAQMD in 14 April 2010. In 2013, the 2006–2007 data were reprocessed using the most recent EPA 15 AERMET version 12345 and AERSURFACE version 13016. Month-to-season allocation and 16 the land use sector were defined following the Bay-wide health risk assessment modeling 17 protocol. The precipitation condition (i.e., wet, dry, or average) used to estimate Bowen Ratio 18 was determined in comparison to the 30-year historical data at representative stations as 19 dictated by the Bay-wide health risk assessment modeling protocol.

20 Response to Comment AQMD-9: Neither CARB nor SCAQMD has established a CEQA 21 significance threshold for PM_{2.5}-related mortality and morbidity. Furthermore, neither CARB 22 nor SCAQMD has established a PM_{2.5} ambient concentration threshold above which mortality 23 and morbidity should be quantified in a project-level CEQA document. In its response to the 24 Notice of Preparation (NOP) of the Draft EIR, SCAQMD did not reference any requirement for 25 conducting a mortality and morbidity analysis for the proposed Project nor provide any 26 suggestion as to how such an analysis would be undertaken (CARB did not respond to the 27 NOP). Moreover, CARB's 2008 and 2010 documents addressing mortality and morbidity, which estimate premature deaths associated with PM2.5, do not provide any guidance as to 28 29 whether or when such an analysis should be prepared for a project-level CEQA assessment 30 where incremental PM_{2.5} concentrations and the affected population are on much smaller 31 scales than the regional and statewide impacts quantified by CARB. Therefore, in the absence 32 of such guidance, the Port developed its own approach to addressing mortality and morbidity, 33 described in detail in Section 3.2.3 of the Draft EIR, Impact AQ-6, and summarized below.

34 Mortality and morbidity studies examining health effects of exposure to fine particulate matter 35 have been used by EPA and CARB to set the National Ambient Air Quality Standards 36 (NAAQS) and California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS), respectively, and by 37 SCAQMD to set the CEQA significant concentration thresholds for particulate matter. For this 38 reason, a comparison of the Project's modeled PM_{2.5} concentrations to SCAQMD's CEQA 39 significance threshold for $PM_{2.5}$, which is more stringent than the NAAQS and CAAQS, 40 implicitly accounts for mortality and morbidity effects on sensitive receptors. Therefore, the 41 Port's position is that a maximum modeled PM_{2.5} concentration less than SCAQMD's 42 threshold is considered sufficiently low such that mortality and morbidity effects in the 43 surrounding population would not be significant; hence, a quantification of mortality and morbidity would not be warranted. 44

Therefore, to determine whether quantification of mortality and morbidity was necessary for the proposed Project, the Port compared the ambient PM_{2.5} impacts predicted for proposed

1 Project operation to the 2.5 µg/m³ 24-hour threshold set by SCAQMD. Table 3.2-22 of the 2 Draft EIR indicates that the maximum $PM_{2.5}$ concentration increment of 0.4 µg/m³ during 3 proposed Project operation, occurring in 2020 and 2025, would be only 17 percent of the 4 SCAQMD threshold of 2.5 μ g/m³. (The updated PM_{2.5} concentration increments for the 5 proposed Project in Table 11.2-7 of response to Comment AQMD-5 are even lower; 0.3 µg/m³ 6 in all 3 analysis years). Moreover, Figure A2-31 in Appendix A of the Draft EIR shows that the 7 locations of the maximum modeled PM_{2.5} concentrations are nearly 0.5 mile from the closest 8 residential receptor. Because the Project-related PM_{2.5} concentrations would be so low at the 9 nearest residential or sensitive receptor, mortality and morbidity effects would be less than 10 significant, and quantification of mortality and morbidity is not warranted for this Project. **Response to Comment AQMD-10:** The comment recommends that the POLB re-examine

11 12 potential new emission control technologies every 2 years rather than every 5 years under 13 Mitigation Measure AQ-3. The POLB believes that the 5-year review cycle is sufficient, is 14 consistent with the timeline for technology review cycles for other port-related projects and leases, and that no substantial additional air quality benefit would be obtained by adopting a 15 16 shorter review cycle. Given the typical timeline for development, demonstration, and 17 deployment of new technologies, which can take a decade or more, the 5-year review cycle will provide adequate time to identify and discuss opportunities for demonstration and 18 19 implementation of emerging technologies. Further, as evidenced by PHL's history in working 20 with the Port on technology demonstrations through the Port's TAP or independently, and as discussed in CARB-7, it is anticipated that PHL will continue to partner with the Port to 21 evaluate and demonstrate promising technologies as they become available. 22

The comment also recommends incorporating into the mitigation measure a reference to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15162 (a)(3)(C). This section of the *Guidelines* would not apply to the approved Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project, however, unless and until a subsequent discretionary approval is required because it is subject to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15162(c), which reads:

- 28 (c) Once a project has been approved, the lead agency's role in project approval is 29 completed, unless further discretionary approval on that project is required. 30 Information appearing after an approval does not require reopening of that approval. 31 If after the project is approved, any of the conditions described in subdivision (a) 32 occurs, a subsequent EIR or negative declaration shall only be prepared by the public 33 agency which grants the next discretionary approval for the project, if any. In this 34 situation, no other responsible agency shall grant an approval for the project until the 35 subsequent EIR has been certified or subsequent negative declaration adopted.
- The referenced subsection (Section 15162 (a)(3)(C)) is not intended to trigger the requirement of a subsequent EIR in the context described in the comment. Instead, it would apply if the Port was considering a future discretionary approval relating to the Project, and at that time, a mitigation measure previously rejected by the Port as infeasible has, with the passage of time, become feasible. In such a circumstance, the now feasible mitigation measure may be considered "new information" that would cause a subsequent environmental review.
- 42 Moreover, CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines do not need to be referenced in mitigation 43 measures. To the extent that they apply to the actions of the Port, they must be followed 44 whether or not they are specifically referenced.

1 11.2.3.6 City of Inglewood (COI)

CITY OF INGLEWOOD ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT Planning Division	
Christopher E. Jackson, Sr. Department Manager	
March 6, 2017	
Ms. Heather Tomley Director of Environmental Planning Port of Long Beach 4801 Airport Plaza Drive Long Beach, California 90815	
RE: Comments to the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project	
Dear Ms. Tomley,	
Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments to the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project. We have no comments at this time regarding the Draft EIR or Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility. However, we request that you continue to apprise us of developments in the CEQA process for this project.	
to receiving updates on the status of this project and we appreciate the opportunity to provide input.	
Sincerely,	
Mindy Wilcox, AICP Planning Manager	
One West Manchester Boulevard, 4th Floor, Inglewood, CA 90301 Website: www.cityofinglewood.org / Office: (310) 412-5230 / Fax: (310) 412-5681	
RECEIVED MAR 1 3 2017	

3 Response to City of Inglewood

2

Response to Comment COI-1: The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your review of the
 Draft EIR and will retain your agency on the Project mailing list so that you will continue to be
 notified of the CEQA process for this Project.

1 **11.2.3.7 Los Angeles Department of Water & Power (LADWP)**

Los Angele	S Bar Department of Water & Pow	ver
EDIC CARCETT	P	BAND II COLOUR
Mayor	MEL LEVINE, President WILLIAM W. FUNDERBURK JR., Vice President	General Manager
	JILL BANKS BARAD MICHAEL F. FLEMING	
	CHRISTINA E. NOONAN BARBARA E. MOSCHOS, Secretary	
January 25, 2017		
Heather A Tomley		
Director of Environmental Pla	nning	
Port of Long Beach 4801 Airport Plaza Drive		
Long Beach, CA 90815	60	
Dear Ms. Tomley:		
Subject: Comment Letter Reg	arding Draft Environmental Impact Repo	rt (DEIR) for the
Pier B On-Dock Rail \$ 2009081079)	Support Facility Project (State Clearingho	buse Number
The Los Angeles Department to review the DEIR for the Pier LADWP is to provide clean, re reviewing your proposed proje project may have impacts to w review for matters related to w comments from other divisions in the DEIR.	of Water and Power (LADWP) appreciate r B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project liable water and power to the City of Los ect description, the LADWP has determine vater resources. The following comments ater resources for the project; you may re- s at LADWP separately referring to other	e the opportunity The mission of Angeles. In ed that the reflect our eccive additional respective areas
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ES.5 ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES; Geo es ES-8 & ES9):	LA
<u>Comment:</u> It is stated that shallow ground As indicated in the excerpt from LADWP encourages parties wh applying the water for beneficia into the sewer rather than discl of Los Angeles meet conservat customer demand. Property ow cost of potable water supply an drain/sewer permitting and more	water may be encountered during constr m Los Angeles City Ordinance No. 18424 ho discharge groundwater to waste to ins al uses onsite, or alternatively, dischargin harging into the storm drain. This practice tion and recycled water goals by reducing whers who beneficially reuse can potentia ad may reduce or eliminate costs associa nitoring. Common applications of benefic	uction activities. 48 below, 51 below, 51 below, 52 below, 53 below, 54 below, 55 below, 56 belo
Putt	ing Our Customers First 🔿 🕮	
111 N. Hope Street, Los Angeles, C	alifornia 90012-2607 Mailing Address: Box 51111, Los Angeles, C/	A 90051-5700



2 Responses to Los Angeles Department of Water & Power

3 **Response to Comment LADWP-1:** The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your review of 4 the Draft EIR. As is noted in Section 3.3.2.3 of the Draft EIR, contaminated groundwater could 5 be encountered during construction. Depending on the characterization of the groundwater at 6 the time of construction, conditions may or may not be amenable to treatment sufficient to 7 permit reuse. Reuse would be considered if conditions permit and in accordance with COLB 8 requirements. Should groundwater removal be required within areas of the COLA affected by 9 the proposed Project, applicable requirements in COLA Ordinance No. 184248 would be 10 followed.

11 **Response to Comment LADWP-2:** Please see response to Comment LADWP-1 above.

1 **11.2.3.8 Los Angeles County Public Works (LACPW)**



3 Responses to Los Angeles County Public Works

Response to Comment LACPW-1: The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your review of
the Draft EIR. Coordination with the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
(LACDPW) has been ongoing during the preliminary engineering phase of Project
development; this will continue as the Project moves into the final design phase.

Response to Comment LACPW-2: The Port of Long Beach acknowledges Assembly Bill
(AB) 530 (February 2015), which establishes the Lower Los Angeles River Working Group.
Port staff, along with COLB staff participate in the Working Group. In addition, the Gateway
Cities Council of Governments (GCCOG) is an identified member of that working group, of

12 which the COLB is a member. Participation via the GCCOG will, therefore, be pursued.

1 **11.2.3.9 Long Beach Board of Health and Human Services (LBBHHS)**

V	2525 GRAND AVENUE • LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90815 • (562) 570-4014 • FAX: (562) 570-4049
	March 10, 2017
	Port of Long Beach Board of Harbor Commissioners President Lori Ann Guzman Vice President Lou Anne Bynum Commissioner Tracy J. Egoscue Commissioner Doug Drummond Commissioner Rich Dines Heather Tomley, Director of Environmental Planning Port of Long Beach 4801 Airport Plaza Drive Long Beach, CA 90815
	Dear President Guzman, Vice President Bynum, Commissioners Egoscue, Drummond, and Dines, and Ms. Tomley:
	We write to offer our comments on the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project. While the Board of Health and Human Services is supportive of the Project's intent to facilitate greater rail efficiency, we remain very concerned about the significant health impacts from the Project.
	As the proposed Pier B Project will be situated 350 feet from the Long Beach Health and Human Services Department's (DHHS) Multi-Service Center for the Homeless, we are concerned about multiple impacts from the construction phase and operations from the Pier B rail yard.
	Led by the DHHS, the Multi-Service Center (MSC) facility houses 12 public and private partner organizations working together to promote self-sufficiency and rebuild the lives of those experiencing homelessness. Annually, the MSC averages 14,000 client visits, making this facility the primary point of entry for persons seeking homeless services assistance in Long Beach. The mission of the MSC is to provide comprehensive supportive services to promote progress towards permanent housing and self-sufficiency by creating a community where health, safety, and well-being are established.
	As you know, the Pier B Project's environmental impact report (EIR) shows significant impacts in the areas of air quality and greenhouse gases, both during the construction phase and operations. The EIR indicates that the proposed 12 th Street Pier B Project will be adding 31 new rail tracks in the area of the Project closest to the MSC. Increased exposure to toxic air contaminants and particulate matter, particularly among sensitive populations, is linked to many adverse health impacts including respiratory illnesses, premature births, low birth weights, higher morbidity rates, and higher risk rates for cancer.

Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility March 10, 2017 Page 2 The MSC is the closest facility to the Pier B Project of the sensitive receptors evaluated in the EIR Air Quality analysis (3-2.13). Given this extreme proximity to the Project, we are concerned for the health and safety of our MSC clients and staff. We request that the Port of Long Beach Board of Harbor Commissioners consider, and implement, additional mitigation measures for the Multi-Service Center which would protect the thousands of LBB clients and staff who utilize and work at MSC. These mitigation measures could include HHS-2 door and window seals, highest quality air filters, repair or upgrades to the facility's central (Cont'd) air and heating systems, landscaping with plants and trees that filter pollution, noise cancelling measures, and safety measures given the proximity of port related operations. We believe that these mitigation measures should be funded outside of the \$1.5 Million designated for the POLB Community Mitigation Grant program from the Pier B Project. We also ask you to consider adding requirements for cleaner locomotives that will be operating in the Pier B rail yard. LBB Again, while we remain supportive of the Pier B Project's intent to increase rail efficiency, HHS-3 we ask that the Board of Harbor Commissioners consider additional measures to protect the health of those who will be most impacted by the Project. Sincerely, Christine E. Petit, Ph.D. Chair, Board of Health & Human Services

1

2 Responses to Long Beach Board of Health and Human Services

Response to Comment LBBHHS-1: Thank you for your review of the Draft EIR and information on the Long Beach MSC. The MSC was identified and considered a sensitive receptor in the detailed air quality and noise analyses. Please see Draft EIR Sections 3.2 and 3.8 for the results of those analyses. Please also see responses to Comments LBBHHS-2 and LBBHHS-3 below.

8 **Response to Comment LBBHHS-2:** The MSC was evaluated as a sensitive receptor in the health risk assessment of the Draft EIR (Table 3.2-4, Receptor No. 63-65). Table 3.2-24 9 10 presents the maximum individual cancer risk increments, chronic and acute hazard index 11 increments, and population cancer burden associated with construction and operation of the 12 proposed Project with mitigation measures. The individual cancer risk, chronic and acute hazard indices, and population cancer burden are all below the respective significance 13 thresholds. Please see the response to Comment PSC-7 for a complete discussion of the 14 15 proposed Project's specific air quality impacts on the MSC.

16 The MSC operates 5 days per week, between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. (2:00 p.m. 17 on Thursdays). Daily use of the facility by staff and clientele is limited by hours of operation 18 and visitation patterns, as people arrive and leave the site as necessary. There are no overnight or long-term occupants of the facility and no child-care services or outdoor
 recreation programming provided, reducing the rate of sensitive receptors onsite.

3 This comment requests that implementation of additional mitigation measures to protect the 4 clients and staff of the MSC be funded outside of the proposed Project's mitigation dollars to 5 be allocated to the CGP. The CGP is a voluntary effort established by the Port in 2016 6 allocating \$46.4 million in funding aimed at mitigating the impacts of goods movement over 7 12-15 years in three specific programs: community health, facility improvements, and community infrastructure. Eligible applicants for funding include government agencies, 8 9 nonprofit organizations providing health services, licensed health providers, and facilities 10 serving the sensitive populations defined by the Port. A CGP Advisory Committee appointed by the mayor of Long Beach helps select project for funding. Before any grants are awarded, 11 12 the Port conducts a thorough staff review and recommended applications go to the BHC for 13 final review.

14 As a result of a recent CGP application process, in October 2017, the Port awarded the MSC 15 its full funding request of \$104,498 for the installation of 100 air filters over 5 years; 16 modification of the existing heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) system: and 17 installation of new HVAC systems. The funding awarded to the MSC is sourced from the initial 18 \$46.4 million fund set aside for the CGP, which does not include the \$1.5 million the Port 19 would contribute to address cumulative GHG impacts and air quality impacts associated with 20 operation of the proposed project, The MSC will continue to be eligible for funding awards in 21 future years for qualifying CGP projects. Please see Master Response – Community Grants 22 Program.

Response to Comment LBBHHS-3: Please see responses to Comments CARB-3 and
 CARB-7, and Master Response – Electrification of Alameda Corridor and Zero Emission
 Locomotives.

1 **11.2.3.10** Church of the Good Shepherd, Arcadia, CA (CGS)

From: Tony Parrille

Sent: Thursday, December 22, 2016 1:56 PM To: heather.tomley@polb.com Subject: Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project Draft EIR

Ms Tomley: My name is Anthony Parrille, I am Chairman of the Board of Trustee of the Church of the Good Shepherd, Arcadia, CA. The Church has a major ownership interest in property that may be acquired for the referenced project. Our interest is in property located at 1664 West Ninth Street, next to the intersection of Ninth Street and Santa Fe Avenue. The legal description is Lot 4, Block 23 of the Long Beach Tract. It would really be of assistance to my Board, if we knew that the Port of Long Beach would include this parcel for acquisition with the project boundaries for the Pier B Project. I understand there is reluctance to be specific, however the Draft EIR would seem to indicate that this property is within the 9th Street Alternative and may be included within the list of parcels to be acquired. Your help in resolving this question would be sincerely appreciated. Anthony P. Parrille Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Church of the Good Shepherd, Arcadia, CA 400 West Duarte Road, Arcadia, CA 91007. My phone number is 626-818-5330. Thank you.

2

3 Response to Church of the Good Shepherd, Arcadia, CA

4 **Response to Comment CGS-1:** Thank you for your comment. With respect to the property 5 owned by Church of the Good Shepherd, Arcadia, CA located at 1664 West 9th Street and its 6 location to relative to the proposed Project, it has been identified to be within the footprint of 7 the proposed Project and its alternatives, which were analyzed in the EIR. The environmental 8 review process is a preliminary part of the planning process that must be completed before 9 the proposed Project or an alternative can be considered for approval by the BHC. Following 10 certification of the EIR, any preparation, decision, or approval of relocation plans, or property 11 acquisitions would be conducted in accordance with all applicable statutes and regulations. 12 Please see Master Response – Property Acquisitions, Compensation, and Relocation.

1 **11.2.3.11** Citizens Coalition for a Safe Community (CCSC)

	13, 2017	
TO:	Heather Tomley, Director of Environmental Planning Port of Long Beach 4801 Airport Plaza Drive Long Beach, CA 90815 heather.tomley@polb.com	
FROM	Dr Tom Williams, Senior Environmental Adviser, Citizen Coalition for A Safe Community Director, LA-32 Neighborhood Council Member, Sierra Club Angeles Chapter - Transportation Committee 4117 Barrett Road LA, CA 90032-1712 ctwilliams2012@yahoo.com 323-528-9682	
SUBJE RE:	CT: Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project, SCH# 200981079 <u>Draft EIR</u> and Appendices Pier B Rail Project Comments	
Pasade consult 1972 w and NE EIRs/E and His As an e Mormo enviror for Dub 3, Port Similar	ena, and Dubai UAE Ports and Free Zones for more than 40 year professional experiences, with many other ancies worldwide. My degrees include BS-MS-PhD in geology and zoology. Work background began in ith preparation of the newly required Environmental Impact Report and Statement under the initial CEQA PA requirements and provided the primary focus for 40 years preparing/reviewing/managing more than 400 ISs/EAs/MNDs. I have been an owner-occupant/resident of NELA and Pasadena and member of LA-32 storic Highland Park Neighborhood Councils. Imployee of Parsons, I was Environmental Specialist for the South-Bay Shell facilities including the Island Terminal and for the LA-Midland Alaskan Oil Terminal and Pipeline EIR. I was also Imental resources specialist for the Master Plan for Dubai UAE and later directly as technical adviser ai World development of Coastal/Islands, and for Free Zone and Development in Dubai (e.g., Palms 1- Rashid, Port of Jebel Ali, World Islands, etc.).	ccsc
for Cair Marsha Thank	o Egypt, Aleppo/Lattakia Syria, Medan Indonesia, Kota Kinabalu/Kauntan/Sandakan Malaysia, Majuro II Island, etc.). you for the opportunity to submit comments for scoping of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) of re R Bail Project Plan(e) and Project(e).	
uie rie		
Genera	al Comments	
Commo Draft E	ents below clearly demonstrate the inadequacies and significant incompleteness found in the current IR, please withdraw, revise, and recirculate the DEIR and provide a thorough revision of the EIR. We ilable for further review and assistance through an ongoing public participation in this project oment and implementation in an environmental sensitive and sustainable manner.	CSC-2
are ava develo	lity/Financial/Economics At numerous points in the EIR reference are made to feasible, financial, CCS	C-3
are ava develo Feasib econor	hics, and employment without any clear definitions and analyses.	
are ava develop Feasib econor Employ in port contair	rment is dismissed as increases being insignificant, but no assessment is provided as to the reduction or transport jobs related to the activities and employment involve in the automation and unitization of er movements within the Port, near the Port, and to/from the "Inland Ports".	CSC-4
are ava develop Feasib econor Employ in port contair Measu inland I Empire	Incs, and employment without any clear definitions and analyses.	CSC-4





projections for SPBP cargo growth were finalized in 2009 by Tioga (Tioga, 38 2009) as an update to the	
comprehensive cargo forecast completed in 2007 (Tioga, 2007). 1-1/8 Overall container throughput expectations and associated estimates of intermodal cargo throughput used in the various analyses presented in this EIR are based on the results of the 2009 forecast update (Tioga, 2009) because the [February] 2016 Mercator forecast data were not available in time for incorporation in each section of this EIR.	
Mercator International LLC: http://www.acta.org/revenue_finance/March%20%202016%20Meeting%20Item%208.pdf pdf-145-501 - p.6/4 San Pedro Bay Cargo Forecasts; Report of the Ports' Independent Consultant Mercator International LLC and Oxford Economics (together, the "Ports' Independent Consultant" or the "Consultant") prepared for the Ports a report entitled San Pedro Bay Long-Term Unconstrained Cargo Forecast (the 'Report of the Ports' Independent Cargo Consultant" or the "Report"), a copy of which is attached hereto as [Appendix K]. The Report of the Ports' Independent Cargo Consultant, incorporated herein by this reference, is part of this Official Statement and should be read in its entirety. [San Pedro Bay Long-term Unconstrained Cargo Forecast Contract No.: HD-8429] Although this document is pivotal to forecasted/projected future transportation industry, the document is not included as an appendix or as a link to a POLB web-page.	← CCSC -11 (Cont'd)
3-14/8 As described in Chapter 1.2.2 (Long-Term Cargo Forecast), the <u>overall container throughput</u> , and associated estimates of <u>intermodal cargo throughput</u> used in the various analyses in this EIR, are based on the results of the <u>2009 forecast update (Tioga, 2009)</u> . The time required to conduct the analyses included in the EIR <u>precluded the incorporation of the new 2016 Long-Term Cargo Forecast</u> . As such, the 2012 RTP/SCS referenced in this EIR utilizes the 2009 long-term forecast. <u>SCAG released the 2016 RTP/SCS in</u>	
April 2016, which also <u>reflects</u> the Port's 2009 long-term <u>cargo forecast</u> . Forecasts or projections of container and cargo throughputs and use of 2009 rather than using drafts of a 2016 report become totally inadequate and incomplete. No clear definition of "containers", "cargo", and "reflects" is provided. Definitions must also clearly separate total, loaded, unloaded/empty containers from cargo and freight passing through the POLB. A supplemental DEIR must be provided with full incorporation of the Mercator report and removal of the Tioga report implications and comparison of Mercator/Tioga/SCAG effects.	- CCSC -12
6-2/1 (e) <u>Encourage rail service</u> <u>Cargo</u> volumes are projected to increase (Tioga, 2009)cargo will result in an increase in the amount of <u>intermodal cargo</u> handled by <u>on-dock rail vards</u> will be an increase in demand for on-dock capacity and supporting rail facilities. Providing a facilitydedicated to supporting more <u>efficient</u> rail operations would improve the <u>overall efficiency of goods movement</u> within the Port and on the <u>regional transportation network</u> would help the marine terminals to <u>optimize</u> their operations; therefore, all users would be <u>equally benefitted</u> . Define "encourage", "cargo", "goods", intermodal/non-intermodal cargo, on-/off-dock in-/near-port, port/terminal/dock/berth, efficient/efficiency, overall/non-overall, optimize, and "equally	-CCSC -13
benefitted".	
benefitted". Provide efficiency/optimization/beneficiary calculations and comparisons of each berth, terminal, and port (total TEUs / berth / yr [e.g., Maersk/Sealand Berth HongKong, 1992: 1M TEUs/yr, no rail, truck only] and how railroad operations have improved/can improve container movements.]
 Benefitted". Provide efficiency/optimization/beneficiary calculations and comparisons of each berth, terminal, and port (total TEUs / berth / yr [e.g., Maersk/Sealand Berth HongKong, 1992: 1M TEUs/yr, no rail, truck only] and how railroad operations have improved/can improve container movements. 6-2/4 6.2.2 Port Goals Among the Port-wide development and expansion goals cited in the PMP, the Pler B Rail Yard improvements would support the following: Goal 2: Encourage Maximum Utilization of Facilities. The full utilization of on-dock rail facilitiescannot be achieved without the proposed Projectexisting Pier B Rail Yard's functionproviding rail car and locomotive storage and staging, rail car maintenance, and locomotive layover/fueling tracksenables the marine terminals' on-dock rail yards to function more efficientlycargo volumeslength of intermodal trains is increasingresult in increases in 	



```
1982/11/18 20:00 2.35 33.783 -118.198 5.7
1983/05/16 16:27 2.00 33.782 -118.196
                                                2.4
1985/09/07 04:12
                  2.19
                         33.785-118.199 4.8
1987/06/08 12:29
                 3.30 33.778 -118.210 11.6
1987/06/08 12:49
                 2.32
                         33,778-118,208 12.0
1987/08/03 13:43
                 2.09
                         33.773 - 118.213 12.0
1993/02/06 20:09
                  1.88
                         33.783 -118.198
                                                2.3
                         33.785-118.218 9.8
1993/08/22 08:18 2.32
1994/06/16 07:53
                  1.74
                                                             CCSC-16
                         33.776 -118.221 14.8
1995/01/20 10:25
                  1.64
                         33.784 -118.197 10.7
                                                             (Cont'd)
1995/03/20 06:08 1.81
                         33.767 -118.226 14.7
1997/07/28 12:11
                  1.36
                         33.784 -118.207
                                           5.0
                         33 772 -118 228 5.0
1999/03/12 08:36
                  1.40
2008/04/21 22:55 1.48
                         33.779 -118.219 10.6
2008/04/30 22:15 1.45 33.769 -118.227 14.0
2009/08/18 09:17
                  1.48
                         33.787 -118.197 12.4
2010/06/28 13:20 1.96
                         33.762 -118.210 16.1
# Number of events: 26
ES-2/4 and 1-17/4 1.6 PROJECT OBJECTIVES
Project Objectives
To maximize the use of on-dock rail, the following are the objectives of the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support
    Facility Project:
Support the transition to a more efficient, more economically competitive and less polluting freight
    transport system as envisioned in the 2016 California Sustainable Freight Action Plan [(State of
    California, 2016)];
Support...shared goals of local and regional transportation agencies to increase Port, rail and highway
    capacities:
Promote...mode shift, from containers shipped by truck to near-dock and/or off-dock facilities to containers
   shipped by rail from the on-dock and supporting rail yards;
Provide additional Port rail capability to support and maximize on-dock intermodal operations to a targeted
    goal of 30 to 35 percent of containers handled by on-dock rail;
Receive and depart, within the confines of the rail yard, up to 10,000-foot-long trains to accommodate the
    increasing use of such trains by the Class I railroads; and
Improve motorist and rail safety by eliminating an existing at-grade crossing at 9th Street and Pico Avenue.
                                                                                                         CCSC
1-11/1 Accordingly, using a baseline year later than 2012 would reflect temporary conditions in the vicinity of
                                                                                                         -17
the Project site that did not exist before the construction projects began and also will not exist when they are
completed....year 2012 conforms to the 2012 Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)
regional travel demand model, which is a base condition for the traffic analysis conducted for this EIR.
Clearly define freight, good, cargo, containers, on-/near-/off-dock and in-/near-port.
Provide clear quantification of port, rail, and highway capacities within local (0-10mi) and regional (10-
    100mi) contexts.
The Tioga 2006 and SCAG 2012 analyses use the 2000 census data for economic development in the
    region while 2016 SCAG and Mercator 2016 analyses use the 2010 census and Calif.Dpt.ofFin.
    2015 projections.
Use of 2012 also reflect early traffic recovery after the Great Recession and thereby is probably not
    typical of a full development mode and uses say in 2014 or 2016.
Compare California Freight Plan and SCAG-2012+2016, Tioga, and Mercator forecasts.
1-16 Figure 1.5-3 4 Class I Southern California Rail Main Lines Leaving Los Angeles
No map of RR going north from LATC and no Metro proposed East-West line (dual tracks) Palmdale to
                                                                                                           CCSC
    Victorville (High Desert Corridor).
                                                                                                           -18
```

ocal Roadway and Utility Deficiencies	
n its current configuration, the at-grade crossingforces extra train movements (i.e., splitting and building	
rains) to keep the road opendeparting trainsfrom several short cuts of carsrequire additional time an	d - CCSC
pack-and-forth movements by locomotivesalso limits the rail yard's ability to receive and generate full-	10
ength intermodal trainsalso non-standard rail and roadway sight distancessignificant vehicle	-19
congestion at the crossing	1
-17/2 Pier B Street is poorly aligned,high and low spots, andawkwardly sandwiched between the	
xisting Pier B Rail Yard and historic terminal boundariesshifted over the years improved roadway	
eometry, including raising and straightening,to bring Pier B Street up to modern standards.	
	·s -20
locess for maintenance purposes.	
Project Objectives.	
Definitions are not provided for terms and therefore are not objective nor quantified, and therefore	CCSC
this section and Project Objectives are inadequate and/or incomplete. Section 1 must be	
withdrawn, revised, and recirculated for PUBLIC review and comments.	-21
47/4 4 C DDO IFOT OD IFOTIVEO, la sussifia (the DUOIs seel for an desk reit, the following are the	้า
-1/14 T.6 PROJECT OBJECTIVES In pursuit of the BHC's goal for on-dock rail, the following are the biastic active of the Biar B Op Deale Pail Support Easility Project:	
Disport the free feel b On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project.	
more efficient	
more economically competitive and	
less polluting freight transport system	
as envisioned in the California Sustainable Freight Action Plan (State of California, 2016);	
Support the shared goals of	
local and regional transportation agencies to	
increase Port, rail, and highway capacities;	
Promote a mode shift from containers shipped by	
truck to near-dock and/or off-dock facilities	
to containers shipped by fail from the on-dock and	- CCSC
supporting rail yards,	20
support and	-22
maximize on-dock intermodal operations	
to a targeted goal of 30 to 35 percent of containers handled by on-dock rail:	
Receive and depart, within the confines of the rail vard,	
up to 10,000-foot-long trains	
to accommodate the increasing use of such trains by the Class I railroads; and	
mprove motorist and rail safety by eliminating an existing at-grade crossing at 9th 35 Street and Pi	co
mprove motorist and rail safety by eliminating an existing at-grade crossing at 9th 35 Street and Pi Avenue.	<u>co</u>
mprove motorist and rail safety by eliminating an existing at-grade crossing at 9th 35 Street and Pi <u>Avenue.</u> Dbjectives must extend and include implementation throughout Project site, local area, and region, out to 100miles	<u>co</u>
mprove motorist and rail safety by eliminating an existing at-grade crossing at 9th 35 Street and Pi <u>Avenue.</u> Dbjectives must extend and include implementation throughout Project site, local area, and region, out to 100miles. Compare their application to cargo, bulk freight, and containers if any differences and to Port. Loca	<u>co</u>
<u>mprove motorist and rail safety by eliminating an existing at-grade crossing at 9th 35 Street and Pi Avenue.</u> Dbjectives must extend and include implementation throughout Project site, local area, and region, out to 100miles. Compare their application to cargo, bulk freight, and containers if any differences and to Port, Loca and Regional project influences.	<u>co</u> 1,
<u>mprove motorist and rail safety by eliminating an existing at-grade crossing at 9th 35 Street and Pi Avenue.</u> Dbjectives must extend and include implementation throughout Project site, local area, and region, out to 100miles. Compare their application to cargo, bulk freight, and containers if any differences and to Port, Loca and Regional project influences.	<u>co</u> I,
 mprove motorist and rail safety by eliminating an existing at-grade crossing at 9th 35 Street and Pi Avenue. Dbjectives must extend and include implementation throughout Project site, local area, and region, out to 100miles. Compare their application to cargo, bulk freight, and containers if any differences and to Port, Loca and Regional project influences. 1-18/1-2 1.7.1 Regional Context 	<u>co</u> ,,
 mprove motorist and rail safety by eliminating an existing at-grade crossing at 9th 35 Street and Pi Avenue. Dbjectives must extend and include implementation throughout Project site, local area, and region, out to 100miles. Compare their application to cargo, bulk freight, and containers if any differences and to Port, Loca and Regional project influences. I-18/1-2 1.7.1 Regional Context The POLB isgeneral area of the Port and adjacent portions of COLB and the City of Los Angeles (COLA) 	
 mprove motorist and rail safety by eliminating an existing at-grade crossing at 9th 35 Street and Pi Avenue. Dbjectives must extend and include implementation throughout Project site, local area, and region, out to 100miles. Compare their application to cargo, bulk freight, and containers if any differences and to Port, Loca and Regional project influences. 1-18/1-2 1.7.1 Regional Context The POLB isgeneral area of the Port and adjacent portions of COLB and the City of Los Angeles (COLA) The Port, one of the world's <u>busiest</u> seaports, is a <u>leading gateway for trade</u> between the U.S. and Asia, 	
 mprove motorist and rail safety by eliminating an existing at-grade crossing at 9th 35 Street and Pi Avenue. Dbjectives must extend and include implementation throughout Project site, local area, and region, out to 100miles. Compare their application to cargo, bulk freight, and containers if any differences and to Port, Loca and Regional project influences. I-18/1-2 1.7.1 Regional Context The POLB isgeneral area of the Port and adjacent portions of COLB and the City of Los Angeles (COLA) The Port, one of the world's busiest seaports, is a leading gateway for trade between the U.S. and Asia, and it is the second busiest port in the U.Shandles more than 6.8 million TEU, which account for the port and adjacent portion. 	<u></u>
 mprove motorist and rail safety by eliminating an existing at-grade crossing at 9th 35 Street and Pi Avenue. Dbjectives must extend and include implementation throughout Project site, local area, and region, out to 100miles. Compare their application to cargo, bulk freight, and containers if any differences and to Port, Loca and Regional project influences. I-18/1-2 1.7.1 Regional Context The POLB isgeneral area of the Port and adjacent portions of COLB and the City of Los Angeles (COLA) The Port, one of the world's <u>busiest</u> seaports, is a <u>leading gateway for trade</u> between the U.S. and Asia, ind it is the <u>second busiest port in the U.S.</u>handles more than <u>6.8 million TEU</u>, which account for improximately 33 percent of <u>all containers moving through approximately 20 percent of all containers moving through approximately 20 percent of all containers moving through approximately 20 percent of a porty in the total approximately 20 percent of approximately 21 percent of approximately 21 percent of approximately 21 percent of approximately 22 percent of approximately 20 percent of approximately 25 percent </u>	∞ ", ft - ccsc
 mprove motorist and rail safety by eliminating an existing at-grade crossing at 9th 35 Street and Pi Avenue. Dbjectives must extend and include implementation throughout Project site, local area, and region, out to 100miles. Compare their application to cargo, bulk freight, and containers if any differences and to Port, Loca and Regional project influences. I-18/1-2 1.7.1 Regional Context The POLB isgeneral area of the Port and adjacent portions of COLB and the City of Los Angeles (COLA) The Port, one of the world's <u>busiest</u> seaports, is a <u>leading gateway for trade</u> between the U.S. and Asia, and it is the <u>second busiest port in the U.S.</u>handles more than <u>6.8 million TEU</u>, which account for all containers moving through California ports, approximately 25 percent of all containers moving through California ports. 	- CCSC -23
 mprove motorist and rail safety by eliminating an existing at-grade crossing at 9th 35 Street and Pi Avenue. Dbjectives must extend and include implementation throughout Project site, local area, and region, out to 100miles. Compare their application to cargo, bulk freight, and containers if any differences and to Port, Loca and Regional project influences. 1-18/1-2 1.7.1 Regional Context The POLB isgeneral area of the Port and adjacent portions of COLB and the City of Los Angeles (COLA) The Port, one of the world's <u>busiest</u> seaports, is a <u>leading gateway for trade</u> between the U.S. and Asia, and it is the <u>second busiest port in the U.S.</u>handles more than <u>6.8 million TEU</u>, which account for upproximately 33 percent of <u>all containers moving through California ports</u>, approximately 25 percent of <u>all containers moving through California ports</u>, approximately 25 percent of <u>all containers moving through California ports</u>, approximately 25 percent of <u>all containers moving through California ports</u>, approximately 25 percent of <u>all containers moving through California ports</u>, approximately 25 percent of <u>all containers moving through California ports</u>, approximately 25 percent of <u>all containers moving through California ports</u>, approximately 25 percent of <u>all containers moving through California ports</u>, approximately 25 percent of <u>all containers moving through California ports</u>, approximately 25 percent of <u>all containers moving through California ports</u>, approximately 25 percent of <u>all containers moving through California ports</u>, approximately 25 percent of <u>all containers moving through California ports</u>, approximately 25 percent of <u>all containers moving through California ports</u>, approximately 25 percent of <u>all containers moving through California ports</u>, approximately 25 percent of <u>all containers moving through California ports</u>, approximately 25 percent of <u>all containers moving through California ports</u>, approximat	- CCSC -23
 mprove motorist and rail safety by eliminating an existing at-grade crossing at 9th 35 Street and Pi Avenue. Dbjectives must extend and include implementation throughout Project site, local area, and region, out to 100miles. Compare their application to cargo, bulk freight, and containers if any differences and to Port, Loca and Regional project influences. 1-18/1-2 1.7.1 Regional Context The POLB isgeneral area of the Port and adjacent portions of COLB and the City of Los Angeles (COLA) The POLB isgeneral area of the Port and adjacent portions of COLB and the City of Los Angeles (COLA) The Port, one of the world's <u>busiest</u> seaports, is a <u>leading gateway for trade</u> between the U.S. and Asia, and it is the <u>second busiest port in the U.S</u>handles more than <u>6.8 million TEU</u>, which account for upproximately 33 percent of <u>all containers moving through California ports</u>, approximately 25 percent of <u>all containers moving through California ports</u>, approximately 25 percent of <u>all containers moving through U.S. ports (POLB, 2010a)</u>. Define and quantify busiest, leading, trade, all (empties?), 	- CCSC -23
 mprove motorist and rail safety by eliminating an existing at-grade crossing at 9th 35 Street and Pi Avenue. Dbjectives must extend and include implementation throughout Project site, local area, and region, out to 100miles. Compare their application to cargo, bulk freight, and containers if any differences and to Port, Loca and Regional project influences. 1-18/1-2 1.7.1 Regional Context The POLB isgeneral area of the Port and adjacent portions of COLB and the City of Los Angeles (COLA) The POLB isgeneral area of the Port and adjacent portions of trade between the U.S. and Asia, and it is the <u>second busiest port in the U.S</u>handles more than <u>6.8 million TEU</u>, which account for upproximately 33 percent of <u>all containers moving through California ports</u>, approximately 25 percent of <u>all containers moving through U.S. ports (POLB, 2010a)</u>. Define and quantify busiest, leading, trade, all (empties?), 	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
 mprove motorist and rail safety by eliminating an existing at-grade crossing at 9th 35 Street and Pi Avenue. Dbjectives must extend and include implementation throughout Project site, local area, and region, out to 100miles. Compare their application to cargo, bulk freight, and containers if any differences and to Port, Local and Regional project influences. 1-18/1-2 1.7.1 Regional Context The POLB isgeneral area of the Port and adjacent portions of COLB and the City of Los Angeles (COLA) The Port, one of the world's busiest seaports, is a leading gateway for trade between the U.S. and Asia, and it is the second busiest port in the U.Shandles more than <u>6.8 million TEU</u>, which account for approximately 33 percent of all containers moving through California ports, approximately 25 percent of <u>II containers moving through West Coast ports</u>. and approximately 20 percent of all containers moving through U.S. ports (POLB.2010a). Define and quantify busiest, leading, trade, all (empties?), 	••• •• •• •• •• •• •• •• •• ••
 mprove motorist and rail safety by eliminating an existing at-grade crossing at 9th 35 Street and Pi Avenue. Dbjectives must extend and include implementation throughout Project site, local area, and region, out to 100miles. Compare their application to cargo, bulk freight, and containers if any differences and to Port, Local and Regional project influences. 1-18/1-2 1.7.1 Regional Context The POLB isgeneral area of the Port and adjacent portions of COLB and the City of Los Angeles (COLA) The Port, one of the world's busiest seaports, is a leading gateway for trade between the U.S. and Asia, and it is the second busiest port in the U.Shandles more than 6.8 million TEU, which account for upproximately 33 percent of all containers moving through California ports, approximately 25 percent of ull containers moving through U.S. ports (POLB, 2010a). Define and quantify busiest, leading, trade, all (empties?), 	- CCSC -23
 mprove motorist and rail safety by eliminating an existing at-grade crossing at 9th 35 Street and Pi Avenue. Dbjectives must extend and include implementation throughout Project site, local area, and region, out to 100miles. Compare their application to cargo, bulk freight, and containers if any differences and to Port, Loca and Regional project influences. 1-18/1-2 1.7.1 Regional Context The POLB isgeneral area of the Port and adjacent portions of COLB and the City of Los Angeles (COLA) The Port, one of the world's <u>busiest</u> seaports, is a <u>leading gateway for trade</u> between the U.S. and Asia, and it is the <u>second busiest port in the U.S.</u>handles more than <u>6.8 million TEU</u>, which account for approximately 33 percent of <u>all containers moving through California ports</u>, approximately 25 percent of <u>all containers moving through California ports</u>, approximately 25 percent of <u>all containers moving through U.S. ports (POLB, 2010a)</u>. Define and quantify busiest, leading, trade, all (empties?), 	- CCSC -23
 mprove motorist and rail safety by eliminating an existing at-grade crossing at 9th 35 Street and Pi Avenue. Dbjectives must extend and include implementation throughout Project site, local area, and region, out to 100miles. Compare their application to cargo, bulk freight, and containers if any differences and to Port, Loca and Regional project influences. I-18/1-2 1.7.1 Regional Context The POLB isgeneral area of the Port and adjacent portions of COLB and the City of Los Angeles (COLA) The Port, one of the world's <u>busiest</u> seaports, is a <u>leading gateway for trade</u> between the U.S. and Asia, and it is the <u>second busiest port in the U.S.</u>handles more than <u>6.8 million TEU</u>, which account for approximately 33 percent of <u>all containers moving through California ports</u>, approximately 25 percent of <u>ul containers moving through West Coast ports</u>, and approximately 20 percent of all containers moving through U.S. ports (POLB, 2010a). Define and quantify busiest, leading, trade, all (empties?), 	- CCSC -23
 mprove motorist and rail safety by eliminating an existing at-grade crossing at 9th 35 Street and Pi Avenue. Dbjectives must extend and include implementation throughout Project site, local area, and region, out to 100miles. Compare their application to cargo, bulk freight, and containers if any differences and to Port, Loca and Regional project influences. I-18/1-2 1.7.1 Regional Context The POLB isgeneral area of the Port and adjacent portions of COLB and the City of Los Angeles (COLA) The Port, one of the world's <u>busiest</u> seaports, is a <u>leading gateway for trade</u> between the U.S. and Asia, and it is the <u>second busiest port in the U.S.</u>handles more than 6.8 million TEU, which account for approximately 33 percent of <u>all containers moving through California ports</u>, approximately 25 percent of <u>all containers moving through California ports</u>, approximately 25 percent of hrough U.S. ports (POLB, 2010a). Define and quantify busiest, leading, trade, all (empties?), 	- CCSC -23
 mprove motorist and rail safety by eliminating an existing at-grade crossing at 9th 35 Street and Pi Avenue. Dbjectives must extend and include implementation throughout Project site, local area, and region, out to 100miles. Compare their application to cargo, bulk freight, and containers if any differences and to Port, Loca and Regional project influences. I-18/1-2 1.7.1 Regional Context The POLB isgeneral area of the Port and adjacent portions of COLB and the City of Los Angeles (COLA) The Port, one of the world's <u>busiest</u> seaports, is a <u>leading gateway for trade</u> between the U.S. and Asia, and it is the <u>second busiest port in the U.S</u>handles more than 6.8 million TEU, which account for approximately 33 percent of <u>all containers moving through California ports</u>, approximately 25 percent of <u>all containers moving through California ports</u>, approximately 25 percent of hrough U.S. ports (POLB, 2010a). Define and quantify busiest, leading, trade, all (empties?), 	- CCSC -23
 mprove motorist and rail safety by eliminating an existing at-grade crossing at 9th 35 Street and Pi Avenue. Dbjectives must extend and include implementation throughout Project site, local area, and region, out to 100miles. Compare their application to cargo, bulk freight, and containers if any differences and to Port, Loca and Regional project influences. I-18/1-2 1.7.1 Regional Context The POLB isgeneral area of the Port and adjacent portions of COLB and the City of Los Angeles (COLA) The Port, one of the world's <u>busiest</u> seaports, is a <u>leading gateway for trade</u> between the U.S. and Asia, and it is the <u>second busiest port in the U.S</u>handles more than <u>6.8 million TEU</u>, which account for approximately 33 percent of <u>all containers moving through California ports</u>, approximately 25 percent of <u>all containers moving through California ports</u>, approximately 25 percent of hrough U.S. ports (POLB, 2010a). Define and quantify busiest, leading, trade, all (empties?), 	••• •• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
 mprove motorist and rail safety by eliminating an existing at-grade crossing at 9th 35 Street and Pi Avenue. Dbjectives must extend and include implementation throughout Project site, local area, and region, out to 100miles. Compare their application to cargo, bulk freight, and containers if any differences and to Port, Loca and Regional project influences. 1-18/1-2 1.7.1 Regional Context The POLB isgeneral area of the Port and adjacent portions of COLB and the City of Los Angeles (COLA). The PoLB isgeneral area of the Port and adjacent portions of COLB and the City of Los Angeles (COLA). The PoLB isgeneral area of the L.Shandles more than 6.8 million TEU, which account for upproximately 33 percent of all containers moving through California ports, approximately 25 percent of all containers moving through U.S. ports (POLB, 2010a). Define and quantify busiest, leading, trade, all (empties?), 	••• •• •• •• •• •• •• •• •• •• •• •• ••

Γ

Cardenas, Mexico. Provide "busiest" - movements, tonnage, \$-value, and containers Change from trade to containers. Include Empties, Loaded In, and Loaded Out. Provide and compare POLB 2010 compared to Tioga and Mercator for post 2015.	- CCSC-23 (Cont'd)
1-18/5 The existing Pier B Rail Yard is approximately 82 acres in area. The proposed Project would re- approximately 182 acres. In addition to Port-owned property, a <u>portion</u> of the area contains privately ov properties and businesses. Several <u>public agenciesown portions</u> of the property <u>inarea and vicir</u> Several public agencies, including POLA, Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority (ACTA) and Los Angeles County Flood Control District (LACFCD). In addition, Southern California Edison (SCE) and oft utilities have property interests in the proposed Project area and vicinity. While the proposed Project site located largely on Pier B, some portions of the proposed Project improvements would extend to the vicin Piers A, C, and D/E. Provide appendix of all relevant boundaries within Project's site, area, local, and regional extant .	er ity of -24
1-18/6 Tracks south of the Project provide rail access to the marine terminals on Piers D/E, F, G, and Tracks near Dominguez Channel provide a direct connection to the Alameda Corridor and the remainder the San Pedro Bay railroad network (Figure 1.6-2). All of the trackage is surrounded by industrial and commercial uses. Provide design/plans for all railroad structures or yards and their elevations.	- CCSC -25
18/7 Pier B handles <u>neo bulk</u> , dry bulk, and liquid bulk cargoes. The tenants on Pier B What is "neo bulk" vs other bulks? (e.g., cars and logs vs coal?) Define and demonstrate relevance to railroad to/from bulk and other types of cargo compared to	ccsc









Port of Long Beach

1 *Responses to Citizens Coalition for a Safe Community*

Response to Comment CCSC-1: The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your review of the
 Draft EIR and your comments concerning the proposed Project.

Response to Comment CCSC-2: As part of the CEQA process, the Port is hereby providing additional information and clarifications in responses to comments received on the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR was prepared in conformance with CEQA and State CEQA Guidelines. The Final EIR does not contain any new or revised information that would trigger a requirement for recirculation of the document. The Port continues to be committed to its ongoing community outreach for this proposed Project to ensure that public concerns are addressed.

Response to Comment CCSC-3: Analyses in the Draft EIR were conducted using best available information. Because this comment does not identify the specific instances where a term is unclear, it is not possible to provide a specific response. The terms "feasible" and "feasibility" as used in the Draft EIR and the Final EIR are intended to mean capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors. This is how the term is defined by CEQA Guideline 15364.

Regarding the other three words referenced in the comment, dictionary definitions are
assumed to apply to their use in the EIR. "Financial" is intended to mean "relating to finance."
"Economics" is intended to mean "the branch of knowledge concerned with the production,
consumption, and transfer of wealth." "Employment" is intended to mean "the condition of
having paid work."

22 **Response to Comment CCSC-4:** The commenter states that no assessment is provided as 23 to the potential reduction in port or transport jobs within the Ports, near the Port, or to/from the 24 "Inland Ports" as a result of the proposed Project. Presumably, the commenter is referring to 25 truck drivers that transport containers from Port terminals to off-dock rail yards. As an initial 26 matter, those drivers are not dispatched to or from the existing Pier B Rail Yard. The expansion 27 of that facility would not directly involve the termination of any truck drivers. With the expansion 28 of the Pier B on-dock rail support facility, it is possible that fewer drayage trucks would be 29 dispatched to the terminals to be served by the expanded facility. How specific containers are 30 transported is within the discretion of the terminal operators and, as explained in the 31 Introduction of the Draft EIR, is largely a function of the container's destination. It would be 32 speculative to assume that any truck driver positions would be eliminated. Moreover, from a 33 CEQA perspective, environmental issues arise from an increase in jobs and the environmental 34 impacts caused by the associated increase in population. If the number of jobs is reduced, 35 that is purely an economic issue, which is beyond the scope of CEQA.

Insofar as the direct employment associated with the proposed Project is concerned, minimal
 increases for the three build alternatives are projected, ranging from 5 to 10 permanent onsite
 jobs.

Response to Comment CCSC-5: Measure M is focused on the improvement of commuter transportation, not the transportation of freight. The Los Angeles County Traffic Improvement Plan, Measure M, was approved by voters in November 2016 to impose retail transactions and use tax to improve traffic flow and safety; repair potholes and sidewalks; repave local streets; earthquake-retrofit bridges; synchronize signals; make public transportation more accessible, convenient, and affordable for seniors, students, and the disabled; expand rail, subway, and bus systems; improve job, school, and airport connections; and create jobs.

1 The Palmdale – High Desert Corridor (HDC) project is a separate project with no connection 2 to the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project or any other projects associated 3 with the Port. The HDC project focus is also on commuter transportation, including 4 construction of a multimodal link that would connect Antelope Valley in Los Angeles County 5 with Victor Valley in San Bernardino County, integrating four components into one project: (1) 6 a freeway/expressway connecting State Route (SR)-14 and United States (US) Route 395, 7 I-15, and SR-18; (2) a high-speed rail connection between the Palmdale Transportation 8 Center (PTC) and the proposed XpressWest Station in Victorville; (3) a grade-separated 9 bikeway; and (4) a green energy production/transmission facility (Metro, 2015; available at 10 media.metro.net/projects studies/hdc/images/factsheet hdc hsr 2015-08.pdf). The EIR certified in June 2016 (Caltrans, 2016; available at http://www.dot.ca.gov/d7/env-11 docs/docs/hdc/HDC%20FED--Vol%201--062016 FINAL.pdf) 12 does not identifv the 13 development of an inland logistics container facility or the transport of freight from the Port 14 through the Palmdale HDC.

15 Response to Comment CCSC-6: As discussed in Section 1.2.2 of the Draft EIR, the Tioga 16 forecast (2009) was the source of projected container cargo utilized in the development of 17 various analyses in the EIR. The Tioga and Mercator reports are public record, which were 18 and are available for inspection upon request.

19 The commenter claims that the 2009 Tioga Report (San Pedro Bay Container Forecast Update, prepared for Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles available at 20 21 http://www.portoflosangeles.org/pdf/SPB Container Forecast Update 073109.pdf) and the 22 2016 Mercator Report (San Pedro Bay Long-term Unconstrained Cargo Forecast prepared 23 by Mercator International Limited Liability Corporation [LLC] and Oxford Economics for the 24 Port of Long Beach and the Port of Los Angeles, Contract No. HD-8429, Final Report, 25 February 2016) "are significantly deficient regarding the total container movement (Loaded Import, Loaded Export, and Empties)." Included as background information, both the Tioga 26 27 and Mercator forecasts include projections of loaded-in, loaded-out, and empty container 28 flows for SPBP over a substantial number of years. The comment does not identify any 29 specific deficiencies in the Draft EIR. The comment does not raise any specific environmental 30 concerns. To the extent specific issues are raised in the commenter's later comments, those 31 issues will be addressed in those later comments.

Response to Comment CCSC-7: The commenter asserts that references are made to electrification and zero emissions locomotives without assessment of such for both the Colton (including Alameda Corridor East) and Palmdale railroad corridors ("Alameda Corridor North") and the Alameda Central Corridor. The benefits and impacts of electrification and major ROW improvements must be analyzed for both direct and indirect-secondary impact, at least throughout the existing Alameda Corridor.

The corridors identified by the commenter are outside the scope of the proposed Project, and
conversion of the locomotive fleet to electricity is not an element of the proposed Project;
therefore, no analysis need be performed. Furthermore, electrification of the Alameda Corridor
would require the collaboration of several entities, including the POLB, POLA, ACTA, and the
Class 1 rail lines. Please see Master Response – Electrification of Alameda Corridor and Zero
Emission Locomotives. **Response to Comment CCSC-8:** The commenter's claims regarding the "assessment of the

Response to Comment CCSC-8: The commenter's claims regarding the "assessment of the
 proposed Project, including the Mercator report, and it's (sic) many connections to L.A. [Los
 Angeles] County and LA/Inland Empire (San Bernardino and Riverside counties) regions" are

1 addressed more thoroughly in the responses to comments that follow. As part of the CEQA process, the Port is hereby providing additional information and clarifications in responses to

3 comments received on the Draft EIR. Please see response to Comment CCSC-2.

4 **Response to Comment CCSC-9:** Please see response to Comment CCSC-3.

Response to Comment CCSC-10: Insofar as direct employment associated with the proposed Project is concerned, minimal increases for the three build alternatives are projected, ranging from 5 to 10 permanent onsite jobs. Regarding the references for potential job losses, please see response to Comment CCSC-4.

9 Response to Comment CCSC-11: The 2016 Mercator report is cited in the Draft EIR in 10 accordance with CEQA Guidelines. As stated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15148: The 11 preparation of EIRs is dependent upon information from many sources, including engineering 12 project reports and many scientific documents relating to environmental features. These 13 documents should be cited but not included in the EIR.

The report is a public record and was and is available for inspection upon request. The
referenced Mercator document was provided to the commenter via e-mail on January 17,
2017 (e-mail correspondence from Allyson Teramoto to Dr. Tom Williams).

17 **Response to Comment CCSC-12:** The use of higher throughput levels in the Draft EIR from 18 the 2009 forecast update (Tioga, 2009) reflects a conservative analysis of impacts from 19 operation of the proposed Project. Because global trade conditions vary over time, the Port 20 periodically conducts cargo forecasts for both the near term and longer time horizon to inform 21 the Port's planning process. As described in Section 1.2.2 of the Draft EIR, at the time the 22 Draft EIR analysis was performed for the proposed Project, only the 2009 cargo forecast was 23 available. It forecasted higher cargo throughput levels than the subsequent cargo forecast prepared by Mercator International in 2016, and both are graphically displayed in the Draft 24 25 EIR. However, it should be noted that continued growth in cargo throughput is expected over 26 time, with smaller variations occurring in shorter periods, with consistent growth expectations 27 occurring over the longer time frame.

The commenter claims that no clear definition of "containers," "cargo," or "reflects" is provided, but does not raise any substantive environmental concerns. The definition of the term "container" is provided in Appendix F, Glossary of Terms. The terms "cargo" and "reflects" are everyday terms that require no definition in the Draft EIR. Although not required for the environmental analysis nor required under CEQA, dictionary definitions for the following commonly used terms are provided:

• *cargo:* the goods or merchandise conveyed in a ship, airplane, or vehicle

• *reflects:* to have bearing or influence

The commenter also requests that definitions clearly separate the total, loaded, unloaded/empty containers from cargo and freight passing through the POLB but does not explain how this information would inform the environmental analysis. When responding to comments, lead agencies need only respond to significant environmental issues and do not need to provide all information requested by reviewers, as long as a good faith effort at full disclosure is made in the EIR.

The Draft EIR adequately utilizes the cargo throughput forecast from the 2009 Tioga Report.
 The discussion in the Draft EIR regarding the Tioga report implications and comparison of

- 1 Mercator/Tioga/Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) effects is a means
- 2 of informing the public of the use of the more conservative approach to analyzing the potential
- 3 impacts associated with the proposed Project. As stated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15144,
- 4 Forecasting: "Drafting an EIR...necessarily involves some degree of forecasting. While 5 foreseeing the unforeseeable is not possible, an agency must use its best efforts to find out
- and disclose all that it reasonably can." This is precisely what the Port has done. No
 supplemental Draft EIR is required.
- 8 Response to Comment CCSC-13: The commenter specifically identifies item (e) under
 9 Chapter 8, Section 30708, which is to "encourage rail service in port areas and multi-company
 10 use of facilities": however, the comment does not raise any specific environmental concerns.
- The comment requests definition of certain terms. Definitions for the terms "intermodal" and "on-dock/off-dock rail (yards)" are provided in Appendix F, Glossary of Terms. Definitions for the following commonly used dictionary terms identified in the referenced section (Section 6-2/1) are provided:
- *encourage:* to spur on; to give help or patronage
- *cargo*: the goods or merchandise conveyed in a ship, airplane, or vehicle
- *goods:* (Economic Goods) a commodity or service that is useful to man but that must be paid for
- 19 *port:* a harbor town or city where ships may take on or discharge cargo
- *dock:* a place (such as a wharf or platform) for the loading or unloading of materials
- *berth:* the place where a ship lies when at anchor or at a wharf
- *efficiency:* effective operation as measured by a comparison of production with cost (as in energy, time, and money)
- *overall:* in view of all the circumstances or conditions; *non-overall:* <u>not</u> in view of all the circumstances or conditions
- optimize: to make as perfect, effective, or functional as possible
- *equally:* in an equal or uniform manner; *benefitted*: something that produces good or helpful results or effects or that promotes well-being
- The term "terminal" refers to a marine facility located at the Port where cargo containers are transported between different transport vehicles for onward transportation. The cargo may be transported between container ships and land vehicles (e.g., trains or trucks).
- 32 The commenter also requests efficiency/optimization/beneficiary calculations and 33 comparisons of each berth/terminal and port but does not raise any specific environmental 34 concerns. Therefore, no additional calculations are warranted. Consistent with the focus on 35 environmental issues in CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, CEQA Guidelines Section 15204(a) 36 provides in relevant part:
- In reviewing draft EIRs, persons and public agencies should focus on the sufficiency
 of the document in identifying and analyzing the possible impacts on the environment
 and ways in which the significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated.
- 40 CEQA does not require a lead agency to conduct every test or perform all research,

Port of Long Beach

study, and experimentation recommended or demanded by commenters. When
responding to comments, lead agencies need only respond to significant
environmental issues and do not need to provide all information requested by
reviewers, as long as a good faith effort at full disclosure is made in the EIR.

Response to Comment CCSC-14: The commenter reiterates the Port Master Plan (PMP) goals that the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility would support, as identified in the Application Summary Report (ASR) (Section 6) of the Draft EIR. The commenter also requests that bulk cargo and container rail and on-dock operations be separated. However, the commenter does not cite any specific environmental concerns related to this information.

Bulk cargo is typically handled directly on the marine terminal by transfer to either truck or rail, depending on whether the material is destined nationally, regionally, or locally. Bulk cargo and non-intermodal cargo that may be transported to the Pier B Rail Yard via on-dock rail would be handled there in the same manner as containerized cargo. It is, therefore, not necessary to distinguish the two forms of cargo for purposes of understanding rail yard operations, nor is a separate assessment required, as requested by the commenter. Regarding the requested definitions, please see responses to Comments CCSC-12 and CCSC-13.

17 Section 6 of the Draft EIR constitutes an ASR and proposed staff recommendations prepared 18 specifically in accordance with the certified PMP, as amended, and the California Coastal Act 19 (CCA). The ASR is intended to demonstrate that the proposed Project is in conformance with 20 the stated goals and policies of the PMP and the CCA. The Project objectives, as required by 21 CEQA, are separate from the goals of the PMP and CCA, and they are discussed in Section 22 1.2 of the Draft EIR. There is no requirement that they be identical to the goals and policies 23 of the PMP and CCA. Therefore, revisions of the goals to be same/consistent with/distinct 24 from the Project objectives, and explanations of why they are not listed as Project objectives 25 in Section 6, ASR, are not warranted.

26 The commenter claims that the EIR should provide clarification about rail operations for 53Us 27 versus 40Us and loaded versus unloaded/empty containers. Section 1.2 of the EIR provides 28 a detailed explanation of rail operations. Assuming the commenter's use of the terms "53Us" 29 and "40Us" is in reference to 53-foot containers and 40-foot containers. Section 1.2.3 of the 30 EIR provides an adequate description of the standard container sizes used today, which are 31 20, 40, or 45 feet long; 8, 8.5, or 9.5 feet high, and 8.5 feet wide. The 20-foot by 8.5-foot by 32 8.5-foot container is the basis for the twenty-foot equivalent Unit (TEU), which is the standard 33 measure of containerized cargo volumes for loaded, unloaded, and empty containers used 34 throughout the Draft EIR. The description of the proposed Project explains that the expanded 35 facility would provide storage areas for both full and empty containers.

36 **Response to Comment CCSC-15:** This commenter requests an appendix with comparisons 37 of the forecasts and isolated container, bulk, and other "goods." The 2007 Tioga and 2016 38 Mercator reports are in the public record, and were and are available for inspection upon 39 request. The referenced Mercator document was provided to the commenter via e-mail on 40 January 17, 2017 (e-mail correspondence from Allyson Teramoto to Dr. Tom Williams). A 41 discussion of the long-term cargo forecasts is provided in Chapter 1 of the Draft EIR, starting 42 on page 1-1. The 2009 and 2016 forecasts are compared in Figure 1.2-1 in Chapter 1. The 43 comment does not identify any specific environmental concerns. Please see responses to 44 Comments CCSC-6 and CCSC-11.

1 **Response to Comment CCSC-16:** The comment expresses a concern that the Draft EIR 2 does not include a map of known earthquake faults, and that the potential impacts of seismic 3 events are not addressed in the Draft EIR. Seismic issues are addressed in Section 3.1 4 (Geology). Figure 3.1-1 illustrates the general locations of earthquake faults within the region, 5 and Figure 3.1-2 shows local fault traces relative to the Project footprint. The Cabrillo fault is 6 discussed on page 3.1-6; it is approximately 5 miles southwest of the Project site. Impact 7 GEO-5 on page 3.1-11 specifically addresses the potential effects on the Project from ground 8 shaking resulting from an earthquake on a local fault. 9 Separately, the comment requests that sea level be expressed as mean sea level (MSL)

Separately, the comment requests that sea level be expressed as mean sea level (MSL) rather than as mean low low water (MLLW) or mean high high water (MHHW). The latter terms are normally used when specifically discussing the tidal cycle, height of the tide, or precise sea levels, whereas MSL is normally used when discussing elevation in general relative to sea level. In the context of Port facilities and operations, situated as they are generally 10 or more feet above sea level and being affected by the tidal cycle, use of MLLW and MHHW is appropriate. The proposed Project is +10 to +25 feet MLLW as stated in Section 3.1 of the Draft EIR on page 3.1-13. No change to the text is necessary.

17 **Response to Comment CCSC-17:** Definitions for the following commonly used terms 18 "goods," "cargo," "containers," "on-/near-/off-dock," and "in-/near-port" are provided in 19 responses to Comments CCSC-12 and CCSC-13. "Freight" is defined to be goods that are 20 carried by ships, trains, trucks, or airplanes.

21 With respect to the commenter's request for clear quantification of port, rail, and highway 22 capacities within local (zero to 10 miles) and regional (10 to 100 miles) contexts, the commenter is referred to Section 1.2.2 of the Draft EIR, which discusses the long-term cargo 23 24 forecast for the Port; this section includes a figure that shows cargo throughput projections to 25 2030 when the Port is expected to reach capacity based on the 2009 cargo forecast (Tioga, 2009). For rail capacities, the commenter is directed to Appendix C of the Draft EIR, Section 26 27 3.0. and Table 3.10, which provide a detailed analysis of rail traffic volumes. In the Draft EIR. 28 highway capacity is measured in terms of LOS, which is discussed in Section 3.5 of the Draft 29 EIR.

30 The commenter refers to the Tioga 2006 and SCAG 2012 analyses use of 2000 census data 31 for economic development in the region, while the 2016 SCAG and Mercator 2016 analyses 32 use the 2010 census and "Calif.Dpt.ofFin" 2015 projections. The commenter is correct in 33 identifying the census data used in the respective analysis. This does not provide a comment 34 related to the environmental analysis; therefore, no further response is necessary. The 35 comment states that "use of 2012 also reflect early traffic recovery after the Great Recession 36 and thereby is probably not typical of a full development mode and uses say in 2014 or 2016." 37 Traffic conditions during these later years were heavily influenced by construction projects 38 and do not reflect normal traffic conditions. In 2014 to 2016, major construction projects were 39 underway at the Port, including the Middle Harbor Redevelopment Project and the Gerald 40 Desmond Bridge Replacement Project. Therefore, 2014 or 2016 would not represent "typical 41 full development mode" as indicated in the comment.

A comparison of the "California Freight Plan and SCAG-2012+2016, Tioga, and Mercator
forecasts' is not warranted under CEQA. The commenter has not identified any purpose of
that comparison or how it would relate to the content of the EIR. Consistent with the focus on
environmental issues in CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, CEQA Guidelines Section 15204(a)
provides in relevant part:
Port of Long Beach

1 In reviewing draft EIRs, persons and public agencies should focus on the sufficiency 2 of the document in identifying and analyzing the possible impacts on the environment 3 and wavs in which the significant effects of the project might be avoided or 4 mitigated...CEQA does not require a lead agency to conduct every test or perform 5 all research, study, and experimentation recommended or demanded by 6 commenters. When responding to comments, lead agencies need only respond to 7 significant environmental issues and do not need to provide all information requested 8 by reviewers, as long as a good faith effort at full disclosure is made in the EIR.

9 Response to Comment CCSC-18: As described in Draft EIR Section 1.5, and as shown in 10 Figure 1.5-3, containerized cargo that is to be transported out of the region via rail is 11 transported from the Port either directly by means of on-dock rail to the Alameda Corridor or 12 by truck to the downtown off-dock yards for transfer onto rail. The Class I railroads then enter 13 their separate main line tracks, all of which lead eastward from the downtown yards, not to 14 the north. Passenger service using the proposed HDC, if and when that were to occur, would 15 operate independently from freight traffic and is not relevant to the improvements proposed 16 at the Pier B Rail Yard. All train traffic operating on the Class I main lines east of Los Angeles, 17 including existing and approved future passenger service, has been included in the analysis 18 of rail-related impacts presented in Draft EIR Section 3.5.

19 Response to Comment CCSC-19: The comment appears to be a restatement of text from 20 the Draft EIR; no question or comment about the text is apparent, and no response is 21 necessary.

Response to Comment CCSC-20: While this Draft EIR is not a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document, the Project Need and Objectives are included in Sections 1.5 and 1.6 to more clearly describe why the Project is being proposed. Please refer to Section 1.6 for a detailed description of the purposes of this Project.

Response to Comment CCSC-21: Terms used in Section 1 and throughout the Draft EIR
 have been defined in the Glossary (Appendix F) or they are commonly understood. The
 commenter has not provided any basis that would require recirculation of the EIR.

29 **Response to Comment CCSC-22:** Project objectives are clearly stated in Draft EIR Section 30 1.6. There is no requirement within CEQA that the objectives must cover or relate to a 31 particular geographic area outside of the Project area. The objectives referenced by the 32 commenter, while being focused on operations within the Port, have implications for both 33 efficiencies and impacts at the local and regional scales. These consequences are discussed 34 in the various impact sections as they are relevant to those topics. The commenter's request 35 for a comparison of objectives to various types of cargo and to differing geographic influences 36 is unclear and does not raise any environmental issue associated with the Draft EIR. Please 37 also see response to Comment CCSC-14 above.

38 **Response to Comment CCSC-23:** The section referred to by the commenter (Chapter 1, 39 Section 1.7.1) describes the proposed Project's setting and location from a regional context 40 as part of the Project Description. Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15124, "The description of 41 the project shall contain...information but should not supply extensive detail beyond that 42 needed for evaluation and review of the environmental impact." Therefore, to expand and 43 quantify for the Pacific Coast of North America, to include the container port at Lázaro 44 Cárdenas, Mexico – 2,000 miles from the proposed Project, as requested by the commenter, 45 is beyond what is needed for the evaluation and review of the environmental impacts

1 associated with the proposed Project, and is not warranted. As discussed in Section 1.7.1,

- 2 the POLB is located in the COLB in southern Los Angeles County (Figure 1.7-1). Figure 1.7-
- 3 2 shows the location on a regional map, while Figure 1.7-3 shows the proposed Project 4 location and boundaries on an aerial map. The information provided in the Project Description
- 5 is consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15124.

6 The comment requests that the Port "define and quantify" various terms. Regarding "busiest," 7 the Draft EIR did quantify what was being referred to, namely the Port's ranking relating to 8 U.S. ports and California ports. Information regarding throughput was provided. If the 9 commenter would like further information regarding cargo information at the Port, it can be found online on the Port's website at www.polb.com/economics/stats/default.asp. Cargo 10 11 information available at this link includes the latest monthly TEU, Yearly TEU, TEU Year-to-12 Date, and an archive of monthly totals since 1995 for import, export, and empty containers. 13 The website also provides a 5-year comparison of cargo volume, value, and container units; 14 a report of year-to-date tonnage figures, with statistics on inbound cargo, outbound cargo, 15 containers, general cargo, petroleum/liquid bulk and dry bulk; and the latest annual financial 16 statement.

17 It is unclear what additional information the commenter is requesting or how the information

18 relates to the environmental impacts of the proposed Project. The comment states "Change

from trade to containers." It is not clear to what the comment is referring. If it is referring to the statement on page 1-18 of the Draft EIR that the Port is a leading gateway for trade between

statement on page 1-18 of the Draft EIR that the Port is a leading gateway for trade between the U.S. and Asia, the requested change is not necessary. The request to "include empties"

22 is unclear. The Draft EIR did include references to empty containers.

Finally, the comment requests that the Port "provide and compare POLB 2010 to Tioga and Mercator for post 2015." It is unclear what comparison is being requested. Cargo information for POLB for the year 2010 can be found in Figure 1.2-1 of the Draft EIR (page 1-2). The Tioga and Mercator cargo forecasts referenced above are public documents, and are available upon request. The comment fails to indicate how any such comparison would affect or relate to the environmental impacts analyzed in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.

Response to Comment CCSC-24: The comment requests that the Port provide an appendix of "all relevant boundaries within the Project's site area local, and regional extant." Other than the reference to the Project boundaries, it is not clear what the commenter is requesting. Relevant boundaries of the proposed Project are shown in Figure 1.7-3 of the Draft EIR (page 1-21). This information need not be included as an appendix because it is contained in Chapter 1. No further response to this comment is required or possible.

Response to Comment CCSC-25: The preliminary design/plans for railroad structures
 associated with the proposed Project and alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR are provided
 in Figures 1.8-1, 1.8-9, 1.8-11, and 1.8-13. The elevation of the Project site ranges from +10
 to +25 feet MLLW, as stated in Section 3.1 of the Draft EIR on page 3.1-13.

- **Response to Comment CCSC-26:** Neo bulk, as defined in the Glossary (Appendix F) comprises goods that are prepackaged; counted as they are; loaded and unloaded, not stored in containers; and transferred as units at the Port. Examples of neo bulk are cars, lumber, and steel. This form of cargo is relevant to the proposed Project because some trains are handled at the Pier B Rail Yard that are made up of cars carrying non-containerized cargo. The term "other bulk" referred to in the comment is not used in the Draft EIR. The last portion of the
- 45 comment states: "Define and demonstrate relevance to railroad to/from bulk and other types

Port of Long Beach

1 of cargo compared to container and any overlap/co-use of railroad system." It is not clear what

- 2 the commenter is requesting or how the request relates to the environmental analysis
- 3 contained in the Draft EIR. No further response is required or possible.

4 **Response to Comment CCSC-27:** Figure 1.7-1 depicts the Project location relative to Los 5 Angeles County. It is unclear what the comment is requesting. To the extent that it is 6 requesting that all rail lines be shown, due to the scale of this figure, it is not possible to depict 7 railroad lines. Not all railroad lines in Los Angeles County are relevant to the proposed Project 8 (see response to Comment CCSC-18). For further information, Figure 2-1 of Appendix C 9 (page C-13) depicts additional railroad lines in the southern California region.

- 10 **Response to Comment CCSC-28:** The Port and its vicinity are depicted in Figures 1.5-2 and 11 1.7-2. Figure 1.7-3 shows the Project boundary and the immediate surroundings. Figure 3.6-4 portrays the Harbor District and its 10 subdivisions. The border between the cities of Los 12 13 Angeles and Long Beach is shown in several of these figures.
- 14 There are many facilities served by rail located throughout the Port, many of which are used 15 for containerized cargo. Figure 1.5-2 provides a view of the Port-related rail lines serving the 16 SPBP. Smaller spurs and local service lines are numerous, but they are not shown because 17 they are not relevant to the proposed Project.
- Response to Comment CCSC-29: The comment simply repeats and adds highlighting to the 18 19 auotations from the CEQA Guideline 15126.6 that were referenced on page 1-22 of the Draft 20 EIR. No comment is made regarding that section. No response is needed.
- 21 **Response to Comment CCSC-30:** The comment is simply quoting language from page 1-22 22 of the Draft EIR without making any comments regarding that language. No response is 23 necessary. However, the Port has identified and examined a range of reasonable alternatives 24 in the Draft EIR; the reasoning for selecting these alternatives is provided in Section 4.3. As 25 stated in Section 4.3, the Environmentally Preferred Alternative is the No Project Alternative. 26 Among the "build" alternatives, the 12th Street Alternative is deemed to be the Environmentally 27 Superior Alternative.
- 28 **Response to Comment CCSC-31:** The Project site does not include any berths, docks, piers, 29 or terminals. Information on the berths, docks, terminals, and piers is not relevant to the rail 30 operations at Pier B for purposes of this Draft EIR. The proposed Project is concerned with 31 the Pier B Rail Yard and does not include any physical changes or improvements to any 32 berths, docks, terminals, and piers.
- 33 **Response to Comment CCSC-32:** Comments are raised about specific aspects of the 34 secondary evaluation of alternatives noted in the Draft EIR. The following are responses:
- 35 "Not tonnage or \$-value" – TEU are typically used to measure the volume of cargo; 36 tonnage is not a relevant measure because it would vary from container to container. 37 Monetary value is similarly not relevant because it would vary from container to container 38 and because cost information is proprietary.
- 39
- "No parameters cars/yr, \$ profit/yr" Rail operations are described and evaluated either in terms of trains or containers handled. The terms "cars/yr" and "\$ profit/yr" as referenced 40 41 in the comment are not relevant.

1 In the comment, several evaluation factors are emphasized in **bold** and underlined text, such

as "affect local traffic, runoff and storm drain facilities, and existing utilities." These factors are
 evaluated in the respective sections of the Draft EIR.

The comment references the complexity of the construction staging, but it does not ask a question or make a comment; therefore, no response can be provided. This portion of the comment goes on to ask for the relative cost to construct the alternatives. Project construction cost is not an evaluation factor required by CEQA.

8 The terms "vicinity, existing utilities, owned/leased, acquired, staging and costs/relative costs"
9 are used as those terms are commonly understood.

10 Another portion of the comment states "container volume as TEU - projections does not

11 provide any value as compared to 40 ft or 53 ft units, etc." The relative value of cargo, whether

12 carried in 40-foot or 53-foot-long containers is not relevant to the Project evaluation, nor is

13 monetary value a consideration requiring evaluation under CEQA.

The comment stating "these following considerations are in fact used as project objectives, etc." appears to be referencing the evaluation factors listed on page 1-23. Those factors were used as part of the engineering analysis that was conducted to reduce a broad range of alternatives to the three proposed build alternatives that are evaluated in the Draft EIR.

18 Response to Comment CCSC-33: The Port's current on-dock rail terminals lack sufficient train staging areas to be operated to their full utilization. Figure 1.3-1 of the Draft EIR shows 19 how each Project alternative would increase the Port's rail capacity. The 12th Street Alternative 20 21 (proposed Project), as an example, would improve the Port's capacity to 4,700,000 TEU 22 moved by rail in 2035, versus 2,700,000 TEU by rail under the No Project Alternative. Expert 23 Port rail engineers and planners at HDR Engineering estimated that up to 17 trains per day 24 (Draft EIR page 1-39) could depart the rail support facility at the proposed Project's maximum 25 physical capacity (Draft EIR page 1-39). This professional judgment of maximum potential 26 train throughput, based on the proposed physical improvements to occur under the Project, 27 was deemed to be a reasonable basis for impact analysis.

Response to Comment CCSC-34: Definitions for the terms listed in the comment are either
 provided in the Glossary, defined in the text, or the terms are used for their common meaning.

30 Existing conditions are described in Draft EIR Section 1.3.3. Quantities are provided (e.g., 2 31 mainline tracks; 10 internal tracks ranging in length from 1,100 to 3,000 feet; 7 trains per day 32 processed; trains averaging 8,000 feet in length). These quantities and measures are generally understandable. Comparisons to berths, gantries, and the like are not relevant. Draft 33 34 EIR Section 1.2.7 (page 1-5) and Section 5.3.2 provide a discussion of cargo "dwell" time and 35 why certain cargo is handled at near-dock or off-dock intermodal yards. As stated in Section 36 5.3.3 of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would increase the ability of the rail system to support operation of the on-dock intermodal facilities, which would help prevent bottlenecks 37 38 on on-dock rail systems and in the overall SPBP rail network. As stated on page 1-9 of the 39 Draft EIR, the two mainline tracks must remain as free as possible for "through train" 40 movement because impairment of that function can have significant adverse effects on overall 41 Port cargo-handling capability.

The comment references the proposed need for a "spatial graphical model of all container logistic flows through the Port and beyond within a 100-mile radius" for the Port Plan and all

44 logistics projects. It does not appear that this is a comment on the Draft EIR. To the extent it

is a comment on the Draft EIR, such a model is not required to properly evaluate the
alternatives under consideration. The Port routinely commissions and updates its rail analysis;
it does understand the importance of logistical systems through 2040. It is not necessary to
include such analysis in the Draft EIR. Nonetheless, the Port included an extensive description
of the container movement process in the Introduction of the Draft EIR at pages 1-1 through
1-5.

7 **Response to Comment CCSC-35:** Insofar as the description of operations within the yard is 8 concerned, "trains per day" refers to the number of fully assembled trains leaving the yard 9 each day, on average. As stated on page 1-9 of the Draft EIR, it is estimated that seven trains 10 per day are released to the external rail network from the existing Pier B Rail Yard: page 1-40 11 states that approximately five locomotive refueling tanker trucks would arrive and depart each 12 day. Trains can be assembled in varying lengths and quantities of containers or cars 13 containing bulk cargo; therefore, a direct translation to "units" (as the commenter has 14 interpreted them) is not available. Please also see response to Comment CCSC-34 regarding 15 "logistical system models."

16 Response to Comment CCSC-36: It would theoretically be possible to construct new fill in 17 the Harbor upon which to shift existing marine terminal space, thereby providing space for a new rail yard in the vacated or partially vacated terminal. However, creating new fill would give 18 19 rise to two significant issues. The first would be that the magnitude of new fill required (i.e., 20 up to 180 acres of finished surface area) would result in substantial water-side impacts, which 21 would be far in excess of the impacts associated with expanding an existing rail yard. Second, 22 entirely new connections to lead tracks connecting to the Alameda Corridor would be needed, 23 with attendant additional impacts and feasibility issues involved. Additionally, expanding the 24 on-dock terminals will not achieve many of the Project goals, such as additional arrival and 25 departure tracks for 10,000-foot trains and expansion of mainline capacity through Pier B and 26 to/from Piers E/G/J. Simply expanding the track inside the terminals would not provide the 27 systemic improvements the proposed Project would deliver.

Response to Comment CCSC-37: The assumptions, constraints, and design criteria were not used as Project objectives; rather, these are pertinent factors relevant to the identification and development of reasonable alternatives. The Project's objectives are the six elements defined in Section 1.6 of the Draft EIR.

32 Response to Comment CCSC-38: As is noted in Draft EIR Section 3.9.2.2, a variety of 33 background source material was used in the hazardous materials analysis. Included among 34 these sources was historical aerial photography, shown in Figure 3.9-1, which depicts active 35 production, injection, or abandoned wells in the Project area. The investigation conducted for 36 the Draft EIR included a review of records and agency information about past contamination. 37 Please refer to Section 6.3.5 for a discussion of procedures that would be followed in the 38 event of inadvertent discovery of contaminated soils. Please also see responses to Comments 39 DTSC-4 and DTSC-5. Therefore, the Hazardous Materials section of the Draft EIR is not 40 incomplete.

Response to Comment CCSC-39: As referenced in Draft EIR Section 3.12.1.4, a comprehensive review of available survey information pertaining to archaeological, paleontological, and historical resources was conducted. Included among these sources was historical aerial photography (pages 3.12-4 through 3.12-8 of the Draft EIR). In addition, Native American consultation was conducted. Finally, a comprehensive survey of the Project site and vicinity was conducted by a qualified cultural resources specialist. Both the survey of potential

resources and their evaluation for potential impacts followed generally accepted procedures
 and protocols. Therefore, the Cultural Resources section of the Draft EIR is not inadequate.

Response to Comment CCSC-40: Please see response to Comment CCSC-39. In addition, the Port of Long Beach included a Special Condition for inadvertent discovery of cultural materials (see Section 6.3.6). This Special Condition would be implemented by the selected contractor(s) responsible for Project construction. The information noted in this section of the Draft EIR is intended to inform the public that, although significant impacts for the factors addressed in Section 6.3 have not been found, procedures would be in place to address issues that cannot be known until construction occurs. These Special Conditions, therefore,

- provide an additional level of protection above and beyond what the analysis has yielded.
 Information sufficient for review and comment by the public is provided in Draft EIR Section
- 11 Information 12 3.12.

13 **Response to Comment CCSC-41:** The commenter states that "ideal" criteria/parameters 14 were not included in the Project objectives, such as having a transfer yard between the 15 Alameda Corridor and Pier B. As described in the CEQA Guidelines, the Project objectives 16 help the lead agency develop a reasonable range of alternatives to evaluate in the EIR (CEQA) 17 Guidelines Section 15124). The proposed Project objectives are not intended to be limited to 18 a specific location for a rail yard, as suggested by the commenter, for a transfer facility 19 between the Alameda Corridor and Pier B. To maximize the use of on-dock rail, the objectives 20 of the proposed Project are outlined in Section 1.6 of the Draft EIR. 21 Although not required for purposes of the environmental analysis nor required under CEQA,

Although not required for purposes of the environmental analysis nor required under CEQA,
definitions for the following the commonly used terms "suitable," "ideal," "effective," and
"identification" as found in the Merriam-Webster Dictionary are provided below. The definition
of "on-dock" is available in Appendix F of the Draft EIR (Glossary of Terms).

- *suitable:* adaptable to a use or purpose
- *ideal:* exactly right for a particular purpose, situation, or person
- effective: producing a decided, decisive, or desired effect
- *identification:* the action of identifying someone or something or the fact of being identified

Measure M is Los Angeles County's plan to improve public transportation and ease traffic congestion. The Measure does not address freight transport. The Palmdale HDC has no connection to the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project or any other projects associated with Port operations. The HDC is a highway-passenger rail corridor alone and does not include the development of an inland logistics container facility.

1 11.2.3.12 Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation (GBMI)

GABRIELENO BAND OF MISSION INDIANS-KIZH NATION Historically known as The San Gabriel Band of Mission Indiana Recognized by the State of California as the aboriginal tribe of the Los Angeles basin Dear Heather A. Tomley Director of Environmental Planning Port of Long Beach Subject: Proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Port of Long Beach CA "The project locale lies in an area where the Ancestral & traditional territories of the Kizh(Kitc) Gabrieleño villages, adjoined and overlapped with each other, at least during the Late Prehistoric and Protohistoric Periods. The homeland of the Kizh (Kitc) Gabrieleños, probably the most influential Native American group in aboriginal southern California (Bean and Smith 1978a:538), was centered in the Los Angeles Basin, and reached as far east as the San Bernardino-Riverside area. The homeland of the Sernoros was primarily the San Bernardino Mountains, including the slopes and lowlands on the north and south flanks. Whatever the linguistic affiliation, Native Americans in and around the project area exhibited similar organization and resource procurement strategies. Villages were based on clan or lineage groups. Their home/ base sites are marked by midden deposits, often with bedrock mortars. During their GB-1 seasonal rounds to exploit plant resources, small groups would migrate within their traditional territory in search of specific plants and animals. Their gathering strategies often left behind signs of special use sites, usually grinding slicks on bedrock boulders, at the locations of the resources. Therefore, in order to protect our resources we're requesting one of our experienced & certified Native American monitors to be on site during any & all ground disturbances (this includes but is not limited to pavement removal, pot-holing or grubbing, auguring, boring, grading, excavation and trenching). In all cases, when the NAHC states there are "No" records of sacred sites" in the subject area; they always refer the contractors back to the Native American Tribes whose tribal territory the project area is in. This is due to the fact, that the NAHC is only aware of general information on each California NA Tribe they are "NOT " the "experts" on our Tribe. Our Elder Committee & Tribal Historians are the experts and is the reason why the NAHC will always refer GB-2 contractors to the local tribes. In addition, we are also often told that an area has been previously developed or disturbed and thus there are no concerns for cultural resources and thus minimal impacts would be expected. I have two major recent examples of how similar statements on other projects were proven very inadequate. An archaeological study claimed there would be no impacts to an area adjacent to the Plaza Church at Olvera Street, the original Spanish settlement of Los Angeles, now in downtown Los Angeles. In fact, this site was the Gabrieleno village of Yangna long before it became what it is now today. The new development wrongfully began their construction and they, in the process, dug up and desecrated 118 burials. The area that was dismissed as culturally sensitive was in fact the First Cemetery of Los Angeles where it had been GB-3 well documented at the Huntington Library that 400 of our Tribe's ancestors were buried there along with the founding families of Los Angeles (Pico's, Sepulveda's, and Alvarado's to name a few). In addition, there was another inappropriate study for the development of a new sports complex at Fedde Middle School in the City of Hawaiian Gardens could commence. Again, a village and burial site were desecrated despite their mitigation measures. Thankfully, we were able to work alongside the school district to quickly and respectfully mitigate a mutually beneficial resolution. Given all the above, the proper thing to do for your project would be for our Tribe to monitor ground disturbing construction work. Native American monitors and/or consultant can see that cultural resources are treated appropriately from the Native American point of view. Because we are the lineal descendants of the vast area of Los Angeles and Orange Counties, we hold sacred the ability to protect what little of our culture remains. We thank you for taking seriously your role and responsibility in assisting us in preserving our culture. GB-1 With respect, (Cont'd) Please contact our office regarding this project to coordinate a Native American Monitor to be present. Thank You Andrew Salas, Chairman Nadine Salas, Vice-Chairman Christina Swindall Martinez, secretar, Albert Perez, treasurer I Martha Gonzalez Lemos, treasurer II Richard Gradias, Chairman of the council of Elders www.gabrielenoindians@yahoo.com gabrielenoindians@yahoo.com POBox 393 Covina, CA 91723 RECEIVED JAN 0 9 2017

Andrew Salas, Chairman Cell (626) 926-4131

Addendum: clarification regarding some confusions regarding consultation under AB52:

AB52 clearly states that consultation must occur with tribes that claim traditional and cultural affiliation with a project site. Unfortunately, this statement has been left open to interpretation so much that neighboring tribes are claiming affiliation with projects well outside their traditional tribal territory. The territories of our surrounding Native American tribes such as the Luiseno, Chumash, and Cahuilla tribal entities. Each of our tribal territories has been well defined by historians, ethnographers, archaeologists, and ethnographers – a list of resources we can provide upon request. Often, each Tribe as well educates the public on their very own website as to the definition of their tribal boundaries. You may have received a consultation request from another Tribe. However we are responding because your project site lies within our Ancestral tribal territory, which, again, has been well documented. What does Ancestrally or Ancestral mean? The people who were in your family in past times, Of, belonging to, inherited from, or denoting an ancestor or ancestors http://www.thefreedictionary.com/ancestral. . If you have questions regarding the validity of the "traditional and cultural affiliation" of another Tribe, we urge you to contact the Native American Heritage Commission directly. Section 5 section 21080.3.1 (c) states "... the Native American Heritage area." In addition, please see the map below.

CC: NAHC



Port of Long Beach

1 Responses to Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation

2 Response to Comment GB-1: The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your review of the 3 Draft EIR and your comments concerning monitoring during ground disturbance. The Port has determined that site conditions do not warrant the need for archaeological monitoring during 4 5 construction. This is because the site is alluvium overlain by imported fill and has been 6 substantially altered by industrial activities (page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR). As stated on page 7 3.12-16 of the Draft EIR, Project construction has a low likelihood of encountering 8 archaeological resources at this site. Furthermore, the proposed Project would implement the 9 Special Condition described in Draft EIR Section 6.3.7.1 for inadvertent discovery of 10 archaeological materials.

11 **Response to Comment GB-2:** This comment is not a comment on the Draft EIR, but rather reflects the commenter's opinion about the practices of the Native American Heritage 12 13 Commission (NAHC). The NOP for the Draft EIR for the proposed Project was submitted to 14 the NAHC on August 20, 2009, to initiate consultation with culturally affiliated tribal groups in 15 the Project area. In a letter dated August 28, 2009, the NAHC indicated a search of the Sacred Lands File did not indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources within the 16 17 Project area of influence. Notification letters were sent to culturally affiliated tribal groups in August 2009; one letter was received on August 27, 2009, from John Tommy Rosas of the 18 19 Tongva Ancestral Territorial Tribal Nation (no response was received from this tribe in 20 2016/2017). In December 2016, the POLB obtained an updated list of tribes culturally affiliated 21 to the Project area from the NAHC and provided notification of the Project to these tribes. 22 including the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation. To date, no tribal cultural 23 information concerning the Project area has been received from any tribal groups.

24 **Response to Comment GB-3:** The POLB thanks you for your comment and appreciates this 25 information on the two referenced projects. The Port shares the concern for protection of 26 cultural resources, and includes a Special Condition for inadvertent discovery of 27 archaeological materials or human remains for all its construction projects. In this instance. 28 the Port does not anticipate that construction activities would encounter tribal resources 29 because the site is comprised of imported fill. Additionally, this Project would implement the 30 Special Condition described in Section 6.3.7.1 for inadvertent discovery of archaeological 31 materials. The Pier B Rail Yard site has a low probability of encountering archaeological 32 resources due to its history and physical condition. This particular condition is different from 33 the two referenced projects, one of which was in an area of known cultural activity (Olvera 34 Street).

35 Response to Comment GB-4: AB 52 (Gatto; Native Americans: California Environmental 36 Quality Act) applies to projects that have a NOP or a Notice of Negative Declaration Filed or 37 Mitigated Negative Declaration on or after July 1, 2015. The NOP for the proposed Pier B On-38 Dock Rail Support Facility was posted by the State Clearinghouse on August 24, 2009. Even 39 though AB 52 does not apply to the proposed Project for this reason, the Port undertook 40 outreach to Native American groups. The Port obtained the appropriate list of tribes culturally 41 affiliated to the Project area from the NAHC, provided notification to these tribes including the 42 Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation, and has not received any consultation 43 requests from other Tribes that claim affiliation to the Project area. The intent of AB 52 is to 44 ensure that local and tribal governments, public agencies, and project proponents have 45 information available early in the CEQA environmental review process for purposes of 46 identifying and addressing potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources and to reduce

1 the potential for delay and conflicts in the environmental review process. The Port followed a 2 process comparable to the process required by AB 52 for outreach to Native American groups 3 with cultural affiliation to the Project area by providing notification of the proposed Project to 4 five tribal groups identified by the NAHC; no tribal cultural information was received. As stated 5 in responses to Comments GBMI-1 and GBMI-3, the Port does not anticipate that construction 6 activities would encounter tribal resources because the site is comprised of imported fill. 7 Additionally, this Project would implement the Special Condition described in Section 6.3.7.1 for inadvertent discovery of archaeological materials. For these reasons, the Port has 8 9 determined that site conditions do not warrant the need for archaeological monitoring at this 10 time.

1 **11.2.3.13 Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)**

From: Pettit, David [mailto:dpettit@nrdc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 12:38 PM
To: Tomley, Heather; Cameron, Rick
Cc: Pettit, David
Subject: Question on Pier B project
7
Hi. Can you tell me whether the Pier B railyard project will be able to handle containers from the Port of LA?
Thanks.
David
David Pettit
Senior Attorney
Natural Resources Defense Council
(310) 434-2300
www.nrdc.org
Follow me on Twitter @TeamAir
From: Pattit David [mailto:doattit@arda.org]
Sant: Vednesda December 21 2016 11:11 AM
To: Tomiey, Heather
Cc: Siyasubramanian, Ramya; Pettit, David
Subject: Pler B DEIR
Heather, I'm starting to read through the DEIR for the Pier B on-dock rail project. Can you tell me what assumptions are
made about SCIG, the proposed ICTF expansion, and the movement of China Shipping / COSCO business from POLA to
POLB?
Thanks.
Devid.
David
David Pottit
Sovie Fett
Service Resources Defense Council
(310) A3A-3300
lovel parago
Endlow man an Twitter @TeamAir
ronowine on routed by realized

2

3 Responses to Natural Resources Defense Council

4 **Response to Comment NRDC-1:** Thank you for your review of the Draft EIR. While the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility is primarily intended to directly support the on-5 dock rail yards at the POLB marine terminals, improvements to the facility would also improve 6 overall shipping efficiencies at the POLB and the POLA. Pier B can efficiently move cargo 7 within San Pedro Bay, which benefits both the POLA and POLB and eases rail congestion. 8 However, Pier B does not ordinarily handle containers from POLA terminals. PHL, the 9 10 switching rail line that serves the two Ports, would be the primary operator of the Pier B On-11 Dock Rail Facility. On occasion, PHL could move train segments containing containers from the POLA to assemble into complete trains at the Pier B On-Dock Rail Facility. 12

13 Response to Comment NRDC-2: The cumulative impact analysis in the Draft EIR was 14 prepared with the assumption that the Southern California International Gateway (SCIG)

1 project (estimated 16 additional trains per day) could occur at some time in the future; that 2 project was identified as a related project, as shown in Table 2.1-1 of the Draft EIR; however, 3 it is not possible to accurately predict if or when that project would be constructed or 4 operational given the ongoing litigation involving that project. The proposed Intermodal 5 Container Transfer Facility (ICTF) expansion (13 additional trains per day) and China Shipping 6 development at Berths 97 - 109 of POLA (approximately 3 additional trains per week) were 7 also included as related projects. Improvements at the China Shipping terminal are included in assumptions about terminal future throughput. The cumulative impact analysis presented 8 9 in the Draft EIR did not assume that businesses would shift their operations from POLA to 10 POLB.

1 11.2.3.14 Sierra Club, Angeles Chapter (SCAC)

March 13, 2017

TO:	Heather Tomley, Director of Environmental Planning
	Port of Long Beach, 4801 Airport Plaza Drive, Long Beach, CA 90815
	heather.tomley@polb.com

FROM: Dr. Jim Stewart (DrJimStewart@gmail.com) 213-820-4345, On behalf of the residents of the West Long Beach Area Steve Wicke, Chair, Climate Change Committee, Angeles Chapter, Sierra Club

Commenters

Dr. Jim Stewart lives at 1720 Chestnut Street, Long Beach, CA 90813, about a mile from the Pier B project. His comments are prepared on behalf of the ~50,000 people who live in West Long Beach and adjacent neighborhoods. The vast majority of these residents are minority and low income residents, therefore environmental justice considerations apply. These residents have long suffered from the negative impact of the pollution and noise from the trucks and trains to and from the Ports.

Dr. Stewart is a sustainability consultant with expertise in analysis of greenhouse gas emissions, waste and energy issues. He has served on the SCAG Transportation Technical Advisory Committee and the SCAQMD Air Quality Management Plan Advisory Committee. He worked for many years as Associate Director of the Southern California Council on Environment and Development and Executive Director of People for Parks. He also has been co-chair of the Sierra Club California Energy Climate Committee for nearly ten years. Previously he was a professor of physics and published papers in nuclear and chemical physics. His academic credentials include a B.S. in Physics from Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, an M.S. and PhD in Physics from Yale University, and an M.S. in Urban Studies from Southern California State University.

Steve Wicke is Chair of the Climate Change Committee, Angeles Chapter, Sierra Club.

General Comments

Comments below clearly demonstrate some inadequacies and significant incompleteness found in the current Draft EIR, please withdraw, revise, and recirculate the DEIR and provide a thorough revision of the EIR. We are available for further review and assistance through an ongoing public participation in this project development and implementation in an environmental sensitive and sustainable manner.

The project exceeds temporary air emission regulations during construction and also exceeds NOx emissions during operation. The construction phase will also increase noise in the area and the increase in trains will increase pollution and noise from trains in the area forever. Currently the train horns during the night keep nearby residents awake, which is unhealthy. The EIR claims "There are no additional feasible mitigation measures identified for Project operation at present." This is unacceptable.

2

SCAC-2

SUBJECT: Comments on Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project, SCH# 200981079 <u>Draft EIR</u> and Appendices

o mitigate those problems, the residents of the West Long Beach area request the following:]
. NOISE: A complete end to all train warning sounds audible (>45 dBA) beyond 100 feet of the train tracks.	
We who live in the West Long Beach area and hear the sounds of the train horns all night are completely confused by the EIR, which contains seemingly erroneous statements, such as p. ES-15, "The expected noise levels from railroad operations would be lower than ambient noise levels at all of the sensitive receptors. Because of this, no exceedances of either the COLB or COLA standards would occur. Impacts from rail yard operations would be less than significant, and mitigation is not required."	-SCAC-3
p. 3.8-6, "Trains leaving the Pier B rail yard do not have any at-grade crossings and horns are not sounded on approach to and within the Alameda Corridor."	
hese statements seem to imply that there are no train horns currently, but all of us who live in the West Long Beach area hear them all night long.]
Ve are pleased that Fig. 3.8-5 Increase in Overall Noise Levels Allowed by FTA Criteria shows that noise exposure can only increase by a few decibels to have no impact, especially for "Category 2: Residences and buildings where people normally sleep. This category includes homes, hospitals, and hotels where a nighttime sensitivity to noise is assumed to be of utmost importance." Yet this criterion is not applied.	SCAC-4
. 3.8-11 states: "FRA operating rules (Part 222; Title 49) prescribe that train horns must be sounded for warning purposes as trains approach at-grade rail crossings. There are no at-grade crossings encountered by trains leaving the Pier B Rail Yard and traveling northwesterly to the entrance of the Alameda Corridor. Because the Alameda Corridor is completely grade separated between its southern entrance point just west of the Dominguez Channel and its northern exit point in downtown Los Angeles, the use of train horns is not required for trains operating within the Corridor. The one exception to this would be when rail work is being conducted on an adjacent track; such use would be sufficiently infrequent to not be considered a source of impact for purposes of this analysis. Train horn sounding would not occur in that area because there are no at-grade crossings in the reach between the western exit of the Pier B Rail Yard and the southern entrance to the Alameda Corridor."	-SCAC-
et there are plenty of train horns now. And Appendix C, p. C-22 projects an increase from current 3.9 to 14.4 trains per day, a net increase of 10.5 trains per day, which could result in a vast increase in train horn sounds. In addition, we are concerned there could also potentially be train horns used on the locomotives making up longer trains, unless prohibited.	
ppendix D on Noise ignores the noise of the train horns.	SCAC-6
herefore, we believe the EIR must be reissued with a study of the noise of the train horns (especially those during the night), both current levels and projected future levels under the various project alternatives.	
he additional EIR study must determine the health impacts of current and projected train warning sounds.	-SCAC-
his additional EIR could be avoided by the guarantee that no train horns will be used anywhere in the West Long Beach area, whether or not they are associated with the Pier B project.	



1 *Responses to Sierra Club, Angeles Chapter*

Response to Comment SCAC-1: The Port of Long Beach appreciates your review of the
 Draft EIR and notes the information provided regarding Dr. Stewart. Regarding the general
 comment in the last paragraph of the comment letter, please see the responses to the specific

5 comments below. However, the comments do not establish the need to recirculate the EIR.

6 **Response to Comment SCAC-2:** Regarding the portion of the comment relating to air quality. 7 as stated in Section 3.2 (Air Quality, page 3.2-5 of the Draft EIR), the Port would implement 8 five mitigation measures to address construction emissions that exceed SCAQMD thresholds. 9 With implementation of mitigation measures, impacts to CO and NO_X would remain significant during all construction phases for the 12th Street Alternative; the federal 1-hour standard for 10 NO₂ would be exceeded, and this would also be a significant impact. Similarly, operational air 11 quality impacts from CO and NO_x, and the federal 1-hour standard for NO₂ would be exceeded 12 with implementation of regulatory and CAAP measures to reduce air pollutant emissions. 13 14 Feasible mitigation has been applied in all instances in which it is available and effective. 15 Despite an exhaustive investigation of potential mitigation, the Port is not aware of additional 16 feasible mitigation measures. 17 With regard to noise, the temporary increase in noise from construction activities would not

18 exceed applicable COLB or COLA noise criteria; therefore, it is not considered to be a 19 significant impact. Operation of any of the Project alternatives would not require horn 20 soundings beyond the perimeter of the yard as trains either arrive from or depart to the 21 Alameda Corridor. Operations on the Alameda Corridor would not require horn soundings 22 because the corridor is completely grade separated. Grade crossings occur on the regional 23 rail network to the east beyond the downtown Class I rail yards; horn soundings would occur 24 there in accordance with safety requirements. On some occasions, horns would be sounded 25 within the yard for safety reasons. Elimination of the at-grade rail crossing at 9th Street and 26 Pier B Street would eliminate horn soundings at that location. Noise from the operation of 27 additional trains from the Pier B Rail Yard would not exceed applicable noise criteria defined 28 on pages 3.8-15 and 3.8-16 of the Draft EIR. The comment has not identified any particular 29 issue with the noise analysis in the Draft EIR.

30 Response to Comment SCAC-3: The comment requests "a complete end to all train warning 31 sounds audible (>45 dBA [A-weighted decibels]) beyond 100 feet of the train tracks." This 32 request is infeasible because locomotive horns are safety devices required by federal law to 33 produce a sound level of 96 to 110 dBA at 100 feet forward of the locomotive in its direction 34 of travel (CFR, Title 49, Subtitle B, Chapter II, Part 229, §229.129).

At present, five to seven trains per day arrive from and leave Pier B. This level of train traffic equates to approximately one train every 3.5 to 5 hours, on average. Assuming trains were evenly spaced over the 24-hour day, that would result in an average of two trains between the hours of 10:00 pm and 6:00 am. Given the high level of industrial and shipping activity in the harbor vicinity and the presence of at-grade rail crossings outside of the harbor complex, some or all of the horn noise cited by the commenter could come from sources other than the Pier B Rail Yard.

- Trains are federally required for reasons of safety to sound their horns (a) at at-grade crossings, and (b) to warn personnel working on adjacent tracks when train movements occur. At present, trains leaving the Pier B Rail Yard traverse no at-grade crossings as they enter the Alema de Carrider and the second dectine d for the Alema de Carrider and the second dectine d for the Alema de Carrider and the second dectine d for the Alema de Carrider and the second dectine d for the Alema de Carrider and the second dectine d for the Alema de Carrider and the second dectine d for the Alema de Carrider and the second dectine d for the Alema de Carrider and the second dectine d for the second d for the second dectine d for the second d for the
- 45 the Alameda Corridor; once trains leave the yard destined for the Alameda Corridor, there are

no grade crossings encountered. Therefore, there is no need for sounding horns once trains leave the yard (unless there is a need to signal to rail yard workers). The sounding of train horns to warn workers in the yard may occur, on an infrequent basis, but the noise from those horn soundings would be limited to the vicinity of the yard area. It is possible that the commenter is referring to horn noise from other railroad lines in the surrounding area that are not part of the proposed Project analyzed in the Draft EIR.

Response to Comment SCAC-4: While train horns may be audible due to their distinctive nature, they are typically of relatively short duration. Analysis in the Draft EIR indicates that operational noise sources directly associated with the proposed Project, including train horns, would not generate average or maximum noise levels that would be perceptible above ambient conditions. Hence, noise levels would comply with the City's standards. It is possible that the commenter is referring to horn noise from other railroad lines in the surrounding area that are not part of the proposed Project analyzed in the Draft EIR.

Train activity occurring within the Pier B Rail Yard could result in intermittent train horn sounding for railroad personnel safety purposes. As is also noted above, there are no at-grade crossings between the yard and the Alameda Corridor. It is possible that local train movements occurring elsewhere in the harbor vicinity could involve grade crossings in various locations that would require the sounding of horns, but those train movements would not result from nor be associated with Pier B activity.

20 The comment states that the FTA noise impact criteria were not applied. This is incorrect. 21 These criteria were incorporated into significance criteria NOISE-6. The FTA criteria, as 22 shown in Figure 3.8-5, were applied in the evaluation of noise impacts for the proposed Project 23 (see Section 3.8.2.1). As discussed on page 3.8-26, this noise criterion was applied to operation of trains along the Alameda Corridor. The increase in train activity from the proposed 24 25 Project was found to result in an increase in noise of less than 1 decibel (dB) (Leg and Ldn). As 26 discussed on page 3.8-26 of the Draft EIR, this increase in noise exposure is only one 27 component of the overall ambient noise environment. The less than 1-dB increase in noise 28 would result in a No Impact level of noise exposure in accordance with the chart in Figure 29 3.8-5. FTA criteria were applied for analysis of potential operational noise impacts along the 30 Alameda Corridor as trains travel across various cities. The FTA criteria (Figure 3.8-5) for the 31 residential category would not apply to the proposed Project because there are no residential 32 properties in the vicinity of the Project.

Response to Comment SCAC-5: As quoted in the comment and noted on page 3.8-11 of the Draft EIR, the Alameda Corridor is northwest of the Pier B Rail Yard, and there are no atgrade crossings between the yard and the Corridor that would require trains to routinely sound their horns. See response to Comment SCAC-3, which addresses this issue.

37 Current noise levels in the Alameda Corridor area are shown in Draft EIR Table 3.8-1 for Sites 38 No. N29 and N32, which represent baseline noise along the Alameda Corridor. The comment 39 correctly notes that the proposed Project is projected to increase the number of trains by 10 40 trains per day. There would be no increase in train horn soundings associated with trains 41 containing multiple locomotives as horns are only sounded for at-grade crossings. The 42 additional trains generated by the proposed Project would not traverse any at-grade crossings 43 because trains either arrive at Pier B from or depart from Pier B to the Alameda Corridor, and 44 there are no at-grade crossings within the Alameda Corridor.

For purposes of potential noise impacts affecting sensitive uses near the proposed Project, however, more stringent and locally applicable significance criteria were applied (see criteria NOISE-3, NOISE-4, NOISE- 5, and NOISE-7). These criteria were used to evaluate potential noise impacts on the sensitive receptors identified in Draft EIR Table 3.8-1. As shown in Draft EIR Table 3.8-9, noise levels associated with activity in the rail yard are not projected to

6 exceed the impact significance criteria at any of the identified sensitive receptors.

7 Response to Comment SCAC-6: Appendix D (Noise) includes ambient noise measurement 8 data that encompasses all noise sources in the area, including horn noise. Train horn noise 9 associated with soundings within the yard was included in the ambient measurements. The ambient sound level, including horn noise, was used as a baseline, so noise from train horns 10 11 is reflected in the projections of future yard-related noise affecting the project area. As stated 12 in response to comment SEA-17, "in yard" activities, including horn soundings, were captured 13 on the noise meters used for collecting the ambient noise levels. The methodology employed 14 factored up ambient levels to reflect the proportionate increase in train activity within the yard. 15 Response to Comment SCAC-7: Train horns are included in the overall noise levels analyzed in the Draft EIR based on recognized standards and thresholds. These standards 16

are developed by public agencies based on available data and evidence regarding the impacts of noise on humans. It is not feasible to guarantee that no train horns will be used anywhere in the West Long Beach area because locomotive horns are safety devices required by federal law to produce a sound level of 96 to 110 dBA at 100 feet forward of the locomotive in its direction of travel (CFR, Title 49, Subtitle B, Chapter II, Part 229, §229.129). The Port believes the analysis of noise impacts is sufficient to justify a less-than-significant impact finding; therefore, reissuance of the EIR would not be necessary.

Health impacts resulting from noise exposure would not require exposure of very high noise levels over significant periods. Because the Draft EIR documents a finding of less-thansignificant impact in accordance with local regulations, such extreme exposure would not occur; therefore, health effects also would not occur.

28 Response to Comment SCAC-8: The comment includes a request that "all train horns must 29 be forever silenced in all trains from the Port of Long Beach, including any trains related to 30 the Intermodal Container Transfer Facility (ICTF)." This request extends beyond the impacts 31 of this Project. Trains are normally required to sound their horns at at-grade crossings of public 32 highways for safety purposes; trains also test their horns periodically. These activities are not 33 under the jurisdiction of the POLB. The FRA is the agency that has jurisdiction over train horn usage. The FRA has a procedure for creating a Quiet Zone entitled Guidance on the Quiet 34 Zone Creation Process (FRA, 2012). The West Long Beach community could follow this 35 36 procedure to establish a Quiet Zone. Creation of a Quiet Zone is a separate process that is 37 not proposed as part of the proposed Project. If such a Quiet Zone was established, this would 38 address both Project and non-project train noise near Pier B; trains would no longer routinely 39 sound their horns at at-grade road crossings. Even in a Quiet Zone, however, trains still would 40 sound their horns as needed to warn workers on adjacent tracks.

41 **Response to Comment SCAC-9:** Please see the following responses to comments from
 42 CARB regarding mitigation measure feasibility: CARB-7 (locomotives), CARB-8 (refrigerated
 43 containers), and CARB-9 (locomotive refueling and brake testing).

Response to Comment SCAC-10: Please see response to Comment CCSC-7 and Master
 Response – Electrification of Alameda Corridor and Zero Emissions Locomotives. The

Port of Long Beach

1 comment suggests that the proposed Project would add an "initial" 10 trains per day and 2 suggests that by 2040 it would add 24 trains per day. This is incorrect. At buildout, the

3 proposed Project would add an estimated 10 additional trains per day.

4 **Response to Comment SCAC-11:** The commenter notes that, due in part to sea level rise, 5 the Project site could occasionally be flooded in the future. The elevation of the Project site is 6 +7.8 feet above MLLW, while MSL is +0.83 feet above MLLW; therefore, the risk of flooding 7 would be minimal. Compared to year 2000 levels, sea level rise projections for the POLB region include: 0.13 to 0.98 feet by 2030; 0.39 to 2.0 feet by 2050; and 1.38 to 5.48 feet by 8 9 2100 (refer to Section 3.14 of the Draft EIR). Although it is possible that future sea level rise could contribute to equipment damage and temporary closure at the Project site, this effect 10 11 would not constitute a significant impact on the environment, as defined under CEQA.

2

1 11.2.3.15 Sierra Club, Long Beach Area Group (SCLB)



3 Responses to Sierra Club, Long Beach Area Group

Response to Comment SCLB-1: The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your review of the Draft EIR.

6 Local residents, local workers, and visitors would experience some delays due to short- and 7 long-term street closures under each of the alternatives as depicted in Figure 3.5-5 and Table 3.5-9 for the 12th Street Alternative (also see Figure 3.5-6 and Table 3.5-14 for the 10th Street 8 Alternative, and Figure 3.5-7 and Table 3.5-16 for the 9th Street Alternative). Access to Anaheim 9 Street for local businesses would continue to be provided after completion of the proposed 10 Project. It is understood that idling vehicles contribute to air pollutants. The emissions from 11 12 idling vehicles were considered and are included in the evaluation of air pollutants. 13 Please see Master Response – Street Closures, Access to Downtown Long Beach and Public

- Services Access. **Response to Comment SCLB-2:** The Port has already imposed all feasible measures for
 construction and operation of the proposed Project. The comment does not suggest any
 specific additional mitigation other than referencing zero emission trains. As explained in
 Master Response Electrification of Alameda Corridor and Zero Emission Locomotives,
- imposing a requirement for zero emission trains would not be feasible. As discussed in Section 3.2, starting on page 3.2-35, the Port has imposed several mitigation measures that would reduce emissions associated with Project construction, including use of on-road heavy-duty construction trucks that meet EPA 2010 emission standards and the use of Tier 4 off-road
- 23 construction equipment.
- 24 Please see the following responses to comments from CARB regarding operational mitigation
- measure feasibility: CARB-7 (locomotives), CARB-8 (refrigerated containers), and CARB-9
 (locomotive refueling and brake testing).
- Response to Comment SCLB-3: Please see Master Response Electrification of Alameda
 Corridor and Zero Emission Locomotives.

1 **11.2.3.16 Wilmington Neighborhood Council (WNC)**

From: Valerie Contreras [mailto:valcwnc@gmail.com]	
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2017 1:55 PM	
Subject: Pier B Rail expansion project for on-Dock rail support facility-deadline March, 13 4:30 pm.	
Director of Environmental Planning, Heather Tomley:	
Please see attached signatures acquired at our Wilmington Neighborhood Council meeting. We had low attendance but many people have voiced their concerns about the community impact this project will have on our residents and stakeholders.	
We ask that you consider the entire community who might not have been able to attend this very important meeting.	WNC-1
We thank your taking the time to carefully consider the negative impact that we already deal with in our area. It is too much to expand this project by 42 tracks. I'm sure you would not approve if your family lived in and around this type of facility.	
We strongly oppose this project altogether.	
Best Regards,	
Valerie Contreras, co-Chair	
Wilminaton Neighborhood Council	
544 N. Avalon Blvd., Suite 103.	
Wilmington, CA 90744,	
Office: 310-522-2013	
Email: wilmingtonNC@empowerlala.org/valcwnc@gmail.com	
Web: www.wilmingtonneighborhoodcouncil.com	

WILMINGTON CALIFORNIA			
	PETITION AGAINST THE		
On-Dock Rail Expansio	n for Pier B in Long Beach	, California 2/22/17	
Port of Long Beach - I do not suppo along Anaheim Street and the 710 f California.	rt the proposed expansion of the exist freeway which flows through my comm	ng Pier B rail facility located nunity of Wilmington,	
I am signing this to express my cond community and environment.	cerns about the negative impact this ra	il expansion will have on our	
It is my wish that the port of Long B the following.	It is my wish that the port of Long Beach WOULD <u>NOT</u> expand the existing rail facility for pier B due to the following.		
1. Increased Noise pollution			
2. Increased traffic dread-lock at rail crossing in our community in Wilmington, CA WNC-2			- WNC-2
3. Longer wait time at rail crossing because these rail cars will buckle/unbuckle in our area.			
4. Daily inconveniences and problem	4. Daily inconveniences and problems with the flow of traffic to and from the port of LA/LB.		
5. Potential long term health effects of too many rail facilities in our area from this expansion. The environmental study proves the impact is substantial to our health.			
6. Reduce ease of access to our nei	6. Reduce ease of access to our neighborhood/homes.		
7. Reduce the value of our homes a	nd business.		
We urge the Board of Harbor Comm	nissioners to consider this petition.	· -]
PRINT NAME	ADDRESS	SIGNATURE	
Steven Contreras	216 East "11" 5t	the Atas	

win

POBRELE

LOCAL

Address

1203 Hyat the

13

1

1

in

Print Name

do

Maiting

Arnedor

n

Signature

en

LA

Port of Long Beach

1 Responses to Wilmington Neighborhood Council

2 Response to Comment WNC-1: The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your comment and 3 review of the Draft EIR. The proposed Project includes railroad improvements within the community of Wilmington in an area that is entirely within an industrial zone where no schools 4 or libraries are located. The proposed Project, if approved, would not "expand this project by 5 42 tracks" as stated in your letter. To clarify, the 12th Street Alternative (proposed Project) 6 would result in the existing railroad of 12 tracks expanding by 31 new tracks within the Pier B 7 8 Rail Yard (not in Wilmington) and 5 new arrival/departure tracks. On the Wilmington side of the proposed Project, the rail line would be expanded by one track. For the 10th Street 9 10 Alternative, the existing railroad would be expanded by 19 new tracks within the Pier B Rail 11 Yard (not in Wilmington) and 3 new arrival/departure tracks within the POLB.

Response to Comment WNC-2: The Port acknowledges your opposition to the proposed Project. Since receipt of comments on the Draft EIR, the POLB engineers have continued preliminary design efforts to refine and reduce the scope of the proposed Project in the Wilmington area. (See Chapter 1 of the Final EIR for additional details). Regarding the numbered points in the petition, the Port responds as follows:

- The Draft EIR found that increased noise associated with the proposed Project would not exceed applicable noise standards; therefore, it would not constitute a significant impact (see Section 3.8 of the Draft EIR).
- The proposed Project would remove the existing at-grade rail crossing at 9th Street, which
 is in the COLB. Trains that pass through the proposed Project would not travel through
 any at-grade rail crossings between the on-dock rail support facility and the Alameda
 Corridor. There are no at-grade railroad crossings located in Wilmington associated with
 the Project. For this reason, the proposed Project would not contribute to increased
 gridlock in this community.
- 26 3. Rail cars associated with the proposed Project would couple and decouple inside the Pier 27 B on-dock rail support facility, not in Wilmington. There are no at-grade rail crossings in 28 Wilmington that would be traversed by trains arriving and departing the proposed Project 29 site. There are other rail yards operated by Class I railroads that could potentially couple 30 and decouple rail cars in Wilmington; however, these rail cars are not within the control of 31 the proposed Project. The proposed Project would provide 5 new arrival/departure tracks 32 and 31 new storage tracks within the rail yard. These improvements would significantly improve train building efficiencies and reduce train building activities that are currently 33 34 occurring within the system in locations that were not originally designed or intended to be 35 used for staging, breaking down, and building trains.
- 36
 4. The traffic analysis conducted for the Draft EIR did not identify any significant impacts
 37 associated with construction or operation of the proposed Project (see Chapter 3.5 of the
 38 Draft EIR for details).
- The long-term health effects associated with the proposed Project and other past, present,
 and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the geographic vicinity of the Project have
 been addressed in Section 3.2.4.
- 42 6. The proposed Project would not result in any change in access to and from Wilmington.
 43 Because the proposed Project is in an industrial area, access to residences would not be
 44 affected. No changes to Anaheim Street would occur; this street would continue to provide

access to businesses in the Wilmington area. In addition, as explained in detail in Chapter
 1 of the Final EIR, POLB engineers have proposed refinements to the 12th Street
 Alternative and the 10th Street Alternative that would reduce the scope of the proposed
 Project in the Wilmington area.

5 7. The petition references reduction in property values. It should be noted that environmental 6 impacts required to be analyzed under CEQA do not typically include economic impacts 7 such as changes in property values or social impacts. CEQA Guidelines Section 15131(a) 8 states that "economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects 9 on the environment." Moreover, since receipt of the comments on the Draft EIR, Port engineers have proposed refinements to the 12th and 10th Street alternatives that would 10 reduce the scope of the proposed Project in the Wilmington area. As it relates to the 11 12 Wilmington area, the basic operations of the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support 13 Facility would be substantially similar to the existing facility; therefore, it is not expected 14 that property values would be adversely affected by the proposed Project.

1 **11.2.3.17** Allied Packing and Rubber, Inc. (APR)

PACKING & RUBBER, INC. January 30, 2017 Heather A. Tomley Director of Environmental Planning Port of Long Beach 4801 Airport Plaza Drive Long Beach, CA 90815 Dear Ms. Tomley, We are writing to you to express our concerns about the projected rail support facility. We are a small business that has been in business for over 50 years. A good portion of our business is customers who work in the area and come by to get sealing supplies for projects they are working on. This means we have a constant stream of traffic coming on to 11th street to visit our APR-1 facility. Along with customer traffic, we also have large trucks, commercial and UPS, bringing us material from all over the country. We have been trying to look at the proposal maps online, but are still unsure of exactly how we will be affected, but it looks like our street will be removed if we are reading it right. We attended the last public hearing in which they mentioned that building owners would be affected, but we did not hear about the relocation plans for the businesses affected. The meeting was heavily attended by Union Workers and there was little to no focus on APR-2 the existing businesses who have struggled for decades to build their customer bases here. We would like to voice our opposition to this proposal. Thank you for your time, Ben Deer Allied Packing and Rubber, Inc. 1335 West 11th St. • Long Beach, CA 90813-2714 • (562) 435-2411 • FAX: (562) 436-2140 RECEIVED FER -1

Responses to Comments

From: lisa@alliedpackingandrubber.com	
Date: 2/14/17 12:10 PM (GMT-08:00)	
Cc: Kurt And Sandy <kusaso@aol.com></kusaso@aol.com>	
Subject: Pier B Rail Support Facility	
Good morning Heather,	
We sent a letter with our comments, but our owner (who is cc'd on this email) has a few questions about the project as well	
I know there are currently not a lot of concrete answers before the EIR is approved, but these are the	
we have about the Pier B rail support facility construction for now.	APR-3
1. We are located between Fashion and Harbor on the north side of West 11th Street. By the looks of the simulation map, we are just outside of the 12th Street alternative's footprint. We just want to confirm that fact, and we are wondering about where the wall separating the tracks from 11th Street will fall?	
Even if we are autride of the main featurist, do they have plane to develop and (as we are load as d	
the land to the North and East of us for public green space or support facilities or will this particular area be efft untouched?	APR-4
3. Why were there 3 alternative plans in the first place? Are the 9th and 10th alternatives still being looked at?	APR-5
1. If we are forced to move, how will we be reimbursed for our property?	APR-6
5. When is the earliest they could possibly begin moving dirt on our street?	APR-7
5. If we are left intact, will the trains running so close to us and torn up roads make it impossible to conduct pusiness?	APR-8
. We are a supplier of industrial hose, gaskets, compression packing and related industrial fluid sealing and ransfer products	
In the Port, will there possibly be bidding opportunities in this project for us?	APR-9
Ben Deer and I will be in attendance at the meeting tomorrow, but per Ms. Teramoto's request, we are submitting these questions via email for consideration during the EIR'S approval process.	
Ve appreciate your time.	
Best regards,	
isa Olsen, with Ben Deer and Kurt Sorensen, Owner and President Illied Packing and Rubber, Inc.	
335 W. 11th Street	
ong Beach, CA 90813	
562) 435-2411	
Ne have a new website!!	
vww.AlliedPackingandRubber.com	

-		
	From: <u>sales@alliedpackingandrubber.com</u> [mailto:sales@alliedpackingandrubber.com] Sent: Monday, March 13, 2017 10:02 AM To: Tomley, Heather	
	Subject: Final comments by Allied Packing	
	Good morning Heather,	
	We have sent letters voicing our opposition to the Pier B Rail expansion, but wanted to add a serious concern that we have had since the meeting at Tepechi. It was there that we learned about the serious issue of the air pollution levels that are expected to occur during the construction project. If our building survives, we will be as close to the construction as anyone could possibly be, literally skirting along the outside track of the 12 th street alternative. This puts all of us here in danger of contracting pollution-based illnesses such as the respiratory problems COPD and asthma, along with an increased risk of lung cancer. This is a huge fear for us, especially hearing that the pollution levels will exceed the AQMD standards which are put in place to protect human lives. We have already had concerns with pollution before this project even came to our attention. Our former CFO, a wonderful woman, worked here for over 25 years, much of which was during the time when pollution levels were higher than they are now with the Port's recent stricter laws regarding clean air. Unfortunately, she contracted a rare blood disease, and it took her life. We have often wondered if the pollution here in the Port (which even your Port rep. admitted is among the worst, if not the worst in the country) had a part in her illness. And now we are told that if the project is approved, the pollution here will skyrocket. That is terrifying to us. We all have families who depend on us to be around for them. Please take this into consideration. We have all worked so hard to keep this business going, through the recession and the tough times following, struggling every single day to make it. Now this project threatens to kill our business through customer's inaccessibility due to road closures, and threatens to kill us with high levels of toxins in the air surrounding us, being on the frontline of the construction.	-APR-10
	Thank you for your time, Lisa Olsen	
	On behalf of all of the people working and living here at Allied Packing and Rubber on 11 th Street, trusting the Port of Long Beach to protect our lungs and our lives.	
	Allied Packing and Rubber, Inc. 1335 W. 11 th ST Long Beach, CA 90813 (562) 435-2411 Check out our website! <u>www.AlliedPackingandRubber.com</u>	

1

2 *Responses to Allied Packing and Rubber, Inc.*

Response to Comment APR-1: The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your comment and
 review of the Draft EIR. The Allied Packing and Rubber building is located at 1335 W. 11th
 Street. As discussed in Chapter 10 of the Final EIR, since release of the Draft EIR, the Port
 has continued the preliminary engineering design for the proposed Project and alternatives,

Responses to Comments

1 and has refined the boundaries of each of the alternatives. Allied Packing and Rubber is not 2 within the footprint of the proposed Project or any of the alternatives. Allied Packing and 3 Rubber would be approximately 50 feet north of the north yard perimeter road for the12th 4 Street Alternative, approximately 150 feet north of the north vard perimeter road for the 10th 5 Street Alternative, and approximately 670 feet north of the north yard perimeter road for the 6 9th Street Alternative. Under each of the alternatives, Allied Packing and Rubber would continue to have access via 11th Street, Fashion Avenue, and Harbor Avenue. Fashion 7 Avenue and Harbor Avenue would be closed south of Allied Packing and Rubber's connection 8 9 to 11th Street.

- The following summarizes the access to and from the Allied Packing and Rubber site for eachalternative:
- 12 Under the 12th Street Alternative, Allied Packing and Rubber would continue to have access via 11th Street, Fashion Avenue, and Harbor Avenue. This alternative would 13 eliminate 9th Street and 10th Street, so the direct connection to Pico Avenue would be 14 15 removed. Allied Packing and Rubber's customers coming from the Pico Avenue area would use the I-710 and Anaheim Street to reach Allied Packing and Rubber. This change 16 17 would add approximately 1 minute of travel time for a typical trip between the Allied Packing and Rubber site and businesses along Pico Avenue. For example, a trip that now 18 19 takes approximately 3 minutes would take approximately 4 minutes using I-710. A non-20 freeway alternative route to the Port (Pico Avenue) is available via Anaheim Street going west to Farragut Avenue, Anaheim Way, and Pier B Street. Travel time would vary 21 22 depending on traffic conditions.
- The10th Street Alternative would result in no change to 11th Street between Harbor and Fashion avenues, and both Harbor and Fashion Avenues would continue to provide access to the north. With the elimination of 9th and 10th streets, there would be no direct connection to Pico Avenue (the same non-freeway alternative route would be available).
 Access and travel time to and from the Pico Avenue area would be the same as for the 12th Street Alternative.
- The 9th Street Alternative would result in no change to 11th Street between Fashion and Canal avenues. This alternative would allow travel along West 9th and West 10th streets, but neither of these roads would connect to Pico Avenue. Access and travel time to Pico Avenue businesses would be via I-710 (the same non-freeway alternative route would be available).
- 34 Under each potential scenario, significant impacts to access would not occur.
- **Response to Comment APR-2:** Allied Packing and Rubber's opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record. However, there is no reason to believe that approval of the proposed Project or any of its alternatives would affect Allied Packing and Rubber's operations or its clients' ability to get to and from the business. As described above, it may add approximately one minute of travel time for a customer coming from the Pico Avenue area.
- Allied Packing and Rubber, 1335 W. 11th Street, is physically located on 11th Street, which would be closed west of Harbor Avenue. The commenter's business currently has access to the front of the building via 11th Street; access to the rear of the building is available along the alley south of the buildings along 12th Street. The commenter's business would continue to access Harbor Avenue (north) via its intersection with 11th Street. Harbor Avenue would be closed to the south of 11th Street. The commenter would also have access to Fashion Avenue.

1 Thus, access to Anaheim Street would continue to be available via Harbor Avenue and 2 Fashion Avenue.

If the proposed Project or one of its alternatives is approved, and if the decision is made to acquire property, all appropriate steps would be followed, including the preparation of relocation plans. This would not apply to the commenter's business, because it is outside of the Project footprint under all scenarios. No relocation plans have been prepared at this time. Please see Master Response – Property Acquisition, Compensation, and Relocation.

8 Response to Comment APR-3: The Port thanks you for your additional comments and 9 review of the Draft EIR. As described in response to Comment APR-1, Allied Packing and 10 Rubber is not within the footprint of the proposed Project or any of its alternatives. Based on 11 preliminary engineering design, a perimeter fence for the 12th Street Alternative would be 12 constructed from just south of the intersection of 11th Street and Harbor Avenue to 10th Avenue 13 just west of Fashion Avenue.

Response to Comment APR-4: The areas to the east and west of Allied Packing and Rubber are not within the footprint of the proposed Project or any of its alternatives. As part of the final engineering design process, adding greenspace where it would not increase the amount of property acquisition, or negatively impact traffic circulation or vehicular access, would be evaluated.

Response to Comment APR-5: Three alternatives to the proposed Project were evaluated
 in the Draft EIR to provide a range of reasonable ways to meet Project needs and objectives.
 CEQA requires that a lead agency study a reasonable range of alternatives as part of the EIR
 process. All of the alternatives will be presented for consideration by the BHC.

Response to Comment APR-6: For the reasons stated in response to Comment APR-1, it is not anticipated that the commenter's business would be required to close or relocate. For a general description as to how the procedures would work for other properties that may be within the Project footprint, see Master Response – Property Acquisition, Compensation, and Relocation.

Response to Comment APR-7: If the proposed Project is approved and all the necessary steps are taken, construction would occur to the south of 11th Street. If one of the alternatives is approved, the construction would be farther to the south. No construction activities would occur until certification of the Final EIR by the BHC, Project approval, final design, preparation and approval of relocation plans, and completion of the property acquisition process in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. Property owners and operators near the Project site would be notified when construction would begin.

Response to Comment APR-8: Regardless of which alternative is selected and approved,
 the proposed Project would not result in torn up roads that would make it impossible for Allied
 Packing and Rubber to conduct business.

The property at 1335 W. 11th Street, is approximately 820 feet from the nearest, existing railroad track at the Pier B Rail Yard. The property would be approximately 50 feet north of the rail yard access road and approximately 142 feet north of the nearest railroad tracks for the 12th Street Alternative. If the 10th Street Alternative is approved and constructed, the property would be approximately 150 feet north of the rail yard access road and approximately 230 feet north of the nearest tracks. 1 Changes to the roadways surrounding Allied Packing and Rubber were described in the 2 response to Comment APR-1.

Roadways would not be left in a 'torn-up' condition. No changes are proposed for West 11th
Street between Fashion Avenue and Harbor Street; the West 10th Street intersection with
Fashion Avenue would be changed into a cul-de-sac that would be adjacent to the proposed
rail yard access road. Access to the Allied Packing and Rubber property would not be affected.
For these reasons, the Port does not believe these physical changes would be incompatible
to continued business activities at Allied Packing and Rubber.
Please see Master Persponse. Street Cleasures. Access to Dewntown Long People and Public

9 Please see Master Response – Street Closures, Access to Downtown Long Beach, and Public
 10 Services Access.

Response to Comment APR-9: Bidding opportunities with the Port for this Project would be open to all qualified vendors and suppliers. Prospective bidders can visit the Port's Online Procurement System (PlanetBids [PB System]), which allows interested suppliers, contractors, and service providers to register online to receive automated e-mail notifications of solicitations for goods and services pertinent to their business. The Port's PB System can be accessed online at the following link: *polb.com/economics/contractors/default.asp.*

Response to Comment APR-10: Air pollutant emissions and health effects were evaluated in Section 3.2.3.4 of the Draft EIR for the 12th Street Alternative (Proposed Project). With implementation of mitigation measures to reduce construction and operational emissions of toxic air contaminants, the individual cancer risk of each alternative would be less than significant.

22 This comment pertains to air pollution levels at the commenter's business location that would 23 occur during proposed Project construction, due to the proximity of the business to the Project site. The two closest receptor points to this business that were evaluated by the dispersion 24 25 model for the EIR are located about 20 feet north and 25 feet south of the business. Table 26 11.2-10, below, shows the highest modeled criteria pollutant and health risk impacts at these two receptor points associated with the mitigated proposed Project. The table shows that the 27 28 peak 1-hour NO₂ concentrations would exceed both the state and federal thresholds during 29 Project construction. All other criteria pollutant and health risk impacts during construction and 30 operation would be less than the thresholds at this location. This result is consistent with the 31 conclusions and information contained in the Draft EIR, as well as the analysis of the proposed 32 Project with the refined boundary presented in response to Comment AQMD-5.

33 The peak 1-hour NO₂ impacts of 364 μ g/m³ (state) and 266 μ g/m³ (federal) would occur during Phase 3 of construction. Emissions from Project construction would contribute only about 30 34 35 percent to these impacts; the background concentration would contribute the remaining 70 36 percent. Moreover, these predicted concentrations are conservative, and would occur very 37 infrequently, if at all, because the analysis assumes all construction equipment would operate 38 simultaneously during worst-case meteorological conditions (i.e., low wind speed, optimum wind direction, and very stable atmosphere), concurrent with the highest observed 39 40 background concentrations measured at the Superblock monitoring station over a 3-year 41 period. Most of the 1-hour NO₂ concentrations during Project construction would be much 42 lower than the peak values, as evidenced by the much lower annual average NO₂ 43 concentration, which is an average of all 1-hour concentrations during the worst-case year.

	TABLE 11.2-10 MODELED AIR POLLUTANT IMPACTS NEAR 1335 W. 11 [™] STREET (MITIGATED PROPOSED PROJECT)			
	Description Modeled Impact ¹ Significance Threshold Significant?			
	C	riteria Pollutants Durin	g Construction ²	
	1-Hour (state)	364	339	Yes
NO ₂	1-Hour (federal)	266	188	Yes
	Annual	56.7	57.0	No
<u> </u>	1-Hour	4,276	23,000	No
0	8-Hour	3,403	10,000	No
DM	24-Hour	3.1	10.4	No
PIVI10	Annual	0.3	1.0	No
PM _{2.5}	24-Hour	1.2	10.4	No
		Criteria Pollutants Duri	ing Operation ³	
	1-Hour (state)	238	339	No
NO ₂	1-Hour (federal)	181	188	No
	Annual	54.0	57.0	No
<u> </u>	1-Hour	3,956	23,000	No
0	8-Hour	3,130	10,000	No
DM	24-Hour	<0 5	2.5	No
PIVI10	Annual	<0	1.0	No
PM _{2.5}	24-Hour	<0	2.5	No
	н	ealth Risks (Constructi	on + Operation) ⁴	
Individua	I Cancer Risk	2.6 × 10-6	10 × 10 ⁻⁶	No
Chronic Hazard Index		0.007	1.0	No
8-Hour C	hronic Hazard Index	0.02	1.0	No
Acute Ha	azard Index	0.2	1.0	No
Notes:				

¹ NO₂ and CO impacts are the modeled project increment plus observed background. All other impacts are the modeled project increment.

 2 $\,$ The highest impacts from all three phases of construction are shown.

³ The highest impacts from all three operational analysis years (2020, 2025, 2035) are shown.

⁴ Health risk values reflect occupational exposure assumptions and include emissions from both construction and operation.

⁵ A PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5} impact <0 means the concentration would decrease relative to the CEQA baseline (existing) conditions.

1 **11.2.3.18 Berns Bros., Inc. (BBI)**

Mark Goshgarian John A. Marshall Merak Eskigian Mark S. Reusch	GOSHGARIAN & Professional Law 23901 Calabasas R Calabasas, Califor Telephone (81 Fax (818) 5	& MARSHALL Corporation (oad, Suite 2073 mia 91302-1542 8) 591-9000 91-0810	
	March 13	, 2017	
Heather Director Port of D 4801 Airp Long Beac	A. Tomley of Environmental Planning Long Beach port Plaza Drive ch, California 90815	BY FAX AND EMAIL (562) 283-7148 heather.tomley@polb.com	
Re:	<u>Property Address</u> :	1700 West Anaheim Street, Long Beach, CA, and described as Lots 1-22, inclusive, of Block 2, Long Beach Harbor tract in the City of Beach as per maps recorded in Book 10, Page 142 of Maps (the "Property")	
	My Client :	Berns Bros., Inc.	
	<u>Subject</u> :	Comments and Objection to Port of Long Beach Pier B On-Dock Rail Facility Project and any projects relating thereto	
Dear Ms.	Tomley:		
Plea ("Berns") is the fe	se be advised that my fir in connection with the Pr e owner of the Property.	m represents Berns Bros., Inc., operty referred to above. Berns	
Bern being cor effect th W. Anahei Jackson A owned the	Berns is advised that substantial changes/improvements are being considered by the Port of Long Beach ("POLB") which may effect the Property. The Property referred to above is located on W. Anaheim Street, and is surrounded by 12 th Street to the south, Jackson Ave. to the west, and Santa Fe Ave. to the east. Berns has owned the Property for decades.		
This purpose o the POLB that an E comments a also to ob failing t	letter is being submitt f objecting to the chang at or near the Property. Invironmental Impact Repo are due by March 13, 2017 oject to the entirety of t o consider all variables,	ed on behalf of Berns for the es/improvements contemplated by Furthermore, Berns is advised rt ("EIR") has been issued and The purpose of this letter is the EIR as being insufficient as including but not limited to,	BI-2
		· ·	

Heather A. Tomley March 13, 2017 Page 2 the impact on surrounding properties, health effects on workers and residents, traffic impact, pollution impact, safety impact and accessability impact. Moreover, inadequate analysis, consideration and disclosure on the impact of the proposed changes/improvements - BBI-2 to existing building structures, subsidence effects, and any other (Cont'd) issues relating thereto has been provided in the EIR. Berns' believes that further investigation and disclosure is necessary to vent these issues and to ensure that the changes/improvements, if any, satisfy the criteria required pursuant to California law. We request that you acknowledge the objection and comments submitted by Berns. Berns reserves the right to supplement these comments and objections after further disclosures are made by the POLB and/or at such time that more information is made public by BBI-3 any other source. Please provide notice of any further action on this project directly to Berns and copy this office on behalf of Berns. Sincerely, GOSHGARIAN & MARSHALL, PLC MARK GOSHGARIAN MG/ cc: Berns Bros., Inc.

2 Responses to Berns Bros., Inc.

1

3 Response to Comment BBI-1: The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your comment and review of the Draft EIR. The Berns Bros.' property at 1700 W. Anaheim Street is not within the 4 5 footprint of the proposed Project or any of its alternatives. Vehicular access to the property 6 from W. 12th Street and W. Anaheim Street would remain. While the property appears to have 7 no driveway connecting to Jackson Avenue or Santa Fe Avenue, those streets adjacent to the 8 property would remain open. The Port does not anticipate that the business operated at that 9 site would be significantly affected by construction or operation of the proposed Project or its 10 alternatives. Berns Bros.' opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record.

11 Response to Comment BBI-2: The comment does not provide any specific comments on 12 the Draft EIR, but rather asserts general objections to the Draft EIR. Those general objections 13 are identified below, along with cross references to the sections in the Draft EIR where those 14 issues are fully addressed.

Heath impacts were addressed in Impact AQ-6 of Draft EIR Section 3.2. With mitigation,
 the cancer and non-cancer impacts associated with construction and operation of the

Responses to Comments

- 1 proposed Project would be less than significant at all off-site business, residential, and 2 sensitive locations.
- Certain significant adverse air quality impacts are projected for the proposed Project.
 Those impacts have been fully analyzed in the Draft EIR. Please see Draft EIR Section
 3.2 for a discussion of all aspects concerning air quality impacts. The commenter has not
 identified any specific issues or errors in the analysis.
- Safety, as it concerns vehicle/train conflicts, would be improved by elimination of the atgrade crossing at 9th Street. No other safety issues associated with the proposed Project have been identified. Please also see Draft EIR Sections 3.5 and 3.7.
- Accessibility impacts were evaluated as part of the traffic evaluation. See Draft EIR
 Section 3.5 and the traffic analysis in Appendix B at pages B-43 through B-65. Access to
 the Berns Bros. property would continue to be from 12th Street to Anaheim Street. No
 alterations of either street adjacent to the property are proposed as part of the proposed
 Project or any of the alternatives. Please also see Master Response Street Closures,
 Access to Downtown Long Beach, and Public Services Access.
- Regarding the reference to "proposed changes/improvements to existing building structures,", it should be noted that no alteration to the building structures on the Berns
 Bros. property are proposed.
- Regarding subsidence, please see responses to Comments SEA-20 and WPAC-4. See also Draft EIR Section 3.1.1.2 (page 3.1-7) and Section 3.1.2.3 (page 3.1-11) for discussion of seismically induced liquefaction.
- Further investigation and disclosure, within the context of CEQA requirements, are not required. The Draft EIR has provided an evaluation of the proposed Project's potential impacts to environmental resources in accordance with standard CEQA criteria.

Response to Comment BBI-3: Berns Bros.' opposition to and comments on the proposed Project are acknowledged for the record. The Port will continue to notify you of Project updates, including notification of any further actions. You have been added to the Project mailing list.

1 11.2.3.19 Berth 55 Landing of Long Beach, Inc. (B55)

BERTH 55 LANDING dba Long B 555 P Long Beach (562	G OF LONG BEACH, INC seach Sportfishing vico Avenue , California 90802 ()432-8993
Port of Long Beach 4801 Airport Plaza Drive Long Beach, CA 90815	Via Email
February 15, 2017 Re: Pier B On-Rail Support Project Draft EIR Comment	
I represent the independent vessel operations "We" all work tirelessly to make a living at so to have access to the water through sports fish probably port only public access to the water	that utilized Berth 55 in the Port of Long Beach. ervicing the tens of thousands of ordinary citizens ning, scuba diving, and whale watching. We are other than fishing from the rocks.
The expansion of the Port of Long Beach's at will, no doubt, enhance the coffers for the Por the "green" efforts in the Pier B On-Rail Supp project for a variety of reasons.	bility to handle more container ship cargo capability rt, City and agencies it benefits. I applaud some of port project. However, we cannot support this - B55-1
Water space, especially which can be accessit that operate from Berth 55 are highly speciali Shoreline Village or Alamitos Bay. The prop railroad tracks along Pico Avenue and moving stating that property will be acquired, etc., etc activities has not been address.	ble by the public is scarce in the port. The vessels zed and cannot operate from a public marina like osed project establishes that the placement of new g Pico Avenue to the west. Although casually and the project, the impact to near water
Roadway realignment is a major component f Realignment to push Pico Avenue severely in available has been a continuing problem. We with Pico Avenue being the re-routed artery o terrified many users that they avoid our facilit	or Pico Avenue in the proposed project. apacts the property we use. Reduction in parking are impacted by the Desmond Bridge construction of the southbound 710 freeway. Truck traffic has ty out of fear of entering and exiting the driveway.
It appears the property creates a bottle a bottle roadway realignment would place it dangerou shop and ticket office conducts business on th heavy equipment truck and other commercial traffic. The project reduces our ability to ope there are no auxiliary parking locations for ow	eneck at the south end. Because of that, the sly close to the retail structures on which the tackle re property. Pico Avenue is a busy street, mainly of vehicle. We do not foresee a reduction of that rate by elimination premium parking spaces and verflow cars, especially on weekends. I am


1 *Responses to Berth 55 Landing of Long Beach, Inc.*

2 Response to Comment B55-1: The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your comments and 3 review of the Draft EIR. Berth 55 Landing of Long Beach, Inc.'s (Berth 55) opposition to the 4 proposed Project is noted.

5 The proposed Project's preliminary design would result in temporary disturbances in the 6 vicinity of Berth 55 businesses due to the realignment of Pico Avenue to the west of its current 7 alignment. No buildings on Berth 55 would be affected, nor would there be any effect on the 8 waterside of Channel No. 3. Pico Avenue would be reconstructed as essentially a new road 9 with no change of accessibility to Berth 55 businesses, other than potential temporary 10 inconveniences associated with the construction process.

11 To maintain access and minimize impacts to Berth 55 during construction, the Port would 12 develop a TMP. The TMP sets construction hours, allowable timeframes for temporary 13 closures, and requirements for maintaining access to businesses. The Port would work 14 directly with Berth 55 and other tenants and businesses and, to the extent possible, 15 incorporate measures into the TMP that minimize impacts on business operations. Access to 16 the Berth 55 businesses would be maintained while construction is underway. Because final engineering has not begun, precise details concerning the construction schedule are not yet 17 18 available. If the proposed Project or one of its alternatives is approved, the Port would 19 coordinate with its tenants to ensure that construction information is provided in advance.

20 **Response to Comment B55-2:** Leasing of the Berth 55 site began in 1976. Since 1976, there 21 have been several revisions and amendments to the lease; the current lease is a holdover 22 from 2009 and is on a month-to-month basis. The lease area is comprised of four (4) parcels 23 of land approximately 4 acres in total. In an amendment to the lease, entered into on January 24 22, 2002, two of the four parcels are identified for vehicle parking use (Parcel 1 and Parcel 3) 25 (First Amendment to Amended and Restated Lease, COLB and Samuel Maehara and 26 Rebecca Maehara, HD 5314A 2002). The potential realignment of Pico Avenue associated 27 with the proposed Project would require restriping and reconfiguring Berth 55's leased parking 28 lot area. Presently, the parking area serving the Berth 55 businesses is striped with a total of 29 192 parking stalls. Based on Long Beach Municipal Code Section 21.41.216 requirements, 30 119 parking spaces are required for the combined sport fishing, retail, and restaurant uses. 31 The preliminary design indicates that, if the proposed Project is approved and implemented, 32 it would eliminate up to 53 parking spaces, resulting in 139 remaining spaces. During final 33 design, more precise engineering would occur to determine actual proposed Project limits. 34 Driveway access to and from Berth 55 businesses would be maintained to accommodate safe 35 entry and exit to and from the site. If the proposed Project or one of its alternatives is approved, 36 the Port would work closely with its tenants to minimize design and construction impacts.

37 Regarding the statement that "Pico is a busy street and we do not see a reduction of that 38 traffic," per Master Response – Street Closures, Access to Downtown Long Beach, and Public 39 Services Access, Pico Avenue serves as a temporary bypass to the Gerald Desmond Bridge 40 ramps that have traditionally provided the primary connection between I-710 and Terminal 41 Island. Traffic volumes will likely return to traditional levels following completion of the bridge 42 replacement in 2019. In addition, the traffic impact analysis for the proposed Project indicates 43 a reduction of an estimated 5,325 trips per day on Pico Avenue with the Project versus without 44 the Project in 2035.

1 **Response to Comment B55-3:** The Draft EIR addresses the potential traffic, noise, air 2 quality, and public health and safety impacts of the proposed Project, and it identifies 3 appropriate measures to mitigate potentially significant impacts of the proposed Project, 4 where feasible. The comment has not identified any inadequacies in this analysis. Berth 55 5 Landing is located on Pico Avenue, along the "Pico Corridor," which serves as a vital 6 connection between the current Pier B Rail Yard and the Port's marine terminals and 7 associated on-dock rail facilities via rail and roadway links. Both the proposed Project and 555 Pico Avenue are located within the General Industrial (IG) district, which is considered the 8 9 City's "industrial sanctuary" district. According to the City's zoning code, this district is "where 10 a wide range of industries that may not be desirable in other districts may locate. The emphasis is on traditionally heavy industrial and manufacturing uses." The uses permitted 11 12 within this district can reasonably expect to generate, and be subject to, higher noise and 13 vibration levels than properties elsewhere in the City.

14 As noted above. Berth 55 businesses are located in a General Industrial District, and the individual parcels are also zoned for industrial use (i.e., "Port-Related Industrial" [IP]) as 15 classified by the COLB. The IP zone is characterized predominantly by maritime industry and 16 17 marine resources. While the IP zone may also include water-oriented commercial and recreational facilities, uses in this district are primarily Port-related (COLB Municipal Code, 18 19 Title 21, Chapter 21.33.020 [D]). As such, businesses at Berth 55 are continuously exposed 20 to Port-related activities that include ongoing noise and vibration from trains transporting cargo on the existing railroad tracks east of Pico Avenue, as well as drayage truck and vehicular 21 22 traffic along Pico Avenue.

23 The four existing rail tracks located along the Pico Corridor currently provide the necessary 24 length to enable short sections to couple or decouple with other sections to form longer or 25 shorter rail trains. The proposed Project would allow necessary trackage within the Pier B Rail Yard for rail cars to couple and decouple, reducing the necessity of coupling and decoupling 26 27 along the Pico Corridor. The coupling and decoupling of rail cars and noise from these 28 activities would not intensify along the Pico Corridor with implementation of the proposed 29 Project, since those activities are expected to occur primarily within the rail yard. Project improvements would improve train-building efficiencies within the Pier B Rail Yard and reduce 30 31 train-building activities that are occurring elsewhere within the system in locations that are not 32 originally designed or intended for storage, breaking down, and building of trains. The addition 33 of four tracks along the Pico Corridor would provide for arrival/departure tracks that would serve as connections to the on-dock rail yards on Piers D through J at the Port. Railroad tracks 34 35 would be approximately 50 feet closer to the Berth 55 buildings than currently located as a result of the 12th Street Alternative; tracks would be approximately 20 feet closer to the 36 buildings as a result of the 10th and 9th Street alternatives. As evaluated in Section 3.8.2.3 of 37 38 the Draft EIR, Project-related noise and vibration impacts would not be considered significant.

39 Response to Comment B55-4: The proposed Project and its alternatives would not require relocation of the business activities at the Berth 55 Landing. In 2012, the Port proposed 40 41 placing a fire boat station and security facility at Berth 55 Landing's location. In response to concerns expressed by the community regarding the need to displace the Berth 55 Landing 42 43 businesses, a siting study was conducted by the Port to identify a suitable alternative location 44 to Berth 55. An alternative location was identified at the Port's Pier D, Berths D-51 and D-52. With an alternative location selected, this allowed Berth 55 Fish Market and Seafood Deli, 45 Queen's Wharf Restaurants, Long Beach Sportfishing, and charter boats to remain at their 46

current location at Berth 55. In July 2016, the Port completed and approved an environmental
 analysis of a new Fire Boat Station at Pier D in accordance with CEQA.

3 Pico Avenue currently serves as a bypass during replacement of the Gerald Desmond Bridge. 4 The new bridge construction requires temporary removal of key connectors between Terminal 5 Island, I-710, and Ocean Boulevard (downtown Long Beach). The traffic volumes on Pico 6 Avenue are projected to return to preconstruction levels upon completion of the new bridge in 7 2019. An objective of the proposed Project is to promote a mode shift, from containers shipped 8 by trucks to near-dock and/or off-dock facilities to containers shipped by rail from the on-dock and supporting rail yards. Implementation of the proposed Project is expected to reduce the 9 number of trucks from the terminal served by the Pier B Rail Yard passing by Berth 55 10 11 businesses compared to the future No Project Alternative. Construction activities related to 12 the proposed Project would be staged and planned to minimize impacts on Port tenants and 13 avoid conflicts with other construction activities, such as those related to the bridge.

14 **Response to Comment B55-5:** The Draft EIR is not required to describe any economic 15 impacts of the proposed Project unless they are likely to result in adverse physical impact. 16 Rather, the Draft EIR was required to identify potential environmental impacts to determine if

17 these would be significant and require mitigation.

18 Berth 55 Landing of Long Beach, Inc.'s opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the

19 record and will be transmitted to the decision-makers.

1 **11.2.3.20** Chemoil Terminals Corporation (CTC)

	6
	CHEMOIL
February 8, 2017 <u>Via Electronic Mail</u> Heather A. Tomley Director of Environmental Planning Port of Long Beach 4801 Airport Plaza Drive Long Beach, CA 90815	Chemoil Terminals Corporation 2365 E. Sepulveda Blvd. Long Beach CA 90810 1944 T +1 562 485 4200 F +1 562 427 4621 www.chemoil.com
Subject: Chemoil Terminals Corporation (Chemoil) Res Rail Support Facility Project	ponse to the Pier B On-Dock
Dear Ms. Tomley: Chemoil understands the overview of the Pier B On-Dock Rail S reconfigure, expand, and enhance existing Pier B rail facility, to "on-dock" rail, and to act as a critical juncture in the Port's rail no opposes the Project with multiple objections. <u>FIRST OBJECTION</u> (Deficient Utility Corridor) One of the objectives of the Project is to enhance utilities. As a to	Support Facility (Project) to support more efficient use of etwork. However, Chemoil utility operator transporting much
required fuel to supply cruise ships and container vessels, the P enhance Chemoil's operation. In contrary, the Project will negat Chemoil's operation by shutting down operation due to the remo 20-Inch, 12-Inch, and 8-Inch pipelines. The proposed utility corri- have significant deficiencies to guarantee relocation for Chemoi utility lines due to the Project. <u>SECOND OBJECTION</u> (Union Jobs Impact)	² roject does not and will not ively and significantly impact oval and relocation of existing idors are not yet finalized and il's pipelines and for all impacted
Chemoil has a total of twenty-seven union employees working a the Marine Terminal. The Project will directly and significantly in relocation of the existing pipelines as named above. Chemoil us basis to connect both terminals together to load and offload tank pipelines, Chemoil will not be able to run its operation and comp competitors who will most likely take advantage of the opportuni container vessels somewhere else other than inside the Port of	tt either the Carson Terminal or npact their jobs due to the ses existing pipelines on a daily ker vessels. Without the bete with local and international ity to fuel cruise ships and Long Beach.
Chemoil has attached a letter written by Teamsters Local Union	848 in opposing the Project.
OTHVERING INSRAY	a member of the Chemoil Group of Companies

<u>(Co</u>	OBJECTION st Impact)
e estimated cost of construction to relocate penditure will hurt Chemoil's businesses a e existence of the Project, Chemoil will hav penditures. Many improvement plans to up iminated or delayed until the Project cost c	e Chemoil's pipelines is \$15,000,000. This cost nd significantly impact Chemoil's bottom line. With re limited funding allocated for any future capital ograde Chemoil's terminals will either have to be an be recovered.
<u>FOURT</u> (Long B	H OBJECTION each Resident)
s. Olga Remizova, a City of Long Beach re e notion of increase locomotive activities in e Project proposal to accommodate up to 2	sident and a Chemoil's employee, is sensitive to the City of Long Beach. Ms. Remizova opposes to 10,000-foot trains in her community.
<u>FIFTH</u> (No Evidence For Motori	OBJECTION st And Rail Safety Improvement)
he Project claims that motorist and rail safe ossing at 9 th Street and Pico Avenue. Ther nd actual accidents occurred from the cros iere are no models shown how the Project aim is invalid until an analysis is conducted	ety will be improved by eliminating existing at-grade re are no studies shown the numbers of near misses sing between 9 th Street and Pico Avenue. Also, will improve motorist and rail safety. Therefore, this d to prove its validity.
(No Evidence For T	1 OBJECTION raffic Congestion Reduction)
nother objective of the Project is to reduce rafted Environmental Impact Report for the educed on local streets and highways. The esults to occur.	congestion on local streets and highways. The Project fails to explain how traffic congestion is re are no studies conducted and concluded for such
Vith many objections, the Teamsters Local are submitting their opposition to the Projec	Union 848, Chemoil, and the Long Beach resident -CTC-7
Should you have any questions regarding the /ince.Godfrey@GLENCORE-US.com.	his matter, please contact Vince Godfrey at
Sincerely Doch	
Vince Godfrey	
(415) 268-2762 Enclosures	
	a member of the Chemoil Group of Compan
DELIVERING ENERGY LAND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND	

Responses to Comments

1 *Responses to Chemoil Terminals Corporation*

Response to Comment CTC-1: The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your comments and review of the Draft EIR. Chemoil Terminals Corporation's (Chemoil) opposition to the proposed Project is noted and will be transmitted to the decision-makers.

5 It should also be noted that Chemoil, in its current Pipeline License with the COLB adopted by the BHC on October 10, 2011, has agreed as the "Licensee," to "at its cost, [shall] alter the 6 7 Pipeline Facilities and change the location thereof whenever and as often as the City deems 8 it convenient or necessary, including without limitation, on account of any construction 9 authorized, permitted, or contemplated by City or its tenants, assignees, or licensees, (including without limitation in connection with City's Middle Harbor Redevelopment Project). 10 Neither Licensee or any other person shall be entitled to any monies, damages or fee 11 adjustment as a result of any such alterations or change of location of Pipeline Facilities or 12 any circumstance arising therefrom or related thereto" (Pipeline License, COLB Ordinance 13 14 HD-2111, 2011).

- The comment states that the proposed Project would not enhance, and would instead negatively impact, the commenter's operation. The comment states that one of the objectives of the proposed Project is "to enhance utilities." This is not among the Project objectives listed in Section 1.6 on page 1-17 of the Draft EIR. The comment has not identified any environmental issue or concern, or any error in the environmental analysis of the Draft EIR.
- The Port has identified the replacement or relocation of utilities, which are not limited to pipelines, as necessary to accommodate the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project.
- Because final engineering has not been completed, details concerning how the proposed Project would be constructed, including the construction schedule, are not available. If the proposed Project is approved, during final engineering, the Port would work closely with Chemoil to develop a utility relocation plan that meets all applicable regulations and is compliant with Chemoil's Pipeline License.
- **Response to Comment CTC-2:** The comment does not relate to an environmental effect of the proposed Project and does not identify any specific issue with the Draft EIR. Thus, CEQA requires no response to the comment. Nonetheless, the Port responds to the comment as follows. While final engineering design has yet to be completed, it is anticipated that Chemoil's pipelines would need to be relocated in association with the proposed Project or one of its alternatives. To convey oil between Chemoil's Pier F facility, World Oil at Pier C, and the refineries located in the area, it is anticipated that the following would be necessary:
- Relocation of 12-inch and 20-inch pipelines from Pier F to Pier C on Pico Avenue (12th, 36
 10th, and 9th Street alternatives)
- Relocation of an 8-inch pipeline from Pier D Street to Pier C on Pico Avenue that is leased to Paramount (12th, 10th, and 9th Street alternatives)
- Relocation of a 10-inch pipeline from Pier C to a Tesoro Vault in the Toyota Logistics
 Services Facility on Pier B via 9th Street (12th, 10th, and 9th Street alternatives).
- Relocation of a 10-inch pipeline from 9th Street and Canal Street (12th, 10th, and 9th Street alternatives).
- A 20-inch pipeline from Pier C to Anaheim and Santa Fe streets would be protected inplace (12th, 10th, and 9th Street alternatives).

- 1 Relocation of all utilities, including those owned and operated by Chemoil, would be conducted
- 2 in a manner such that unacceptable service interruptions would not occur. If the proposed
- 3 Project or one of its alternatives is approved, close consultation would be conducted with all
- 4 utility owners and operators to determine the optimal timing for switchover from existing lines
- 5 to the new lines to be provided in the designated utility corridors within the yard. If the
- 6 proposed Project or one of the alternatives is approved, details of these procedures would be
- 7 specified as final engineering occurs. It should also be noted that ongoing dialogue with utility
- 8 providers has been underway during the entire preliminary engineering and planning process,
- 9 including information exchanges regarding the status of preliminary engineering activities and
 10 identification/specification of utility location. If the proposed Project or one of its alternatives is
- 11 approved, this process would continue onward as final design proceeds.
- 12 The comment letter received from Teamsters Local Union 848 has been included separately 13 herein. To the extent specific issues are raised in the letter from Teamsters Local Union 848, 14 these issues will be addressed in these later commente
- 14 those issues will be addressed in those later comments.
- 15 Response to Comment CTC-3: The comment relates to issues of economics rather than 16 environmental impacts, and is beyond the scope of CEQA (Section 15131 of the CEQA 17 Guidelines). Please see response to Comment CTC-1.
- 18 Response to Comment CTC-4: The objection of Ms. Olga Remizova to increased locomotive 19 activities in the COLB is noted for the record and will be transmitted to the decision-makers. 20 Because the location of Ms. Remizova's residence is not provided, no further specific 21 response is possible. The impact of the additional trains on area residents has been assessed 22 in the Draft EIR. This includes the impacts of train emissions and train noise. In addition, the 23 potential for the additional trains to block traffic at grade crossings has been assessed. As 24 discussed in the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would eliminate one at-grade train crossing, 25 thus eliminating delays at that location (9th Street and Pico Avenue).
- 26 **Response to Comment CTC-5:** The elimination of the at-grade railroad crossing on 9th Street 27 at Pier B Street/Pico Avenue near the I-710 freeway ramps is needed for the proposed Project. 28 This closure has been contemplated by the Port and the City for several years in accordance 29 with policies of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) and FRA. It has been the 30 mission of CPUC and FRA "to reduce hazards associated with at-grade crossings by reducing 31 the number of at-grade crossings on freight or passenger railroad mainlines in California" 32 General Order No. 75-D available at http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/published/ (CPUC GENERAL ORDER/60157.htm). The 9th Street crossing experiences high train volumes that 33 34 cross at slow speeds, resulting in frequent delays to vehicular traffic. The 2012 traffic counts 35 for the morning (AM) Peak Hour totaled 576 vehicles. Elimination of this crossing would 36 remove the risk of auto/train collisions at this location.
- In addition to the railroad crossing elimination, the proposed Project would also improve the
 geometry of the Pier B Street alignment. The improvements would reduce grade differences
 and curvature, resulting in site distance improvements. These improvements are planned for
 each of the alternatives associated with the proposed Project.
- 41 **Response to Comment CTC-6:** The proposed Project would result in an overall reduction of 42 an estimated 158,000 miles of truck travel daily, or 11,000 fewer truck trips compared to the 43 future No Project Alternative.
- Response to Comment CTC-7: This comment reiterates the opposition of Chemoil, the Long
 Beach Resident (presumably, Ms. Olga Remizova), and Teamsters Local Union 848 to the

Responses to Comments

proposed Project. The opposition is noted for the record and will be transmitted to the
 decision-makers. The Teamsters Local Union No. 848 comment letter dated February 14,
 2017, is included and addressed separately herein. To the extent specific issues are raised in
 the letter from Teamsters Local Union 848, those issues will be addressed in those later

5 comments.

1 **11.2.3.21 Golden Star Restaurants (GSR)**

- Carl	1560 West Pacific Coast Highway Long Beach, CA 90810 (562)435-6528
То:	
Heather Tomley	
Director of Environmental Planning	. UND 13 2017
Port of Long Beach	RECEIVED MAN IS
4801 Airport Plaza Drive	
Long Beach, CA 90815	
From:	
Sotiria Contos	
Owner/Manager Golden Star Restaurants	
Re: Opposition to POLB Pier B: On Dock Rail Faci	lity
Ms. Tomley,	
Golden Star Family Restaurants firmly oppose th	e POLB Pier B project.
Jimmy Contos. We are loyal to our community, o long-time business on the Westwide, we unders project is not a favorable one to this area. We d	but schools and our Westside neighbors and business colleagues. As a tand the dynamics of this vital section in Long Beach, and the proposed to not support the Pier B project for several reasons.
Our PCH location's doors are open 24 hours, 7 d allows us to cater to everyone: truck drivers, po our schools, families and friends of surrounding full-time workers who are Long Beach residents Our "veterans" have been with us an average of making their way through college. We proudly si regarded as family members, and we fervently p apprehension.	ays a week, including holidays. Our 24-hour presence in this community rt employees, longshoremen, the refineries, teachers and students of neighborhoods. Currently, our staff is comprised of 21 employees, all living within a mile of our store, and many of them walk to work daily. 22 years, and our younger generation includes full-time students upport them and admire their determination. Our employees are protect them as such. The Pier B proposed project causes us much
Red Flag #1: The project will drastically deteriora "America's Green Gateway", fails to disclose to l its consequential increase in pollution levels. The South Coast Air Quality Management District, sta accountable.	ate the air quality of the Westside. The project's deceptive name, ocal businesses and residents the alarming details of your proposal and e EIR report reveals that your project does not meet the standards of the andards for which my business as well as over 300 on the Westide are all
How can your project be such a significant excep several times a day, emitting black smoke into th and living in this area? How will students safely v	tion? How do you plan to justify your pollution pumping trains, running he air we are breathing? How, I ask, will you protect the people working walk to school? How will my employees safely walk to work? How can

Responses to Comments

you deny the dangers? As an asthma	tic myself, I shudder when thinking about the possible state of our beloved
Westside should your project come to	o term. My employees and I work on our premises daily, not at a separate office GSR-
where the air may be cleaner. We do	not wish to breathe contaminated air. Ultimately, no form or extent of mitigation (Cont'd
can offset the air your project will po	llute. This project cannot move forward in any way.
Red Flag #2: The project will severely	compromise Westside businesses—even shut them down to realize the "Green
Highway" hoax. Many of the Westsid	e businesses, such as Phillips Steel Company and Superior Electric are regarded as
landmarks amongst locals. Generatio	ns of workers have passed through their doors families were fed and cared for
from these companies and dreams re	alized. These are not the makeshift "come-and-go" companies that we so often see
today: these establishments are the l	ackhone of our community and deserve a voice in this matter. Your committee
failed to regard them in talks about the	he project. My family and Ltake great offense to such disregard and your deviour
approach to pursuing plans for this p	roject. This is NOT our way of doing business on the Westside!
Red Flag #3: The project declares to	"improve roadway traffic flow". How is this possible when you plan to completely
sever our access to the port? Our We	stside community and businesses thrive from the traffic flow to and from the port.
BIOCKING US OTT IS like blocking a lifelin	e, not to mention creating a dire financial hardship to the area with a domino GSR-5
errect of consequences—reduced pro	perty values, sales, and income along with higher Worker's Compensation and
Health Insurance Premiums to name	just a rew.
More importantly, emergency and po	lice authorities that cross through our Westside neighborhood to access the port
will need an alternate route-perhap	s most alarming would the increased response time to get to the Port. How do you
propose they do this without lengthe	ning the time it takes to respond to emergencies? Without a doubt, the proposed GSR-6
project ignores very serious matters t	hat endanger the well-being of the Westside community and businesses.
conclusion. Too many red hags to an	ow this project to gain ANT momentum.
Ms. Tomley, I fervently urge that thes this project is very real, our anger eve dangerous environmental consequen my family stating our opposition to th citizens who support us have signed t	e concerns and many others are heard and taken very seriously. Our anxiety over en more sol. The POLB Pier B project is laced with deception and will result in ces; it completely disregards the Westside community. Below are the signatures of the POLB Pier B project. Our employees, many of our customers, and concerned he attached petition as well
Ms. Tomley, I fervently urge that thes this project is very real, our anger eve dangerous environmental consequen my family stating our opposition to th citizens who support us have signed t	e concerns and many others are heard and taken very seriously. Our anxiety over en more so! The POLB Pier B project is laced with deception and will result in ces; it completely disregards the Westside community. Below are the signatures of he POLB Pier B project. Our employees, many of our customers, and concerned he attached petition as well.
Ms. Tomley, I fervently urge that thes this project is very real, our anger eve dangerous environmental consequen my family stating our opposition to th citizens who support us have signed t Sincerely,	ee concerns and many others are heard and taken very seriously. Our anxiety over en more so! The POLB Pier B project is laced with deception and will result in ces; it completely disregards the Westside community. Below are the signatures of the POLB Pier B project. Our employees, many of our customers, and concerned he attached petition as well.
Ms. Tomley, I fervently urge that thes this project is very real, our anger eve dangerous environmental consequen my family stating our opposition to th citizens who support us have signed t Sincerely,	ee concerns and many others are heard and taken very seriously. Our anxiety over en more so! The POLB Pier B project is laced with deception and will result in ces; it completely disregards the Westside community. Below are the signatures of the POLB Pier B project. Our employees, many of our customers, and concerned he attached petition as well.
Ms. Tomley, I fervently urge that thes this project is very real, our anger eve dangerous environmental consequen my family stating our opposition to th citizens who support us have signed t Sincerely, Sotiria Contos	e concerns and many others are heard and taken very seriously. Our anxiety over en more so! The POLB Pier B project is laced with deception and will result in ces; it completely disregards the Westside community. Below are the signatures of he POLB Pier B project. Our employees, many of our customers, and concerned he attached petition as well.
Ms. Tomley, I fervently urge that thes this project is very real, our anger eve dangerous environmental consequen my family stating our opposition to th citizens who support us have signed t Sincerely, Sotiria Contos	GSR-7 a concerns and many others are heard and taken very seriously. Our anxiety over an more so! The POLB Pier B project is laced with deception and will result in ces; it completely disregards the Westside community. Below are the signatures of the POLB Pier B project. Our employees, many of our customers, and concerned the attached petition as well.
Ms. Tomley, I fervently urge that thes this project is very real, our anger eve dangerous environmental consequen my family stating our opposition to th citizens who support us have signed t Sincerely, Sotiria Contos	GSR-7 Concerns and many others are heard and taken very seriously. Our anxiety over an more sol. The POLB Pier B project is laced with deception and will result in ces; it completely disregards the Westside community. Below are the signatures of the POLB Pier B project. Our employees, many of our customers, and concerned the attached petition as well.
Ms. Tomley, I fervently urge that thes this project is very real, our anger eve dangerous environmental consequen my family stating our opposition to th citizens who support us have signed t Sincerely, Sotiria Contos	GSR-7 Concerns and many others are heard and taken very seriously. Our anxiety over an more sol The POLB Pier B project is laced with deception and will result in ces; it completely disregards the Westside community. Below are the signatures of the POLB Pier B project. Our employees, many of our customers, and concerned the attached petition as well.
Ms. Tomley, I fervently urge that thes this project is very real, our anger eve dangerous environmental consequen my family stating our opposition to th citizens who support us have signed t Sincerely, Sotiria Contos	Be concerns and many others are heard and taken very seriously. Our anxiety over an more sol The POLB Pier B project is laced with deception and will result in ces; it completely disregards the Westside community. Below are the signatures of the POLB Pier B project. Our employees, many of our customers, and concerned he attached petition as well. <i>Quist Cortos GSR-7 Aristi Contos Parasteri Contos</i>
Ms. Tomley, I fervently urge that thes this project is very real, our anger eve dangerous environmental consequen my family stating our opposition to th citizens who support us have signed t Sincerely, Sotiria Contos Angula Contos Angula Contos	GSR-7 Concerns and many others are heard and taken very seriously. Our anxiety over an more so! The POLB Pier B project is laced with deception and will result in ces; it completely disregards the Westside community. Below are the signatures of the POLB Pier B project. Our employees, many of our customers, and concerned the attached petition as well.
Ms. Tomley, I fervently urge that thes this project is very real, our anger eve dangerous environmental consequen my family stating our opposition to th citizens who support us have signed t Sincerely, Sotiria Contos Angula Contos Angela Contos	GSR-7 Concerns and many others are heard and taken very seriously. Our anxiety over an more so! The POLB Pier B project is laced with deception and will result in ces; it completely disregards the Westside community. Below are the signatures of the POLB Pier B project. Our employees, many of our customers, and concerned the attached petition as well.
Ms. Tomley, I fervently urge that thes this project is very real, our anger eve dangerous environmental consequen my family stating our opposition to th citizens who support us have signed t Sincerely, Sotiria Contos Angela Contos Multiple Emmanouil Choytlis	GSR-7 Concerns and many others are heard and taken very seriously. Our anxiety over an more so! The POLB Pier B project is laced with deception and will result in ces; it completely disregards the Westside community. Below are the signatures of the POLB Pier B project. Our employees, many of our customers, and concerned the attached petition as well.
Ms. Tomley, I fervently urge that thes this project is very real, our anger eve dangerous environmental consequen my family stating our opposition to th citizens who support us have signed t Sincerely, Sotiria Contos Angela Contos Mugula Contos Emmanouil Choutlis	Are concerns and many others are heard and taken very seriously. Our anxiety over Immore sol The POLB Pier B project is laced with deception and will result in ces; it completely disregards the Westside community. Below are the signatures of the POLB Pier B project. Our employees, many of our customers, and concerned the attached petition as well. Aristi Contos Paraskevi Contos Vasilis Contos
Ms. Tomley, I fervently urge that thes this project is very real, our anger eve dangerous environmental consequen my family stating our opposition to th citizens who support us have signed t Sincerely, Sotiria Contos Angela Contos Mugula Contos Mugula Contos	Aristi Contos
Ms. Tomley, I fervently urge that thes this project is very real, our anger eve dangerous environmental consequen my family stating our opposition to th citizens who support us have signed t Sincerely, Sotiria Contos Angela Contos Mutul Emmanouil Choutlis	Aristi Contos Cash Contos
Ms. Tomley, I fervently urge that thes this project is very real, our anger eve dangerous environmental consequen my family stating our opposition to th citizens who support us have signed t Sincerely, Sotiria Contos Angela Contos Mutual Emmanouil Choutlis	ee concerns and many others are heard and taken very seriously. Our anxiety over an more so! The POLB Pier B project is laced with deception and will result in ces; it completely disregards the Westside community. Below are the signatures of the POLB Pier B project. Our employees, many of our customers, and concerned the attached petition as well.
Ms. Tomley, I fervently urge that thes this project is very real, our anger eve dangerous environmental consequen my family stating our opposition to th citizens who support us have signed t Sincerely, Sotiria Contos Angela Contos Mutul Emmanouil Choutlis	Aristi Contos Aristi Contos Aristi Contos Vasilis Contos Correction and many others are heard and taken very seriously. Our anxiety over an more so! The POLB Pier B project is laced with deception and will result in ces; it completely disregards the Westside community. Below are the signatures of the POLB Pier B project. Our employees, many of our customers, and concerned the attached petition as well. Case-7
Ms. Tomley, I fervently urge that thes this project is very real, our anger eve dangerous environmental consequen my family stating our opposition to th citizens who support us have signed t Sincerely, Sotiria Contos Angela Contos Mutul Emmanouil Choutlis	ee concerns and many others are heard and taken very seriously. Our anxiety over an more so! The POLB Pier B project is laced with deception and will result in ces; it completely disregards the Westside community. Below are the signatures of the POLB Pier B project. Our employees, many of our customers, and concerned the attached petition as well.
Ms. Tomley, I fervently urge that thes this project is very real, our anger eve dangerous environmental consequen my family stating our opposition to th citizens who support us have signed t Sincerely, Sotiria Contos Angela Contos Mutuy Emmanouil Choullis	e concerns and many others are heard and taken very seriously. Our anxiety over in more sol The POLB Pier B project is laced with deception and will result in ces; it completely disregards the Westside community. Below are the signatures of he POLB Pier B project. Our employees, many of our customers, and concerned he attached petition as well.
Ms. Tomley, I fervently urge that thes this project is very real, our anger eve dangerous environmental consequen my family stating our opposition to the citizens who support us have signed to Sincerely, Sotiria Contos Angela Contos Magula Contos	e concerns and many others are heard and taken very seriously. Our anxiety over in more sol The POLB Pier B project is laced with deception and will result in ces; it completely disregards the Westside community. Below are the signatures of he POLB Pier B project. Our employees, many of our customers, and concerned he attached petition as well.
Ms. Tomley, I fervently urge that thes this project is very real, our anger eve dangerous environmental consequen my family stating our opposition to the citizens who support us have signed to Sincerely, Sotiria Contos Angela Contos May Contos May Contos	e concerns and many others are heard and taken very seriously. Our anxiety over in more sol The POLB Pier B project is laced with deception and will result in ces; it completely disregards the Westside community. Below are the signatures of he POLB Pier B project. Our employees, many of our customers, and concerned he attached petition as well.

1 *Responses to Golden Star Restaurants*

Response to Comment GSR-1: The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your comments and review of the Draft EIR. It should be noted that the commenter's location at 1560 West Pacific Coast Highway is more than 0.5 mile north of the Pier B Rail Yard, as measured from the north perimeter of the 12th Street Alternative. There would be no diminution of access to the commenter's business location for customers or employees as a result of construction or operation of the proposed Project.

8 **Response to Comment GSR-2:** The proposed Project's air quality impacts have been fully 9 assessed in Section 3.2 of the Draft EIR. The comment states that the proposed Project does 10 not meet the "standards" of SCAQMD. Presumably, what the comment is referring to are 11 SCAQMD's thresholds of significance which, in certain cases, are exceeded, resulting in an impact being identified as significant. It is important to differentiate between thresholds of 12 13 significance and SCAQMD regulations. The proposed Project would be fully compliant with all 14 of SCAQMD's applicable regulations. It is also important to note that the fundamental purpose 15 of the proposed Project is to allow for a greater number of containers to be transported to their destinations in a cleaner method in terms of air quality. To be conservative, the air quality 16 17 analysis does not take credit for reductions in drayage truck trips and their associated 18 emissions resulting from the proposed Project. Specifically, the proposed Project would allow 19 more containers to be transported by rail rather than by more-polluting drayage trucks. This 20 replacement of truck trips with on-dock rail transport is one of the primary objectives of the 21 proposed Project, and supports the COLB goal of improving citywide freight-related 22 infrastructure, especially on-dock rail facilities. According to the City's Mobility Element, three 23 truck trips are typically required for each container loaded onto a train: one from point of 24 dispatch to the container location, a second to the intermodal rail yard, and a third return trip 25 to the point of dispatch. Each train loaded on-dock at the POLB, because it would typically 26 carry 250 containers, is therefore estimated to replace up to 750 truck trips on local streets 27 and freeways. For every ton-mile, trains are almost four times more fuel efficient than trucks. 28 A typical truck today emits roughly three times more NO_x and particulates than a locomotive 29 per ton-mile (City of Long Beach General Plan. Mobility Element. Department of Development 30 Services and Department of Public Works. October 2013).

Response to Comment GSR-3: Please see response to Comment GSR-2. Again, it is important to differentiate between thresholds of significance and regulations. The purpose of thresholds of significance is to assist in defining which environmental impacts are significant and which are less than significant. Therefore, the comment's reference to the proposed Project being an "exception" is not an accurate description.

36 Because the proposed Project exceeds certain of SCAQMD's air quality thresholds of 37 significance, the BHC would be required to make findings of fact and a statement of overriding 38 considerations pursuant to CEQA Guideline 15093 to approve the proposed Project or one of 39 its alternatives. This comment, along with all other comments, will be provided to the BHC for 40 their consideration on the matter.

Regarding health impacts of the proposed Project's air emissions on the commenter's employees of the referenced restaurant, predicted impacts specific to this location were extracted from the Draft EIR analysis, and are summarized here. The closest receptor point to this business that was evaluated by the dispersion model for the Draft EIR is located approximately 180 feet east of the business. Table 11.2-11 shows the highest modeled criteria pollutant and health risk impacts at this receptor point associated with the mitigated proposed 1 Project. The table shows that the peak federal 1-hour NO₂ concentration would exceed the

2 threshold during Project construction. All other criteria pollutant and health risk impacts during

3 construction and operation would be less than the thresholds at this location.

	Description	Modeled Impact ¹	Significance Threshold	Significant?
	(Criteria Pollutants durin	g Construction ²	
	1-Hour (state)	285	339	No
NO ₂	1-Hour (federal)	199	188	Yes
	Annual	52.4	57.0	No
СО	1-Hour	4,017	23,000	No
	8-Hour	3,175	10,000	No
DM	24-Hour	0.3	10.4	No
PINI ₁₀	Annual	0.01	1.0	No
PM _{2.5}	24-Hour	0.1	10.4	No
		Criteria Pollutants dur	ing Operation ³	
	1-Hour (state)	265	339	No
NO ₂	1-Hour (federal)	180	188	No
	Annual	52	57.0	No
00	1-Hour	3,970	23,000	No
CO	8-Hour	3,151	10,000	No
514	24-Hour	0.004	2.5	No
PM ₁₀	Annual	0.002	1.0	No
PM _{2.5}	24-Hour	0.002	2.5	No
	н	lealth Risks (Constructi	on + Operation) ⁴	
Individua	l Cancer Risk	0.4 × 10-6	10 × 10 ⁻⁶	No
Chronic I	Hazard Index	0.0006	1.0	No
8-Hour C	hronic Hazard Index	0.002	1.0	No
Acute Ha	azard Index	0.02	1.0	No

¹ NO₂ and CO impacts are the modeled project increment plus observed background. All other impacts are the modeled project increment.

 $^{2}\;$ The highest impacts from all three phases of construction are shown.

³ The highest impacts from all three operational analysis years (2020, 2025, 2035) are shown.

⁴ Health risk values reflect occupational exposure assumptions and include emissions from both construction and operation.

4 The peak federal 1-hour NO₂ impact of $199 \mu g/m^3$ would occur during Phase 3 of construction.

5 Emissions from Project construction would contribute only about 12 percent to this impact; the

6 background concentration would contribute the remaining 88 percent. Moreover, this

1 predicted concentration is conservative and would occur very infrequently, if at all, because 2 the analysis assumes all construction equipment would operate simultaneously during worst-3 case meteorological conditions (i.e., low wind speed, optimum wind direction, and very stable atmosphere), concurrent with the highest observed background concentration measured at 4 5 the Superblock monitoring station over a 3-year period. Most of the 1-hour NO₂ concentrations during Project construction would be much lower than the peak value, as evidenced by the 6 7 much lower annual average NO₂ concentration, which is an average of all 1-hour 8 concentrations during the worst-case year.

9 Furthermore, the proposed Project may produce operational criteria pollutant and health impacts that are less than the values presented in the Draft and Final EIR by replacing many future drayage truck trips from the terminals served by the Pier B Rail Yard with rail transport. The potential air quality benefit associated with fewer drayage truck trips was not quantified in this EIR (although the impact of the additional rail transport *was* quantified). Please see response to Comment GSR-2 for a more thorough discussion of this potential air quality benefit.

16 Response to Comment GSR-4: The Port welcomes all input into its planning process and, to 17 date, has held three public hearings for this proposed Project. There has been no intention to 18 disregard Westside businesses. Information about this proposed Project has been available 19 on the Port website since December 2016, and notices regarding this process were mailed to 20 the owners of properties and businesses that could potentially be impacted by the proposed 21 Project.

22 **Response to Comment GSR-5:** The proposed Project or any of the build alternatives under 23 consideration would alter access to the Port from the Westside area. Major portions of the 24 subregional transportation grid north of Pier B would remain unaffected by the proposed 25 Project. As shown in Table 11.2-2 on page 11-13, maximum travel times between the Port and Downtown Long Beach would increase by up to 4 additional minutes (at 5:00 p.m.) with 26 27 implementation of the proposed Project. This increase is not considered to be significant and 28 would not be expected to substantially deter customers seeking particular businesses, goods, 29 or services in the Project area. Circulation patterns would be altered by the proposed Project. 30 but adequate access to all portions of the community would be maintained.

The proposed Project would also reduce a portion of heavy truck traffic into and out of the Port that would otherwise occur, due to the ability to directly transport containers in cuts of cars from the marine terminals to the Pier B Yard. This effect of the proposed Project should reduce congestion on local streets, improving access and reducing travel times. Without the proposed Project, truck traffic is expected to increase, resulting in more vehicle traffic on local streets as motorists attempt to circumvent congestion on local segments of I-710. Thus, the proposed Project would have an indirect beneficial effect on local traffic circulation.

38 The comment's unsupported speculation about potential effects of the proposed Project on 39 property values, sales, and income as a result of reduced motor vehicle access is not 40 supported by objective evidence nor reasoned argument. Moreover, such economic issues 41 are beyond the scope of CEQA. However, it is also possible that the Pier B On-Dock Rail 42 Support Facility Project, along with other infrastructure projects underway at the Port to upgrade, modernize, and increase productivity, would attract more Port-related businesses to 43 44 the Westside area. This would, in turn, raise property values and increase the customer base 45 for retail services in the area.

	Chapter 11
Responses to Comments	Port of Long Beach

Please see Master Response – Street Closures, Access to Downtown Long Beach, and Public
 Services Access.

3 **Response to Comment GSR-6:** The impact analyses in the Draft EIR do not ignore the issue of emergency response; this topic is addressed in Section 3.7 of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR 4 5 observed that the proposed Project could have a slight beneficial effect by eliminating at-grade 6 crossings at 9th Street; this would reduce delays due to road blockages by trains. The Draft 7 EIR also noted that the proposed Project is expected to replace certain heavy truck traffic created by drayage trucks with rail transport. The Draft EIR concluded that the effects of the 8 9 proposed Project on emergency services response times were less than significant and response times would remain within acceptable parameters. This issue is further addressed 10 in Master Response – Street Closures, Access to Downtown Long Beach, and Public Services 11 12 Access.

- 13 Response to Comment GSR-7: The Port will continue to approach subsequent planning 14 efforts of the proposed Project in such a way as to be as communicative as possible. The Port 15 also stresses that this proposed Project is still very much in the planning stage and has not 16 yet been considered by the BHC. Golden Star Restaurant No. 1's opposition to the proposed 17 Project is noted for the record, and the comments will be presented to the decision-makers
- 18 for consideration.

1 **11.2.3.22 Harbor Trucking Association (HTA)**

Heather A. Tomley	SOCIONON
Director of Environmental Planning	
Port of Long Beach	
4801 Airport Plaza Drive	
Long Beach, CA 90815	
Fax: (562)283-7148	
Heather.tomley@polb.com	
RE: Harbor Trucking Association Comments on Draft Enviro Summary Report; SCH Number 2003081079	onmental Impact Report/Application
Dear Director Tomley,	
The Harbor Trucking Association (HTA) is a coalition of Califor hirds of the drayage moves in California's international cargo se capitol improvement projects that create terminal and cargo hand project, we do have some concerns.	nia drayage operators representing two aports. While generally we support lling facilities, including the Pier B Rail
We support the Pier B project with the proper path forward. In re both forward is to acquire the necessary properties to complete the what the impacts to the property owners and businesses in this ar	ading the DEIR, it is unclear what the he project. This also makes it unclear ea will be as well.
The HTA supports this project, with the caveat that no businesse acquired without the consent of the property owner. The use of fe would be opposed by our organization and should be analyzed to he current property owners and tenants.	s are forcibly displaced or property orced sale, such as eminent domain, the economic and financial impacts on
for more information or to ask questions, please contact me at W	eston@pearstrategies.com or 570-242-
Respectfully,	
Unic	
Veston LaBar	
Veston LaBar Executive Director	it.
Veston LaBar Executive Director	

3 Response to Harbor Trucking Association

2

4 **Response to Comment HTA-1:** The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your comment and 5 review of the Draft EIR. Please see Draft EIR Section 3.6.4, beginning on page 3.6-27, and

6 Master Response – Property Acquisition, Compensation, and Relocation.

1 11.2.3.23 HJ Baker (HJB)

H.J.	BAKER	
LSTAT	Arming 1810	
	H L Bakar LLC	
	1001 Schley Avenue	
	Wilmington, CA 90744	
	March 5, 2017	
	Port of Long Beach	
	4801 Airport Plaza Drive	
	Long Beach CA 90815 Attn. Heather Tomley; Director of Environmental Planning	
	Dear Heather Tomley,	
	- I wanted to take a minute to introduce myself and reach out to you about the Pier B On-	1
	Dock Rail Support Facility.	
	My name is Kevin Courtney and I am the General Plant Manager of the H.J. Baker	
	Sulphur Processing Facility here in Wilmington. H.J. Baker is a very storied, family owned	
	company dating back over 160 years. We play a key role in helping the local refineries to	
	a byproduct of oil refining and converting it into a form that can be safely and	
	responsibly transported to the Port of Long Beach for bulk export overseas. By doing so	
	we have taken something that used to contribute to smog and health hazards, and turned it into a prosperous business that supplies jobs and opportunities to our local	
	community.	
		Lunga
	Having owned and operated this facility in Wilmington for the better part of 35 years,	
	offering well-paying jobs with benefits to our local residents and supporting numerous	
	vendors in the local community we also use our success to help the community.	
	Examples include helping the YMCA to build a new pool, hosting high school students	
	supporting dozens of presentations and activities in our neighborhood through our	
	membership with the Wilmington Chamber of Commerce. We have been able to	
	achieve all of this while operating a manufacturing facility to the utmost standards of safety and environmental responsibility.	
	The Environmental Impact Report recently released for the Pier B rail expansion shows maps that indicate land acquisitions that will be made by the POLB through imminent	
	RECEIVED	MAR (1 7 2017



Responses to Comments

1 Responses to HJ Baker

Response to Comment HJB-1: The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your comment and review of the Draft EIR. The Port acknowledges the role your company has played in the community with regard to the local refineries. Along with ongoing engineering design to ensure adequate access and mobility, the Port is coordinating with the COLA to identify ways to avoid disruptions and inconveniences. As part of this effort, the Port has refined the Project boundaries. Please see Master Response – Property Acquisitions, Compensation, and Relocation.

The H.J. Baker property (APN 7428-022-903), 1001 Schley Avenue, in the COLA is now well outside the Project footprint. Acquisition of the property would not be required for the 12th, 10th, or 9th Street alternatives. Figure 3.6-5 has been revised in the Final EIR, page 10-39, to show that this property is not within the footprint for the 12th Street Alternative (proposed Project).

- 14 **Response to Comment HJB-2:** Please see response to Comment HJB-1.
- 15 **Response to Comment HJB-3:** Please see response to Comment HJB-1.

1 11.2.3.24 LAN Logistics, Inc. (LLI)







Responses to Comments













livelihood; it is their jobs; it is their retirements. Businesses are not made overnight and should be treated with goodwill and dignity by including them in the planning process.
This is not to say that these are the only issues not addressed by the EIR. To reiterate, given the amount of time allotted to review and prepare a response to the EIR (a very expansive document), it is likely many affected parties are still unaware of the project and its potential impact on their livelihoods.
-LAN Logistics, Inc.
JOHN C. DOWALDSON ARES/CEO

Robert M. Or Attorney at Law	r
6700 E. Pacific Coast Hwy. Suite 285 Writer's E-Mail: RMOrrEsq@gmail.o Long Beach, California 90803	Telephone: (562) 594-7800 com Facsimile: (562) 594-7833
March 13, 2017	
Heather Tomley Director of Environmental Planning Port of Long Beach 4801 Airport Plaza Dr. Long Beach, CA 90815	
Re: Our Clients, Lan Logistics, Inc. & Lan	Warehouse, Inc.
Dear Ms. Tomley:	
Please be advised that this office represents Lan Logist Our clients own and operate businesses at 1520 W. 11	ics, Inc. and Lan Warehouse, Inc. th St., Long Beach, California.
Our clients oppose and object to the draft Environment Port of Long Beach Pier D On Dock Rail Facility on num prepared a written statement of their concerns in this re herewith for your records and reference.	al Impact Report for the proposed - LLI-29 nerous grounds. Our clients have gard, a copy of which is enclosed
Also, as you may be aware, there were problems with project to our clients and perhaps to others. Our client this proposed project until they received an e-mail regar until later that they received notice by Certified Mail.	the giving of notice regarding this s did not learn of the existence of ding it on 12/15/16, and it was not
In the future, please make sure that proper and timely clients, and this office, of all further hearings, proceeding	written notice is provided to our ngs, filings, and deadlines.
Sincerely yours,	
Robert M. Orr	
RMO:pg Enclosure	

1

2 *Responses to LAN Logistics, Inc.*

Response to Comment LLI-1: The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your comment and review of the Draft EIR. The Port of Long Beach released the Notice of Completion, Availability, Comment Period, and Public Meeting for the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project Draft EIR/Application Summary Report on December 16, 2016, establishing a 60-day review period, which exceeds the required 45-day public review period for a Draft EIR according to Section 15105 of the State CEQA Guidelines. During a public hearing held on

1 January 18, 2017, for the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Draft EIR, Mr. Kevin 2 Donaldson, representing LAN Logistics, provided oral comments, stating that LAN Logistics 3 had only heard about the proposed Project and associated meeting through a press release. 4 To ensure that all stakeholders received direct notice, the Port released an Amended Notice 5 of Completion, Availability, Comment Period, and Public Meeting for the proposed Project. 6 The notice was sent to the attention of Mr. John Donaldson at LAN Logistics and delivered by 7 United Parcel Service (UPS) on January 27, 2017. As a result of the amended Notice of Completion, Availability, Comment Period, and Public Meeting for the proposed Project, the 8 9 Port further extended the comment period, providing a total of 90 days for public review. The 10 comment period ended on March 13, 2017. Notices relating to release of the Draft EIR were also published in the local newspaper, the Press-Telegram on December 15, 2016; and 11 12 January 8, 27, and February 12, 2017. Please see Master Response – CEQA Notification. 13 **Response to Comment LLI-2:** Section 3.6.4 of the Draft EIR provided a detailed discussion

14 on potential property acquisitions that may be required if the proposed Project or one of its 15 alternatives is approved. As stated in Section 3.6.4.1, the proposed Project is in the planning 16 process. No final construction plans, ROW mapping, or decisions regarding possible 17 acquisitions of any privately held interests in properties have been made. No commitment to 18 acquire any property interest can be made without compliance with a series of procedural 19 steps called for under the California Eminent Domain Law (California Code of Civil Procedure 20 Secs. 1230.010 et seq.) and applicable relocation statutes and resolutions (CCR Secs. 6000 21 et seq.), among other requirements.

The Port is conducting outreach to the property owners and business tenants in and around the proposed Project location. As the planning process for the proposed Project progresses, and if the proposed Project or one of its alternatives is approved, the Port would work with these stakeholders to ensure that concerns are addressed in accordance with applicable regulations.

Response to Comment LLI-3: The commenter lists a series of questions in portions of the comment on page 1 of the letter; however, it is not clear as to whether the commenter has listed the questions to represent what was already included in the EIR process or if the commenter is asking these questions as they relate to the Draft EIR for the proposed Project. Nonetheless, the Port is providing responses as follows.

As discussed in the Draft EIR, Section 1.8.2, the railroad track work for the proposed Project would begin just west of the Dominguez Channel at the junction of the Long Beach Lead track with the Alameda Corridor (shown in Figure 1.8-1). The number of tracks for each Project alternative is listed in Table 1.8-1 of the Draft EIR. For the proposed 12th Street Alternative, there would be 48 tracks. For the 10th Street Alternative, there would be 34 tracks. There would be 21 tracks under the 9th Street Alternative.

38 The commenter asks where the associated operating stations would be located. There would

- be no "stations" associated with the proposed Project. All yard activity would occur in the openyard areas.
- 41 PHL would continue to manage activities within the yard, as it does at present.
- 42 Section 3.13 of the Draft EIR discusses the existing visual environment and changes resulting
- 43 from implementation of the proposed Project or one of its alternatives. As discussed on page
- 44 3.13-1 of the Draft EIR, one of the fundamentals of aesthetic analysis is the evaluation of
- 45 visual resources among visual landscape character, including background views. In the

- 1 context of the background, the skyline can be important as a visual element because objects
- 2 above this point are highlighted against the typically blue background. The Draft EIR did not
- 3 identify any significant aesthetic or visual impacts associated with the proposed Project.

Marine life would not be affected by the proposed Project, because no work within the harbor
waters would be necessary.

As noted in Master Response – Property Acquisition, Compensation, and Relocation, final
design activities have not begun. Once final design begins, subsequent to approval of a
Project by the BHC, more precise information would become known regarding many of the
guestions articulated in the comment.

For responses to questions about potential property acquisitions, please see Master Response – Property Acquisition, Compensation, and Relocation. Please note that it would be premature for the commenter to have been contacted regarding the information contained in the second set of bulleted items on page 2 of the comment letter at this time for the reasons stated in the referenced Master Response.

Response to Comment LLI-4: The comment relates to issues of economics rather than environmental impacts, and is beyond the scope of CEQA (Section 15131 of the CEQA Guidelines). Nonetheless, the Port responds as follows. Please see response to Comment LLI-2. Please also see Master Response – Property Acquisitions, Compensation, and Relocation.

- 20 **Response to Comment LLI-5:** The comment relates to issues of economics rather than 21 environmental impacts, and is beyond the scope of CEQA. (Section 15131 of the CEQA 22 Guidelines). Nonetheless, the Port responds as follows. The CEQA EIR process is only the 23 initial step in the planning process. Final Project design (including the final list of properties 24 affected) would not occur until after certification of the Final EIR and approval of the Project 25 by the BHC. The purpose of an EIR is to determine potential environmental effects associated 26 with a proposed project. The EIR preparation does not preclude property owners from 27 conducting business or selling property. Furthermore, economic issues, such as property 28 values, are not a consideration required to be evaluated under CEQA.
- 29 **Response to Comment LLI-6:** Please see response to Comment LLI-5 above.

Response to Comment LLI-7: CEQA mandates a minimum of 45 days for public review of a Draft EIR for a project of regional significance; the Port exceeded this requirement by initially establishing a 60-day public review period (ending on February 13, 2017). The Port extended this review to 90 days (ending on March 13, 2017). It also held three public hearings during this period. Stakeholder concerns are addressed by means of responses to individual comments raised during the comment period. Stakeholders may submit additional comments prior to certification of the Final EIR. Please see Master Response – CEQA Notification.

It is important to note that no property acquisitions or relocations would occur until after
 certification of the Final EIR, and only if certain other legally required steps have been
 completed. Please see Master Response – Property Acquisitions, Compensation, and
 Relocation.

Response to Comment LLI-8: Please see Master Response – Property Acquisition, Compensation, and Relocation. The Port recognizes the many factors associated with relocation of businesses. For those businesses that may be subject to acquisition, each such business would be consulted regarding their individual requirements, regarding a broad range 1 of factors and considerations. Adequate time would be provided for business planning,

- 2 relocation site selection, equipment and supply moving, customer notification, and such other
- 3 factors as may be important to the individual affected business. These considerations would
- 4 apply to businesses on privately owned parcels and POLB tenants within the Project footprint.

5 **Response to Comment LLI-9:** The Port recognizes that construction activities would result 6 in temporary jobs if the proposed Project or one of its alternatives is approved. The Port would 7 work with affected property owners and Port tenants to ensure relocation or compensation in 8 accordance with California Eminent Domain Law (California Code of Civil Procedure Secs. 9 1230.010 et seq.) and applicable relocation statutes and resolutions (CCR Secs. 6000 et seq.), among other requirements. For those businesses who are successfully relocated, there 10 11 should be no adverse effect on associated permanent employment, assuming the affected 12 business chooses to continue operation as it has prior to the relocation. A suitable relocation 13 site would be provided consistent with the business plan of the affected business.

Response to Comment LLI-10: The comment does not relate to the content of the Draft EIR or raise an environmental issue. Nonetheless, the Port responds as follows. The Port concurs with the commenter that ancillary support services will grow over time commensurate with the growth in general cargo. The attributes noted in the comment concerning private businesses will likely contribute to the ongoing allocation of land uses within the general Harbor District to those businesses.

Response to Comment LLI-11: Please see Master Response – Property Acquisition, Compensation, and Relocation. If the proposed Project or one of its alternatives is approved, the Port would work with affected property owners and Port tenants to ensure compliance with California Eminent Domain Law (California Code of Civil Procedure Secs. 1230.010 *et seq.*) and applicable relocation statutes and resolutions (CCR Secs. 6000 *et seq.*), among other requirements.

- Response to Comment LLI-12: Please see Master Response Property Acquisition,
 Compensation, and Relocation.
- Response to Comment LLI-13: Please see Master Response Property Acquisition,
 Compensation, and Relocation.
- Response to Comment LLI-14: Please see Master Response Property Acquisitions,
 Compensation, and Relocation.
- Response to Comment LLI-15: Please see Master Response Property Acquisitions,
 Compensation, and Relocation.
- Response to Comment LLI-16: Please see Master Response Property Acquisitions,
 Compensation, and Relocation.
- Response to Comment LLI-17: Please see Master Response Property Acquisitions,
 Compensation, and Relocation.
- 38 **Response to Comment LLI-18:** The Port agrees with the commenter that projections of
- 39 future cargo volumes are subject to change as the result of changes in socioeconomic and
- 40 political conditions. As stated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15144 Forecasting: Drafting an EIR
- 41 necessarily involves some degree of forecasting. While foreseeing the unforeseeable is not
- 42 possible, an agency must use its best efforts to find out and disclose all that it reasonably can.

1 Because global trade conditions vary over time, the Port periodically conducts cargo forecasts 2 for both the near term and longer time horizon to inform the Port's planning process. As 3 described in Section 1.2.2 in the Draft EIR, at the time the Draft EIR analysis was performed for the proposed Project, the 2009 cargo forecast was used, which forecasted higher cargo 4 throughput levels than the subsequent cargo forecast prepared in 2016. It is too early to 5 predict the impact of the United States' withdrawal from the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP). 6 7 **Response to Comment LLI-19:** With respect to the comment about inconsistencies with train 8 capacities, in Section ES.2 (Project Need and Objectives), it is stated "Approximately 40 9 percent of waterborne container cargo destined for the U.S. flow through the two ports. The 10 most efficient means of moving that cargo to its ultimate destination is to transfer containers 11 directly to rail, assemble trains carrying an average of 250 containers each, and dispatch

12 those trains to their respective Class 1 railroad main lines as guickly as possible."

13 Transporting a container by means of truck chassis typically involves three trips: one trip from 14 the truck dispatch location to pick up the container, a second trip to the destination, and a third 15 trip back to the point of dispatch. Therefore, 250 containers on a train would translate to 750 truck trips. The commenter refers to presentations held on March 3, 2017; however, it does 16 17 not identify who provided the presentations or where the presentations were held. The Port is not aware of any presentations specific to the proposed Project on March 3, 2017, nor of any 18 19 references to "in excess of 1000 tucks [sic]," as it relates to the elimination of container trucks 20 from the road. The Draft EIR and presentations provided in the public hearings and in 21 materials related to the proposed Project consistently cite the 750 container trucks 22 comparison. Please also see response to Comment GSR-2.

23 **Response to Comment LLI-20:** The Port recognizes that vacancy rates are low. The Draft 24 EIR, as an environmental review document prepared according to CEQA, does not include 25 nor require a commitment to develop properties for relocation because all displacements are considered potential only. It would be premature to make such commitments at this juncture. 26 27 After the Final EIR is certified, if the proposed Project or one of its alternatives is approved, 28 the Port would work with affected property owners and its tenants to assist with relocation at 29 that time. Because this timeframe cannot be predicted, the vacancy rate and availability of 30 suitable relocation space would be assessed at that time. Please also see response to 31 Comment LLI-8 and Master Response – Property Acquisition, Compensation, and Relocation.

32 Response to Comment LLI-21: The comment states that the proposed Project "does not 33 meet the requirements of the [SCAQMD]." It is unclear to what "requirements" the commenter 34 is referring. The proposed Project, if approved, would comply with all applicable SCAQMD 35 requirements. To the extent that the commenter is referring to SCAQMD's thresholds of 36 significance, it is important to note that those are simply the suggested thresholds against 37 which air quality impacts are to be assessed for significance. With regard to the potential 38 health effects of the proposed Project, please see Section 3.2 of the Draft EIR, particularly 39 pages 3.2-53 through 3.2-63. Please see response to Comment GSR-2 for a discussion of 40 the potential for the proposed Project to replace many future drayage truck trips from the 41 terminal served by the Pier B Rail Yard.

42 **Response to Comment LLI-22:** Please see Master Response – Community Grants Program.

43 **Response to Comment LLI-23:** The CGP provides funding opportunities for community 44 programs and capital projects aimed at mitigating effects of projects located in the COLB, Responses to Comments

including those with cumulative environmental impacts that potentially affect neighboring
 cities. Please see Master Response – Community Grants Program.

Response to Comment LLI-24: The noise and vibration analysis in the Draft EIR was performed consistent with industry standards and in accordance with CEQA requirements. The Draft EIR findings indicate that there are no significant noise or vibration impacts associated with construction and operation of the proposed Project. For a response to the comment about liquefaction, please see response to Comment SEA-20. Please also see Master Response – Noise and Vibration Associated with Trains.

Response to Comment LLI-25: The issue of train horn noise is addressed in the Draft EIR
in Section 3.8.1.3 (page 3.8-6), Section 3.8.1.5 (pages 3.8-9 and 3.8-11), and Section 3.8.2.2
(page 3.8-20). Train horn noise is also addressed in response to Comments SCAC-3 and
SCAC-8. Rail car coupling noise was included in the evaluation of rail yard noise on page
3.8-24 of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response – Noise and Vibration Associated
with Trains.

15 Response to Comment LLI-26: In the Draft EIR, Section 3.7 (Public Services and Safety) 16 evaluated the potential impacts of the proposed Project on emergency service response times 17 and service levels, and determined that proposed Project impacts would be less than 18 significant. As explained in Section 3.7, there would still be access between the West Side of 19 Long Beach and the downtown area via Anaheim Street and Pacific Coast Highway. The 20 comment does not directly dispute the information, analyses, or conclusions in Section 3.7. Please also see Master Response - Street Closures, Access to Downtown Long Beach, and 21 22 Public Services Access.

Regarding emergency evacuations, the COLB maintains an emergency evacuation plan that
 is updated regularly. Collaboration with and review of the proposed Project by both the Fire
 and Police Departments has been ongoing, and would continue through Project approval, final
 design, construction, and implementation.

27 **Response to Comment LLI-27:** With regard to the conclusion that the Draft EIR did not 28 adequately address the items listed in the prior comments, please see responses to 29 Comments LLI-1 through LLI-26. Please also see Master Response – Property Acquisition, 30 Compensation, and Relocation. The Port recognizes the importance of private property and 31 businesses in our community. The CEQA evaluation is the first step in the Project planning 32 process; and it is envisioned that this process will continue to evolve. The concerns raised by 33 this comment are not issues that are necessarily addressed in the CEQA document, rather 34 these are part of the procedural steps that would occur if the proposed Project is approved 35 and final engineering is completed. It the proposed Project is approved, the Port is committed 36 to working with affected property owners and Port tenants to ensure relocation or 37 compensation in accordance with California Eminent Domain Law (California Code of Civil 38 Procedure Secs. 1230.010 et seq.) and applicable relocation statutes and resolutions (CCR 39 Secs. 6000 et seq.), among other requirements.

Response to Comment LLI-28: With regard to the portion of the comment relating to parties
 being unaware of the proposed Project, please see Master Response – CEQA Notification
 and response to Comment LLI-1. The comment is otherwise noted and will be presented to
 the decision-makers for their consideration.

1 **Response to Comment LLI-29:** The Port thanks you for your review of the Draft EIR and 2 your comments concerning LAN Logistics and LAN Warehouse, Inc. Responses to the 3 attached letter are shown in responses to Comments LLI-1 through LLI-28.

Response to Comment LLI-30: Please see Master Response – CEQA Notification and response to Comment LLI-1. The Port appreciates your comment concerning notification. The e-mail notification of December 15, 2016, was the first notification that the public received on issuance of the Draft EIR. The Port will continue to provide notification to affected property owners and its tenants throughout the course of Project planning and will add your office to

9 the notification list.

1 11.2.3.25 Magnolia Industrial Group, Inc. (MIG)

long	Box 16325 Beach, CA 90806
March	13, 2017
Via Er Heath Direct Port o 4801 Long I	nail: heather.tomley@polb.com er Tomley or of Environmental Planning f Long Beach Airport Plaza Drive Beach, CA 90815
	Re: PIER B On-Dock Rail Facility
Dear I	vls. Tomley:
Below Harbo and C	is the Opposition on behalf of Magnolia Industrial Group. Please distribute to all the r Commissioners and to whomever else requires a copy. I am also copying the Mayor MIG .
	Opposition to POLB Pier B: On-Dock Rail Facility
Envi	ronmental Issues
	Air Pollution: The Preliminary EIR Report clearly states that this project will NOT meet with the requirements of the South Coast Air Quality Management District. This will increase Asthma & Cancer Rates for all Owners, Management & Employees of the more than 300 Industrial Businesses and the thousands of residents living in the Willmore, Wrigley & Westside Areas, especially effecting the Children, Teachers & Staff at the Schools in Long Beach.
	Inadequate Mitigation: The Preliminary EIR states that the Port will fund a


2 Responses to Magnolia Industrial Group, Inc.

Response to Comment MIG-1: The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your review of the
 Draft EIR. Your comments will be taken into consideration as the BHC evaluates its decisions
 regarding the proposed Project.

6 **Response to Comment MIG-2:** The comment states that the proposed Project "does not 7 meet the requirements of the [SCAQMD]." It is unclear what "requirements" the commenter is 8 referring. The proposed Project, if approved, would need to comply with all applicable 9 SCAQMD requirements. To the extent that the commenter is referring to SCAQMD's 10 thresholds of significance, it is important to note that those are simply the suggested thresholds against which impacts are to be assessed for significance. With regard to potential 11 12 health effects of the proposed Project, please see Section 3.2 of the Draft EIR, particularly 13 pages 3.2-53 through 3.2-63. The potential impact on the students, teachers, and staff at area 14 schools was considered.

Res	nonses	to	Comments
1103	ponses	10	Commenta

1 Specifically, schools were modeled for potential health risks under both occupational and

2 student exposure assumptions (teachers and staff are included in the "occupational" receptor

3 category, and students are included along with other receptor types in the "sensitive" receptor 4 category). Draft EIR Table 3.2-24 shows that all modeled receptors, including area schools.

5 would have less than significant cancer and non-cancer health impacts during construction

6 and operation of the mitigated proposed Project.

7 Impacts from criteria pollutant concentrations associated with the proposed Project are 8 described on pages 3.2-40 through 3.2-45 of the Draft EIR for the construction period, and 9 pages 3.2-49 through 3.2-52 of the Draft EIR for the operational period. Response to Comment AQMD-5 evaluates the operational period for the proposed Project with the refined 10 11 boundary, as described in Section 10.1 of the Final EIR. The mitigated proposed Project would 12 produce significant NO₂ concentrations in certain areas near the Project site during both the 13 construction and operational periods. The geographical extent of significant NO₂ impacts 14 during the operational period of the proposed Project with the refined boundary is shown in 15 Figures 2.2-1 through 2.2-5 in response to Comment AQMD-5. These NO₂ exceedance areas 16 during proposed Project operation would not extend over any modeled school; the closest 17 school is Edison Elementary School, located approximately 1,200 feet southeast of the nearest exceedance area. A discussion of the types of health effects that may be associated 18 19 with NO_x and NO₂ exposure is provided on pages 3.2-48 and 3.2-49 of the Draft EIR.

Furthermore, the proposed Project may produce operational criteria pollutant and health impacts that are less than the values presented in the Draft and Final EIR by replacing many future drayage truck trips from the terminals served by the Pier B Rail Yard with rail transport. The potential air quality benefit associated with fewer drayage truck trips was not quantified in this EIR (although the impact of the additional rail transport *was* quantified). Please see response to Comment GSR-2 for a more thorough discussion of this potential air quality benefit.

27 **Response to Comment MIG-3:** The comment expresses an opinion that the level of funding

of community grants as air quality and GHG mitigation measures is inadequate to address the
 extent of the environmental impacts. Please see Master Response – Community Grants
 Program.

31 Response to Comment MIG-4: The comment expresses a concern that the proposed 32 Project's effects on the local ground transportation network would restrict access to the Port 33 and to the COLB from West Long Beach. The commenter is not correct regarding the streets 34 that would be closed off. As shown in Figure 3.5-5 of the Draft EIR, access would continue to be available from along the entirety of Anaheim Street; portions of the southerly segments of 35 36 Jackson, Santa Fe, Canal, and Harbor avenues would be permanently closed, while 9th Street 37 would be closed south of Anaheim to its terminus at I-710. Access to the Port and COLB 38 (Downtown Long Beach) from West Long Beach would continue to be available via Anaheim 39 Street to I-710 south to the Port. Access to Downtown Long Beach from West Long Beach would continue to be available via Pacific Coast Highway as well. 40

The traffic analysis addressed the potential for traffic congestion as a result of the changes to
 the roadway system proposed as part of the proposed Project and determined that the impacts

would be less than significant. The comment did not identify any deficiencies in the traffic
 impact analysis prepared for the proposed Project. Please also see Master Response – Street

impact analysis prepared for the proposed Project. Please also see Master Res
 Closures, Access to Downtown Long Beach, and Public Services Access.

Response to Comment MIG-5: Please see response to Comment LLI-26 and Master
 Response – Street Closures, Access to Downtown Long Beach, and Public Services Access.

3 **Response to Comment MIG-6:** The commenter indicates that police from the Long Beach 4 West Division located at 1835 Santa Fe Avenue can easily get to the main Long Beach Police 5 Department Headquarters in 5 to 7 minutes and that if the proposed Project is approved, it 6 would take 20 to 30 minutes, depending on traffic. The main Long Beach Police Department 7 (also South Patrol Division), is located at 400 West Broadway in Downtown Long Beach, 8 approximately 2.5 miles southwest of the West Division Station; currently this route is 9 estimated to take 5 minutes, subject to traffic conditions. It is anticipated that if the proposed 10 Project is approved and implemented, the time needed to drive from the West Division to the 11 main Police Department would increase by approximately 5 minutes via West Anaheim Street 12 or Pacific Coast Highway. However, as discussed in Section 3.7 of the Draft EIR, a portion of 13 the proposed Project's area of influence is served by the West and South Patrol Divisions. 14 Police from these stations would directly serve the population near the proposed Project.

15 Section 3.7 of the Draft EIR addresses the potential impacts to public services that would 16 result from construction and operation of the proposed Project and its alternatives. Emergency 17 services include law enforcement and fire protection. Section 3.7.2.1 of the Draft EIR (page 18 3.7-7) defines the significance criteria for public services (police and fire protection) in terms 19 of whether the proposed Project would result in the need to add, expand, modify, or relocate 20 existing public facilities (i.e., police and fire) to maintain acceptable service ratios, response 21 times, or other performance objectives, and the construction of which could cause significant 22 impacts. For purposes of CEQA, emergency response times, in and of themselves, are not 23 considered an environmental issue. Because the Pier B Rail Yard is not a public facility, 24 proposed improvements to the rail yard would not result in any need for additional police and 25 fire services, nor would it burden existing staff levels. The proposed Project would not result 26 in significant impacts on emergency services.

Response to Comment MIG-7: Economic issues are not a consideration that must be
 evaluated under CEQA (CEQA Guidelines Section 15131). Please also see response to
 Comment WPAC-9.

30 Response to Comment MIG-8: This comment expresses the commenter's views regarding 31 the potential economic effects of the proposed Project. This view will be considered by the 32 decision-makers when they consider approval of the proposed Project. However, as is noted 33 in response to Comment MIG-7 above, economic issues are not required to be evaluated 34 under CEQA. Please also see response to Comment WPAC-9.

Response to Comment MIG-9: Please see responses to Comments MIG-1 through MIG-8
 and WPAC-9.

1 **11.2.3.26 Marisa Foods (MF)**

Mare	h 13, 2017	
Heatl Direc Port o 4801 Long	her Tomley ctor of Environmental Planning of Long Beach Airport Plaza Drive ; Beach, CA 90815	
RE: I	PIER B ON DOCK RAIL SUPPORT FACILITY	
Dear	Ms. Tomley:	
As be Facil comm reside altern	oth a property and business owner in Long Beach, I am writing to oppose the On Dock Rail Support ity at Pier B. This project will have a severe negative impact on the Long Beach Westside nunity. These negative impacts are environmental, financial, and economic, and will affect both ents and businesses on the Westside and surrounding communities. For this reason, we oppose all natives, except the No Project Alternative.	ЛF
The e Desp stand stand surro with this p	environmental issues are many, including increased air pollution, noise pollution, and vibration. ite the Port's efforts to reduce air pollution in the area, air quality remains far below regulatory lards. The draft EIR contends that even with mitigation, the project will not meet regulatory lards for air quality. In addition, once the project is complete, employees and residents in the bunding area will be subject to increased health risks. How will the Port address the costs associated increased risk of pulmonary disease for residents and employees, risks that are the direct result of project?	MF
Vibra exist the d will t prob will t	ation is already a problem on the Westside, the increased vibration from trains would endanger ing structures, or at the least require additional maintenance and support. In addition, I do not believe raft EIR adequately addresses noise pollution, as anyone who has lived or worked near a rail terminal tell you. Furthermore, the disruption of utilities, such as intermittent power outages, is already lematic in the area. These power outages and spikes endanger sensitive computer equipment. How the project address these cost increases on its neighbors?	ЛF
Acces acces unsu hamp econ to ha	ess to surrounding areas is also an issue. Many on the Westside are dependent for their livelihood on ss to Downtown Long Beach and the Port. Without easy, ready access, many would experience stainable decreases in business activity. Customers, vendors, employees, and other services would be pered. Changing the existing infrastructure without adequately addressing access may well disrupt the omic viability of many business in the area. How will the Port address the need for these businesses we easy access, not only to the port, but to Downtown Long Beach and surrounding areas?	ЛF
Beca	use of these many factors, property owners, no doubt will see reduced property values. This will	٨F

business owners, property owners, residents, and other stakeholders in the community for these losses? If the business of the Port is to take precedence over the business of community members, then how does the Port intend to compensate those losses? The Port has little right to impose costs against its neighbors' will without just compensation if this project is to be approved.	– MF6 (Cont'd)
It is evident that the draft EIT does not adequately address the costs associated with this project and the severe negative impact on the surrounding community. For these reasons, I am opposed.	- MF-7
Sincerely	
Vincent Passanisi	
President	
Santa Fe Importers, Inc.	

2 Responses to Marisa Foods

3 Response to Comment MF-1: The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your review of the Draft EIR and your comments. Air pollution is evaluated in Section 3.2 of the Draft EIR, while 4 noise and vibration are evaluated in Section 3.8. Noise impacts from the proposed Project 5 6 were found to be less than significant (see Table ES.10-1). Mitigation measures for impacts 7 to air quality would reduce some pollutant concentrations but not below applicable thresholds 8 of significance, and there is no additional mitigation available or feasible. As is noted in 9 response to Comment MIG-7, economic issues are not required to be evaluated under CEQA 10 unless they have corresponding adverse environmental impacts.

11 **Response to Comment MF-2:** This comment asks how the Port would address the costs of 12 the increased risk of pulmonary disease for residents and employees, risks that are the direct 13 result of this Project. Presumably the commenter is referring to the proposed Project's 14 significant NO_X emissions and NO₂ concentrations identified in Tables 3.2-19 and 3.2-21, 15 respectively, of the Draft EIR. The geographical extent of significant NO₂ concentrations during the operational period is shown in Figures A2-32 through A2-36 in Appendix A2. The 16 17 impacts of the proposed Project with its refined boundary, as described in Section 10.1 of the 18 Final EIR, are presented in response to Comment AQMD-5 with no change in the Draft EIR's 19 significance findings. A discussion of the types of health effects (including pulmonary effects) 20 that may be associated with NO_x and NO₂ exposure is provided on pages 3.2-48 and 3.2-49. While the statistical risk of pulmonary disease might be increased by the proposed Project, 21 22 the actual link between local air pollutant concentrations and specific cases of pulmonary 23 disease is difficult to identify, as is the contribution to the overall risk of other, non-Project-24 related factors. As stated on page 3.2-48 of the Draft EIR, the Port is not aware of any scientific 25 models that are designed to statistically correlate mass emissions of NO_x and project-specific 26 health impacts.

Moreover, the proposed Project may produce operational criteria pollutant and health impacts that are less than the values presented in the Draft and Final EIR by replacing many future drayage truck trips from the terminal served by the Pier B Rail Yard with rail transport. The potential air quality benefit associated with fewer drayage truck trips was conservatively not quantified in this EIR (although the impact of the additional rail transport *was* quantified). Please see response to Comment GSR-2 for a more thorough discussion of this potential air guality benefit.

Response to Comment MF-3: As is noted in Section 3.8 of the Draft EIR, construction and operational vibration have been analyzed and found not to result in a significant impact in accordance with FTA criteria and City standards. Please see Section 3.8.2.3 (NOISE-2 and NOISE-8) of the Draft EIR for further information.

5 The comment states that vibration is already a problem in the Project area, but it does not 6 identify the sources, timing, or duration of the vibration. Existing vibration on the West side could not possibly be associated with train activity at the Pier B Rail Yard because of the 7 8 substantial distance (i.e., approximately 0.25 mile) that exists between the yard and West 9 side. Instead, this vibration would most likely be associated with heavy trucks travelling on the very poorly maintained streets in the area. The vibration impact is assessed entirely based on 10 11 train operations related to the proposed Project because the criteria is based on expected 12 vibration levels generated by the Project itself (and does not consider the background level of 13 vibration). The existing vibration is not relevant to assessment of operational vibration impacts. 14 Evaluation of vibration impacts is based solely on whether the vibration source will exceed 15 FTA human annovance or building damage criteria. Per the analysis in the Draft EIR, these 16 vibration criteria are not expected to be exceeded; therefore, neither human annoyance nor 17 building damage vibration impacts relating to train operations are anticipated.

18 The comment expresses a concern that vibration from trains could endanger existing 19 structures; this concern is addressed in detail in response to Comment SEA-20. As noted in 20 that response, vibration from train movement expected at a distance of 25 feet would be less 21 than that of a vibratory compactor/roller. Marisa Foods (1401 Santa Fe Avenue) is 22 approximately 1,300 feet from the existing Pier B Rail Yard; this business would be 23 approximately 735 feet from the proposed Project. Only a substantially higher peak stress 24 level, such as that associated with an earthquake, would have a noticeable effect on soil-25 transmitted vibration. Finally, the comment expresses an opinion that the Draft EIR does not adequately address noise pollution, but it does not provide specific information on what 26 27 aspects of the noise analysis presented in Section 3.8 of the Draft EIR are deemed to be 28 inadequate. The general nature of the comment makes a specific response difficult to 29 formulate. Responses to Comments SCAC-3, SCAC-8, LLI-24, and LLI-25 all address specific 30 noise issues associated with the proposed Project. Please also see Master Response – Noise 31 and Vibration Associated with Trains.

32 Response to Comment MF-4: Changeovers of utilities from various locations within the 33 proposed Project footprint to the proposed utility corridors within the improved Pier B Rail Yard would occur in a planned manner, with service transfers occurring in as short of a period as 34 35 is practicable. The Port would coordinate closely with SCE and other domestic utility providers 36 to avoid interruptions to local service. While it is not known if any utilities would be affected that currently serve the vicinity of Marisa Foods, given that the business location is several 37 38 blocks to the north of the proposed Project, the likelihood of a utility interruption would be low. 39 However, the concern is noted and attention will be paid to the business vicinity as utility 40 planning continues.

Response to Comment MF-5: The comment expresses a concern that Westside businesses would be affected by possible loss of access to Downtown Long Beach and the Port. The traffic analysis addressed the potential for traffic congestion as a result of the changes to the roadway system proposed as part of the proposed Project, and determined that the impacts would be less than significant. The proposed Project and alternatives would not affect the existing access from West Long Beach to Downtown Long Beach available along Anaheim

- 1 Street, Pacific Coast Highway, and I-710. Access from Westside businesses to the Port would
- 2 continue to be available on the east via Anaheim Street to I-710 to Pico Avenue; access from
- 3 the west would be via Anaheim Street, Farragut Street, Anaheim Way, and Pier B Street.
- 4 Please see Master Response – Street Closures, Access to Downtown Long Beach, and Public
- 5 Services Access.
- 6 Response to Comment MF-6: This is not a comment on the Draft EIR. Economic issues such as those mentioned are beyond the scope of CEQA. Please also see responses to 7 8 Comments MIG-7, MIG-8, and WPAC-9. Please also see Master Response – Property
- 9 Acquisition, Compensation, and Relocation.
- 10 Response to Comment MF-7: While economic and social effects of the proposed Project 11 are generally beyond the scope of the CEQA process, the Port is committed to preventing and minimizing community impacts to the extent feasible. 12
- 13 Marisa Foods' opposition to the proposed Project is noted. The comment is hereby part of the
- 14 Final EIR; therefore, it is before the decision-makers for their consideration prior to taking any
- 15 action on the proposed Project.

1 **11.2.3.27** Pacific Maritime Shipping Association (PMSA)

PACIFIC MERCHANT SHIPPING ASSOCIATION	
March 13, 2017	
Heather Tomley Director of Environmental Planning Port of Long Beach 4801 Airport Plaza Drive Long Beach, CA 90815	
Subject: Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Draft Environmental Impact Report	
Dear Ms. Tomley:	
The Pacific Merchant Shipping Association (PMSA) would like to express its support for the Pier B On- Dock Support Facility. This needed infrastructure will allow more cargo to move on-dock, improving efficiency while at the same time reducing pollution.	
The use of on-dock railyards eliminates truck trips and congestion both at the port and throughout the region. As a leading gateway, the Port of Long Beach has already invested in some of the most extensive on-dock facilities in the country; the Pier B On-Dock Support Facility will leverage that investment allowing terminals to increase their efficiency. As a downstream effect, this infrastructure will also improve port competitiveness and help the port retain market share.	A-1
In addition, the proposed project will also positively impact the surrounding community. For one, a smaller number of trucks on the road will reduce pollution and improve air quality—improving community health and the environment. Also, the project construction will create needed jobs in the area. Not only will this initiative be a benefit to the Port of Long Beach terminals, but an environmental and economic benefit to the surrounding community.	
The Port should move forward with this project as quickly as possible. The sooner this facility is completed, the sooner this community will gain the benefits of improved air quality and reduced traffic.	
Sincerely, Homes Adenie' Thomas Jelenić Vice President	
PMSA LONG BEACH One World Trade Center, Suite 1700, Long Beach, California USA 90831 PMSASHIP.COM	

3 *Response to Pacific Maritime Shipping Association*

4 **Response to Comment PMSA-1:** The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your review of the

5 Draft EIR and your comments in support of the proposed Project.

1 11.2.3.28 Phillips Steel Company (PSC)

	GREEN	BERG, WHITCOMBE, TAKEU	CHI,
		GIBSON & GRAYVER, LLP	
RICHARD C. GREENBER	RG	2:515 HAWTHORNE BOULEVARD, SUITE 450	MICHAEL E. ADLER*
DERRICK K. TAKEUCHI	I	(310) 540-2000	JEFFREY L. PARKER*
MICHAEL J GIBSON LEONARD GRAYVER		FAX (310) 540-6609 - (310) 315-0505 E-MAIL: GWTLLP@GWTLLP.COM	•OF COUNSEL
SAMANTHA F LAMBER MICHAEL J. WEINBERG	iG ER		
JOEL L. BENAVIDES DIMITRY LENSKY			
‡Also Member of District of	of Columbia Bar		SENDERS E-MAIL SLAMBERG@GWTLLP.COM
		March 3, 2017	orthweather the two sectors and the development
			OUR FILE JDW/3260
VIA E-MAII	L AND HAND DELIV	ERY	
Ms. Heather	Tomley		
Director of Er	nvironmental Planning		
Port of Long	Beach		
4801 Airport	Plaza Drive		
Long Beach,	California 90815		
Email: heathe	r.tomley@polb.com		
	Comment and Oppo	sition by Phillips Steel Company	
Dear Ms. Tor	nley:		
Th	his firm represents Phill	lips Steel Company ("Phillips") a far	mily-owned business started in
Long Beach o	over 100 years ago. Phi	illips strongly opposes the Pier B On	h-Dock Rail Support Facility
and devastation	ng impact on Phillips' k	business and its employees and will	likely require the closure of
Dhilling' hugi	ness at its longtime loca	ation Nevertheless the Draft EIR h	as no meaningful discussion of
FILLINGS LODGE	nvironmental impacts or	or a plan for relocation as they relate	to Phillips.
the adverse en		1	. ೨
the adverse er			
the adverse en	duction		
the adverse er	duction		
1. Intro	duction he Draft EIR fails to cor	mply with the requirements of CEQ/	A. Given the inevitable regional
1. Intro	duction he Draft EIR fails to cor al impacts of this massi	mply with the requirements of CEQ/ ive Project, it is especially important	A. Given the inevitable regional that the Draft EIR contain the
1. Intro Th and acute locs necessary ana employage	duction he Draft EIR fails to cor al impacts of this massi ilysis and description to of the public to underst	mply with the requirements of CEQ/ ive Project, it is especially important > enable decision makers, impacted b	A. Given the inevitable regional that the Draft EIR contain the pusinesses, residents and pacts. But here the Draft EIR
1. Introd The adverse end 1. Introd The and acute loc: necessary ana employees, and	duction he Draft EIR fails to cor al impacts of this massi alysis and description to nd the public to underst	mply with the requirements of CEQ/ ive Project, it is especially important benable decision makers, impacted be land the Project's environmental imp	A. Given the inevitable regional that the Draft EIR contain the businesses, residents and bacts. But here, the Draft EIR
I. Introd Th and acute loc: necessary ana employees, an	duction he Draft EIR fails to cor al impacts of this massi alysis and description to nd the public to underst	mply with the requirements of CEQ/ ive Project, it is especially important o enable decision makers, impacted b tand the Project's environmental imp	A. Given the inevitable regional that the Draft EIR contain the businesses, residents and bacts. But here, the Draft EIR
I. Introv Th and acute loc: necessary ana employees, an	duction he Draft EIR fails to cor al impacts of this massi alysis and description to nd the public to underst	mply with the requirements of CEQ/ ive Project, it is especially important enable decision makers, impacted b tand the Project's environmental imp	A. Given the inevitable regional that the Draft EIR contain the businesses, residents and bacts. But here, the Draft EIR
1. Intro Th and acute loc: necessary ana employees, an	duction he Draft EIR fails to cor al impacts of this massi alysis and description to nd the public to underst	mply with the requirements of CEQ/ ive Project, it is especially important b enable decision makers, impacted b tand the Project's environmental imp	A. Given the inevitable regional that the Draft EIR contain the businesses, residents and bacts. But here, the Draft EIR



¹ The very first illustration, Figure ES-1, which purports to be the Project Vicinity Map, is mislabeled. For instance, the wrong street is identified as Anaheim Street (a core project boundary). 14th Street, which is also labeled as 11th Street, is incorrectly labeled as well. See Exhibit 1 attached.

² Attached as Exhibit 2 are satellite photographs of these two locations provided by GoogleMaps.

PSC-4

LAW OFFICES GREENBERG, WHITCOMBE, TAKEUCHI, GIBSON & GRAYVER, LLP

Ms. Heather Tomley March 3, 2017 Page 3

3. Other Opposition

We understand that numerous other Westside businesses, including those associated with the WestPAC, are adamantly opposed to the Pier B Rail Project, as well as Long Beach homeowners both on the west side and on the east side of the Long Beach Freeway. Residents, employees and businesses on the Westside will suffer the most direct impacts, as the Project adds 36 tracks to the existing 12 to service trains as long as 10,000 feet. The massive scope of that rail system as it relates to the Westside can be seen in Exhibit 3, attached.³ The related air and noise pollution and traffic impacts on adjacent businesses will be not just "significant," but enormous. We understand that counsel for Superior Electrical has filed a more technical challenge to the draft EIR. We have read, and join, that opposition. Rather than repeat those comments, we are particularizing the impact to Phillips and the other businesses located on the block bordered by Harbor Avenue and Fashion Avenue to the west and east, and Anaheim Street and 12th Street, to the north and south.

4. Westside Businesses and Local Impacts, Including on the MSC

In the Draft EIR, the Port touts the significant advantages of the Project to the Port and its business. That states the obvious. The Draft EIR also acknowledges that numerous businesses in the direct pathway of the 36 new tracks will have to be condemned and/or relocated. What it does not acknowledge, much less detail, are the numerous small and large Long Beach businesses and hundreds of PSC-5 employees and Long Beach citizens on the Westside that will be devastated by the Project as described. One has to simply drive up and down the local streets with a copy of the plans to imagine what will result from operating and living next to a 48-track rail system both during construction and after it is completed. Long time businesses and substantial employers like Phillips and Superior Electrical will ultimately be forced out of business at their current locations, as their existing commerce pathways are eliminated. Until that happens, their employees and customers (and particularly their yard employees) will be subject to air pollution that the Port acknowledges is significant and cannot be mitigated, with resulting health hazards like cancer and lung disease. The Draft EIR identifies no mitigation, relocation or compensation PSC-6 plans for these established businesses, and with all the business closures occasioned by the Project, query where these businesses would go without a tremendous loss of goodwill and related damages.⁴

³ The second page of this Exhibit 3 shows the very close proximity of the many tracks to the Multi-Service Center for the Homeless, as well as to the Phillips and Superior Electrical sites (see hand printed annotations).

⁴ Businesses in the path of the Project have already lost significant value because of the mere possibility of this development and the less than thoughtful manner in which it is proceeding. We understand that the Port has pegged its offered compensation to properties within the Project footprint based on those depressed values, rather than the fair value as if the Project were not occurring. To the extent relocation, condemnation, and compensation issues become a reality, it is importa to note that Westside businesses are entitled to fair, full-value compensation for their properties, and the related goodwill, pre-Project, as well as their relocation costs. It should be noted that, to the extent permissible, the Port's attempt to shortchange Westside businesses will be introduced at condemnation and other proceedings.



LAW OFFICES GREENBERG, WHITCOMBE, TAKEUCHI, **GIBSON & GRAYVER, LLP** Ms. Heather Tomley March 3, 2017 Page 5 PSC-9 Shoemaker ramps and downtown Long Beach will now be packed onto Anaheim and PCH. No (Cont'd) meaningful traffic study has been provided which analyzes this impact. However, it defies logic to suggest the impact will not be significantly adverse. The same will be true for travel times for police and emergency services to and from the Westside. In the event of a large scale emergency relating to the trains, other Port activities, or the large-scale industrial operations of Westside businesses, emergency PSC-10 services will no longer have direct access across the Shoemaker ramp to the Port or other Westside businesses. Emergency vehicles traveling back in the other direction to hospitals will be similarly delayed. 6. Conclusion The Draft EIR does not provide adequate project features or mitigation measures to minimize the severe impacts to surrounding businesses and operations, including Phillips and the MSC. Due to the significant noise, vibration, and transportation/circulation impacts, Phillips will not be able to successfully operate. Phillips' employees, and children, homeless people, low income families, and employees at the MSC, will be subject to hazardous air quality and much higher risks of cancer and lung disease. The Port's unsupported conclusion that its proposed uses are not incompatible with existing and future land PSC-11 use in the Project area is both false and disingenuous. The Draft EIR fails to satisfy CEQA, and the Project puts the surrounding community materially at risk. For these reasons and those identified in the Superior comment, Phillips is opposed to the Project and believes that the Project should be rejected, or, at the very least, a revised Draft EIR with additional analysis and mitigation should be required and circulated. Respectfully submitted, ohn D. Whitcombe for the firm JDW\sfl Mayor Robert Garcia, City of Long Beach (via e-mail) cc: Mark Taylor, Chief of Staff to Mayor Garcia, City of Long Beach (via e-mail) City Manager Patrick West, City of Long Beach (via e-mail) Jeannine Pearce, Councilmember, City of Long Beach (via e-mail) Christian Kropff, Chief of Staff to Councilmember Pearce, City of Long Beach (via e-mail) Lena Gonzalez, First District Councilwoman, City of Long Beach (via e-mail) Cory Allen, Chief of Staff to Councilwoman Gonzalez, City of Long Beach (via e-mail) Chief of Police Robert Luna (via e-mail) Fire Chief Michael DuRee (via e-mail)











	-0	To Long Beach Executive Summary
1	٠	Providing for up to 10,000-foot long receiving/departure tracks;
23	•	Widening the existing rail bridge over Dominguez Channel to accommodate one additional track; and
4	•	Constructing an area for locomotive refueling within the yard.
5 6 7	Re rea	alignments and closures of some roadways would be required. Pier B Street would be aligned to the south, its geometrics would be improved, and two lanes of traffic in each rection would be provided.
8 9	•	The realignment of Pier B Street would require the reconstruction of two intersections, at Anaheim Way and Edison Avenue.
0 1	•	The existing at-grade 9 th Street railroad grade crossing would be closed and the Shoemaker ramps removed.
2 3 4	•	Pico Avenue would be realigned to the west beginning at the I-710 ramps south to approximately Pier D Street, allowing space for four additional tracks between Pico Avenue and the I-710 freeway.
5 6 7	•	Areas needed for new rail tracks would require the closure of portions of 9 th , 10 th , 11 th , and 12 th streets and Edison, Jackson, Santa Fe, Canal, Caspian, Harbor, and Fashion avenues between Anaheim Street and Pier B Street, in the COLB.
8 9	•	Portions of Farragut, Foote, Cushing, Macdonough, and Schley avenues would be closed in the vicinity of existing railroad right-of-way (ROW) in the COLA.
0	Th	e reconfigured Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility would:
1	•	Be used to receive/depart and stage inbound and outbound intermodal trains.
2	•	Include storage tracks for empty rail cars required to support on-dock intermodal operations.
4	٠	Provide rail car storage and classification facilities.
5	•	Provide an assembly area for departing trains.
6	٠	Provide an area where inspection and departure brake tests would be performed.
8	٠	Include staging tracks for non-intermodal cars bound to and from non-container terminals.
9	٠	Provide trackage for rail car repair activities.
0	Th	e proposed Project would support the following rail operations:
12	٠	Up to four Pacific Harbor Line (PHL) locomotives operating onsite each day in 2015 and up to eight in 2035.
3	•	Approximately five tanker truck locomotive refueling vehicles, loaded with fuel offsite, would service onsite locomotives.
15	•	Approximately five rail and rail car repair vehicles would be operating within the on-dock support facility.
	Pi	er B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project ES-5 December 2016
		EXHIBIT 4





1 Responses to Phillips Steel Company

Response to Comment PSC-1: The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your review of the Draft EIR and your comments concerning your client's business. The three Phillips Steel Company locations along Anaheim Street are located outside of the Project footprint for the 12th Street Alternative (proposed Project) as well as for the other alternatives. Based on the information presented in the Draft EIR and its supporting analysis, the Port does not believe any of these three sites would be directly impacted by the proposed Project nor would relocation be necessary.

9 Response to Comment PSC-2: The Draft EIR has been prepared in accordance with 10 applicable CEQA statutes and guidelines, and evaluates the required environmental 11 resources. The Project location and site are accurately described and depicted in Chapter 1 12 of the Draft EIR. However, as the comment notes, certain streets were inadvertently 13 mislabeled in general vicinity maps depicted in Figures ES-1 and 1.7-2. These labeling errors 14 have been corrected in the Final EIR. The more detailed maps showing the footprint of the 15 proposed Project did not include these errors (e.g., Draft EIR Figure 1.8-1 on page 1-27).

16 The comment generally states that critical information regarding what the proposed Project 17 would do and how the rail system would operate were omitted; however, the comment does 18 not identify what information was omitted. Chapter 1 of the Draft EIR included a thorough 19 discussion of the proposed Project operation and provided an extensive background on rail 20 operations within the Port so that readers would understand the technical aspects of the 21 operation. The existing operations were extensively described, and the proposed changes to 22 the existing rail yard were described in text, on diagrams, and in comparison charts. Impacts 23 of the proposed Project were evaluated using generally accepted standard methodology and 24 criteria to identify those impacts that were considered significant. While the comment states 25 that environmental impacts were understated or ignored, the comment does not specifically identify any such impacts. Therefore, it is not possible to respond further. The Draft EIR is 26 27 adequate; therefore, revision and recirculation of the Draft EIR are not required as the 28 commenter requests.

Response to Comment PSC-3: Access from Phillips Steel Company to downtown Long Beach would continue to be available via Anaheim Street to I-710 to West Shoreline Drive; an alternate route would be via Anaheim Street over the Los Angeles River and south on Magnolia Avenue. The alternate route may result in an increase in travel time subject to traffic conditions.

Access from the Phillips Steel Company to the POLB would also continue to be available via Anaheim Street and I-710. The comment indicates that Phillips' average time to customers at the Port is approximately 10 to 12 minutes (non-freeway); it would be expected that use of the I-710 route would require a similar or possibly shorter amount of time after the Shoemaker

- 38 ramps have been removed, subject to traffic conditions.
- 39 A change in route is not a significant impact in and of itself. These are public roads, not private
- roads, and being able to utilize the shortest route between two places is not something that isguaranteed.

42 Please see Master Response – Street Closures, Access to Downtown Long Beach, and Public
 43 Services Access.

1 **Response to Comment PSC-4:** The Port recognizes the concerns of other entities in the 2 Westside business community; responses to those concerns are included in this document in 3 response to the comment letters from other Westside businesses. Access to business locations and from those locations to customers would not be impaired, and would likely be 4 5 improved, given elimination of the at-grade rail crossing at 9th Street and the ability to handle long trains within the improved rail yard configuration. The comment includes generalized 6 7 observations about air, noise, and traffic impacts based on the proximity of certain businesses 8 and operations, such as the MSC, to the proposed Project. The comment does not identify 9 any specific issue with or error in the analysis in the Draft EIR. Because of the general nature 10 of the comment, it is not possible to provide a meaningful response to the comment. The responses to the Superior Electrical comment letter referenced in this comment are set forth 11 12 below at SEA-1 to SEA-21. The commenter's opinions regarding the impacts are noted and 13 will be provided to the decision-makers.

Response to Comment PSC-5: This comment concerns potential property condemnations
 and relocations that could affect area businesses. As explained in response to Comment
 PSC-1, the commenter's client's properties are outside of the Project footprint. Please see
 Master Response – Property Acquisition, Compensation, and Relocation.

18 Response to Comment PSC-6: The comment states that employees and customers of 19 nearby businesses would be subject to air pollution that the Port acknowledges is significant 20 and cannot be mitigated, with resulting health hazards like cancer and heart disease. The Port 21 would implement mitigation measures but, even with application of available mitigation 22 measures, certain air quality impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

23 With regard to the potential health effects of the proposed Project from toxic air contaminants. 24 please see Section 3.2 of the Draft EIR, particularly pages 3.2-53 through 3.2-63. Draft EIR 25 Table 3.2-24 shows that all modeled receptors in the Project area would have less than 26 significant cancer and non-cancer health impacts during construction and operation of the 27 mitigated proposed Project. Impacts from criteria pollutant concentrations associated with the 28 proposed Project are described on pages 3.2-40 through 3.2-45 for the construction period, 29 and pages 3.2-49 through 3.2-52 for the operational period. The mitigated proposed Project 30 would produce significant NO₂ concentrations in certain areas near the Project site during 31 both the construction and operational periods. The impacts of the proposed Project with its 32 refined boundary, as described in Section 10.1 of the Final EIR, are presented in response to 33 Comment AQMD-5 with no change in the Draft EIR's significance findings. The geographical extent of significant NO₂ impacts during the operational period of the proposed Project with 34 35 the refined boundary is shown in Figures 2.2-1 through 2.2-5 in response to Comment 36 AQMD-5. A discussion of the types of health effects that may be associated with NO_x and 37 NO_2 exposure is provided on pages 3.2-48 and 3.2-49.

The predicted air quality impacts specific to the Phillips Steel Company's business locations were extracted from the Draft EIR analysis, and are summarized here. The closest receptor points to this business that were evaluated by the dispersion model for the Draft EIR are located directly on the 1368 W. Anaheim Street location, and at the southwest and southeast corners of the 1545 W. Anaheim Street location.

Table 11.2-12 shows the highest modeled criteria pollutant and health risk impacts at 1368 W. Anaheim Street associated with the mitigated proposed Project. The table shows that the peak state and federal 1-hour NO₂ concentrations would exceed the thresholds during Project construction. All other criteria pollutant and health risk impacts during construction and

1 operation would be less than the thresholds at this location. The peak state and federal 1-

2 hour NO₂ impacts of 349 μ g/m³ and 262 μ g/m³, respectively, would occur during Phase 3 of 3 construction. Emissions from Project construction would contribute only about 26 and 33

percent, respectively, to these impacts; the background concentration would contribute the 4

5 remaining 74 and 67 percent.

TABLE 11.2-12 MODELED AIR POLLUTANT IMPACTS NEAR PHILLIPS STEEL -1368 W. ANAHEIM STREET (MITIGATED PROPOSED PROJECT)

	Description	Modeled Impact ¹	Significance Threshold	Significant?
	C	riteria Pollutants durin	g Construction ²	
	1-Hour (state)	349	339	Yes
NO ₂	1-Hour (federal)	262	188	Yes
	Annual	55.3	57.0	No
<u></u>	1-Hour	4,204	23,000	No
CO	8-Hour	3,339	10,000	No
DM	24-Hour	2.6	10.4	No
PIVI10	Annual	0.2	1.0	No
PM _{2.5}	24-Hour	1.0	10.4	No
		Criteria Pollutants duri	ng Operation ³	
	1-Hour (state)	269	339	No
NO ₂	1-Hour (federal)	185	188	No
	Annual	53.8	57.0	No
<u></u>	1-Hour	3,995	23,000	No
0	8-Hour	3,165	10,000	No
DM	24-Hour	<0 5	2.5	No
PIVI10	Annual	<0	1.0	No
PM _{2.5}	24-Hour	<0	2.5	No
	н	ealth Risks (Construction	on + Operation) ⁴	
Individua	I Cancer Risk	1.7 × 10-6	10 × 10 ⁻⁶	No
Chronic Hazard Index		0.007	1.0	No
8-Hour C	hronic Hazard Index	0.02	1.0	No
Acute Ha	zard Index	0.1	1.0	No
Notes:				

¹ NO₂ and CO impacts are the modeled project increment plus observed background. All other impacts are the modeled project increment.

² The highest impacts from all three phases of construction are shown.

³ The highest impacts from all three operational analysis years (2020, 2025, 2035) are shown.

⁴ Health risk values reflect occupational exposure assumptions and include emissions from both construction and operation.

5 A PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5} impact <0 means the concentration would decrease relative to the CEQA baseline (existing) conditions.

1 Table 11.2-13 shows the highest modeled criteria pollutant and health risk impacts at 1545 2 W. Anaheim Street associated with the mitigated proposed Project. The table shows that the peak federal 1-hour NO₂ concentration would exceed the threshold during Project 3 4 construction. All other criteria pollutant and health risk impacts during construction and 5 operation would be less than the thresholds at this location. The peak federal 1-hour NO₂ impact of 247 µg/m³ would occur during Phase 3 of construction. Emissions from Project 6 construction would contribute only about 29 percent to this impact; the background 7 8 concentration would contribute the remaining 71 percent.

TABLE 11.2-13MODELED AIR POLLUTANT IMPACTS NEAR PHILLIPS STEEL –1545 W. ANAHEIM STREET (MITIGATED PROPOSED PROJECT)

Description		Modeled Impact ¹	Significance Threshold	Significant?	
Criteria Pollutants during Construction ²					
	1-Hour (state)	333	339	No	
NO ₂	1-Hour (federal)	247	188	Yes	
	Annual	54.5	57.0	No	
<u> </u>	1-Hour	4,138	23,000	No	
0	8-Hour	3,265	10,000	No	
DM	24-Hour	1.4	10.4	No	
	Annual	0.1	1.0	No	
PM _{2.5}	24-Hour	0.6	10.4	No	
Criteria Pollutants during Operation ³					
	1-Hour (state)	273	339	No	
NO ₂	1-Hour (federal)	188	188	No	
	Annual	53.8	57.0	No	
<u> </u>	1-Hour	3,997	23,000	No	
0	8-Hour	3,166	10,000	No	
DM	24-Hour	0.06	2.5	No	
FIVI10	Annual	0.002	1.0	No	
PM _{2.5}	24-Hour	0.03	2.5	No	
Health Risks (Construction + Operation) ⁴					
Individual Cancer Risk 1.7 × 10-6 10 × 10 ⁻⁶ No				No	
Chronic Ha	azard Index	0.004	1.0	No	
8-Hour Ch	ronic Hazard Index	0.01	1.0	No	
Acute Hazard Index		0.07	1.0	No	

Notes:

¹ NO₂ and CO impacts are the modeled project increment plus observed background. All other impacts are the modeled project increment.

² The highest impacts from all three phases of construction are shown.

³ The highest impacts from all three operational analysis years (2020, 2025, 2035) are shown.

⁴ Health risk values reflect occupational exposure assumptions and include emissions from both construction and operation.

1 Moreover, these peak 1-hour predicted air pollutant concentrations are conservative and 2 would occur very infrequently, if at all, because the analysis assumes all construction 3 equipment would operate simultaneously during worst-case meteorological conditions (i.e., low 4 wind speed, optimum wind direction, and very stable atmosphere), concurrent with the highest 5 observed background concentration measured at the Superblock monitoring station over a 3-6 year period. Most of the 1-hour NO₂ concentrations during Project construction would be much 7 lower than the peak values, as evidenced by the much lower annual average NO₂ 8 concentration, which is an average of all 1-hour concentrations during the worst-case year.

9 Furthermore, the proposed Project may produce operational criteria pollutant and health 10 impacts that are less than the values presented in the Draft and Final EIR by replacing many 11 future drayage truck trips from the terminal served by the Pier B Rail Yard with rail transport. 12 The potential air quality benefit associated with fewer drayage truck trips was not quantified 13 in this EIR (although the impact of the additional rail transport was quantified). Please see 14 response to Comment GSR-2 for a more thorough discussion of this potential air quality 15 benefit. Because the proposed Project is still in preliminary planning stages and has not been 16 approved, the Draft EIR does not include a relocation plan or a compensation plan for 17 businesses. It would be premature to have prepared such plans at this juncture. This was 18 addressed in Section 3.6.4 of the Draft EIR. Please see Master Response - Property 19 Acquisition, Compensation, and Relocation.

20 With regard to the comment's reference to its Footnote 4 concerning possible decreases in 21 property values related to this proposed Project, the Port has not made any offers to purchase 22 property in the Pier B Rail Yard area. The Port fully understands the procedures and 23 requirements described in Section 3.6.4 of the Draft EIR. As discussed in Section 3.6.4.1, if 24 the proposed Project is approved, once all required prerequisites are completed, the Port would 25 attempt to enter into voluntary sales by entering into purchase and sale transactions to acquire private properties at fair market value. However, this process cannot occur until the Final EIR 26 27 has been certified and the proposed Project approved by the BHC. In addition, the Port would 28 have to complete all required property acquisition steps before this could occur.

Response to Comment PSC-7: The first paragraph of the comment repeats information contained in the Draft EIR regarding the MSC and its relationship to the proposed Project. The MSC facility is not within the proposed Project footprint, and is approximately 1,200 feet from the existing Pier B Rail Yard. The EIR analysis, including the air quality analysis, took this distance into account in assessing the impacts. The MSC site was specifically identified as the closest sensitive receptor location.

The proposed Project boundary would be approximately 475 feet from the MSC. The nearest train track within the proposed Project site would be a mainline track, located approximately 570 feet from the MSC.

38 The predicted air quality impacts specific to the MSC's location were extracted from the Draft

- EIR and Final EIR analyses, and are summarized here. The dispersion model evaluated
 receptor points directly on the MSC.
- 41 Table 11.2-14 shows the highest modeled criteria pollutant and health risk impacts at the MSC
- 42 associated with the mitigated proposed Project. The table shows that the peak state and
- 43 federal 1-hour NO₂ concentrations would exceed the thresholds during Project construction.
- 44 All other criteria pollutant and health risk impacts during construction and operation would be
- 45 less than the thresholds at this location. The peak state and federal 1-hour NO₂ impacts of 354

1 μ g/m³ and 261 μ g/m³, respectively, would occur during Phase 3 of construction. Emissions

2 from Project construction would contribute only about 27 and 33 percent, respectively, to these

3 impacts; the background concentration would contribute the remaining 73 and 67 percent.

MO	DELED AIR POLLUTAN (MITIG	I ABLE 11.2- IT IMPACTS NEA ATED PROPOSE	IA R THE MULTI-SERVIC D PROJECT)	E CENTER
	Description	Modeled Impact ¹	Significance Threshold	Significant?
	Criter	a Pollutants during	Construction ²	
	1-Hour (state)	354	339	Yes
NO ₂	1-Hour (federal)	261	188	Yes
	Annual	54.9	57.0	No
<u> </u>	1-Hour	4,191	23,000	No
00	8-Hour	3,322	10,000	No
DM	24-Hour	2.5	10.4	No
1 10110	Annual	0.2	1.0	No
PM _{2.5}	24-Hour	0.9	10.4	No
	Crite	eria Pollutants during	g Operation ³	
	1-Hour (state)	269	339	No
NO ₂	1-Hour (federal)	184	188	No
	Annual	53.6	57.0	No
<u> </u>	1-Hour	3,984	23,000	No
CO	8-Hour	3,160	10,000	No
DM	24-Hour	0.1	2.5	No
PIVI10	Annual	0.02	1.0	No
PM _{2.5}	24-Hour	0.01	2.5	No
	Health	Risks (Construction	+ Operation) ⁴	
Individual	Cancer Risk, Occupational	1.3 × 10-6	10 × 10 ⁻⁶	No
Individual Cancer Risk, Child Care		1.3 × 10-6	10 × 10 ⁻⁶	No
Chronic H	lazard Index	0.002	1.0	No
8-Hour C	hronic Hazard Index	0.007	1.0	No
Acute Ha	zard Index	0.1	1.0	No

Notes:

¹ NO₂ and CO impacts are the modeled project increment plus observed background. All other impacts are the modeled project increment.

² The highest impacts from all three phases of construction are shown.

³ The highest impacts from all three operational analysis years (2020, 2025, 2035) are shown.

⁴ Health risk values reflect occupational exposure assumptions and include emissions from both construction and operation.

⁵ The Multi-Service Center was modeled in the HRA with occupational and child care exposure assumptions. Occupational exposure assumptions are 250 days/year, 8 hours/day, for 25 years. Child care exposure assumptions are 250 days/year, 8 hours/day, for 6 years (child age 0-5). Age sensitivity factors of x10 were applied for child age 0<2, and x3 for age 2-5.</p>

1 These predicted peak 1-hour concentrations during construction are conservative and would 2 occur very infrequently, if at all, because the analysis assumes all construction equipment 3 would operate simultaneously during worst-case meteorological conditions (i.e., low wind 4 speed, optimum wind direction, and very stable atmosphere), concurrent with the highest 5 observed background concentration measured at the Superblock monitoring station over a 3-6 year period. Most of the 1-hour NO₂ concentrations during Project construction would be much 7 lower than the peak values, as evidenced by the much lower annual average NO₂ concentration, which is an average of all 1-hour concentrations during the worst-case year. 8

9 Furthermore, the proposed Project may produce operational criteria pollutant and health 10 impacts that are less than the values presented in the Draft and Final EIR by replacing many 11 future drayage truck trips from terminals served by the Pier B Rail Yard with rail transport. The 12 potential air quality benefit associated with fewer drayage truck trips was not quantified in this 13 EIR (although the impact of the additional rail transport was quantified). Please see response 14 to Comment GSR-2 for a more thorough discussion of this potential air quality benefit. The 15 replacement of truck trips with rail transport would be particularly beneficial to the MSC given 16 its close proximity to the I-710 freeway. The MSC was also evaluated as a sensitive receptor 17 in the noise assessment in the EIR (Table 3.8-9), which indicates that the predicted noise 18 levels associated with operation of the proposed Project are below the limits established by 19 the Long Beach Municipal Code, posing no significant impacts. The comment does not 20 provide any information suggesting that there was an error in how these assessments were 21 completed. The Draft EIR and its technical studies were prepared pursuant to recommended 22 protocols. The MSC includes an outdoor area (i.e., picnic benches, shade structure in a grassy 23 area) at the rear of the building; this outdoor area is adjacent to the off-ramp of I-710. The 24 MSC provides services for the homeless, including outreach, intake and assessment, referrals 25 to shelters, and other social service programs. The MSC is not a residential facility; it is open 26 from 8:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. and no one lives there. Services at the center include showers, 27 laundry, mail, medical clinic, employment assistance, case management, and shelter and housing placement assistance (City of Long Beach 2013 – 2021 Housing Element, prepared 28 by Long Beach Development Services, adopted January 7, 2014; COLB, 2014). 29

30 The entire Long Beach Harbor District is located within the Industrial District (Port-Related 31 Industrial [IP]), as classified by the COLB. The IP zone is characterized predominantly by 32 maritime industry and marine resources (COLB Municipal Code, Title 21, Chapter 21.33.02 33 [D]) and is identified in the Port Master Plan as used predominantly for Port-related and ancillary Port uses and facilities. As part of the Naval Station Long Beach Disposal and Reuse 34 35 planning process, a portion of land at the former Naval Station was proposed to be transferred to the COLB for subsequent use as a multi-service homeless service center as a result of the 36 military base closure process (Site 6-A, FEIS/FEIR, Naval Station Long Beach Disposal and 37 38 Reuse [POLB, 1998]). However, to accommodate Port development on Terminal Island, the 39 Port moved the location of the non-residential homeless service center from the former Naval Station Long Beach by purchasing an alternative location in the North Harbor (Port Planning 40 41 District 1) where the MSC is currently located. The Port also committed \$700,000 in funding 42 to renovate the property for homeless services. This alternative location in the North Harbor, 43 within the IP zone, allowed the service center to better serve its clients by centrally locating 44 the facility near public transportation services. Port Planning District 1 was originally only permitted for port-related uses; in 1997, the Port amended its Port Master Plan to include non-45 46 Port uses for a 3-acre homeless service center as a permitted use. The MSC is an allowable 47 use within the COLB IP zone and operates under a Conditional Use Permit (CUP9612-17 Homeless Processing Center – Alpha Project). Therefore, when the MSC was moved to its
 current location in the North Harbor, it was known that it would be located in an industrial area.

The distance from the MSC to downtown Long Beach is the same via West Anaheim Street to Long Beach Boulevard as it is using 12th Street/Harbor Avenue/11th Street/Canal Avenue/9th Street/Shoreline Drive; both routes are 2.3 miles. Using Anaheim Street would add 1 minute to the travel time compared to the 9th Street route, subject to traffic conditions. If the proposed Project or one of its alternatives is approved, the 9th Street route would be eliminated due to road closures associated with the proposed Project and all other build alternatives.

9 **Response to Comment PSC-8:** The comment and the accompanying Exhibit 5 depict street 10 and ramp closures that would occur as a result of the proposed Project. While the travel routes 11 from Phillips Steel Company to the Port, as shown in Exhibit 5, would no longer be available if the proposed Project is approved due to permanent road closures, access to the Port from 12 13 Anaheim Street would continue to be available via I-710 on the east and on the west via 14 Anaheim Street to Farragut Avenue and Anaheim Way to Pier B Street. Depending on the 15 time of day, travel times using I-710 would be expected to increase by approximately 2 minutes, subject to traffic conditions. These alternate routes are not depicted in Exhibit 5. 16 17 Please see Master Response – Street Closures, Access to Downtown Long Beach, and Public Services Access. 18

19 Response to Comment PSC-9: While the travel routes from Phillips Steel Company and 20 other businesses on the Westside to the Port would no longer be available due to permanent 21 road closures, access to the Port from alternate routes using I-710 would not be expected to 22 double travel times. The Traffic Impact Analysis Report, provided in Appendix B of the Draft 23 EIR, found that traffic impacts would not be considered significant. Alternate routes would add 24 less than 0.5 mile to the travel distance from Anaheim Street to the Port and could result in 25 an increase of approximately 3 minutes to travel time. Based on roadway capacity and LOS 26 that would result, the impact to traffic would not be considered significant. Please see Master 27 Response – Street Closures, Access to Downtown Long Beach, and Public Services Access.

28 Response to Comment PSC-10: The comment contends that travel times for police and 29 emergency services to and from the Westside would be similarly affected, that direct access 30 across the Shoemaker ramp to the Port would be lost, and that emergency vehicles traveling back to hospitals would be similarly delayed. Emergency responders are located near the Pier 31 32 B Rail Yard, on all sides and include the JCCC at 1249 Pier F Avenue supported by City and 33 federal partner agencies to provide quick and uniform response to emergencies at the Port 34 (see Figure 3.7-1 of the Draft EIR). Hospitals located in Long Beach, Wilmington, and San 35 Pedro would continue to be accessible from the Port via the Seaside Freeway and I-710. 36 Please see Master Response – Street Closures, Access to Downtown Long Beach, and Public 37 Services Access.

Response to Comment PSC-11: The comment summarizes the earlier comments in the
 letter, which are responded to above.

- 40 Phillips Steel Company's opposition to the proposed Project is noted. The comment is hereby
- part of the Final EIR; therefore, it is before the decision-makers for their consideration prior to
 taking any action on the proposed Project.

- SCE-1

1 11.2.3.29 Southern California Edison (SCE)



Sent via electronic mail to heather.tomley@polb.com

March 13, 2017

Heather Tomley, Director of Environmental Planning Port of Long Beach 4801 Airport Plaza Drive Long Beach CA 90815

RE: Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Ms. Tomley:

Southern California Edison (SCE) is pleased to submit the following comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project. We have appreciated the opportunity to coordinate with the Port of Long Beach (POLB) on this Project and look forward to working together for successful completion.

SCE's Electrical Facilities

SCE provides electric service to the Port of Long Beach and maintains electrical transmission and distribution facilities, as well as substations and supporting appurtenances in the Long Beach. The Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Project identified within the Executive Summary on page ES-18 that "Proposed Project construction activities would require the relocation and reorganization of various water, wastewater, storm drains, natural gas, electrical utility lines and infrastructure, and oil lines within the Project site." Further, on page 1-26 of the Introduction and Project Description, it states "utility lines would be newly constructed or relocated into subsurface utility corridors that would run between areas of tracks, thereby providing ease of access for repair and maintenance of the lines" and that "existing electrical lines would be relocated as necessary. Any new lines required would be installed in conformance with applicable standards to serve the proposed Project structures."

However, we do not see any analysis or details in the DEIR of how the Project would impact SCE's facilities. While it is noted on page 1-31 of the Introduction and Project Description that "The utilities in Pier B Street and Pico Avenue would be relocated to new designated locations" and that "the utilities within the Project footprint would be relocated to the new yard Utility Corridors," these relocation construction activities have not been analyzed within the Environmental Setting and Project Impacts sections within Chapter Three. Specifically, the following resources need to be addressed specifically for SCE facilities: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Noise, Traffic, Cultural Resources and Biological Resources (nesting birds) in order for SCE to utilize this EIR and provide the required support without separate permitting with the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC).

General Order 131-D

The construction, modification, and relocation of transmission lines, or electrical facilities that are designed to operate at or above 50 kilovolts (kV) may be subject to the California Public Utilities Commission's (CPUC) General Order 131-D¹. If the construction, modification, or relocation of transmission lines results in significant environmental impacts, they should be identified and discussed

¹ http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PUBLISHED/Graphics/589.PDF

within the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Project Environmental Impact Report. If not, SCE may be required to pursue a separate, mandatory CEQA review through the CPUC, which could delay approval of the SCE (Cont'd) transmission line portion of the project for two years or longer.
General Order 95
line design, construction, and maintenance, GO 95 also includes vertical clearance requirements from
thoroughfares, ground, and railroads, as well as specific minimum clearances from tree branches and SCE-3
vegetation around overhead wires. The project's landscaping should not conflict with SCE's existing and proposed transmission line designs.
Catenary Wires
Overhead catenary wires used to power trains possibly may not meet GO 95 vertical clearance standards
and could require SCE to increase the height of several towers along the adjacent right-of-way as well as
possibly several towers down-line. Without engineering drawings and plans, it is not clear if there is SCE-4
sufficient horizontal clearance. Accordingly, this may require the relocation or realignment. Additionally,
24-hour access must be provided to SCE employees to repair and maintain all structures and facilities.
Again, SCE appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Project. SCE looks
forward to working and collaborating with the Port of Long Beach. If you have any questions regarding
this letter, please contact me at heather.neely@sce.com or 626.476.7839.
Regards,
Heather Neely
Third Party Environmental Reviews
Environmental Services
Southern California Edison
6040B N Irwindale Ave
 Irwindale CA 91702

2 Responses to Southern California Edison

1

3 **Response to Comment SCE-1**: The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your review of the 4 Draft EIR and your comments concerning utility corridors. Recognizing that there are many utilities in the footprint of the proposed Project and its build alternatives, and further 5 6 understanding that there is a long history of utility installation within the port complex, utilities 7 have been a prime consideration for the proposed Project, in terms of implementation 8 logistics, construction cost, and administrative agreements. Accordingly, the Port has been 9 engaged in an ongoing coordination with the many utility owners and providers likely to be 10 involved if the proposed Project moves forward. This ongoing coordination process has been 11 underway since the proposed Project was first conceived, in 2007. Periodic and special 12 purpose meetings and information exchanges have occurred on a frequent basis since then, 13 and such coordination would continue if the proposed Project is approved until all utilities have been successfully relocated to their new permanent locations. The Port has met with SCE 14 15 transmission, distribution, and telecommunications teams on multiple occasions regarding 16 how relocation of SCE's existing lines would be best managed, including the development of 17 cost estimates for their relocation. As part of this estimate, the Port has authorized SCE to 18 perform preliminary engineering.

19 Regarding the accounting of impacts associated with utility relocation in general, preliminary 20 construction schedules have been developed, for purposes of the EIR, for each of the

alternatives under consideration (see Final EIR Figures 1.8-6, 1.8-13 and 1.8-16); for each
 alternative, construction steps 3 and 4 in construction Phase 1 specifically address utility
 relocation.

4 Furthermore, impacts associated with utility relocation are specifically addressed in the Draft EIR Section 3.11. A total of 750 known utility lines, owned by 70 companies, are 5 6 acknowledged (see Section 3.11.1.2), including providers of electricity (Southern California 7 Edison [SCE]), and LA Department of Water and Power [LADWP]), natural gas (Long Beach Gas and Oil), water (Long Beach Water Department [LBWD] and LADWP), sewer (LBWD and 8 9 Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation [LABOS]), storm water (Los Angeles County Flood Control [LACFCD]), telephone (Frontier Communications), and oil (30 different owners). Also in that 10 11 EIR section (see Draft EIR Section 3.11.2.1), impact significance criteria are stated that 12 address utility impacts per CEQA guidance. Following that section, other sections of the Draft 13 EIR (i.e., 3.11.2.3, 3.11.2.4 and 3.11.2.5) address the impacts.

In addition to the above, each of the other relevant impact sections which could have impacts
 associated with Project construction (which includes utility relocation as noted above) address

16 those impacts. Most pertinent of these would include Air Quality and Health Risk (Section 3.2),

Hydrology and Water Quality (Section 3.3), Ground Transportation (Section 3.5), Public
Services and Safety (Section 3.7), and Noise (Section 3.8).

By way of example, the air quality impacts associated with utilities demolition and relocation were accounted for and quantified in the Draft EIR. These tasks are reflected in Tables A1.1-2

21 (Phases 1C and 1D), A1.1-4 (Phase 3D), A1.1-5, and A1.1-7 of Appendix A1.

The noise, ground transportation, cultural resources, and biological resources impacts of Project construction were likewise addressed extensively in the Draft EIR. Specifically, the utility relocations are included in Project construction impacts.

Response to Comment SCE-2: The comment notifies the Port that construction, modification, or relocation of electricity transmission lines or other electrical facilities that operate at or above 50 kilovolts may be subject to CPUC General Order 131-D. This was noted in Table 1.10-1 on page 1-57 of the Draft EIR. Please see response to comment SCE-1, above.

The Port understands that CPUC will independently determine whether the level of environmental analysis of electrical facilities in the Draft EIR is sufficient to satisfy the requirements of General Order 131-D and that CPUC may determine that supplemental environmental review is required prior to approval of the SCE transmission line portion of the proposed Project.

The environmental effects of the utilities relocation were quantified and included in the Draft EIR air quality analysis (Chapter 3.2), as indicated in response to Comment SCE-1.

37 **Response to Comment SCE-3:** The Port recognizes the requirement for overhead power line design, construction, and maintenance to comply with CPUC General Order 95. If the 38 proposed Project or one of its alternatives is approved, the Port would ensure that the 39 40 landscaping is designed and installed so that it would not conflict with existing or future 41 transmissions lines. The Port has included utility relocations in its description of the Project, 42 and believes the level of environmental analysis for this element of the Project is 43 commensurate with the degree of potential environmental concerns raised by those 44 relocations.

Response to Comment SCE-4: There would be no overhead catenary wires installed as part 1 2 of the proposed Project or any of its alternatives. Diesel-powered locomotives, either from the 3 Class I railroads or PHL, would operate within the Pier B Rail Yard. Regarding the last 4 sentence of the comment, it is not clear whether that was intended to apply to a situation 5 involving the installation of catenary wires or whether that was a broader request. The Port 6 recognizes the right of SCE to have access to its facilities and structures for maintenance and 7 repair purposes and would coordinate with SCE as necessary to provide such access during 8 construction and operation of the proposed Project if it (or one of its alternatives) is approved.

1 11.2.3.30 Spun Products, MLZ, Inc. (SP)

Spun Products, MLZ, Inc. 1800 West 9th Street Long Beach, CA 90813 A High Precision Metal Spinning Company 562 436-1040 Fax 562 495-3629 @sounproducts.con March 10, 2017 Port of Long Beach Attention: Heather Tomley - Director of Environmental Planning 4801 Airport Plaza Drive Long Beach, California 90815 Re: Opposition to On-Dock Rail Support Facility at Pier B Dear Ms. Tomley: Please accept this letter as written notice of opposition to the proposed Port of Long Beach On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project at Pier B, by M L Z INC. dba Spun Products, and its employees. Spun Products is a family-owned, small business, which has operated out of our location at 1800 W. 9th Street, since 1973. We specialize in metal spinning and manufacturing for the aerospace, energy and defense industries, both locally and internationally. SP-1 Due to our long-term success at this location, we are fortunate to have paid off our mortgage and have operated without property-related debt for over ten years. It's due to this reduced overhead, that we've been able to stay in business through several economic downturns and industry demand fluctuations. As of today, Spun Products maintains a workforce of twelve full-time employees and sustains robust employee benefit packages that help us retain our highly skilled operators. Port of Long Beach's On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project would require relocation of our facilities, which will impact our business in the following ways: Financial Hardship: Our lack of mortgage-related debt allows us to minimize overhead costs and keep pricing at levels which retain our customer base. In an extremely price-sensitive industry SP-2 (aerospace/defense) an exponential increase in operating costs would directly result in a loss of business. With expenses related to acquisition of a new property, construction and modification, heavy machinery relocation and AS9100:ISO 9001 Re-certification costs, Spun Products will be placed in a precarious position, that may impact our ability to stay in business moving forward. Zoning and New Property Availability: The lack of local, properly zoned real-estate, is extremely concerning to us. Our business would likely need to relocate out of the city to find affordable real-SP-3 estate that meets zoning and haz-mat related regulations required for our operations. Workforce Retention: Spun Products employs 12 people, of which 9 are highly-skilled tradesman, and 6 are Long Beach residents. Not only could higher overhead costs impact our ability to provide robust benefit packages to our employees, but moving to a different city may result in a resignation SP-4 of several key employees that desire to work locally. As our craft requires many years of experience and on-the-job training to perfect, replacing these workers may potentially impact our ability to continue successful operation. We understand that the proposed Rail Support Facility may improve train transit for port operations. However, we appreciate any consideration that may be given to the impact this project will make on Westside businesses, and subsequently, the Long Beach residents and workers that depend on their SP-5 success. Please feel free to contact me or the Management Team at Spun Products for further information or questions, as needed. Best regards, Kristen Junghanel Quality Director MLZINC. dba Spun Products

1 *Responses to Spun Products, MLZ, Inc.*

2 **Response to Comment SP-1:** The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your review of the Draft

3 EIR, for the information concerning your business, and for your long-term tenure in the Harbor 4 area. The comment is general and does not reference any specific section of the Draft EIR;

5 therefore, no further response is necessary.

6 Response to Comment SP-2: The comment does not relate to an environmental issue or to 7 the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, it requires no formal response. The 8 comment is hereby part of the Final EIR; therefore, it is before the decision-makers for their 9 consideration prior to taking any action on the proposed Project. Please see Master 10 Response – Property Acquisition, Compensation, and Relocation.

Response to Comment SP-3: The comment does not relate to an environmental issue or to the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, it requires no formal response. The comment is hereby part of the Final EIR; therefore, it is before the decision-makers for their consideration prior to taking any action on the proposed Project. Please see Master Response – Property Acquisition, Compensation, and Relocation for a detailed description regarding the property acquisition and relocation processes that would be followed if the proposed Project or one of its alternatives is selected.

18 Response to Comment SP-4: Please see response to Comment SP-3 and Master
 19 Response – Property Acquisition, Compensation, and Relocation.

Response to Comment SP-5: If the Final EIR is certified and the proposed Project or one of its alternatives (other than the No Project Alternative) is approved by the BHC, additional detailed engineering would proceed. At that time, the Port would begin contacting affected businesses and property owners regarding the acquisition and relocation steps that would be followed. Please also see Master Response – Property Acquisition, Compensation, and Relocation.

1 **11.2.3.31 SRM Corporation (SRM)**

From: Clara Driscoll [mailto:cmaehara1@gmail.com] Sent: Monday, March 13, 2017 3:52 PM To: Tomley, Heather Subject: Opposition to Draft EIR by SRM Corp

Dear Ms. Tomley: Attached is the opposition of SRM Corporation to the Draft EIR for the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility. Please copy me on all future notices relating to this project. Thank you, Clara Driscoll

> SRM Corporation 555 Pico Avenue Long Beach, CA 90807 (562) 495-3617

> > March 13, 2017

VIA EMAIL AND HAND DELIVERY

Ms. Heather Tomley Director of Environmental Planning Port of Long Beach 4801 Airport Plaza Drive Long Beach, CA 90815

> Re: Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project Draft Environmental Impact Report SCH#2009081079 ("Draft EIR")

Dear Ms. Tomley:

The SRM Corporation ("SRM"), which is doing business as Queen's Wharf, Berth 55 Seafoods, and Long Beach Sport Fishing (under a sublease) hereby opposes the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project ("the Project"). The Project, as outlined in the Draft EIR will have a devastating impact on the business and employees of SRM and its sublessees, and will likely result in its closure of the business at its current location. The Draft EIR is not specific enough and fails to adequately analyze the impacts of the Project on the surrounding properties, including Queens' Wharf. The Draft EIR does not provide adequate project features or mitigation measures to minimize the impact on Queen's Wharf and the other surrounding businesses. The Draft EIR does not propose mitigation in the form of any relocation possibilities for businesses, recommended resources or compensation plans.

Background

Queen's Wharf has been in business in its current location under previous ownership since the 1960's. SRM, a family-owned business, has been operating Queen's Wharf since 1988. Queen's Wharf contains a restaurant and bar, and includes a separate restaurant, Berth 55 Seafoods. Berth 55 Seafoods is a retail fish market and restaurant with all outdoor seating. Also located in Queen's Wharf is Long Beach Sportfishing, which operates a tackle shop and provides dockage for additional small businesses engaged in sportfishing and other recreational uses. There are boats docked that are engaged in other commercial uses, including fishing. At present there are 12 boats docked at Queen's Wharf. The health of approximately 130 employees may be negatively affected by the project, and could result in the loss of approximately 130 jobs.




1

2 Responses to SRM Corporation

Response to Comment SRM-1: The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your review of the
 Draft EIR and comments. As indicated in the comment, SRM Corporation (SRM) currently
 operates under sublease with the COLB.

6 Based on the information presented in the Draft EIR, its supporting analysis, and Project 7 engineering, significant adverse impacts are not expected to occur for any of the businesses 8 noted in your comment letter (i.e., Queen's Wharf, Berth 55 Seafoods, Long Beach Sport 9 Fishing) as a result of the proposed Project or any of its alternatives. Business relocations 10 would not be necessary. The potential realignment of Pico Avenue associated with the 11 proposed Project would require restriping and reconfiguration of SRM's subleased parking lot 12 area. Presently, the parking area serving SRM businesses is striped with a total of 192 parking 13 stalls. Based on Long Beach Municipal Code Section 21.41.216 requirements, 119 parking 14 spaces are required for the combined sport fishing, retail, and restaurant uses. The preliminary 15 design indicates that the proposed Project would eliminate up to 53 parking spaces, leaving 16 139 remaining spaces. During final design, more precise engineering would occur to determine actual Project limits. Driveway access to and from SRM businesses would be 17 maintained to accommodate safe entry and exit to and from the site. The Port would work 18 19 closely with its tenants to minimize design and construction impacts.

No buildings would be affected, nor would there be any effect on the waterside of Channel
No. 3. Pico Avenue would be reconstructed with no change of accessibility to the SRM
businesses other than the temporary disruption associated with the construction process
itself. Access to the SRM businesses would be maintained while construction is underway.

	Chapter 11
Port of Long Beach	Responses to Comments
_	-

Because final engineering has not begun, precise details concerning the construction schedule are not available. If the proposed Project or one of its alternatives is approved, the Port would coordinate with its tenants regarding the parking lot.

Port would coordinate with its tenants regarding the parking lot. **Response to Comment SRM-2**: The comment contends that the propo

Response to Comment SRM-2: The comment contends that the proposed Project may
negatively affect the health of SRM's 130 employees and also result in the loss of 130 jobs.
The air quality analysis for the proposed Project is contained in Section 3.2 of the Draft EIR
and in Appendix A.

8 With regard to the health impacts of the proposed Project's air emissions on the SRM facilities 9 at Queens Wharf, predicted impacts specific to this location were extracted from the Draft EIR 10 and Final EIR analyses, and are summarized here. The closest receptor point to the Queens 11 Wharf facilities that was evaluated by the dispersion model for the EIR is located about 85 12 feet east of Berth 55 Seafoods, on the eastern edge of Pico Avenue. This receptor is a very 13 conservative representation of Queens Wharf because it is much closer to the proposed 14 Project site than the Queens Wharf facilities.

Table 11.2-15 shows the highest modeled criteria pollutant and health risk impacts at this receptor point associated with the mitigated proposed Project. The table shows that the peak federal 1-hour NO₂ concentration would exceed the threshold during both Project construction and operation. All other criteria pollutant and health risk impacts during construction and operation would be less than the thresholds at this location.

- 20 The peak federal 1-hour NO₂ impact of 227 µg/m³ during construction would occur during 21 Phases 1 and 2. Emissions from Project construction would contribute only about 22 percent 22 to this impact; the background concentration would contribute the remaining 78 percent. The 23 peak federal 1-hour NO₂ impact of 190 μ g/m³ during operation would occur only for the 2020 24 analysis year; the impact would become less than significant due to cleaner locomotives in 25 2025 and 2035. Emissions from Project operation would contribute only about 13 percent to 26 the 2020 impact; the background concentration would contribute the remaining 87 percent. 27 The geographical extent of significant NO_2 concentrations during the operational period of the 28 proposed Project with the refined boundary (as described in Section 10.1 of the Final EIR) is 29 shown in Figures 2.2-1 through 2.2-5 in response to Comment AQMD-5. A discussion of the 30 types of health effects that may be associated with NO_x and NO₂ exposure is provided on pages 3.2-48 and 3.2-49 of the Draft EIR. 31
- 32 The predicted 1-hour NO₂ concentrations in Table 11.2-15 are conservative, and would occur 33 very infrequently, if at all, because they assume worst-case meteorological conditions (i.e., 34 low wind speed, optimum wind direction, and very stable atmosphere) concurrent with the 35 highest observed background concentration measured at the Superblock monitoring station 36 over a 3-year period. The construction concentration further assumes all construction 37 equipment would operate simultaneously during these worst-case conditions. Most of the 1-38 hour NO₂ concentrations during Project construction and operation would be much lower than 39 the peak values, as evidenced by the much lower annual average NO₂ concentrations, which 40 are averages of all 1-hour concentrations during the worst-case year.

Furthermore, the proposed Project may produce operational criteria pollutant and health impacts that are less than the values presented in the EIR and Table 11.2-15 by replacing many future drayage truck trips from terminals served by the Pier B Rail Yard with rail transport. The potential air quality benefit associated with fewer drayage truck trips was conservatively not quantified in this EIR (although the impact of the additional rail transport -

was quantified). Please see response to Comment GSR-2 for a more thorough discussion of
 this potential air quality benefit.

	MODELED AIR (M	TABLE 11.2 POLLUTANT IMPAC ITIGATED PROPOS	2-15 CTS NEAR QUEENS WI SED PROJECT)	HARF
	Description	Modeled Impact ¹	Significance Threshold	Significant?
	C	riteria Pollutants during	g Construction ²	
	1-Hour (state)	313	339	No
NO ₂	1-Hour (federal)	227	188	Yes
	Annual	55.5	57.0	No
~~~	1-Hour	4,110	23,000	No
00	8-Hour	3,271	10,000	No
DM	24-Hour	1.9	10.4	No
PIVI10	Annual	0.2	1.0	No
PM _{2.5}	24-Hour	0.6	10.4	No
		Criteria Pollutants duri	ng Operation ³	
	1-Hour (state)	246	339	No
NO ₂	1-Hour (federal)	190	188	Yes
	Annual	55.1	57.0	No
со	1-Hour	3,929	23,000	No
	8-Hour	3,113	10,000	No
PM10	24-Hour	0.06	2.5	No
	Annual	0.03	1.0	No
PM _{2.5}	24-Hour	0.05	2.5	No
	н	ealth Risks (Construction	on + Operation) ⁴	
Individua	l Cancer Risk	2.6 × 10-6	10 × 10 ⁻⁶	No
Chronic Hazard Index		0.003	1.0	No
8-Hour Chronic Hazard Index		0.01	1.0	No
Acute Ha	zard Index	0.05	1.0	No
Notes: ¹ NO ₂ a	nd CO impacts are the m	odeled project incremen	t plus observed background.	All other impacts are

NO₂ and CO impacts are the m the modeled project increment.

² The highest impacts from all three phases of construction are shown.

³ The highest impacts from all three operational analysis years (2020, 2025, 2035) are shown.

⁴ Health risk values reflect occupational exposure assumptions and include emissions from both construction and operation.

3 Regarding the referenced potential for loss of jobs, that is an economic issue rather than an

4 environmental issue, and thus no response is required. Nonetheless, it is not anticipated that

5 businesses at this location would close or relocate as a result of the proposed Project or any

of its alternatives. Therefore, there would be no loss of jobs at Berth 55 businesses associated
 with the proposed Project.

3 **Response to Comment SRM-3:** Please see response to Comments B55-2 and SRM-1.

**Response to Comment SRM-4:** The proposed Project's preliminary design would result in temporary disturbances near the SRM businesses due to the realignment of Pico Avenue to the west of its current alignment. Pico Avenue would be reconstructed as essentially a new road with no change of accessibility to Berth 55 businesses, other than the potential temporary inconveniences associated with the construction process.

9 To maintain access and minimize impacts to SRM businesses during construction, the Port 10 would develop a TMP. The TMP would establish construction hours, allowable timeframes for 11 temporary closures, and requirements for maintaining access to businesses. The Port would 12 work directly with SRM businesses and, to the extent possible, incorporate measures into the 13 TMP that minimize impacts on business operations. Access to the SRM businesses would be 14 maintained while construction is underway. Because final engineering has not begun, precise 15 details concerning the construction schedule are not yet available. If the proposed Project or 16 one of its alternatives is approved, the POLB would coordinate with its tenants to ensure that 17 construction information is provided in advance.

18 Response to Comment SRM-5: The commenter notes that public access to Berth 55 would 19 be permanently limited as a result of road closures associated with the proposed Project. 20 Berth 55 is located at 555 Pico Avenue, between Pier C and Pier D streets. Other than the 21 proposed realignment of Pico Avenue, access roads near Berth 55 would not be changed 22 under any of the Project alternatives. However, the roadway system to the north of Berth 55 23 would be modified under the 12th, 10th, and 9th Street alternatives, requiring potentially longer 24 travel times and distances to reach Berth 55 if approaching from the north. The following 25 summarizes current and potential future conditions for accessing Berth 55:

- Access to Berth 55 from the North Current Conditions. Under current conditions, travelers from the vicinity of Anaheim Street and Harbor Avenue could use Fashion Boulevard to West 9th Street to Pico Avenue. Depending on traffic conditions, this would be an approximately 3-minute trip by car, which requires travel over an at-grade rail crossing at 9th Street and Pier B Street.
- Access to Berth 55 from the North Proposed Project. Under the proposed Project and alternatives (where streets would be removed to expand the Pier B Rail Yard), travelers from north of the Port could head east on Anaheim Street and take I-710 south to Pico Avenue. This route would add 0.5 mile to the travel distance but could take less time depending on traffic conditions and avoidance of the rail crossing.
- Access to Berth 55 from Downtown Long Beach Current Conditions. From greater Downtown Long Beach, access to 555 Pico is via West 3rd Street and West Shoreline Drive, through to 9th Street and then Pico Avenue. Travel times for this 2-mile trip are in the 3- to 7-minute range, depending on traffic conditions. An alternate route would be via West 3rd Street, to Queens Way, West Ocean Boulevard to Pico Avenue. This alternative routing could be 1 minute shorter at a distance of 1.7 miles.
- Access to Berth 55 from the South. Access from the Ports areas would be mostly unaffected because 555 Pico is south of the Project area where roads would be shortened or eliminated.

Responses to Comments

Please see Master Response – Street Closures, Access to Downtown Long Beach, and Public
 Services Access.

3 Response to Comment SRM-6: The commenter states that road closures would also make 4 access for emergency services that much more difficult. Emergency responders are located on all sides, and in proximity, of the Pier B Rail Yard, and include the JCCC at 1249 Pier F 5 6 Avenue supported by City and federal partner agencies to provide quick and uniform response 7 to emergencies at the Port (see Figure 3.7-1 of the Draft EIR). Access by emergency 8 responders would utilize Anaheim Street and I-710, which may offer more direct travel to area 9 hospitals located in Long Beach, Wilmington, and San Pedro. Changes in emergency response time are not, in and of themselves, environmental issues. Please see Master 10 11 Response – Street Closures, Access to Downtown Long Beach, and Public Services Access.

12 Response to Comment SRM-7: The realignment of Pico Avenue would not result in any blocking of ingress and egress of Berth 55 businesses. Construction staging and laydown 13 14 would not be placed in the Berth 55 parking lot; thus, a lack of parking during construction 15 would not occur. As stated in Section 6.3.3.1 of the Draft EIR, the Port requires that the contractor develop and implement a TMP for construction activities along Pico Avenue; this 16 17 plan would include, but not be limited to, advance coordination with SRM and other tenants at Berth 55, public notification, and signage. Parking during operation of the proposed rail yard 18 19 would be adequate (as stated in response to Comment SRM-3). The proposed Project and 20 alternatives would permanently remove portions of certain streets adjacent to the rail yard. but alternative travel routes would continue to be available (as discussed in response to 21 22 Comment SRM-5). There is no reason to expect that public access to Berth 55 would be 23 inhibited or that businesses at Queen's Wharf would not be able to operate during the 24 construction and operational periods.

25 Response to Comment SRM-8: The proposed Project's air quality impacts have been fully 26 assessed in Section 3.2 of the Draft EIR and in Appendix A to the Draft EIR. The comment 27 does not identify any flaws in the analysis. The analysis took into account the distances 28 between the operations and sensitive receptors. Railroad tracks would be approximately 50 29 feet closer to SRM business buildings than currently located as a result of the 12th Street 30 Alternative; tracks would be approximately 20 feet closer to the buildings as a result of the 31 10th and 9th Street alternatives. Response to Comment SRM-2 presents the location-specific air quality impacts that could be expected at Queens Wharf as a result of the proposed Project, 32 33 including the four additional tracks. These changes would not result in any impacts to air quality or noise that would be considered significant. 34

35 The comment states that the proposed Project does not meet the "requirements" of SCAQMD. 36 Presumably, what the comment is referring to are SCAQMD's thresholds of significance 37 which, in certain cases, are exceeded, resulting in some impacts being identified as significant. It is important to differentiate between thresholds of significance and SCAQMD 38 39 regulations. The proposed Project would fully comply with all of SCAQMD's applicable 40 regulations. It is also important to note that the fundamental purpose of the proposed Project 41 is to allow for a greater number of containers to be transported to their destinations in a cleaner 42 method in terms of air quality. Please see response to Comment GSR-2. The Draft EIR also 43 addresses the potential noise, vibration, air quality, and public health and safety impacts of 44 the proposed Project, and it identifies appropriate measures to mitigate potentially significant 45 impacts of the proposed Project. The comment does not indicate any error in the methodology or its application. Furthermore, under CEQA, a lead agency can still approve a project by 46

#### Port of Long Beach

1 making a statement of overriding considerations that acknowledges the benefits of the

2 proposed Project (CEQA Guidelines 15093). The BHC will consider the Findings of Fact and

3 Statement of Overriding Considerations which, if adopted by the BHC, will serve as the legal

4 basis for approval of the Project.

5 Both the proposed Project and 555 Pico Avenue are located within the General Industrial (IG) 6 district, which is considered the City's "industrial sanctuary" district (Long Beach Municipal 7 Code, Title 21 – Zoning, Chapter 21.33 – Industrial Districts. 21.33.020 Districts established; 8 Ord. C-7360 § 3, 1995). According to the City's zoning code, this district is "where a wide 9 range of industries that may not be desirable in other districts may locate. The emphasis is on traditionally heavy industrial and manufacturing uses." The uses permitted within this district 10 11 can reasonably expect to generate, and be subject to, higher noise and vibration levels than 12 properties elsewhere in the City. 555 Pico Avenue is already subject to ambient noise and 13 vibration from sources similar to those generated or affected by the proposed Project, 14 including existing rail operations to the north, east, and south, as well as traffic on Pico 15 Avenue, I-710, and nearby ramps. These conditions are already present at the location and 16 are accepted by patrons.

17 **Response to Comment SRM-9:** SRM Corporation's opposition to the proposed Project is 18 noted for the record. The comment is hereby part of the Final EIR; therefore, it is before the

19 decision-makers for their consideration prior to taking any action on the proposed Project.

## 1 **11.2.3.32 Superior Electrical Advertising (SEA)**

	31	Lisa Kolieb
		Akarman 11 P
		38th Floor
Akerman	1	725 South Figueroa Street
CONTRACTOR OF COMMA		Tel: 213.688.9500
		Fax: 213.627.6342
		Dir: 213.533,5947 Dir Fax: 213.599,2666
		lisa.kolleb@akerman.com
February 28, 2017		8
*		
	*	
AUTA DI MARTI ANITO HAN		
VIA E-MAIL AND HAP	ND DELIVERY	
Heather Tomley		
Director of Environment	al Planning	
Port of Long Beach	ð	
4801 Airport Plaza Drive	0	
Long Beach California 9	0815	
Emails heather temler@n		
Eman. <u>neauter.tonney@p</u>	<u>oib.com</u>	
Re: Pier B On-Dock I - Comment Letter	Rail Support Facility Project r from Superior Electrical Ac	t Draft Environmental Impact Report dvertising Inc.
Dear Mr. Tomlar:		1.
Dear wis. ronney.		
Dear Ms. Tonney.		
This firm represents Sup	erior Electrical Advertising	Inc. ("Superior"), a long time City of
This firm represents Sup Long Beach business loca	erior Electrical Advertising ted at 1700 W Anaheim St, L	Inc. ("Superior"), a long time City of ong Beach 90813 (the "Superior Site").
This firm represents Sup Long Beach business loca Superior has operated in	erior Electrical Advertising ted at 1700 W Anaheim St, L the City of Long Beach for o	Inc. ("Superior"), a long time City of ong Beach 90813 (the "Superior Site"). over 45 years, and at the Superior Site
This firm represents Sup Long Beach business loca Superior has operated in since 1972. Superior emp	erior Electrical Advertising ted at 1700 W Anaheim St, L the City of Long Beach for o loys 135+ people, and about	Inc. ("Superior"), a long time City of ong Beach 90813 (the "Superior Site"). over 45 years, and at the Superior Site t one third are Long Beach residents.
This firm represents Sup Long Beach business loca Superior has operated in since 1972. Superior emp Many employees are sec	erior Electrical Advertising ted at 1700 W Anaheim St, L the City of Long Beach for o loys 135+ people, and about xond and third generation f	Inc. ("Superior"), a long time City of ong Beach 90813 (the "Superior Site"). over 45 years, and at the Superior Site t one third are Long Beach residents. family employees. It manufactures
This firm represents Sup Long Beach business loca Superior has operated in since 1972. Superior emp Many employees are sec signage for high profile	perior Electrical Advertising ted at 1700 W Anaheim St, L the City of Long Beach for o loys 135+ people, and about cond and third generation f clients such as McDonald's	Inc. ("Superior"), a long time City of ong Beach 90813 (the "Superior Site"). over 45 years, and at the Superior Site t one third are Long Beach residents. family employees. It manufactures s, Starbucks, Disney, CVS, Universal
This firm represents Sup Long Beach business loca Superior has operated in since 1972. Superior emp Many employees are sec signage for high profile Studios etc. This letter is	perior Electrical Advertising ted at 1700 W Anaheim St, L the City of Long Beach for o loys 135+ people, and about cond and third generation f clients such as McDonald's s written on behalf of Supe	Inc. ("Superior"), a long time City of ong Beach 90813 (the "Superior Site"). over 45 years, and at the Superior Site t one third are Long Beach residents. family employees. It manufactures s, Starbucks, Disney, CVS, Universal prior in response to the Port of Long
This firm represents Sup Long Beach business loca Superior has operated in since 1972. Superior emp Many employees are sec signage for high profile Studios etc. This letter is Beach's Pier B On-Dock J	perior Electrical Advertising ted at 1700 W Anaheim St, L the City of Long Beach for o cloys 135+ people, and about cond and third generation f clients such as McDonald's s written on behalf of Super Rail Support Facility Project	Inc. ("Superior"), a long time City of ong Beach 90813 (the "Superior Site"). over 45 years, and at the Superior Site t one third are Long Beach residents. family employees. It manufactures s, Starbucks, Disney, CVS, Universal erior in response to the Port of Long Draft Environmental Impact Report
This firm represents Sup Long Beach business loca Superior has operated in since 1972. Superior emp Many employees are sec signage for high profile Studios etc. This letter i Beach's Pier B On-Dock I SCH# 2009081079 ("DEIR"	perior Electrical Advertising ted at 1700 W Anaheim St, L the City of Long Beach for o cloys 135+ people, and about cond and third generation f clients such as McDonald's s written on behalf of Super Rail Support Facility Project	Inc. ("Superior"), a long time City of ong Beach 90813 (the "Superior Site"). over 45 years, and at the Superior Site t one third are Long Beach residents. family employees. It manufactures s, Starbucks, Disney, CVS, Universal erior in response to the Port of Long t Draft Environmental Impact Report
This firm represents Sup Long Beach business loca Superior has operated in since 1972. Superior emp Many employees are see signage for high profile Studios etc. This letter i Beach's Pier B On-Dock I SCH# 2009081079 ("DEIR"	berior Electrical Advertising ated at 1700 W Anaheim St, L the City of Long Beach for o cloys 135+ people, and about cond and third generation f clients such as McDonald's s written on behalf of Super Rail Support Facility Project ).	Inc. ("Superior"), a long time City of ong Beach 90813 (the "Superior Site"). over 45 years, and at the Superior Site t one third are Long Beach residents. family employees. It manufactures s, Starbucks, Disney, CVS, Universal erior in response to the Port of Long Draft Environmental Impact Report
This firm represents Sup Long Beach business loca Superior has operated in since 1972. Superior emp Many employees are sec signage for high profile Studios etc. This letter i Beach's Pier B On-Dock I SCH# 2009081079 ("DEIR"	perior Electrical Advertising ted at 1700 W Anaheim St, L the City of Long Beach for o loys 135+ people, and about cond and third generation f clients such as McDonald's s written on behalf of Super Rail Support Facility Project ).	Inc. ("Superior"), a long time City of ong Beach 90813 (the "Superior Site"). over 45 years, and at the Superior Site t one third are Long Beach residents. family employees. It manufactures s, Starbucks, Disney, CVS, Universal erior in response to the Port of Long Draft Environmental Impact Report
This firm represents Sup Long Beach business loca Superior has operated in since 1972. Superior emp Many employees are sec signage for high profile Studios etc. This letter i Beach's Pier B On-Dock I SCH# 2009081079 ("DEIR"	berior Electrical Advertising ted at 1700 W Anaheim St, L the City of Long Beach for o cloys 135+ people, and about cond and third generation f clients such as McDonald's s written on behalf of Super Rail Support Facility Project ).	Inc. ("Superior"), a long time City of ong Beach 90813 (the "Superior Site"). over 45 years, and at the Superior Site t one third are Long Beach residents. family employees. It manufactures s, Starbucks, Disney, CVS, Universal erior in response to the Port of Long Draft Environmental Impact Report
This firm represents Sup Long Beach business loca Superior has operated in since 1972. Superior emp Many employees are sec signage for high profile Studios etc. This letter i Beach's Pier B On-Dock I SCH# 2009081079 ("DEIR"	perior Electrical Advertising ted at 1700 W Anaheim St, L the City of Long Beach for o cloys 135+ people, and about cond and third generation f clients such as McDonald's s written on behalf of Super Rail Support Facility Project ').	Inc. ("Superior"), a long time City of ong Beach 90813 (the "Superior Site"). over 45 years, and at the Superior Site t one third are Long Beach residents. family employees. It manufactures s, Starbucks, Disney, CVS, Universal rrior in response to the Port of Long Draft Environmental Impact Report
This firm represents Sup Long Beach business loca Superior has operated in since 1972. Superior emp Many employees are see signage for high profile Studios etc. This letter i Beach's Pier B On-Dock I SCH# 2009081079 ("DEIR"	berior Electrical Advertising ated at 1700 W Anaheim St, L the City of Long Beach for o loys 135+ people, and about cond and third generation f clients such as McDonald's s written on behalf of Super Rail Support Facility Project ).	Inc. ("Superior"), a long time City of ong Beach 90813 (the "Superior Site"). over 45 years, and at the Superior Site t one third are Long Beach residents. family employees. It manufactures s, Starbucks, Disney, CVS, Universal erior in response to the Port of Long Draft Environmental Impact Report
This firm represents Sup Long Beach business loca Superior has operated in since 1972. Superior emp Many employees are sec signage for high profile Studios etc. This letter i Beach's Pier B On-Dock I SCH# 2009081079 ("DEIR" akerman.com	berior Electrical Advertising ated at 1700 W Anaheim St, L the City of Long Beach for o loys 135+ people, and about cond and third generation f clients such as McDonald's s written on behalf of Super Rail Support Facility Project ').	Inc. ("Superior"), a long time City of ong Beach 90813 (the "Superior Site"). over 45 years, and at the Superior Site t one third are Long Beach residents. family employees. It manufactures s, Starbucks, Disney, CVS, Universal rrior in response to the Port of Long Draft Environmental Impact Report



#### Responses to Comments





- SEA-15

SEA-16

SEA-17

-SEA-18

SEA-19

SEA-20

Ms. Tomley February 28, 2017 Page 5 WITHOUT A DETAILED SITE PLAN, RIGHT OF WAY MAPPING OR CONFIRMATION OF WHAT PRIVATE SITES WILL BE ACQUIRED, THE PROJECT'S IMPACTS AND DETERMINATION ON EXISTING BUSINESSES IS UNKNOWN AND NOT PROPERLY ANALYZED. The land use section of the DEIR only addresses the impacts to the properties that are within the footprint of the Project, not those which are directly adjacent to the Project which would be negatively impacted by the Project. The City/Port does not appear to have plan to acquire properties or relocate such properties, nor has it proposed any mitigation to reduce impacts to Noise. If the Project moves forward as proposed, mitigation should include acquisition of properties immediately adjacent to Project and relocation payments to any tenants in such properties. > THE NOISE ANALYSIS IS FLAWED. The conclusions in the noise analysis seem both unreasonable and questionable. Specifically, the noise level predictions seem very low. Moreover, without an adequate description of the proposed rail operations, noise estimates are unreliable. For example, the conclusions that the predicted noise levels for the Project will be below the baseline ambient noise levels in the area seems unlikely that with the constant coupling and coupling, refueling and movement of trains that the noise would not be above the ambient noise in the area. Using existing rail yard operations which would only represent a small portion of the Project to predict Project operations without describing how it was calculated is insufficient. For example, has a multiplier been used? What methodology was used to predict the Project's noise impacts? Much more detail is necessary in the body of the DEIR to justify the DEIR's conclusions. The reasoning supporting the determination of insignificance must be disclosed. City of Maywood v. Los Angeles Unified Sch. Dist. (2012) 208 CalApp4th 362,393. Even with the existing trains several blocks away, when a train whistles, the sound is so intense that employees feel like the whistle is being sounded within the Superior building. With the Project, that number would be increased exponentially. Train whistles are not even mentioned in the DEIR. Similarly the vibration impacts on the Project are not adequately measured. Despite acknowledging that the Project may cause vibration impacts, and states that historic buildings (of which the Superior building is potentially classified), no mitigation measures are proposed to address the vibration impacts. Although the DEIR makes brief references to liquefaction and notes that the liquefaction potential at the Project site is high, the DEIR proposes no project features or mitigation measures to address potential liquefaction impacts on neighboring properties. In fact, the vibration analysis fails RECEIVED FEB 2 8 2017 {41027389;1}

Ms. Tomley February 28, 2017 Page 6

to even discuss liquefaction. The vibration, along with liquefaction could cause severe damage to the foundation of Superior's building, which was constructed in 1943.

ן (conta)

For the aforementioned reasons, Superior is opposed to the Project and believes that **SEA-21** additional analysis and mitigation is required.

Sincerely,

Kink

Lisa Kolieb Akerman LLP

Mayor Robert Garcia, City of Long Beach (via e-mail)
 Mark Taylor, Chief of Staff to Mayor Garcia, City of Long Beach (via e-mail)
 Jeannine Pearce, Councilmember, City of Long Beach (via e-mail)
 Christian Kropff, Chief of Staff to Councilmember Pearce, City of Long Beach (via e-mail)
 Lena Gonzalez, First District Councilwoman, City of Long Beach (via e-mail)
 Cory Allen, Chief of Staff to Councilwoman Gonzalez, City of Long Beach (via e-mail)

mail)

Jim Sterk, Chief Executive Officer, Superior Electrical Adv., Inc. (via e-mail) Stan Janocha, Chief Operations Officer, Superior Electrical Adv., Inc. (via e-mail) Patti Skoglund, President, Superior Electrical Adv., Inc. (via e-mail)

Doug Tokeshi, Sr. Vice President, Superior Electrical Adv., Inc. (via e-mail)

{41027389;1}

1

RECEIVED FEB 2 8 2017

Responses to Comments

## 1 Responses to Superior Electrical Advertising

Response to Comment SEA-1: The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your review of the
 Draft EIR, the information concerning your business, your employees, and your long-term
 tenure in the harbor area.

5 The comment contends that the adverse effects of the proposed Project are so substantial as 6 to cause Superior Electrical to relocate. The proposed Project is intended to upgrade existing 7 rail operations on Pier B, improving the efficiency of its operations and decreasing dwell times 8 while minimizing adverse effects. Superior Electrical's facilities are currently located 9 approximately 500 feet from the existing Pier B Rail Yard. If the proposed Project is approved and built, Superior Electrical's facilities still would be separated from the Pier B Rail Yard 10 operations by a portion of 12th Street, a limited parking area, the new Pier B Rail Yard's 11 perimeter road, a new perimeter fence, and the Pier B Rail Yard access road. It is estimated 12 13 that the separation between the business and the yard operations would be approximately 14 125 feet.

- The proposed Project would not cause the Superior Electrical facility to close or relocate. It would not be necessary to acquire the property at 1700 W. Anaheim Street for any of the alternatives. Superior Electrical's access to 12th Street along its southern property boundary would continue to be available. Superior Electrical's access gate to Jackson Avenue, leading to Anaheim Street, would not be affected. No changes to Superior Electrical's perimeter along Santa Fe Avenue would be required.
- It is important to remember that this portion of the Port is zoned as a General Industrial (IG) district. According to the City's zoning code, this district is "where a wide range of industries that may not be desirable in other districts may locate. The emphasis is on traditionally heavy industrial and manufacturing uses." The uses permitted within this district can reasonably expect to generate, and be subject to, higher noise and vibration levels than properties elsewhere in the City.
- 27 Thus, the Pier B Rail Yard is an existing use in an appropriately zoned area. From a land use

standpoint, it is important to note that the proposed Project is consistent with the PMP and

29 with the COLA General Plan's Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan goals and objectives.

- 30 Moreover, the nature of the proposed Project is such that it cannot be moved to a different 31 location.
- The Draft EIR has analyzed the potential environmental impacts of the proposed Project and generally determined these to be non-significant; only air quality and global climate change impacts were determined to be significantly adverse.
- To the extent specific issues are raised in the commenter's later comments, those issues will be addressed later.
- 37 Response to Comment SEA-2: The comment claims that the Draft EIR fails to adequately analyze the impacts of the proposed Project on surrounding properties. The four areas of 38 environmental concern identified in the comment (i.e., noise, vibration, air quality, and 39 40 transportation/circulation) have all been thoroughly evaluated in the Draft EIR. Of these four 41 areas of environmental concern, only air quality impacts have been determined to be 42 significant. Neither the analysis presented in the Draft EIR nor the information provided by 43 Superior Electrical have demonstrated how increased levels of air pollutants would render it 44 unable to operate at its current location.

1 From a land use perspective, operation of a rail yard is consistent with the industrial land use

2 designation. The Pier B Rail Yard currently operates in its existing location with surrounding

3 businesses; continued rail yard operations would not result in negative effects that would

4 cause businesses to shut down.

**Response to Comment SEA-3:** The comment indicates that the Draft EIR does not provide adequate project features or mitigation measures to minimize the severe impacts to supporting businesses and operations. The proposed Project was evaluated in the Draft EIR, and this evaluation found that impacts would be less than significant except for air pollutant emissions for which feasible mitigation measures are currently not available for some pollutants.

10 Response to Comment SEA-4: If the proposed Project or one of its alternatives is approved, 11 there is no need for the Port to acquire the property on which Superior Electrical conducts its 12 operation because the property is outside the Project footprint. Moreover, an EIR is not the 13 appropriate document to evaluate or propose a compensation plan or a relocation plan. 14 Please see Master Response – Property Acquisition, Compensation, and Relocation.

Response to Comment SEA-5: The preparation of relocation plans is premature at this point in time because the EIR has not been certified and the BHC has not determined whether they wish to proceed with the proposed Project or one of the alternatives, including the No Project Alternative. The details regarding relocation are not within the scope of the CEQA analysis, and would be addressed in accordance with all applicable regulations at the appropriate time. Please see Master Response – Property Acquisition, Compensation, and Relocation.

**Response to Comment SEA-6:** The comment states that Superior Electrical would be unable to operate at the site due to the significant noise, vibration, air quality, and transportation/ circulation impacts that would result from the proposed Project.

Continued operation at the Superior Electrical site would not be prevented by construction or operation of the proposed Project. The Draft EIR did not identify any significant impacts to noise, vibration, or transportation/circulation. Mitigation measures for air quality impacts have been identified to reduce emissions to the extent possible.

28 Noise. As discussed in Section 3.8.2 of the Draft EIR, noise generated by the proposed 29 Project and its alternatives would not exceed COLB ambient noise limits for the nearest 30 sensitive receptors. Superior Electrical is located in an industrial land use area and subject to 31 the allowable noise level for industrial land uses, which is 65 dBA any time. However, as 32 allowed by the Long Beach Municipal Code and as described in the Draft EIR on page 3.8-13), 33 if the existing ambient noise level already exceeds this noise limit, the LBMC permits the 34 allowable level to be increased in 5 dB increments (until the ambient level is encompassed). 35 The nearest sensitive receptor to the Project is the MSC, which is north of the proposed 36 Project boundaries. At that location, ambient noise was measured at 64 dBA (see Table 37 3.8-11). The Superior Electric property is several blocks distant, but assuming that ambient 38 noise at the Superior Electric location would be equivalent to that at the MSC (i.e., 64 dBA), a 39 significant impact would nonetheless not result, because the projected Project plus ambient 40 noise level from yard noise, at the Superior Electric site, would also be 64 dBA (see Table 41 3.8-11), which is less than the allowable 65 dBA, at any time, for an industrial use. Moreover, 42 taking into account the attenuation produced by the intervening distance, the resultant noise 43 level would likely be even lower than as estimated in the above discussion.

44 **Vibration.** As discussed on page 3.8-27 of the Draft EIR under the NOISE-8 impact 45 evaluation, a vibration impact would occur when the distances from the centerline of tracks to

the point where exceedances of the 80 vibration decibels (VdB) Category 2 (residential) and 1 2 83 VdB Category 3 (institutional) limits would be 50 and 25 feet, respectively. The distance 3 from the centerline of the nearest tracks to the edge of the Superior Electrical property is approximately 94 feet (12th Street Alternative). Therefore, because this property is nearly 70 4 5 feet from the source of vibration, its resultant vibration level would be considerably below the 6 FTA acceptability limit of 83 VdB. For this reason, operation of the expanded rail yard under 7 the 12th Street Alternative would not result in operational groundborne vibration that would exceed the FTA acceptability limit. Similarly, for the 10th Street Alternative, the distance from 8 9 the centerline of tracks to the Superior Electrical property would be approximately 104 feet; 10 groundborne vibration would not exceed the FTA acceptability limit. Train activity would be infrequent events, and would not be expected to interfere with conducting business within the 11 12 harbor industrial zone.

13 Air Quality. With regard to the air quality impacts of the proposed Project's air emissions on 14 Superior Electrical, predicted impacts specific to this location were extracted from the Draft EIR analysis and are summarized here. The closest receptor points to Superior Electrical that 15 16 were evaluated by the dispersion model for the EIR are located on the Superior Electrical site. 17 Table 11.2-16 shows the highest modeled criteria pollutant and health risk impacts at Superior Electrical associated with the mitigated proposed Project. The table shows that the peak state 18 19 1-hour NO₂ concentration would exceed the threshold during Project construction, and the peak federal 1-hour NO₂ concentration would exceed the threshold during both Project 20 21 construction and operation. All other criteria pollutant and health risk impacts during 22 construction and operation would be less than the thresholds at this location.

23 The peak state and federal 1-hour NO₂ impacts of 343  $\mu$ g/m³ and 248  $\mu$ g/m³, respectively, 24 during construction would occur during Phase 3. Emissions from Project construction would 25 contribute only about 24 and 29 percent to the state and federal impacts, respectively; the background concentration would contribute the remaining 76 and 71 percent. The peak 26 federal 1-hour NO₂ impact of 196 µg/m³ during operation would occur in the 2020 analysis 27 28 year; the impact would gradually decrease to 191 µg/m³ by 2035. Emissions from Project 29 operation would contribute only about 10 percent to the 2020 impact; the background concentration would contribute the remaining 90 percent. The geographical extent of 30 31 significant NO₂ concentrations during the operational period of the proposed Project with the 32 refined boundary (as described in Section 10.1 of the Final EIR) is shown in Figures 11.2-1 33 through 11.2-5 in response to Comment AQMD-5. A discussion of the types of health effects 34 that may be associated with NO_x and NO₂ exposure is provided on pages 3.2-48 and 3.2-49 35 of the Draft EIR.

36 The predicted 1-hour NO₂ concentrations in Table 11.2-16 are conservative and would occur 37 very infrequently, if at all, because they assume worst-case meteorological conditions (i.e., 38 low wind speed, optimum wind direction, and very stable atmosphere) concurrent with the 39 highest observed background concentration measured at the Superblock monitoring station 40 over a 3-year period. The construction concentrations further assume all construction 41 equipment would operate simultaneously during these worst-case conditions. Most of the 1-hour NO₂ concentrations during Project construction and operation would be much lower 42 43 than the peak values, as evidenced by the much lower annual average NO₂ concentrations, 44 which are averages of all 1-hour concentrations during the worst-case year.

	MODELED AIR POL ADVERTI	TABLE 11. LUTANT IMPACTS. SING (MITIGATED F	2-16 NEAR SUPERIOR ELE PROPOSED PROJECT)	CTRICAL
	Description	Modeled Impact ¹	Significance Threshold	Significant?
		Criteria Pollutants durin	g Construction ²	
	1-Hour (state)	343	339	Yes
NO ₂	1-Hour (federal)	248	188	Yes
	Annual	55.3	57.0	No
со	1-Hour	4,160	23,000	No
	8-Hour	3,277	10,000	No
	24-Hour	1.5	10.4	No
PIVI10	Annual	0.1	1.0	No
PM _{2.5}	24-Hour	0.6	10.4	No
		Criteria Pollutants dur	ing Operation ³	
	1-Hour (state)	281	339	No
NO ₂	1-Hour (federal)	196	188	Yes
	Annual	55.0	57.0	No
со	1-Hour	3,994	23,000	No
	8-Hour	3,167	10,000	No
PM10	24-Hour	0.04	2.5	No
	Annual	0.0002	1.0	No
PM _{2.5}	24-Hour	0.04	2.5	No
	н	lealth Risks (Constructi	on + Operation) ⁴	
Individua	I Cancer Risk	2.5 × 10-6	10 × 10 ⁻⁶	No
Chronic Hazard Index		0.005	1.0	No
8-Hour C	hronic Hazard Index	0.01	1.0	No
Acute Hazard Index		0.08	1.0	No
Notes:		- -	· · ·	

¹ NO₂ and CO impacts are the modeled project increment plus observed background. All other impacts are the modeled project increment.

 2   $\,$  The highest impacts from all three phases of construction are shown.

³ The highest impacts from all three operational analysis years (2020, 2025, 2035) are shown.

⁴ Health risk values reflect occupational exposure assumptions and include emissions from both construction and operation.

Furthermore, the proposed Project could produce operational criteria pollutant and health impacts that are less than the values presented in the EIR and Table 11.2-16 by replacing many future drayage truck trips from the terminal served by the Pier B Rail Yard with rail transport. The potential air quality benefit associated with fewer drayage truck trips was conservatively not quantified in this EIR (although the impact of the additional rail transport *was* quantified). Please see response to Comment GSR-2 for a more thorough discussion of this potential air quality benefit. Responses to Comments

1 With regard to air quality mitigation, please see response to Comment SEA-11.

2 Transportation/Circulation. Access to the local street network via Jackson Avenue would 3 be maintained, thereby permitting deliveries of raw materials and transport of finished 4 products from the site as at present. As mentioned in response to Comment SEA-1, acquisition of the property at 1700 W. Anaheim Street would not be required for any of the 5 6 alternatives. Superior Electrical's access onto 12th Street along its southern property boundary 7 and on its other three sides of the property would continue to be available. Superior Electrical's 8 access gate to Jackson Avenue, leading to Anaheim Street, would not be affected. No 9 changes to Superior Electrical's perimeter along Santa Fe Avenue would be required. 12th Street would be left in place to allow continued ingress and egress. A proposed perimeter 10 road around the rail yard would be constructed south of 12th Street connecting to Jackson and 11 12 Santa Fe avenues. On-street parking would continue to be available along the south side of 13 12th Street. Access to the Superior Electrical property would not change. For these reasons, 14 the physical changes associated with the proposed Project would not be incompatible to continued business activities at Superior Electrical. The proposed perimeter road to be 15 16 provided would be a benefit to the flow of traffic. Please also see Master Response - Street

17 Closures, Access to Downtown Long Beach, and Public Services Access.

18 **Response to Comment SEA-7:** The comment claims that the Project description is 19 inadequate and, specifically, that it does not identify the exact location of the proposed Project.

The comment identifies a mislabeling of two streets on Figure ES-1 and finds this to be a "significant defect" in the Draft EIR. One of the purposes of releasing the Draft EIR for public review is to identify errors and deficiencies so that the Final EIR is sufficiently accurate and complete to fully inform the decision-makers. Because the Project location is accurately depicted in other figures in the document and described within Chapter 1, the mislabeling of Figure ES-1 is not a "significant defect." Figure ES-1 and Figure 1.7-2 have been revised in the Final EIR.

27 Regarding the remainder of the comment, it must be noted that a project description need not 28 supply details beyond those needed for evaluation and review of the environmental impacts 29 of a project (CEQA Guideline 15124). Moreover, it need not include information not specified 30 in CEQA Guideline 15124. Regarding location, the EIR complies completely with the 31 Guideline by including both the regional map and the more detailed map. (see Figures 1.7-1 32 and 1.8-1). The Port disagrees with the commenter regarding the level of detail on these 33 maps. These detailed maps are augmented by detailed textual descriptions of the location 34 (pages 1-18 and 1-24).

- The comment does not identify any omission of the Project description information specified in CEQA Guideline 15124. The description of the proposed Project is more than adequate.
- 37 With regard to accessibility to 12th Street:
- Under the original proposed Project (12th Street Alternative), 10th Street Alternative, and
   9th Street Alternative, 12th Street would continue to be accessible from Jackson and Santa
   Fe avenues.
- Under the 12th Street Alternative, as refined, a new perimeter road (open to the public) for
   the rail yard would connect Jackson and Santa Fe avenues. Superior Electrical's access
   to 12th Street would be maintained. 12th Street would connect to Santa Fe Avenue;
   however, 12th Street would no longer connect to Jackson Avenue.

#### Port of Long Beach

- Under the 10th Street Alternative, as refined, the northern side of 12th Street would be accessible from Jackson and Santa Fe avenues. The perimeter road would displace a portion of the south side of 12th Street.
- Under the 9th Street Alternative, there would be no changes to 12th Street; Jackson and
   Santa Fe avenues would terminate at 9th Street.

6 Response to Comment SEA-8: The commenter contends that the level of detail about proposed Project operations in the Project Description is insufficient. CEQA Guideline 15124 7 8 requires only a "general description of the project's technical, economic, and environmental 9 characteristics, considering the principal engineering proposals, if any, and supporting public service facilities." The description in the Draft EIR more than met this requirement. The 10 11 proposed Project is intended to enhance an existing facility and existing operations, so it 12 reasonably focuses on how the existing facilities and operations would be enhanced and how 13 that would improve throughput and reduce dwell time. In other words, the proposed Project is 14 not the Pier B rail operations, per se, but consists of the changes in Pier B rail operations.

15 The 58-page Project description describes Pier B rail facilities and operations in sufficient 16 detail to support the environmental impact analysis. Section 1.3.3 discusses the use of the 17 various tracks in the rail yard and states "several of the yard tracks are dedicated to either automobile rail car storage or for other activity ..." (page 1-9). Section 1.8.2 includes a detailed 18 description of the Project elements, which correspond to features shown on Figure 1.8-1. 19 20 Operations of those elements are described in detail on pages 1-39 and 1-40. The relevant 21 operations are described again, in detail, within the various environmental assessments in 22 Chapter 3.

The commenter asks about the occurrence of various rail yard activities, including assembly, disassembly, coupling and uncoupling, refueling, and maintenance. The proposed Project would result in a reconfigured Pier B on-dock rail support facility that will include, but is not limited to, the following rail activities and capabilities (see page ES-5):

- 27 Receive, depart, and stage inbound and outbound intermodal trains
- 28 Rail car storage and classification facilities
- 29 A departing train assembly area
- 30 An inspection and departure brake test performance area
- Staging tracks for non-intermodal cars traveling to and from non-container terminals
- Approximately five tanker truck locomotive refueling vehicles (loaded with fuel offsite) to
   service onsite locomotives (see Figure 1.8-1 on page 1-27)
- Approximately five rail and rail car repair vehicles operating within the facility
- 35 Passenger van support vehicles to pick up and drop off train crews within the facility
- Vehicle operations, including vehicles arriving and departing for refueling operations, rail
   and rail car repair, and daily rail yard administrative staff individual passenger vehicles,
   and locomotive operation personnel vehicles

The commenter states that the Project description identifies proposed "repairing tracks on dedicated tracks," and requests identification of said dedicated tracks. It is presumed that the commenter intended to inquire about repairing rail cars on dedicated tracks. Trackage for rail car repair activities are located within the existing rail yard, but currently do not provide sufficient space for repairing cars, to allow other tracks to remain clear. As such, the Draft EIR identifies, on page 1-39 of the Introduction and Project Description, Lines 35-37, "Repairing

1 cars on dedicated tracks within the Pier B Rail Yard allows the tracks to remain clear for 2 incoming and outgoing cargo." The proposed Project would include one track that would 3 provide a track line predominantly designed for repair of cars on an as-needed basis. This 4 track would be located approximately 125 feet from Superior Electrical Advertising's back 5 entrance on 12th Street. As repairing loaded rail cars is more difficult and generally avoided, 6 most rail car repair activities occur at locations offsite, in the on-dock rail yards at the marine 7 terminals, once the cars have been unloaded. Within the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail 8 Support Facility, if rail car repair must occur, repair could feasibly take place upon track(s) 9 located adjacent to aisle ways that allow equipment vehicles to assist the rail car repair 10 activities. The arrival and departure tracks for trains entering and leaving the Pier B Rail Yard, functioning as the primary ingress and egress, would be located near (i.e., northernmost 11 proposed Project boundary) Anaheim Street (Figure 1.8-1, page 1-27). 12

13 If the BHC ultimately approves the proposed Project or one if its alternatives, Engineering 14 design prior to construction would determine the final use of future rail tracks, dedicated or 15 otherwise. Other onsite rail activities, as described above and in the EIR, would take place on 16 tracks located within the boundaries of the proposed Pier B Rail Yard.

17 **Response to Comment SEA-9:** The comment states that more Project details are provided 18 in the various impact analyses than in Chapter 1 (Project Description). The comment does not 19 provide any examples of this. However, as pointed out in response to Comment SEA-8, CEQA 20 Guideline 15124 requires only a "general description of the project's technical, economic, and 21 environmental characteristics, considering the principal engineering proposals, if any and 22 supporting public service facilities." The Project description is consistent throughout the Draft 23 EIR in that its basic characteristics are the same, with variations only pertaining to the size of 24 the footprint, operational capacity, and alterations to the local street network. Each of these 25 variables is consistently evaluated across all impact factors. To the extent that certain details require analysis for certain associated impacts (e.g., locomotives for purposes of air quality 26 27 analysis or internal rail yard operations for purposes of noise analysis), those factors and 28 descriptors are evaluated across the range of alternatives in those specific analyses.

The purpose of describing a project is to allow a proper assessment of its environmental impacts. The fact that additional descriptions may be provided in the context of explaining an impact is by no means a violation of CEQA. To the contrary, it is totally appropriate to describe Project operations in the context of a particular impact analysis.

33 **Response to Comment SEA-10:** The comment contends that the Project description 34 misleads readers in the way it describes 94 properties on page 1-31 of the Draft EIR. The 35 commenter quotes the section out of context and attempts to suggest that the Draft EIR was 36 suggesting that only the 94 properties within the Project footprint would be affected by the 37 proposed Project. That is not what the Draft EIR states. The partially guoted language comes 38 from a description of construction impacts, and it is specifically under the heading "Potential 39 Property Acquisition." Read in context, the language is clearly describing the properties that 40 might be affected by acquisition. It never suggested that these properties were the limit of the 41 environmental impacts of the proposed Project. The Project description is not misleading.

Response to Comment SEA-11: The comment contends that the Draft EIR should include additional mitigation measures. The comment references the need for additional measures to address operational NO_X emissions. The comment does not identify any such additional measures, but it appears to assume that additional feasible mitigation measures for NO_X are available but are not being included. As explained in the Draft EIR on page 3.2-47, there are

#### Port of Long Beach

1

2

3

4

no additional feasible mitigation measures available at this time. For example, in responses to Comments CARB-7 and CARB-8, the Port explained why certain suggested additional measures were not feasible. It is possible that new measures would be developed over time. For this reason, the Port has imposed a Special Condition in Section 6.3.2, which imposes a

mandatory technology review every 5 years. Please also see Master Response –
 Electrification of Alameda Corridor and Zero Emission Locomotives.

**Response to Comment SEA-12:** The Shoemaker Bridge (West Shoreline Drive) is located at the southern end of I-710, and is bisected by the Los Angeles River. Shoreline Drive and West Anaheim Street provide direct access from the proposed Project area to Downtown Long Beach and would continue to do so. Without the ramps, the Shoemaker Bridge (West Shoreline Drive) would continue to be accessible via I-710 south from the east, which will provide access to Downtown Long Beach.

13 The comment indicates that it is unclear what the proposed Project's relationship is with the 14 Shoemaker Bridge. The Shoemaker ramps include: (1) an on-ramp to southbound Shoemaker 15 Bridge at 9th Street in the North Harbor District that provides access to downtown Long Beach; and (2) an off-ramp from northbound Shoemaker Bridge at 10th Street, which feeds into 9th 16 Street in the North Harbor District. The proposed Project (12th Street Alternative) would 17 remove the Shoemaker Ramps on the westerly end of the Shoemaker Bridge. Under the 10th 18 19 Street Alternative the ramps would be reconfigured to maintain a connection between 20 Anaheim Street and Downtown Long Beach via Harbor Avenue. In the 9th Street Alternative 21 and No Project Alternative, the Shoemaker Ramps would remain unchanged.

22 In April 2016, the COLB issued a NOP for a separate project to replace the Shoemaker Bridge 23 (West Shoreline Drive). The Shoemaker Bridge Replacement Project is an Early Action 24 Project of the Interstate I-710 Corridor Improvement Project. Three alternatives are being 25 evaluated as part of the Shoemaker Bridge Replacement Project. In addition to the No Build Alternative (Alternative 1), Alternatives 2 and 3 will replace the existing Shoemaker Bridge 26 27 over the Los Angeles River with a new bridge located just south of the existing bridge. Both 28 Alternatives will include the evaluation of design options for a roundabout or a "Y" intersection 29 at the easterly end of the bridge. The primary difference between Alternative 2 and 3 is that 30 Alternative 2 provides for the re-purposing of the existing bridge for non-motorized 31 transportation and recreational use and Alternative 3 includes removal of the existing bridge.

32 While emergency response times are not environmental concerns, as explained in the Draft 33 EIR, the proposed Project would improve emergency response in some locations by 34 eliminating the at-grade crossing at Pier B/9th Street (page 3.7-10). The traffic analysis 35 contained in Chapter 3.5 of the Draft EIR took into account the roadway modifications of the 36 proposed Project, including elimination of the Shoemaker Bridge ramps, and concluded that 37 the rerouted traffic would not cause any significant traffic impacts (depending on traffic 38 conditions, travel time could increase by up to 4 minutes by not using the 9th Street ramps to 39 access West Shoreline Drive). The roadways at issue are publicly owned. The comment 40 relating to increased travel time relates to convenience and does not give rise to a CEQA 41 issue. The driving public does not have any vested right in being able to utilize the shortest 42 route between two locations. The street network in place with the proposed Project would 43 maintain access to all destinations in either the downtown area or port vicinity. Substantial 44 inconvenience due to additional driving time is not expected. Please see Master Response -45 Street Closures, Access to Downtown Long Beach, and Public Services Access.

1 **Response to Comment SEA-13:** The commenter contends that the proposed Project 2 introduces a land use that is incompatible with existing land use. The proposed Project is 3 intended to upgrade existing rail operations on Pier B, improving the efficiency of its operations 4 and decreasing dwell times while minimizing adverse environmental effects. Thus, the 5 proposed Project is an existing use in an appropriately zoned area. The Project is consistent 6 with the Port Master Plan and with the COLA General Plan's Wilmington-Harbor City 7 Community Plan goals and objectives. The nature of the Project is such that it cannot be moved to a more appropriate location (see Draft EIR Section 1.9.1). The EIR has presented 8 9 the potential environmental impacts of the Project, and, after considerable analysis, 10 determined these to be less than significant; the only exception being air quality impacts which were determined to be significantly adverse. 11

12 None of the impacts evaluated in the Draft EIR were determined to be of sufficient significance 13 that they would be inconsistent with similar effects currently being experienced by adjacent 14 properties and businesses. The entire area surrounding the Project area is classified as the 15 IG (General Industrial) district by the COLB (Municipal Code: Section 21.33.020). This zoning 16 designation applies to all properties in the area bounded by the Harbor District to the south, 17 Pacific Coast Highway to the north, the COLA to the west, and the vicinity of the Los Angeles River to the east. Within the IG district, "a wide range of industries may locate, such industries 18 19 that may not be desirable in other districts. The emphasis is on traditionally heavy industrial 20 and manufacturing uses. The IG district is intended to promote an industrial sanctuary where 21 land is preserved for industry and manufacturing and where existing industries are protected 22 from non-industrial users that may object to the operating characteristics of industry." It is, 23 therefore, presumed that by locating a business within the IG district, such business is cognizant and accepting of the similar uses, operations, conditions and circumstances 24 25 associated with general industrial operations, those being potentially adjacent, nearby, or 26 otherwise occurring within the district.

The Port understands that the Superior Electrical Advertising is a manufacturing business that operates within industrial land use and General Industrial (IG) zoning. Please see response to Comment SEA-1 for physical features that would be constructed between Superior Electrical's 12th Street perimeter and the Pier B Rail Yard as part of the proposed Project or alternatives. Surrounding businesses are also industrial in nature. Based on the environmental analyses for the proposed Project, these industrial land uses would not experience significant negative impacts associated with land use compatibility.

**Response to Comment SEA-14:** The comment claims that the proposed Project would cut off access to Superior Electrical's primary entrance on 12th Street. This is not the case; accessibility to 12th Street would be maintained from the Superior Electrical property's driveway onto 12th Street. On-street parallel parking would be provided along the perimeter road. A rail yard fence would separate the perimeter road from an interior rail yard access road.

40 **Response to Comment SEA-15:** The comment claims that the land use impact analysis in 41 the Draft EIR only addresses properties within the footprint of the proposed Project. This is 42 not the case, as explained in response to Comment SEA-11 and other prior comments. The 43 Draft EIR identifies the specific properties within its footprint that would be displaced by the 44 proposed Project if it were approved and implemented. However, the environmental analysis 45 in the Draft EIR studies the impacts of the proposed Project and its alternatives on the entire area, including the properties closest to the footprint of the proposed Project (see Figures
 3.6-5 through 3.6-7).

3 As stated in Section 3.6.4.1, the proposed Project is in the planning process. No final 4 construction plans, ROW mapping, or decisions regarding possible acquisitions of any privately held interests in properties have been made. The Port has identified properties that 5 6 might be subject to acquisition. However, no commitment to acquire any property interest can be made without compliance with a series of procedural steps called for under the California 7 8 Eminent Domain Law (California Code of Civil Procedure Secs. 1230.010 et seq.) and applicable relocation statutes and resolutions (CCR Secs. 6000 et seq.), among other 9 10 requirements.

11 Proposed land uses that would be near Superior Electrical are all industrial in nature. Based 12 on preliminary engineering design, the proposed rail yard south of Superior Electrical would 13 include roadway improvements (i.e., a perimeter road) to connect Jackson and Santa Fe 14 avenues; rail yard perimeter fencing; and an interior access road. Neighboring properties and 15 businesses adjacent to the Project footprint are within the IP (Port Industrial) land use district, 16 as established by the COLB. As such, these land uses would not be incompatible with each 17 other because both Superior Electrical and the railyard are industrial land uses. The proposed 18 Project is still in the planning stage, and no decisions have been made.

19 Response to Comment SEA-16: As explained above, the proposed Project would not 20 significantly impact the environment at Superior Electrical. The comment suggests that the 21 Port should implement mitigation to include acquisition of properties immediately adjacent to 22 the proposed Project. Given that the proposed Project would not have a significant impact on 23 the commenter's business, the suggested mitigation is not appropriate. In addition, the suggested mitigation is legally infeasible. It would be improper for the Port to commit to 24 25 acquiring property without first having gone through all of the legally required steps. 26 Furthermore, California law only permits acquisition through eminent domain of property that 27 is actually necessary for a public project.

The comment also suggests that mitigation should be required for noise impacts. The Draft EIR found that changes in ambient noise levels, including at receptor location M1 near Superior Electrical, would be less than significant; for this reason, mitigation is not required.

**Response to Comment SEA-17:** The comment characterizes the results of the noise impact analysis as "unreasonable and questionable" and states that "noise levels for the Project will be below the baseline ambient noise levels ... seems unlikely," but does not note any specific flaws in the noise analysis, giving rise to those comments. The commenter states that "noise level predictions seem very low." These perceptions, because they are not informed by technically based information, can only be responded to by reference to the technical noise analysis presented in Section 3.8 of the Draft EIR.

The commenter further states that "without an adequate description of the proposed rail operations, noise estimates are unreliable." The commenter does not reference any particular project description information in the EIR that it considers to be inadequate and, therefore, a direct response to that assertion cannot be provided. The Draft EIR presents detailed descriptions of how the existing and improved rail yard would operate and how those operations would vary among the alternatives under consideration (see Draft EIR Sections 1.3.3 and 1.8).

1 The commenter asks, "what methodology was used to predict the Project's noise impacts?" 2 The operational noise analysis was conducted pursuant to established FRA and FTA 3 guidelines and procedures. Operational noise was projected for each of the proposed Project 4 alternatives, by taking the results of existing ambient readings in the yard and expanding them 5 to reflect the proportional increased level of operations associated with each of the Project 6 alternatives. In capturing the in-yard existing in-yard baseline noise, the various activities 7 occurring within the yard (e.g., trains moving on tracks, coupling and de-coupling, locomotive 8 engine noise, safety-related horn soundings, and other typical yard sounds) were also 9 captured on the noise meters used to measure ambient noise.

The reasoning for the finding of less than significant noise impacts is based on technical analysis, founded on actual field noise measurements, following generally accepted prediction methodology as established by the two federal agencies (FRA and FTA) having authority over

13 that subject.

14 Response to Comment SEA-18: As a point of clarification, the warning devices on modern 15 locomotives such as those discussed in the Draft EIR are referred to as horns rather than whistles. As such, the term horn is use for all discussion of such devices. The comment states 16 17 incorrectly that the number of train horns would "be increased exponentially" with the proposed Project. That is not the case. The use of train horns would increase in proportion to the 18 19 increase in the number of trains leaving Pier B, as train horns are a safety feature. The 20 comment claims that train whistles are not even addressed in the Draft EIR; train horns are 21 discussed in Sections 3.8.1.3, 3.8.1.5, and 3.8.2.2. Finally, the comment is focused on noise 22 effects at an existing industrial building within the COLB, which is not a noise-sensitive 23 receptor for the purposes of CEQA analysis. Both the proposed Project and the Superior 24 Electrical Advertising building are contained within the General Industrial (IG) district, which 25 is considered the City's "industrial sanctuary" district. According to the City's zoning code, this district is "where a wide range of industries that may not be desirable in other districts may 26 27 locate. The emphasis is on traditionally heavy industrial and manufacturing uses." The uses 28 permitted within this district can reasonably expect to generate, and to be subject to, higher 29 noise levels than properties elsewhere in the city.

30 Response to Comment SEA-19: The comment claims that the potential vibration impacts of 31 the proposed Project are not adequately analyzed. Potential ground-borne vibration impacts from proposed Project construction and operation are discussed under Impact NOISE-2 (Draft 32 33 EIR pages 3.8-21 through 3.8-23) and Impact NOISE-8 (Draft EIR pages 3.8-27 and 3.8-28), respectively. The analysis was conducted following FRA and FTA guidelines and procedures. 34 The analysis of construction-generated vibration indicates that building damage could 35 36 potentially occur at distances of 26 feet or less from construction activity (with the highest vibration-generating construction equipment used); the Superior Electrical Advertising 37 38 building would be approximately 85 feet from the nearest railroad track (under the 12th Street 39 Alternative, as refined). That is the nearest construction activity (under the 12th Street 40 Alternative, as refined).

The analysis of operational ground-borne vibration levels focuses on human annoyance, in accordance with FTA criteria (see Draft EIR Table 3.8-2). Three categories of land use are identified for consideration of such impacts. None of those categories include industrial uses; therefore, human annoyance vibration impact criteria, as per FTA guidance, do not apply.

45 **Response to Comment SEA-20:** The proposed Project site is in an area mapped by the 46 State of California as a potential earthquake liquefaction zone (California Division of Mines

#### Port of Long Beach

1 and Geology, 1999, Seismic Hazard Zones). The Draft EIR accordingly addresses the 2 potential for earthquake-induced liquefaction, as well as other seismic hazards, in Draft EIR

3 Section 3.1.2.3 (page 3.1-10).

Energy released during an earthquake is orders of magnitude greater than the energy released by train and construction vibrations. Earthquake shaking is attenuated over several miles from the rupturing fault, while train or construction vibrations is attenuated within a few feet of the source. Thus, the intensity of shaking during an earthquake is very similar from one end of Long Beach to the other end. However, the train or construction vibration will be much more intense at the source than 25 to 150 feet away.

10 The estimates for vibration due to train passages, as discussed in NOISE-8 on pages 3.8-27 11 and 3.8-33 of the Draft EIR, are approximately 83 VdB at a distance of 25 feet from the track centerline. For comparison, one can convert into VdB the earthquake spectral response 12 13 curves for the Operating Level Earthquake and Design Earthquakes at frequencies of 10 and 14 33 hertz (Hz) (Port of Long Beach Wharf Design Criteria, 2012). These values are expected 15 to bracket the probable frequencies of soil resonance, train vibration, and construction vibration, as shown in Table 11.2-117 below. Clearly, within 25 feet of the train or vibration 16 17 source, the vibration levels are already substantially lower than the vibrations expected under 18 the buildings during an earthquake.

TABLE 11.2-17 COMPARISON OF EARTHQUAKE AND PROJECT-RELATED GROUND-SHAKING INTENSITIES			
Approximate Velocity Level (VdB)			.evel (VdB)
	Earthquake Intensity		Peak Particle
Vibration Source	@ 10 Hz	@ 33 Hz	Velocity
Operating Level Earthquake	112	102	NA
Design Earthquakes	121	109	NA
Train @ 25 feet	NA	NA	83
Vibratory Compactor/Roller @ 25 feet NA NA 94		94	
NA not applicable			

19 Source: Port of Long Beach, Port of Long Beach Wharf Design Criteria, Version 3.0, February 29, 2012.

20 Liquefaction and vibration-induced settlements generally require strong shear waves to pass 21 through deeper soils. Earthquake vibrations generally include large components of 22 compression and shear waves because the shaking source is deep within the bedrock and 23 transmitted to the soils through the bedrock movements. Studies have shown that trains and 24 most construction vibration sources generate primarily surface waves (mainly Rayleigh 25 waves), while only a small portion of the energy is transmitted as compression and shear 26 waves that move through the soil mass. Evaluations by Seed and Carter (1988) show multiple 27 lines of evidence from field observations, laboratory testing, and theoretical analysis that, 28 when railroad tracks are laid on level ground, train vibrations are insufficient to cause 29 liquefaction in loose sand deposits that are known to be liquefiable in earthquakes. A freight 30 locomotive will cause the highest vibration levels associated with a freight train, and there will 31 be approximately 100 cycles associated with the locomotives of a freight train at a given 32 location (Seed, H.B. and D.P. Carter, Liquefaction Potential of Sand Deposits under Low Responses to Comments

1 Levels of Excitation, Earthquake Engineering Research Center, University of California, 2 Berkeley, August 1988). The remaining freight cars will produce many more cycles but at a 3 lower energy level. The increases in pore pressure that cause liquefaction and settlement due 4 to vibrations require many more cycles at low stresses than the number of cycles required at 5 high stresses (Seed and Carter, 1988). Once a train has passed by, the pore pressures will 6 dissipate and the soil deposit will repeat the process again when the next train passes. 7 Because the weight, length, and speed of freight trains tends to be similar when averaged 8 over time, the first few trains that operate at a location will cause most of the potential impacts. 9 such as liquefaction and settlement. Once the soils have densified, their resistance to further 10 liquefaction and settlement has increased, but the stresses applied with each train passage does not change significantly. Because freight trains have been operating at Pier B since the 11 12 1950s, it is estimated that 100,000 or more trains have already traveled through this corridor. 13 The potential impacts of these trains will have occurred decades ago, and the potential for 14 liquefaction and settlement caused by train vibrations is now very low under normal loadings. The addition of 10 trains per day will not change the magnitude of the stress levels to which 15 16 these soils are subjected. Only a substantially higher peak stress, such as an earthquake, would change this condition. For this reason, no mitigation is necessary to address potential 17 18 liquefaction.

19 **Response to Comment SEA-21:** Superior Electrical's opposition to the proposed Project is

20 noted for the record and is hereby part of the Final EIR; therefore, it is before the decision-

21 makers for their consideration prior to taking an action on the proposed Project.

#### 1 11.2.3.33 Teamsters Local Union No. 848 (T848)

Teamstens Local Platon No. 848 Charlend in SP17 ERIC TATE February 14, 2017 Sent Via Electronic Mail Heather A. Tomley Director of Environmental Planning Port of Long Beach 4801 Airport Plaza Drive Long Beach, CA 90815 Subject: Teamsters Local Union # 848's Opposition to the Pier B **On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project** Dear Ms. Tomley: Teamsters Local Union # 848 supports our union members and Chemoil Terminals Corporation (Chemoil) in opposing the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project. We understand how crucial pipelines are to Chemoil's operation and to the Port of Long Beach. We strongly oppose the Project for its negative impact on the jobs of our union members whose families and kids T848-1 depend on Chemoil as a company for their bi-weekly pay checks. Our trucking company members' jobs also depend on road transportation of containers, which will be affected by the Pier B Rail Project. Should you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact me at Erictate@local848.net. Sincerely, Eric Tate Secretary-Treasurer Teamsters Local Union # 848 Enclosures Our Members Are Our Strength . . . Our Children Are Our Future. . . Our Retirees Are Our Foundation 731 EAST ARROW HIGHWAY GLENDORA, CALIFORNIA 91740 FHONE (626) 732-4700 FAX (626) 732-4707 Affiliated with the International Brotherhood of Teamstars - COD

Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project 11-217

Responses to Comments

## 1 Response to Teamsters Local Union No. 848

**Response to Comment T848-1:** The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your comment. Teamsters Local Union No. 848's opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and is hereby part of the Final EIR; therefore, it is before the decision-makers for their consideration prior to taking any action on the proposed Project. Regarding Chemoil's pipelines, please see responses to Comments CTC-1 and CTC-2.

7 Among the objectives of the Pier B On-Dock Rail On-Dock Rail Support Facility, as described 8 in Section 1.6 (page 1-17) of the Draft EIR, are support in the transition to a more efficient, 9 more economically competitive and less polluting freight transport system as envisioned in the California Sustainable Freight Action Plan; and promoting a mode shift from containers 10 shipped by truck to near-dock and/or off-dock facilities to containers shipped by rail from the 11 12 on-dock and supporting rail yards. The proposed Project would be able to accommodate 13 longer trains up to 10,000 feet long; placing more containers onto trains at the Port would 14 reduce container moves by individual trucks, thereby reducing air emissions.

In addition, the Harbor Trucking Association (HTA), which represents two-thirds of the drayage moves in California's international cargo seaports, has expressed its general support for capital improvement projects that create terminal and cargo handling facilities, including the

18 Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project. HTA's letter and responses to comments are

19 also included herein.

# 1 11.2.3.34 Tesoro SoCal Pipeline Company, LLC (TSPC)

	TECOPO
	TESORO
	Tesoro SoCal Pipeline Company LLC 6 Centerpointe Drive, Suite 500 La Palma, CA 90623
Heath Direct	er A. Tomley for of Environmental Planning
Port o	f Long Beach Airport Plaza Drive
Long	Beach, CA 90815
Fax: ( Heath	562)283-7148 er tomley@polb.com
RE:	Report/Application Summary Report; SCH Number 2003081079
Dear l	Director Tomley,
Tesor (POL) On-Do to be r active replac enviro the op Summ	SoCal Pipelines Company LLC (TSPC) looks forward to cooperating with the Port of Long Beach 3) on the safe, environmentally responsible and economically efficient implementation of the Pier B sek Rail Support Facility Project (Project). The impact to TSPC resulting from the Project is likely nore significant than the impact to other pipeline companies involved in the Project. TSPC has 15 pipelines that would be required to be moved. These include two lines (71 and 79) that TSPC ed approximately 5 years ago. Accordingly, TSPC is strongly motivated to ensure a safe, nmentally responsible and efficient implementation of the Project. To that end, TSPC appreciates portunity to submit these comments on POLB's Draft Environmental Impact Report/Application tary Report (Report).
Evalu Facili	<u>ation of the Environmental Impact of Demolition, Movement or Reconstruction of Existing</u> ties
Gener equipt facilit POLE 400 of least 2 includ Repor move evalua sched	ally speaking, TSPC is concerned that the Report does not adequately account for the nmental impact of the demolition, movement and reconstruction of existing utility lines and nent. Rather, the Report focuses solely on the impacts of the construction and expansion of the rail y itself, and provides only a cursory analysis of utility relocation impacts. As stated in the DEIR, estimates that 750 utility lines run under Pier B rail yard and surrounding area and approximately 1 pipelines traverse the Project site. We estimate the Pier B project will require the relocation of at 200 lines; approximately 75 of these lines are petroleum related, and the others are utility lines ling water, sewer, and other public services. Despite disclosing this extensive utility relocation, the t provides limes. The Report does not account for the environmental impact of the demolition, nent and reconstruction of these structures, nor identify the costs and other details required to the feasibility of completing utility relocation pursuant to the Project's proposed construction alle.
There page 3 less th not tri	appears to be very little analysis or information provided to support the Report's conclusion on 11-6 that the impacts of construction activities for relocation of hundreds of utility lines will be an significant. Although the demolition, movement or reconstruction of each individual line might gger CEQA on its own, the en masse demolition, movement or reconstruction is likely to be

Consideration of Certain Particular Environmental Risks
TSPC is also concerned that the Report does not account for the following environmental risks:
• The report does not account for the possibility that demolition, movement and reconstruction activities might expose existing contaminated soil in the new pipeline corridor where new lines are to be relocated. It is not clear who will have responsibility for the cost and remediation of any contaminated soil that utilities encounter in the new pipeline corridor identified by POLB for relocation.
<ul> <li>The Report does not provide sufficient site characterization for TSPC to plan for reconstruction of its facilities. There does not appear to have been sufficient potholing for site characterization purposes. The Report relies exclusively on published historical data, which is not likely to be sufficient for construction planning purposes.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>The Report does not disclose or discuss potential off-site impacts, including the construction activities required outside of the Project site to re-connect utility lines that are relocated by the Project. All of these off-site impacts should be analyzed in the Report, not deferred for future analysis or considered on a piece-meal basis.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>The Report includes three alternatives each of which include a different phasing of the expansion.</li> <li>POLB has suggested that TSPC and other tenants might accommodate relocation in phases.</li> <li>TSPC is concerned that this approach might require the demolition, movement and reconstruction of lines and equipment as many as three times in order to complete the project. The Report does not account for the cost burden and environmental impact of multiple phases of demolition, movement or reconstruction.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>TSPC has proposed to abandon-in-place/protect-in-place all existing lines rather than remove and relocate lines. TSPC believes that this would greatly reduce environmental impact. However, POLB has indicated a preference for all lines to be removed. The Report does not adequately compare the difference in the environmental impacts associated with these alternatives. Accordingly, we ask that POLB evaluate an alternative that includes abandoning-in-place/protecting-in-place all existing lines.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>The rail yard expansion will reduce the number of exit roads. The Report does not adequately account for the increased risk from rail accidents presented by the reduction in exit routes. For the safety of our employees and other port tenants, Tesoro would like to see a more robust plan and analysis for an emergency response and evacuation routes in the event of an incident.</li> </ul>
Thank you for considering TSPC's comments on the Report. Please contact me at (714) 880-1670 if you have any questions regarding these comments.
Respectfully,
Chris Maudlin
Chris Maudlin Tesoro Logistics, LLC Vice President, West Coast Logistics Operations

1

## 2 Responses to Tesoro SoCal Pipeline Company, LLC

**Response to Comment TSPC-1:** The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your review of the Draft EIR. The Port appreciates Tesoro SoCal Pipeline Company, LLC's (TSPC) input regarding utility aspects of the proposed Project, as well as managing the relationship between proposed Project construction activities and Tesoro operations. The Port acknowledges that there are several TSPC pipelines that would need to be relocated to

1 accommodate the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project. The various 2 pipelines that would be affected by the proposed Project, based on their location, are 3 governed by agreements with different parties. Specific to TSPC's agreements with the COLB, 4 TSPC would be responsible, at its cost, to alter pipeline facilities and change the location 5 thereof whenever and as often as the City deems it convenient or necessary. For those pipelines in areas that are subject to agreements with other parties, in addition to close 6 7 coordination with TSPC, the Port would ensure that there is coordination with the respective 8 owners and operators regarding relocation of the respective pipelines to accommodate the 9 proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project. Details about the relocation of 10 pipelines would be specified as final engineering occurs. It should also be noted that ongoing dialogue between the Port and pipeline companies has been underway during the entire 11 preliminary engineering and planning process, including information regarding the status of 12 13 preliminary engineering activities and identification/specification of utility location. This 14 process would continue onward as final design proceeds.

15 Response to Comment TSPC-2: The commenter expresses concern that the EIR does not 16 adequately account for the environmental impact of the demolition, movement, and 17 reconstruction of existing utility lines and equipment.

A full scope of utility relocation has not been determined at this stage of proposed Project development, because the EIR is a planning document not intended for construction purposes. Furthermore, CEQA does not require feasibility studies or the analysis of costs as these represent economic issues, which are generally beyond the scope of a CEQA evaluation.

23 Each phase of construction, as described in Section 1.8.2, outlines the steps of the removal 24 and relocation of utilities throughout the Project area. Section 3.11.1.2 of the Draft EIR 25 discloses that there are approximately 750 utility lines owned or operated by approximately 26 70 companies beneath the Pier B Rail Yard and surrounding the North Harbor area. The Draft 27 EIR also identifies numerous active and abandoned oil lines and wells within the Project area. 28 approximately 400 large and small oil pipelines traverse the Project site, and there are more 29 than 30 different owners and operators of these lines. On page 3.11-6, discussion of Impact 30 UTIL-1 of the proposed Project concludes that new replacement infrastructure would be 31 constructed and installed in conformance with current design standards, including utility 32 provider requirements, and COLB and COLA code requirements. As such, impacts from the 33 replacement of utility lines would be less than significant, and mitigation measures are not 34 required.

- The air quality impacts associated with utilities demolition and relocation were accounted for and quantified in the Draft EIR. For example, these tasks are seen in Tables A1.1-2 (Phases 1C and 1D), A1.1-4 (Phase 3D), A1.1-5, and A1.1-7 of Appendix A1.
- Final Project design and construction plans, including the relocation of utilities, would not occur until after certification of the Final EIR and approval of the proposed Project or one of its alternatives by the BHC. Engineering design prior to phased construction will determine the final scope of utility line relocations, including the demolition, movement, and relocation of existing utility lines and equipment.

Response to Comment TSPC-3: The commenter contends that there is very little analysis
 or information provided to support the EIR's conclusion that the impacts of construction
 activities for relocation of hundreds of utility lines would be less than significant. The Draft EIR

	Chapter II
Responses to Comments	Port of Long Beach
	-

Chapter 11

- identifies on page 1-26 that construction of the proposed Project would result in utility lines that are either newly constructed or relocated from yard expansion areas into subsurface utility
- 3 corridors that run between areas of rail tracks to provide ease of access for future repair and
- 4 maintenance. Most of the existing oil lines within the Project footprint would also be removed
- 5 or relocated; however, a full scope of utility relocation has not been determined at this stage
- 6 of Project development, as the EIR is a planning document and not intended for construction.
- 7 Please refer to responses to Comments TSPC-2 and TSPC-6.
- 8 Response to Comment TSPC-4: The possibility of encountering soil or groundwater 9 contamination during construction is discussed in Section 6.3.5 on page 6-6 of the Draft EIR. 10 A Special Condition would be imposed on contractors working on the proposed Project to 11 address encountering of contamination. Section 6.3.5 also details the procedures for stopping 12 work in the affected area, sampling and testing so that proper storage, discharge, or disposal is completed. The responsibility for costs of any remediation of contaminated soil encountered 13 14 during construction, including utility relocations, would be determined on a case-by-case basis. Cost burden of remediation activities is an economic issue, which is generally beyond 15 16 the scope of the CEQA evaluation. In certain cases, the Port may elect to handle excavation, 17 stockpiling, soil characterization, and soil management itself, with cost sharing among the responsible parties, where applicable. All contaminated soil encountered would be handled in 18 19 accordance with the law and Port policy.
- Response to Comment TSPC-5: The EIR is not intended to provide site characterization for construction purposes. Final Project design and construction plans, including the relocation of utilities for the proposed Project, would not occur until after certification of the EIR and approval of the proposed Project or one of its alternatives by the BHC.
- Upon Project approval, the Port and affected utilities would conduct a more extensive site investigation. In many cases, pipeline owners would be responsible for their own utility line relocations and would be expected to perform all necessary investigations to their own standard of care and in compliance with the law.
- 28 **Response to Comment TSPC-6:** The commenter asserts that the Draft EIR does not 29 disclose or discuss potential offsite impacts, including construction activities required outside 30 of the Project site to reconnect utility lines that would be relocated by the proposed Project.
- 31 **Response to Comment TSPC-7:** The commenter expresses concern that an approach to 32 relocate in phases by TSPC and other tenants might require the demolition, movement, and 33 reconstruction of lines and equipment as many as three times to complete the proposed 34 Project, and that the Draft EIR does not account for cost burden and environmental impact of 35 multiple phases of demolition, movement, or reconstruction.
- The Port of Long Beach anticipates that utilities would be relocated just one time for the proposed Project. The Port would coordinate with the utility owners to ensure that multiple moves are not required.
- 39 Response to Comment TSPC-8: The commenter requests the Port to evaluate an alternative 40 that includes abandoning-in-place/protecting all existing lines. An alternative that considers 41 the abandoning-in-place/protecting in-place all existing lines would not feasibly attain most of 42 the basic objectives of the proposed Project, as identified in Section 1.6 of the Draft EIR. 43 Abandoned pipelines pose a risk of degradation over time, creating pathways for potential 44 contaminants. They also create obstacles for future development and difficulty maintaining 45 records and contact points with the responsible utility owner as ownership can change over

#### Port of Long Beach

time. The Port would consider each pipeline relocation proposed and evaluate abandoningin-place only in specific cases where removal of the line would significantly affect Port

3 operations, such as closing a main line railroad track.

4 **Response to Comment TSPC-9**: This comment raises a concern regarding the reduction in 5 the number of exit roads as a result of the expansion of the existing Pier B Rail Yard, and 6 indicates that the EIR does not adequately account for the increased risk from rail accidents 7 presented by the reduction in exit routes. As discussed in Section 3.7 (Public Services and 8 Safety) of the Draft EIR (pages 3.7-9 and 3.7-10), construction of the proposed Project would 9 result in less-than-significant impacts to public services and safety, and it is not expected to 10 significantly degrade emergency response times or services levels. Standard security 11 measures would be implemented during construction to minimize the burden on police, fire, 12 and other security agency staff levels, including development of a TMP as a Special Condition 13 (please see Section 6.3.3.1 of the Draft EIR). The TMP would establish several parameters 14 to minimize construction impacts on the community, including provisions such as allowable 15 construction hours, allowable timeframes for temporary closures, construction traffic routes, 16 and requirements for maintaining access to businesses. If the proposed Project or one of its 17 alternative is approved, the Port would continue to work directly with emergency response 18 agencies serving the Harbor District, as well as local businesses, to identify and incorporate 19 measures into the TMP that minimize impacts on business operations to the extent possible. 20 The Fire and Police Departments have not identified impacts associated with construction or 21 operation of the proposed Project.

22 Following construction, operation of the proposed Project could have a beneficial effect on 23 motorist and rail safety because the existing 9th Street at-grade crossing at Pier B Street and 9th Street would be eliminated. With closure of the Pier B Street/9th Street crossing, access 24 25 between Anaheim Street and Pier B Street, including the areas north and south of these 26 streets, could result in improvements to emergency response times. Furthermore, elimination 27 of the Pier B Street/9th Street grade crossing would reduce the chance of delays to emergency 28 vehicles caused by train blockage of the crossing. All public service locations would continue to be accessible during operation of the proposed Project. 29

11.2.3.35 Trans Harbor	Inc.	, Trans Harbor	Investments	, Inc. (	(TH)	)
					/	

From: Chris Balden [mailto:balde	nca@gmail.com]	
Sent: Wednesday, February 01, 2	2017 11:38 AM	
To: Tomley, Heather	nu Krouch Stacod	
Subject: Dier B On-Dock Pail Su	ny; Crouch, Statey	
Subject. Her b on bock Kan Su	spore raciney	
Heather:		
Heddrict.		
I received via registered mail har	d copies of the amended notice of completion. (Jan 26 maili	ngs)
The address it was sent to is a PO	Box.	
I own 8 different APN #'s thru 2 d	ifferent companies, (36 were identified in DEIR)	
Please correct the mailing address	s as follows.	
Trans Harbor Inc.	APN: 7436-006-017, 7436-006-019, 7436-006-021,	
Attention: Chris Balden	7436-006-040, 7436-006-041	LTH-1
2501 N. Rosemead Blvd.	(Lots 1-11)	[
S. El Monte, CA 91733-1531		
Trans Harbor Investments, Inc.	APN: 7436-006-024 (Lot #16,) 7436-006-025 (Lot #17)	
Attention: Chris Balden	7436-006-026 (Lot #18)	
2501 N. Rosemead Blvd.		
S. El Monte, CA 91733-1531		_
I attended the first public meetin	g. Your team did an excellent iob. Thank you in advance.	Г
I have owned these properties fo	r a long time and have tenants that have occupied the prop	erties for over twenty years
They have been an integral part of	of the Port's growth. I trust you will treat them well.	7110
If you have any questions please	don't hesitate to call.	F IH-2
This project will continue the Por	t of Long Beach standing as the best	
Port complex in the country. This	project has been a long time coming.	
My contact info		
Chris Balden		
President		
Trans Harbor Inc., Trans Harbor I	nvestments, Inc	
2501 N. Rosemead Blvd.		
S. El Monte, CA 91733-1531		
Cell: 949 632-5754		
Email: Baldenca@gmail.com		

2

## 3 Responses to Trans Harbor, Inc., Trans Harbor Investments, Inc.

4 **Response to Comment TH-1:** The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your notification of your correct mailing addresses.

6 Response to Comment TH-2: The Port appreciates the cooperation of Trans Harbor. With 7 respect to the properties referenced by the commenter and their locations to relative to the proposed Project, it has been identified to be within the footprint of the proposed Project and/or 8 9 its alternatives analyzed in the EIR. The environmental review process is a preliminary part of 10 the planning process which must be completed before the proposed Project, or an alternative 11 can be considered for approval by the BHC. Following certification of the EIR, any preparation, 12 decision, and approval of relocation plans, and/or property acquisitions would be conducted in accordance with all applicable statutes and regulations. Please also see Master 13 14 Response – Property Acquisition, Compensation, and Relocation.

# 1 **11.2.3.36 Westside Project Area Council (WPAC)**

WESTSIDE	WESTPAC WESTSIDE PROJECT AREA COUNCIL 1415 COTA AVENUE LONG BEACH, CA 90808
March 12, 2017	
VIA E-MAIL AND HAN	D DELIVERY
Ms. Heather Tomley Director of Environmen Port of Long Beach 4801 Airport Plaza Driv Long Beach, California Email: <u>heather.tomley@</u>	tal Planning e 90815 polb.com
Re: Pier B: On-Dock Draft Environme Comments and	Rail Support Facility Project ntal Impact Report ("Draft EIR") – SCH#2009081079 Opposition by the Westside Project Area Council ("WestPAC")
Dear Ms. Tomley,	
As concerned Business Beach we are adamant Facility Project. We fir Businesses and thousar The following is a listin	Owners, Land Owners, Employees & Residences of the Westside of Long y opposed to the Port of Long Beach proposed Pier B: On-Dock Rail Support ad the Draft EIR inadequate and flawed and it does not serve the over 300 ids of Residencies in the Westside, which would be impacted the most.
Environmental Issues	, p
Air Pollution: The requirements of Cancer Rates for Businesses and t effecting the Chi	e Preliminary EIR. Report clearly states that this project will NOT meet with the the South Coast Air Quality Management District. This will increase Asthma & all Owners, Management & Employees of the more than 300 Westside Industrial the Thousands of Residents living in the Willmore & Westside Areas, especially ildren, Teachers & Staff at the Schools in the Westside of Long Beach.
<ul> <li>Noise Pollution: are extremely lo several blocks to</li> </ul>	Coupling trains, screeching train wheels on the tracks, and especially train whistles ud and would be very disruptive to all the existing businesses on Anaheim St. and the North and could cause serious hearing loss for employees that work outside.
<ul> <li>Vibration Damag and unstable soi other pipelines r cars loaded with heavy loads wou Industrial Area.</li> </ul>	the proposed area for the train facility is sitting on some of the most liquefiable is in Southern California and there are currently hundreds of utility, oil, gas and unning under this area. The EIR does not address how the weight of all the train 2 high containers would effect the pipelines and how the vibrations from these and effect the foundations and structures of existing buildings in the Westside

	WestPAC Opposition Letter Re: POLB Proposed Pier B: On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project 3/12/17, Page 2 OF 3
•	Inadequate Mitigation: The Preliminary EIR state the Port will fund a Community Grant Program of \$149,757 to mitigate the Air Quality issues. In addition, The Port will fund a Community Grant Program to partially address the cumulative GHG impact of the proposed Project. The Port shall provide \$1.4 million dollars, as determined by POLB GGP funding methodology. For this Project and the scope of its realistic negative impacts, the very small amount of money will not even come close to mitigating the environmental effects of the Project to the Health, Welfare and Financial harm that will negatively effect Property Owners, Businesses, Employees and Residences in the Westside of Long Beach. These offers of mitigation should be increased by a factor of 100x to \$150 million dollars to be realistic.
Acc	ess Issues: From the Westside to the Port of Long Beach & City of Long Beach
•	Our Easy Access from the Westside Industrial Area: via Santa Fe Ave., Anaheim St., 9th St., Harbor Ave., Canal Ave. and Jackson Ave. to the Port & City of Long Beach will all be closed off. Hundreds of Business and Thousands of People currently use these routes and after they are closed it will be very difficult and time consuming to access the Port & City of Long Beach from the Westside of Long Beach.
•	Emergency Access to the Port of Long Beach: If there is any Earthquake, Flood, Fire, Terrorist Attack or other Natural or Manmade Disaster it will be very difficult for the Emergency Vehicles to access the Port.
•	Police Access: Currently Police from the Westside Division can easily get to the main Long Beach Police Department Headquarters in 5 to 7 minutes. If this project gets built it will take them 20-30 minutes depending upon traffic.
Fina	ncial Issues:
•	Reduced Westside Property Values: Due to the added pollution, noise and vibration caused during the Construction and Use of the proposed Project, adjacent property values will decrease.
•	There are 28 privately owner properties that would have to be purchased by the Port through "Eminent Domain" process and the existing businesses would have to be relocated. There are no properties located within 1 mile that have the correct zoning for these existing businesses to be relocated. When these properties are taken over by the Port, their will be no more property taxes paid to the State and the City of Long Beach will lose tens of thousands of dollars in tax increment that is currently going into the City.
•	One of the existing businesses in the potential Project area currently facilitates highly dangerous materials that can not be transported by Train. There are no lots available anywhere in the region for them to relocate. These businesses would be put out of business and there would be great financial loss to the land owner, the business owner and the employees.
•	Phillips Steel Company (established in 1915 with 65 employees and owns property on both sides of Anaheim Street) and Superior Electrical Advertising (established in 1959 with 132 employees, of which 36 are residents of Long Beach), 2 highly successful, outstanding Long Beach Business will be directly adjacent to the Project within 30 feet of the proposed train tracks. It will be virtually impossible for these businesses to survive and thrive as they have done for many years.
•	Financial Hardship will definitely be felt by Westside Businesses and Property Owners. There will be reduced Property, Sales, Income, Social Security, Fuel Federal, State and Local Taxes collected, along with higher Worker's Compensation and Employee Health Insurance premiums paid. This project is a Lose, Lose for the Westside Businesses and Residences and the City of Long Beach.
WestPAC Opposition Letter Re: POLB Proposed Pier B: On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project 3/12/17, Page 2 OF 3 Serious Concerns regarding the Preliminary EIR (Environmental Impact Report) The scope of the EIR does not take into account the devastating Environmental, Access & Financial WPAC-14 Impact to the Property Owners, Businesses, Employees and Residences in the Westside of Long Beach. We demand to have all of our concerns addressed in any future EIR document. Until then we are 100% opposed to the POLB Pier B: On-Dock Rail Facility. Please refer to the attached copies of the petition in opposition to the proposed Pier B: On-Dock Rail WPAC-15 Support Facility Project. We collected over 1,000 signatures in one week, and we are expecting to easily obtain in excess of 15,000 signatures, as we continue to reach out and work with the local effected Residential Neighborhood Associations, Long Beach Unified Schools, SCAQMD, Federal EPA, CA Water Quality Control Board, CA Coastal Commission, and other Federal, State and Local Governmental Agencies. Best Regards, Collins Paul Collins, Chairman Larry Machara, Vice Chairman Mayor Robert Garcia, City of Long Beach (via e-mail) Cc: Mark Taylor, Chief of Staff to Mayor Garcia, City of Long Beach (via e-mail) City Manager Patrick West, City of Long Beach (via e-mail) Lena Gonzalez, First District Councilmember, City of Long Beach (via hand delivery & e-mail) Jeanine Pearce, 2nd District Councilmember, City of Long Beach (via e-mail) Cory Allen, Chief of Staff to Councilwoman Gonzalez, City of Long Beach (via e-mail) Christian Kropff, Chief of Staff to Councilmember Pearce, City of Long Beach (via e-mail) Lori Ann Guzmán, Port Commission President, Port of Long Beach (via hand delivery & e-mail) Lou Anne Bynum, Port Commission Vice President, Port of Long Beach (via e-mail) Tracy J. Egoscue, Port Commission Secretary, Port of Long Beach (via e-mail) Doug Drummond, Commissioner, Port of Long Beach (via e-mail) Rich Dines, Commissioner, Port of Long Beach (via e-mail) Richard E. Jordan, Chief of Staff, Port of Long Beach (via e-mail) Shana Ortiz, Administrative Officer, Port of Long Beach (via e-mail) Daryl Phillips, CEO, Phillips Steel Company (via e-mail) Stan Janocha, COO, Superior Electrical Advertising (via e-mail) All current Members of the WestPAC (via e-mail)

1

# 2 Responses to Westside Project Area Council

**Response to Comment WPAC-1:** The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your review of the Draft EIR. The Westside Project Area Council's opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record. The comment is hereby part of the Final EIR; therefore, it is before the decisionmakers for their consideration prior to taking any action on the proposed Project.

**Response to Comment WPAC-2:** The proposed Project's air quality impacts have been fully
assessed in Section 3.2 of the Draft EIR. This analysis included a health risk assessment.
The comment does not identify any error or flaw in the analysis. The comment states that the

1 proposed Project does not meet the "requirements" of SCAQMD. Presumably, what the 2 comment is referring to are SCAQMD's thresholds of significance, which in certain cases, are 3 exceeded, resulting in impacts being identified as significant. It is important to differentiate 4 between thresholds of significance and SCAQMD regulations. The proposed Project would 5 be fully compliant with all of SCAQMD's applicable regulations. It is also important to note that 6 the fundamental purpose of the proposed Project is to allow for a greater number of containers 7 to be transported to their destinations in a cleaner method in terms of air quality. Please see 8 response to Comment GSR-2 for a discussion of the potential for the proposed Project to 9 prevent many future drayage from the terminal served by the Pier B Rail Yard truck trips, the 10 beneficial effects of which were not quantified in the air quality analysis.

11 **Response to Comment WPAC-3:** The comment expresses a concern that train noise 12 associated with the proposed Project, in particular the noise from coupling cars, from train 13 wheels, and from train horns, could result in serious hearing loss for employees of nearby 14 businesses that work outside. Train noise is addressed in Section 3.8 of the Draft EIR. The 15 comment does not identify any flaw or error in the analysis or the methodology used in the 16 analysis. The noise analysis in the Draft EIR determined that increased noise from the 17 proposed Project would be a less-than-significant impact. There is no evidence to indicate 18 that future ambient noise levels with implementation of the proposed Project would approach 19 a level that would result in hearing loss for local workers. Please also see Master Response 20 - Noise and Vibration Associated with Trains. Additionally, train noise is addressed in 21 responses to Comments SCAC-3, SCAC-8, and LLI-25.

Response to Comment WPAC-4: Vibration impacts were assessed to determine if train operations would generate vibration that could result in building damage by exceeding FTA acceptability limits. This evaluation was based on the potential for vibration from the entire rail yard at the distance from the centerline of the train tracks where the acceptability limits are exceeded.

27 The comment states that the EIR did not address how the weight of trains with two-high 28 containers would affect pipelines and how vibration from these heavy loads would affect 29 foundations and structures in the Westside Industrial Area. The predicted vibration for freight 30 train pass-bys was based on actual measurements conducted by the FTA/FRA on a variety 31 of sample freight trains of varying loads and lengths. A sufficient number of sample trains were 32 measured to represent vibration at various distances generated by freight trains in general. 33 The criteria take into account vibration caused by all train pass-bys including double-stacked 34 loads. 35 Relocated pipelines would be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained to modern

36 standards and in accordance with all applicable regulations. Pipelines are generally designed 37 to modern standards that can withstand numerous surface loads, especially concentrated 38 loads such as truck tires, by burying them in the ground deep enough to distribute those loads 39 down to acceptable levels (Moser, A.P. Buried Pipe Design, Second Edition, McGraw Hill, 40 2001). Furthermore, the American Railway Engineering and Maintenance of Way Association 41 (AREMA) has adopted standards for protecting railroads and pipelines where they cross each 42 other. These standards vary by utility type, but they typically include encasement within a 43 carrier pipe and minimum depth requirements.

Pipelines have been found to be very resistant to earthquake shaking, which occurs at much
 higher stresses than construction or train vibrations (Federal Emergency Management
 Agency, *Earthquake Resistant Construction of Gas and Liquid Fuel Pipeline Systems Serving,*

1 or Regulated by, the Federal Government, FEMA 233. July 1992), as discussed in response 2 to Comment SEA-20. It is customary to compact backfills around pipes using vibratory 3 compaction equipment, so the pipes likely have been exposed to vibration from construction equipment at levels much higher than would be induced by trains farther away. The most 4 5 common causes of pipeline failure are pipeline bends, elbows, and other eccentricities that have been subjected to large ground movements caused by earthquakes, where the ground 6 7 movements can be measured in feet. 8 The foundations and structures of existing buildings are not expected to be subjected to new, larger vibration loads by the proposed Project, as discussed in Section 3.8 of the Draft EIR 9 and in response to Comment SEA-20. 10 11 **Response to Comment WPAC-5:** The Port of Long Beach would evaluate applications for mitigation grants from gualified applicants based on the air guality impacts of the proposed 12 13 Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project and in accordance with the Port of Long Beach 14 Mitigation Grants Program. Please see Master Response – Community Grants Program.

15 **Response to Comment WPAC-6:** The comment expresses a concern that closure of roads

16 associated with the proposed Project would cause access to POLB and Downtown Long Beach from West Long Beach to be difficult and time consuming. Access to the Port would 17 18 continue to be available via I-710 on the east and on the west via Anaheim Street to Pier B 19 Street. Depending on the level of traffic, the travel time for alternate routes would be minimally 20 affected by the closures. The traffic impact analysis indicates that, with the proposed Project, 21 access between Downtown Long Beach and the Westside would be maintained via a 22 redundant transportation system. Levels of service along the redundant routes indicate that 23 the proposed Project or alternatives would not result in significant impacts to traffic access or 24 operations.

Please also see Master Response – Street Closures, Access to Downtown Long Beach, and
 Public Services Access.

27 **Response to Comment WPAC-7:** The comment expresses a concern that closure of roads 28 associated with the proposed Project would have a negative impact on access to the area by 29 emergency services. Emergency vehicles would continue to access the Port using emergency 30 responders located on all sides of the Port, including fire boats operated by the Ports. As 31 shown in Figure 3.7-1 of the Draft EIR, one COLA, four Port-based, and three COLB fire 32 stations are near the proposed Project. Similar to the joint agency fire response capabilities, the Port of Long Beach's Harbor Patrol based out of the JCCC at 1249 Pier F Avenue is 33 34 supported by both the COLB's West and South Police Department Divisions, as well as Los 35 Angeles and federal partner agencies. The JCCC houses representatives from all partner 36 agencies, including police, fire, and federal agencies, allowing for a quick and uniform 37 response to emergencies within the Port. Please see Master Response - Street Closures, 38 Access to Downtown Long Beach, and Public Services Access.

39 **Response to Comment WPAC-8:** Please see response to Comment MIG-6.

40 **Response to Comment WPAC-9:** Economic issues are not a consideration under CEQA 41 unless they result in adverse environmental changes. The purpose of the Draft EIR is to 42 assess environmental impacts, not economic issues. Nonetheless, the Port responds as 43 follows. Responses to Comments

**Response to Comment WPAC-10:** Economic issues are not a consideration under CEQA unless they result in adverse environmental changes. The purpose of the Draft EIR is to assess environmental impacts, not economic issues. The CEQA EIR process is only the initial step in the planning process. If the EIR is certified and the proposed Project or one of its alternatives is approved, preparation and approval of relocation plans and the property acquisition process would be conducted in accordance with all applicable statutes and regulations, including the California Eminent Domain Law.

8 Please also see Master Response – Property Acquisition, Compensation, and Relocation.
9 With regard to tax increment and revenue from these properties, the economic effects of the
10 proposed Project are generally beyond the scope of the CEQA evaluation.

**Response to Comment WPAC-11:** It is premature to address relocation of a particular business at this stage. Moreover, without knowing which business or parcel is being referred to in this comment, it is not possible to provide a more definitive response at this time. Assuming the certification of the Final EIR occurs and the proposed Project or one of its alternatives is approved, potential relocation sites for impacted businesses would be assessed in accordance with all legal requirements. Please also see Master Response – Property Acquisition, Compensation, and Relocation.

18 **Response to Comment WPAC-12:** Please see response to Comment SEA-1.

19 Response to Comment WPAC-13: Economic issues are not a consideration under CEQA 20 unless they result in an adverse change to the environment. The purpose of the Draft EIR is 21 to assess environmental impacts, not economic issues.

Response to Comment WPAC-14: The scope of the Draft EIR is sufficiently broad to encompass a full range of environmental factors, each of which has been evaluated using accepted analysis methodologies. The comment does not identify any specific environmental issue or take issue with any specific analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is necessary.

27 **Response to Comment WPAC-15:** Please see response to Comment WPAC-1.

# 1 11.2.3.37 Wilmington Chamber of Commerce (WCC)

Post Office Box 90 Wilmington, California 90748	
Heather Tomley Director of Environmental Planning Port of Long Beach 4801 Airport Plaza Drive Long Beach, CA 90815 or <u>heather.tomley@polb.com</u>	
March 9, 2017	
Re: Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility	
Dear Heather Tomley,	
Thank you and your team for the presentation of this project to our Board of Directors. We appreciate the outreach and opportunity to ask questions and comment on this project.	
We support cleaning up the Environment and improving efficiencies of our twin ports, unfortunately we cannot and do not support this project until we can resolve a number of concerns. • Concern that the EIR relies on compatibility of the Wilmington Community Plan which is over 25 years old	WCC-1
DEIR doesn't address lack of infrastructure in Far East Wilmington	WCC-2
This is the largest rail project in the past 50+ years in Long Beach which appears will have significant negative impacts on traffic, access to businesses, and emergency vehicle access to critical facilities if not designed considering the existing over capacity of roads in the Pier B on-dock rail facility, Anaheim street, 9 th street and Anaheim Way locations	WCC-3
• Employees at the POLB SSA, Valero, Petro Diamond, Toyota and others currently experience significant delays caused by the rail crossings in place today. The use of flares and manual rail personnel in the road to halt traffic for over twenty minutes at a time, delaying employee and business access is unacceptable and results in a loss of productivity due to delayed access	WCC-4
<ul> <li>Most concerning in the new design is emergency access to the Valero refinery and other business along Pier B and Pier A way. There are times today that traffic has been blocked at the Pier B rail crossing by the 710 on ramp, Anaheim Way and the SSA terminal all at the same time, which completely isolates the Valero refinery to emergency services.</li> </ul>	WCC-5
<ul> <li>traffic stops caused by train crossings will cause Idling trucks and cars which will increase air emissions.</li> <li>We need to understand if the neighboring households will be impacted by additional noise pollution.</li> </ul>	WCC-6 WCC-7
310.834.8586 Fax 310.834.8887	

2

Post Office Box 90	Wilmington, California 90748
<ul> <li>A map with more detail w Long Beach Businesses tha Relocation. DEIR doesn't</li> <li>This project could result i will bear the burden of th</li> <li>We think it is necessary to directly and indirectly imp</li> </ul>	ould be appreciated, including a list of the Wilmington and it may be impacted, the jobs and projected sites for address taking of land in Far East Wilmington n significant investments for at least two refineries; who is expense to relocate pipelines o do additional outreach to existing businesses that may be bacted WCC-10
We urge the POLB to construct the opportunity to construct emergency access, business dock rail project route.	uct flyovers at these critical intersections. The POLB has t a "forward-future" thinking traffic plan which considers access delays, and employee access along the Pier B on
We also appreciate that you Wilmington Community and plan.	u have considered the impact this project will have on the for including Wilmington in your community grant benefit <b>WCC-12</b>
Sincerely, Nav Aufman Dan Hoffman Executive Director	
Cc: Assemblymember Mike G Assemblymember Patrick ( Supervisor Janice Hahn Mayor Eric Garcetti Councilmember Joe Buscai	ipson O'Donnell ino
	310.834.8586 Fax 310.834.8887

Port of Long Beach

# 1 Responses to Wilmington Chamber of Commerce

**Response to Comment WCC-1:** The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your review of the Draft EIR. Opposition to the proposed Project by the Wilmington Chamber of Commerce is noted for the record. The comment is hereby part of the Final EIR; therefore, it is before the decision-makers for their consideration prior to taking any action on the proposed Project.

6 The Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan (last amended September 2016) is referenced 7 in the Draft EIR (see Section 3.6.1.3). Seven policies, two objectives, and one goal embodied 8 in that plan are stated. Of these, Objectives 3-1 and 3-2, and Policies 3-1.1, 3-1.2, 3-2.1, and 9 3-2.2 pertain to industrially zoned and planned areas. The areas within the footprint of the 10 proposed Project that are within the Wilmington-Harbor City planning area are all located in 11 Heavy Industrial Zoned (M3) areas. The proposed Project is consistent with all requirements 12 pertaining to the M3 zone; therefore, it is also consistent with the Community Plan (see Draft 13 EIR Section 3.6.2.3).

14 **Response to Comment WCC-2:** For purposes of the environmental analysis, the Draft EIR 15 considered the current infrastructure in its existing condition. This comment is not specific as 16 to the type of infrastructure that is lacking in far east Wilmington; it is assumed this comment 17 refers to the transportation network. As an example, the traffic analysis was based on existing 18 roadways and intersections, as discussed in Section 3.5 of the Draft EIR. No alterations or 19 improvements to existing infrastructure in far east Wilmington are proposed as part of the 20 proposed Project, except for proposed improvements to the Long Beach Lead connecting to 21 the Alameda Corridor. Improvement of this segment of infrastructure is described in the Draft 22 EIR (see Chapter 1).

Response to Comment WCC-3: The comment contends that, as the largest rail project in Long Beach in the past 50+ years, proposed improvements to the Pier B Rail Yard appear to have significant negative impacts on traffic, business access, and emergency access in consideration of the overcapacity of roads in the vicinity of the Pier B Rail Yard.

27 Traffic was evaluated in Section 3.5 and Appendix B of the Draft EIR. The traffic impact 28 analyses for each of the alternatives evaluated the projected traffic flow and roadway network 29 changes associated with potential street closures associated with the proposed Project and 30 alternatives. The results of the analyses indicated that there would be no roadway segments 31 or intersections that would operate at an unacceptable LOS and that access to businesses 32 would be maintained. Access would be maintained via a redundant transportation system allowing alternate access routes with minimal increase in travel times. Significant impacts to 33 access would not result from the proposed Project (12th Street Alternative), the 10th Street 34 35 Alternative, or the 9th Street Alternative. Therefore, the proposed Project and its alternatives 36 would not result in significant negative impacts on traffic or access for businesses or 37 emergency vehicles.

Please see Master Response – Street Closures, Access to Downtown Long Beach, and Public
 Services Access.

40 **Response to Comment WCC-4:** As noted in Chapter 1 of the Draft EIR, one key element of 41 the proposed Project (under any of the three build alternatives) would be permanent removal 42 of the existing at-grade rail crossing at 9th Street. Removal of this crossing would eliminate 43 the potential for rail/vehicle conflicts at that location and, thereby, would improve vehicular 44 safety. It would also remove the impediment to normal traffic flow otherwise occurring with the 45 grade crossing in place. The proposed Project would not alter any private at-grade crossings 1 or rail operations at Toyota or SSA Marine's Pier A facility. However, the proposed Project

2 would provide 31 additional storage tracks and 5 new arrival/departure tracks. These new

tracks would improve overall rail operations, resulting in fewer blockages on the mainlinerailroad tracks.

5 **Response to Comment WCC-5:** The comment concerns emergency access to the Valero 6 Refinery and other businesses along Pier B and Pier A Way. As shown in Figure 3.5-6 (page 3.5-36 of the Draft EIR), streets that provide access to this refinery, including Pier A Way, 7 8 would not be permanently closed, and the proposed Project would not alter the current 9 emergency response access or plan for responding to emergencies at the Valero Refinery. The proposed Project would eliminate the at-grade rail crossing on 9th Street, and Pier B Way 10 11 would be reconfigured, thereby eliminating access impacts associated with rail and roadway 12 congestion.

**Response to Comment WCC-6:** Please see response to Comment WCC-4 regarding the elimination of the at-grade crossing at 9th Street. In addition, the proposed Project would create an improved on-dock rail support facility with the capability to handle trains up to 10,000 feet in length to arrive at, and depart from, Alameda Corridor without any grade crossings. This would substantially improve traffic impacts noted in the comment and reduce emissions associated with trucks and cars idling.

19 **Response to Comment WCC-7:** The proposed Project site is located in a predominantly 20 industrial zone within the harbor area. No residential areas are located within or near the 21 proposed Project site. The nearest area of consistent residential land use is to the north of the 22 proposed Project's center of activity, nearly 1 mile distant, near Pacific Coast Highway, but there are several scattered residences located at distances ranging from 0.5 to 0.8 mile from 23 24 the site. As discussed on page 3.8-6 of the Draft EIR, data for receptors have been included 25 to represent the ambient noise environment along the Alameda Corridor. There are no noise-26 sensitive receptors located in the COLA portion of the proposed Project's influence area, 27 which is the area between the western exit from the Pier B Rail Yard and the southern 28 entrance to the Alameda Corridor. Two receptors were chosen for analysis along the Alameda 29 Corridor (Noise Measurement Sites N29 and N32); these receptors were selected because 30 they are the nearest residential receptors close to the point of entry of both the Port of Los 31 Angeles and the Port of Long Beach trains onto the Alameda Corridor. These receptor sites 32 fairly represent potential impacts related to additional trains resulting from the proposed 33 Project operating along the Alameda Corridor. As noted in Section 3.8 of the Draft EIR, construction and operational noise have been analyzed, and would not result in a significant 34 35 impact. Please see Section 3.8 of the Draft EIR for further information.

36 **Response to Comment WCC-8:** Figure 3.6-5 of the Draft EIR has been revised and provides 37 a footprint for the proposed Project (please see this revised figure in Chapter 10 of the Final 38 EIR); as discussed in Section 3.6.4.1, the properties depicted in Figure 3.6-5 are "potential" 39 property acquisitions. This diagram was included to illustrate the potential acquisitions that 40 may occur from implementation of the proposed Project, if approved, and if all the subsequent 41 steps necessary for property acquisition are taken. This diagram depicts the properties within 42 the proposed Project footprint that are situated within the COLA ("far east Wilmington"), as 43 well as the COLB, and reflects those businesses operating on these properties. Parcel 44 ownership is depicted by color. Because Project approval and final design have not occurred, 45 it is not possible to include information such as jobs and projected sites for relocation. This 46 level of information would be developed as part of individual relocation plans that would be prepared at a later date after Project approval and final design. Please also see Master
 Response – Property Acquisition, Compensation, and Relocation.

3 Response to Comment WCC-9: This comment asks about responsibility for expenses for 4 relocating pipelines. That is an economic issue that is beyond the scope of the CEQA 5 evaluation.

Response to Comment WCC-10: The Port of Long Beach will continue its ongoing public
 outreach effort to the affected stakeholders in and around the Project footprint.

**Response to Comment WCC-11:** The commenter urges the Port to "construct flyovers at these critical intersections," but it does not identify the critical intersections; therefore, it is not possible for the Port to respond to the comment regarding flyovers. Future roadway access plans are within the jurisdiction of Caltrans and the COLB. Major transportation improvements, such as a flyover, are not warranted by the ground transportation impacts of the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project.

14 **Response to Comment WCC-12:** The comment is appreciated and is noted for the record 15 and will be provided to the decision-makers.

#### 1 **11.2.3.38 Wilson Trust (WT)**





1

	that as a result of the new administration's promise to drastically modify or totally cancel NAFTA that the POLB generate and incorporate into the Final EIR a more (Cont'd) realistic set of forecasts
7.	Incomplete ROW Mapping: (ES.9) The lack of ROW mapping and the necessary securing of the required ROW's is a major concern, and the possibilities of major issues involved in securing them in areas far from the COLB and POLB is highly probable. These ROW's could be in areas hostile to the project. How does the POLB plan to solve these conflicts?
8.	Lack of negotiated Cooperative Agreements with COLA, POLA and adjacent municipalities: (ES.9) What difficulties are anticipated in securing the cooperative agreements with the COLA? What progress, if any, has been made in these cooperative agreements? Since the COLB and the POLB strongly opposed the COLA International Rail Yard and appealed its approval, why would the POLB not anticipate the COLA to respond in the same fashion? Furthermore, why would the same COLB residents and groups not oppose the Pier B Railyard expansion as they did the COLA's International Gateway Railyard?
9.	Rail Traffic Impacts and 710 Freeway traffic projections: (ES-1 & ES-30) Each 10,000 foot is projected to carry "an average of 250 containers". Trucks will not have to travel the 710 Frwy to carry these containers. Where are the projects on Truck traffic 0n the 710 Frwy, there is no guarantee that truck traffic will be reduced on the 710 Frwy. As container volume increases, and it will, what are the projections for rail versus truck percentages? Where is this addressed in the DEIR?

1

# 2 Responses to Wilson Trust

3 **Response to Comment WT-1:** The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your review of the Draft EIR. At this juncture, it would be premature to prepare a relocation plan or to assist 4 5 business owners with replacement properties. At this stage, the proposed Project is only in 6 the planning stage. It may or may not be approved. Once the Final EIR is completed, it will be 7 presented to the BHC. If they certify the Final EIR and approve the proposed Project or one 8 of its alternatives, the Port would undertake the final Project engineering, and then would take 9 the steps necessary to consider all of the elements associated with acquiring the properties 10 necessary for the proposed Project including a funding plan. The purpose of the Draft EIR is 11 to review the environmental impacts of the proposed Project so that the decision-makers can make an informed decision relating to matter. Please see Master Response - Property 12 13 Acquisitions, Compensation, and Relocation. 14

14 **Response to Comment WT-2:** The comment partially quotes a statement from page 3.6-21 15 of the Draft EIR; however, the language is not quoted correctly, and the last part of the 16 sentence, which is critical, is left off. In full, the referenced language states: "The Port has had 17 preliminary planning discussions with COLB officials regarding assessing the current status

1 and availability of parcels in an attempt to help define the scope of the Project-related 2 acquisitions and the relocations that might be necessary." This sentence does not relate to 3 privately owned parcels, but rather to the parcels that are owned by the COLB. The paragraph 4 that discusses the process that would apply to private parcels, if the proposed Project is 5 approved, is the paragraph immediately above the paragraph to which the comment refers. 6 The commenter requests "a calendar and copy of meeting records for meetings between the 7 Port and COLB concerning availability of parcels." The purpose of the comments on the Draft 8 EIR is to address any issues or concerns that the public may have regarding the contents of 9 the Draft EIR. If the commenter would like to inspect or obtain copies of records, the 10 appropriate procedure is to submit a request for public records pursuant to the California Public Records Act. 11

Response to Comment WT-3: The Port is not involved in the relocation process for any businesses at this time because it would be premature. The Final EIR has not been certified, and there has been no approval of the proposed Project or any of its alternatives. Based on current design, the 10th and 9th Street alternatives would not require acquisition of the subject property (1520 W. 11th Street). Thus, there have been no decisions on property acquisition or relocations. Please see Master Response – Property Acquisitions, Compensation, and Relocation.

19 **Response to Comment WT-4:** The comment alleges that the property owner has been 20 damaged by the pendency of the Port's CEQA process. This is not a comment on the Draft 21 EIR itself or on any environmental issue; therefore, no response is required. Nonetheless, the 22 Port responds as follows. The proposed Project is very complex. Since the Notice of 23 Preparation was released in 2009, extensive coordination, significant modeling, and analysis 24 of potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed Project were required for 25 development of the EIR released in December 2016. The CEQA EIR process is only the initial 26 step in the planning process. Development of an EIR to determine potential environmental 27 effects associated with a proposed Project does not preclude property owners from 28 conducting business, including selling the potentially affected property. The purpose of the 29 Draft EIR and the Final EIR is to provide information to decision-makers and the public before 30 the decision is made whether to proceed with the proposed Project or one of the alternatives.

31 **Response to Comment WT-5:** The commenter contends that "over the 8 years, there has 32 been "virtually no communication from the POLB to impacted stakeholders." To the contrary, 33 Port staff has had extensive correspondence with the commenter during development of the EIR. The description set forth in Section ES.7 on page ES-29 accurately summarizes the 34 35 public outreach as of the issuance of the Draft EIR. The Port acknowledges the commenter's 36 suggestion that the POLB communicate much more proactively during the remainder of the 37 process. However, it must be understood that there are limitations on the actions that the Port 38 may take, as there is a specified process that must be followed in these instances. Please 39 see Master Response – Property Acquisition, Compensation, and Relocation.

Response to Comment WT-6: Feasible mitigation has been applied in all instances in which such mitigation is available and effective. The comment does not offer any specific mitigation recommendations. The COLB's reasons for filing a legal challenge to the SCIG project are set forth in the official records of that litigation. The commenter has not accurately described the basis of the lawsuit. The Port is not aware of additional feasible mitigation measures that would further mitigate air quality impacts. Under CEQA, a lead agency can still approve a project with significant environmental impacts by adopting a statement of overriding 1 considerations that acknowledges the proposed Project's other benefits (CEQA Guidelines

2 Section 15093). The BHC will consider whether or not to adopt the Findings of Fact and

3 Statement of Overriding Considerations. If adopted by the BHC, the Findings and Statement

4 of Overriding Considerations will serve as the legal basis for approval. However, as a Special

5 Condition in Section 6.3.2, the Port would reassess available mitigation every 5 years.

6 Response to Comment WT-7: The comment questions the plans to maintain, expand, or 7 redesign the Overweight Corridor. Under California Vehicle Code Section 35700.5, Caltrans, 8 the COLB, the POLB, and the COLA established a system of overweight corridor routes in the 9 harbor districts and surrounding area for trucks with containers/loads weighing in excess of 80,000 pounds but less than 95,000 pounds. The BHC has the authority to designate 10 11 overweight routes in the Harbor District. For loads in excess of 80,000 pounds but less than 12 95,000 pounds, a permit can be issued with the provision that designated overweight vehicle 13 routes must be followed.

Several Overweight Vehicle Special Permit Routes ("Overweight Routes") would be affected by the proposed Project or one of its alternatives. During construction, to ensure adequate access and mobility of cargo, including adequate access to Overweight Routes, the Port would require a TMP as discussed in Section 6.3.3.1 to minimize traffic congestion during Project construction.

19 The realignment or closure of portions of five local streets in the COLB currently identified as 20 Overweight Routes would occur if the proposed Project is approved and implemented:

- Pier B Street/Pier A Way. This street would be realigned and could continue to serve as an overweight corridor upon completion of construction. Pier B Street would be realigned southward from Anaheim Way east to near Edison Avenue. As part of the roadway work, the existing at-grade rail crossings at Pier B Street/Baker Lead, Pier B Street/Edison Avenue, and Anaheim Way would be modified and upgraded. Access to I-710 would remain open via the existing ramps at the 9th Street /Pico Avenue intersection.
- 9th Street. This street would be closed just south of Anaheim Street to Pier B Street/Pico
   Avenue. Because it is within the footprint of the proposed Project and its alternatives, this
   portion of 9th Street would no longer be available to serve as an overweight corridor.
- 10th Street. A portion of this street would be closed from 9th Street to Fashion Avenue.
   Because it is within the footprints of the 12th Street and 10th Street alternatives, it would not be available to serve as an overweight corridor.
- Santa Fe Avenue. A portion of this street would be closed from 12th Street to 9th Street,
   which is within the footprint of the proposed Project; this portion of Santa Fe Avenue would
   not be available to serve as an overweight corridor.
- Pico Avenue. This street would be realigned, and could continue to serve as an overweight corridor upon completion of construction.
- There would be no changes to Overweight Routes in the COLA (East Anaheim Street or East I Street). There would be no modifications to SR 47/SR 103, however, crash walls would be added to the existing bridge support columns where SR 47/SR 103 crosses over the existing and proposed railroad tracks.
- There would also be no changes to the State-designated Overweight Routes along PacificCoast Highway and the Terminal Island Freeway.

1 **Response to Comment WT-8:** The comment suggests that the Port's cargo forecasts should 2 be revised to assume that the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) would be 3 modified or canceled. NAFTA is an agreement signed by Canada, Mexico, and the United States. It is not clear what impact NAFTA has on the Port's primary business as goods 4 5 movement between Canada and Mexico only makes up a very small portion of the Port's overall business, therefore, it would be speculative to make this assumption or to attempt to 6 7 revise the forecast based on that assumption in advance of any final action on the 8 renegotiation or cancelation of NAFTA. Therefore, revising the forecast is not warranted.

9 Response to Comment WT-9: Section 3.6.4 of the Draft EIR contains figures showing the 10 footprint of the proposed Project and its alternatives (e.g., Figure 3.6-5). As explained in 11 Section 10.1 of the Final EIR, boundaries have been refined in certain locations to reduce the 12 footprint of the proposed Project. Whether there would be major issues if the Port were, in the 13 future, to decide to pursue acquisition of the subject properties is not an environmental issue 14 and is beyond the scope of CEQA. Please see Master Response – Property Acquisition, 15 Compensation, and Relocation.

16 Response to Comment WT-10: Because this comment does not raise any issues related to 17 the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis, no further response is necessary. Nevertheless, the Port provides the following response: Presumably, the commenter is 18 19 referring to properties within the COLA that would be acquired by the COLA or another entity 20 with the power of eminent domain, perhaps by way of some cooperative agreements as 21 described in Section 3.6.4, page 3.6-21 of the Draft EIR. The CEQA EIR process is only the 22 initial step in the planning process. At this point in time, no cooperative agreement has been 23 negotiated or entered between the Port and COLA because there has been no decision about 24 whether or not to approve the proposed Project. The purpose of an EIR is to identify potential 25 environmental effects associated with a proposed Project to allow decisions to be made in an 26 informed manner. If the Port certifies the Final EIR and approves the proposed Project or one 27 of its alternatives, the Port would then cooperate with the respective agencies, including the 28 COLA, and follow the appropriate procedures and legal requirements for acquisitions and/or 29 relocations. As described in Section 10.1 of the Final EIR, the footprint of the proposed Project 30 has been refined within the COLA. This refinement reduced the scope of potential property 31 acquisitions within the COLA. Please also see Master Response – Property Acquisitions, 32 Compensation, and Relocation.

The commenter also raises questions regarding the COLB opposition to the "COLA International Rail Yard," and asks "why would the POLB not anticipate the COLA to respond in the same fashion?" and "why would the same COLB residents and groups not oppose the Pier B Rail Yard expansion as they did the COLA's International Gateway Railyard?" These comments do not raise any issues associated with the environmental analysis; however, the Port provides the following response.

39 Persons and public agencies, including the COLA, were given the opportunity to comment on 40 the Draft EIR during the public review period. The public comment process is described fully 41 as part of Chapter 11 of the Final EIR, which includes responses to all comments received. 42 Comments were received from the COLA Department of Water & Power related to water 43 resources for the proposed Project; no other comments were received from other COLA 44 departments. Comments received from the public, including residents of the COLB, are 45 included herein. All of the comments received have been noted for the record and will be before the BHC for its consideration. 46

1 **Response to Comment WT-11:** The comment states that "[e]ach 10,000 foot is projected to 2 carry 'an average of 250 containers." Assuming the commenter meant to reference 10,000 3 foot "trains," this is a correct summary of the information on page ES-1. The comment is correct that the containers that are moved via the Pier B Rail Yard would not be moved by 4 5 drayage trucks traveling on I-710. With respect to the I-710 volumes, traffic modeling for the 6 proposed Project versus No Project 2035 conditions indicates a slight decrease in truck 7 volumes on I-710 and a slight increase in auto traffic. Per the model, the Passenger Car Equivalent (PCE) volumes on I-710 would increase from 133,001 to 133,249 trips per day – a 8 9 change of approximately a tenth of 1 percent; however, this shift in traffic would result in reductions in traffic on north/south streets adjacent to I-710, including a 30 percent reduction 10 11 on Santa Fe Avenue.

#### 1 11.2.3.39 Lynette Ferenczy (LF)

From: Lynette Ferenczy [mailto:lferenczy62@verizon.net]	
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 8:11 AM	
Subject Pier B EID	
Subjett. Fier D EIA	
February 12, 2017	
Comments on EIR SCH#2009081079 Pier B On-dock Rail Facility Port of Long Beach	
To Heather Tomley	
I support the full project as proposed at the public meeting held at Silverado park in January which will help to reduce truck traffic from the port to the west side of Long Beach; however, I do have a few comments on the EIR as follows:	LF-1
1. Air Quality section 3.2 - The trains shall be the most fuel efficient low emission locomotives available. Tier 4 engines should be used immediately if possible and if not then phased in as soon as they are available.	LF-2
1a. Fuel used in all forms of transportation (trains, switch locomotives, line haul locomotives, yard equipment, on-road vehicles, etc) shall be the cleanest form of fuel available to minimize the unmitigated effect to air quality. The west side of Long Beach has some of the most hazardous air in the LA basin. Also, a plan shall be provided for the long term monitoring of these fuels and posted on line for public review. There have been other recent mitigation measures in the port where compliance with required mitigation measures was not verified.	LF-3
3. Hazardous Waste- please verify if any hazardous waste will be hauled in these containers and, if so, a plan shall be provided in case of accidents or derailment.	LF-4
4. Other projects- Long Beach is updating their general plan land use element and the majority of new housing units are proposed in the downtown and west long beach near the blue line. This will mean more housing in the worst air quality areas and near the proposed project.	LF-5
Please require this project to be as environmentally sensitive as possible using the latest technology and fuels to minimize impacts to our air quality.	LF-6
Thank you,	
Lynette Ferenczy	
lferenczy62@verizon.net	
2926 Eucalyptus Avenue	
Long Beach, CA 90806	

#### 3 *Responses to Lynette Ferenczy*

2

**Response to Comment LF-1:** The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your review of the Draft EIR. Your support for the Project is appreciated, and is noted for the record. The comments are part of the Final EIR; therefore, they will be before the decision-makers for their consideration prior to taking any action on the proposed Project.

8 Response to Comment LF-2: The comment recommends that the trains serving Pier B be
9 the most "fuel efficient low emission locomotives available." This issue is addressed in
10 response to Comment CARB-3, above.

**Response to Comment LF-3:** Page 3.2-17 of the Draft EIR describes the California Diesel Fuel Regulations, which require ULSD fuel, which is the cleanest diesel fuel widely available, in on-road vehicles, off-road vehicles, and intrastate locomotives. Additionally, federal regulations require ULSD in interstate locomotives. Because the use of ULSD is already required as a matter of law, a mitigation monitoring plan is not warranted.

16 The commenter states that there have been recent incidents in the Port of mitigation measures 17 not being verified. Because the commenter does not identify to what project or mitigation

18 measure she is referring, it is not possible to respond further. The Port is diligent regarding

implementation of all imposed mitigation measures pursuant to the terms of the mitigation
 monitoring and reporting program adopted with each project's CEQA clearance.

**Response to Comment LF-4:** Hazardous materials and wastes can be transported through the Port in specially designed shipping containers, regular box-style shipping containers, or other types of enclosed containers handled at the marine terminals. Shipping companies are required to prepare, package, and label hazardous material shipments in accordance with federal regulations (49 CFR 170-179) to permit the surface transport of such containers. In addition, all hazardous materials in containers are required to be properly manifested, thereby increasing awareness of the sensitivity of the contents.

In 2012, POLB handled approximately 6 million TEU, approximately 200,000 of which were estimated to contain hazardous materials (3.5 percent of the total). Assuming 40-foot containers would typically be used, an estimated 100,000 containers carried hazardous materials in 2012. This would equate to an estimated 274 containers with hazardous materials handled daily, on average.

- 15 Approximately 25 percent of TEU brought into the POLB are carried out by means of on-dock 16 rail, either in trains assembled on the marine terminals or carried to the Pier B Rail Yard in 17 cuts of cars and then carried out on assembled trains; the balance would be carried out on 18 truck chassis, to either near-dock or off-dock yards. Using this proportion, an estimated 71 containers with hazardous materials either passed through the Pier B Rail Yard as part of a 19 20 complete train previously assembled at a marine terminal or were handled within the Pier B 21 Rail Yard on a daily basis. The balance of containers with hazardous materials (75 percent, 22 or 203 40-foot containers), would be transported on truck chassis by means of local streets 23 and the freeway system.
- 24 According to the U.S. Department of Transportation, FRA, rail transport of hazardous 25 materials in the United States is recognized to be the safest method of moving large quantities of chemicals over long distances. Continuous sponsored industry and government 26 improvements in rail equipment, tank car and container design and construction, and 27 28 inspection and maintenance methods have results in reducing derailments, spills, leaks, and 29 casualties while the volume of traffic increases (Hazardous Materials Transportation. U.S. 30 Department of Transportation FRA. https://www.fra.dot.gov/Page/P0151. Accessed 31 September 2017).

32 PHL, which would be the primary operator of the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility, 33 maintains a corporate Emergency Response Plan that contains information for the 34 management of a hazardous materials incident on PHL property or involving PHL employees, regardless of cause (i.e., derailment, equipment failure, vehicular accident, third party leak). 35 36 The Emergency Response Plan contains the PHL Hazmat Incident Response Checklist and 37 two decision aides: a Hazmat Responsibility Map for determining which entity has reporting 38 responsibility and a Hazmat Radius Map identifying personnel safe distances for various geographic points, depending on the specific hazard. Furthermore, PHL is required in its 39 40 operating agreement with the Port to provide derailment notification as soon as practicable, 41 but within 24 hours of occurrence, or if a derailment occurs on a weekend, then by the end of 42 the first business day thereafter. Per the agreement, PHL is required to submit a summary 43 report describing the date, time, location, and a general description of the incident, including 44 any corrective measures, if applicable and available. All applicable agencies, including public 45 safety personnel would be contacted in the event of a derailment.

Responses to Comments

Response to Comment LF-5: A review of the most recent version of the draft Land Use 1 2 Element of the COLB General Plan (November 2017) shows that zoned residential areas 3 within the COLB would remain outside the mitigated 10 in a million residential cancer risk contour shown in Figure 3.2-4 of the Draft EIR. Figures 2.2-1 through 2.2-5 in response to 4 5 Comment AQMD-5 show that the areas of exceedance of the annual and 1-hour federal NO₂ 6 concentration thresholds from proposed Project operation would not extend over zoned residential areas within the COLB. The land uses in the draft Land Use Element would not 7 8 result any new significant air quality impacts in the Draft EIR.

9 Response to Comment LF-6: The comment requests that the POLB employ the "latest
 10 technology and fuels" to minimize impacts on air quality. Please refer to response to Comment

11 CARB-3.

#### 1 11.2.3.40 Thomas Gillilan (TG)

ent: Monday, January 09, 2017 5:49 PM			
c: Thomas Gillilan			
ubject: KILLER AIR			
he most caustic and the most unhealthy air pollution of a ecognizing just how ubiquitous and how unhealthy outdo roduces as much pollution as any train locomotive. Iverall, the trains will produce less pollution than trucks n and will provide a better air quality for all the residents of ong Beach would be crazy not to approve the rail project.	Il comes from the people the or cooking really is. Fireplace ow in use, will make the road Long Beach.	mselves. Even China is smoke is the worst and s and the freeway less crowde	_{ed,} - TG-

2

#### 3 Response to Thomas Gillilan

Response to Comment TG-1: The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your review of the 4

Draft EIR. Your comment will be part of the record and will be transmitted to the Board of 5

Harbor Commissioners for their consideration. 6

### 1 **11.2.3.41 Kat Janowicz (KJ)**

From: Kat Janowicz MSME, MBA, CEM, LEED GA [mailto:kat@3cotech.com] Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2017 7:57 PM To: Tomley, Heather Subject: Fwd: ELEEP in LA - meeting with the Port of Long Beach Hi Heather, It was nice to see you today. I'd like to let you know that I fully support the Pier B project, both as a business owner and Long Beach resident. In addition, I have been engaged in the first risk workshop for the Pier B Rail Yard couple years ago KJ-1 and now I have a chance to continue the risk assessment and analysis for this project. I appreciate your accommodating the ELEEP group. Please see below the information. I will be glad to answer any questions you might have, and discuss or arrange a discussion with Max Gruenig regarding the details of the meeting. Best regards, Kat Janowicz, MSME, MBA, CEM, LEED GA, ENV SP President 3COTECH Profitable Sustainability 3COTECH, Inc. 224 W 8th St. | San Pedro, CA 90731 714.478.4434 kat@3cotech.com | www.3cotech.com https://www.linkedin.com/in/katjj 3COTECH is an Envision Qualified Company, certified Small Business Enterprise (SBE), and certified Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE). CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE: This email message and its attachments contain work product or other information which is privileged, confidential and/or protected from disclosure. This information is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you think that you have received this message in error, please email or phone the sonder. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution or copying is strictly prohibited.

# 2

#### 3 *Response to Kat Janowicz*

**Response to Comment KJ-1:** The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your comment and support of the proposed Project. Your comment will be part of the record and provided to the decision-makers for their consideration. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

# 1 **11.2.3.42 David Kelly (DK)**

,	David Kelly 2268 Tevis St. Long Beach CA 90815
Port Of Long Beach Heather Tomley, Director of Environmental Planning, 4801 Airport Plaza Drive, Long Beach, CA 90815	30 January 2017
Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Pier B	On-Dock Rail Support Facility
Dear Ms. Tomley,	_
I support the construction the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facili drive the 710 freeway daily and have witnessed firsthand the non- safety standards on big rigs. Using more trains will reduce the trais safety.	ity at the Port of Long Beach. I enforcement of emission and ffic on the 710 and increase
if the railyard is not constructed the only means to accommodate to widen the 710 freeway by three lanes in each direction paving over echarging of the aquifer, and destroying habitat for wild animals reeway would also remove private land from tax generating servi- s converted into freeway lanes. Widen the 710 would also displace to the local area. Finally the rail yard will use less materials than finhat require energy to manufacture. The cascading effect of widen eplacing all of the existing overpasses, costing more tax payer more	the increase port traffic is to er raw land that allows for and foliage. Widening the the when residence and industry be businesses that provide jobs reeway construction, materials ing the 710 would require oney.
	D. J.m. Kelly
	David M. Kelly

# 2

# 3 Response to David Kelly

4 **Response to Comment DK-1:** The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your review of the 5 Draft EIR. Your support of the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be transmitted

6 to the decision-makers.

#### 1 **11.2.3.43 Mike Laquatra (ML)**

From: Mike Laquatra [mailto:mjllmf@verizon.net]
To: Tomilay, February 13, 2017 7:54 AM
Subject Der B ETD
Subject Her D LIK
February 10, 2017
Comments on EIR SCH#2009081079 Pier B On Dock Rail Facility Port of Long Beach
To Heather Tomley
I attended the informational meeting at Silverado Park on 1/11/17 and gained a favorable impression of the proposed project. Dock to rail remains the gold standard for movement of cargo and after years of excuses from carriers such as BNSF detailing why this could not be accomplished in our area it was refreshing to be presented with a plan to meet this goal. We were shown 4 prospective plans and I am in favor of the most comprehensive project as it seems short sighted to downsize the project which would inevitably lead to the need for further expansion in the near future. Local construction/expansion related disruption is inevitable so I feel that maximum results are called for. While it became clear during the presentation that environmental impact has been strongly considered, I would like to submit some suggestions for improvement.
I hope that all on-road and yard vehicles will be required to use the cleanest available technology including requirements to upgrade over time. I also would like to see a requirement for Tier 4 locomotives to be used as soon as possible as there are no environmental benefits to be gained from a delayed phase in. In both cases this would help to mitigate the impact on our already very substandard air quality.
The transport of hazardous waste is another area of concern. The plan should speak to any planned hauling of such cargo and must ensure comprehensive plans to address the possibility of derailments and/or leaks.
It would also be prudent to keep in mind that Long Beach is updating their general plan which will lead to more density in West Long Beach in the vicinity of the Blue Line which means an increased degradation of air quality. In light of this fact it is imperative that the proposed Dock Rail Plan be as environmentally friendly as possible.
Thank you for your consideration of these comments,
Mike Laquatra 2926 Eucalyptus Ave Long Beach, Ca 90806 562-424-9141 <u>mjllmf@verizon.net</u>
Mike Laquatra mjilmf@verizon.net

### 3 *Responses to Mike Laquatra*

2

**Response to Comment ML-1:** The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your review of the
 Draft EIR. Your support for the Project and noted preference for the 12th Street Alternative are
 noted for the record and will be transmitted to the decision-makers.

**Response to Comment ML-2:** The comment recommends that the POLB employ the "cleanest available technology" and that it require the use of Tier 4 locomotives as soon as possible to improve local air quality. Response to Comment CARB-3 addresses the recommendation for Tier 4 locomotives. The Draft EIR includes a Special Condition (Section 6.3.2) to periodically re-examine the potential for new, more efficient technologies and, if such technologies are available and are cost effective, to implement them to improve air quality.

**Response to Comment ML-3:** Documented incidents occurring within the Pier B Rail Yard are few in number and are adequately managed. Standard safety procedures are in place to effectively respond to incidents if they occur. Please also see response to Comment LF-4 above.

1 Response to Comment ML-4: The City of Long Beach General Plan Update process and 2 proposed Land Use Element density maps for each District, as of this writing, have been 3 revised in response to public comment. Final action to adopt the proposed revisions to the 4 Land Use Element's maps has not yet taken place. Should the City Council vote to adopt 5 some or all of the proposed revisions to the Land Use Element's maps, it is not clear that 6 degradation of air quality would necessarily result from increased density, particularly if the 7 increased density is coupled with public transit incentives or related objectives. However, 8 assuming a density increase in West Long Beach in the vicinity of the Metro Blue Line, 9 associated air quality impacts could only occur upon new construction in accordance with said 10 densities.

Please see response to Comment LF-5 for further discussion of potential air quality implications of the General Plan Update as it relates to the proposed Project. As explained in Section 3.2 (Air Quality) of the Draft EIR for the proposed Project, all feasible mitigation measures have been imposed to reduce air quality impacts. In addition, the Draft EIR includes a Special Condition (Section 6.3.2) to periodically re-examine the potential for new, more efficient technologies and, if such technologies are available and are cost effective, to

17 implement them to improve air quality.

#### 1 **11.2.3.44 Russ McCurdy (RM)**

From: Russ McCurdy <<u>russmccurdy@msn.com</u>> Date: 2/13/17 3:48 PM (GMT-08:00) To: "Tomley, Heather" <<u>heather.tomley@polb.com</u>> Subject: Comments to Rail Facility Study

Dear Ms. Tomley,

The draft EIR is very comprehensive and focuses on the long term environment. What does not seem to be addressed are the following:

The project schedule takes too long. The proposed project schedule will take 7 years to complete. This delays the financial and environmental benefits significantly. This project does not appear to be technologically challenging, and I am surprised that it won't be completed in 3 years or less. The disruption to port facilities which began in 2012 will now be extended to 2025 - over a decade of disruption. The project should complete by 2020.

2. The target of 30-35% on dock intermodal operations is too low as a strategic goal. To facilitate the Port of Long Beach's growth by becoming the most cost and schedule efficient port, the plan needs to consider enabling further future expansion of on dock modal operations. The critical modal infrastructure should be sized to enable expansion of on dock intermodal operations to other Long Beach port piers. As the cost, schedule and environmental benefits are realized the need to expand intermodal capacity beyond 35% will justify future projects. These future projects can be completed with less port disruption and at lower cost, if the non-pier specific infrastructure is sized for more capacity or planned for easy modular expansion.

The purpose of my comments are to support the growth and competitiveness of the Port of Long Beach. Thank for the opportunity to support the Port of Long Beach.

Best regards, Russ McCurdy

#### 2

#### 3 Responses to Russ McCurdy

**Response to Comment RM-1:** The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your review of the Draft EIR. Regarding the length of time for construction of the proposed Project, the schedule was developed to include realistic timeframes for the estimated sequence phasing of specific activities defined in Figure 1.8-5, many of which cannot proceed without completion of prior activities.

9 **Response to Comment RM-2:** The Ports have made significant investments over the years 10 to build rail infrastructure with the goal of accommodating 35 percent of all cargo leaving the Port Complex by rail. In 2016, 24 percent of all containerized cargo moving through the Ports 11 went by rail. Currently, on-dock rail infrastructure is available at nearly all container terminals 12 13 at the Ports. Many non-container terminals are also served by rail in both Ports. Some on-14 dock rail facilities have physical limitations due to, for instance, the capacity of storage tracks. 15 The proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project would provide the additional tracks 16 to optimize building blocks of rail cars from multiple terminals to make destination trains and 17 maximize the amount of cargo loaded onto rail at the terminals.

### 1 **11.2.3.45 Colleen McDonald (CM)**

From: Colleen Mcdonald [mailto:colleenmcdnld03@gmail.com] Sent: Monday, March 13, 2017 1:08 PM To: Tomley, Heather Cc: Adam Wolven; Council District 6; Paul Collins; Annie Greenfeld Subject: Port of Long Beach On-Dock Railway concerns
I live in the Wrigley area of Long Beach, near Pacific Coast Highway and well within pollution fallout from the port. This pollution already imposes a significant health danger to myself and the draft environmental impact underscores that pollution will likely continue for many years to come. These are the elements I am particularly opposed to: 1 the expected widespread use of diesel locomotives of an outdated design which do not meet the status of 'green' and which will contribute to noise pollution 2 the staging of significant traffic close to residential areas which are downwind of the prevailing winds leading to the devaluation of property values for residents and businesses 3 the potential of a catastrophic event from transport 'accidents' and the diminution of adequate emergency response due to proposed closure of east-west egris across the LA River and isolation of businesses 4 the building of such significant infrastructure c without studying the effects of this upon the existing underground pipelines which pretty much saturate the westside of Long Beach from north to south and east to west
5 mitigation efforts proposed are way to small in concept and in resources- the Port should be underwriting Health Clinics free for those affected by the increased Port pollution and underwriting the creation of a financial asset that homeowners and businesses in the area can access to retrofit their homes against increased noise and air pollution
Your attention to my concerns will be appreciated Regards, Colleen Mc Donald member Wrigley Association board
 Colleen McDonald 562-6767480

2

# 3 Responses to Colleen McDonald

**Response to Comment CM-1:** The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your review of the Draft EIR and your comments. Please see response to Comment GSR-2 for a discussion of the potential for the proposed Project to replace many future drayage truck trips with less polluting rail transportation.

8 Response to Comment CM-2: The comment opposes the use of outdated diesel locomotives 9 because of their noise and air quality impacts. The noise analysis presented in Section 3.8 of 10 the Draft EIR indicates that diesel locomotives associated with the Project would not have a 11 significant impact on the noise environment. The impacts of diesel locomotives on air quality 12 are addressed in Section 3.2 of the Draft EIR. The use of "green" (i.e., Tier 4) locomotives is 13 addressed in response to Comment CARB-3. Emission standards for both nonroad Responses to Comments

locomotives (used by PHL for train handling within the Port) and road locomotives (BNSF and
 UPRR) are prescribed by EPA. The Port does not set these standards.

3 **Response to Comment CM-3:** It is unclear what is being referred to in the comment's 4 reference to "the staging of significant traffic close to residential areas." The proposed Project would provide five new arrival/departure tracks and 31 new storage tracks closer to marine 5 6 terminal operations. This is not close to a residential area. These improvements would 7 significantly improve train building efficiencies and reduce train building activities that are 8 occurring within the system in locations that were not originally designed or intended to be 9 used for staging, breaking down, and building trains. The Project location is farther away from 10 sensitive receptors than other locations within the rail system that are being used for coupling 11 and decoupling cuts of rail cars.

Response to Comment CM-4: The commenter expresses opposition to "the potential of a catastrophic event from transport 'accidents' and the diminution of adequate emergency response due to proposed closure of east-west egris [sic] across the LA River and isolation of businesses and residents."

16 It is not clear as to what "transport accidents" the commenter refers to, whether rail transport 17 of cargo or vehicle transport of passengers. The risk of transport accidents relating to 18 hazardous materials was extensively analyzed in Impact HAZ-8 starting at page 3.9-18 of the 19 EIR. The proposed Project is eliminating the 9th Street at-grade crossing and is thus reducing 20 the potential for vehicle-train collisions within the area.

The proposed Project's construction or operations would not extend across the Los Angeles River, nor does the proposed Project or its alternatives seek to close east-west access across the Los Angeles River via Shoemaker Bridge. Rather, the proposed Project (12th Street Alternative) would remove the Shoemaker Ramps on the westerly end of the Shoemaker Bridge, and the 10th Street Alternative would reconfigure the ramps to maintain a connection between Anaheim Street and Downtown Long Beach via Harbor Avenue. In the 9th Street Alternative, the Shoemaker Ramps would remain unchanged.

28 As stated above, neither construction nor operation of the proposed Project or its alternatives 29 would result in closure of the Shoemaker Bridge. It is possible the comment relates to a 30 different project. In April 2016, the COLB issued a Notice of Preparation for a separate project 31 to replace the Shoemaker Bridge (West Shoreline Drive). The Shoemaker Bridge 32 Replacement Project is an Early Action Project of the Interstate I-710 Corridor Improvement 33 Project. Three alternatives are being evaluated as part of the Shoemaker Bridge Replacement 34 Project. In addition to the No Build Alternative (Alternative 1), Alternatives 2 and 3 would 35 replace the existing Shoemaker Bridge over the Los Angeles River with a new bridge located 36 just south of the existing bridge. Both alternatives would include the evaluation of design options for a roundabout or a "Y" intersection at the easterly end of the bridge. The primary 37 38 difference between Alternative 2 and 3 is that Alternative 2 provides for repurposing the 39 existing bridge for non-motorized transportation and recreational use and Alternative 3 40 includes removal of the existing bridge. East-west access across the Los Angeles River would 41 still be available via alternative routes including Anaheim Street, which is located 42 approximately 0.3 mile north of the Shoemaker Ramps.

As discussed in Section 3.7 (Public Services and Safety), the area of influence evaluated in
 the EIR is comprised of the largest Project footprint (i.e., the proposed Project) and the
 adjacent area within a minimum of approximately 0.5 mile of the Project site boundary. The

1 0.5-mile area of influence boundary was chosen to ensure that potentially affected public 2 services and facilities were included in the environmental analysis, and this zone extends 3 across the Los Angeles River. A diminution of emergency response would not occur as a 4 result of the proposed Project. As discussed on pages 3.7-9 through 3.7-10 in the Draft EIR. 5 construction of the proposed Project would result in less-than-significant impacts to public 6 services and safety, and they are not expected to significantly degrade emergency response 7 times or services levels. Standard security measures would be implemented during construction to minimize the burden on police, fire, and other security agency staff levels, 8 9 including development of a TMP, which would provide advance notice and information to all 10 public service providers and their affected clients and service areas prior to construction 11 activity.

- Following construction, operation of the proposed Project could have a beneficial effect on motorist and train safety because the existing 9th Street at-grade crossing at Pier B Street and 9th Street would be eliminated. Elimination of the Pier B Street/9th Street grade crossing would reduce the chance of delays to emergency vehicles caused by train blockage of the crossing. All public service locations would continue to be accessible during operation of the proposed Project.
- Response to Comment CM-5: The comment expresses a concern about the proposed
   Project's effects on underground pipelines underlying the Project site. This issue is addressed
   in response to Comment WPAC-4.
- 21 **Response to Comment CM-6:** The comment remarks that mitigation efforts are too small in 22 concept and resources. Please see Master Response – Community Grants Program.

#### 1 **11.2.3.46 Robert Rodine (RR)**

To: FuturePorts	,,											
Cc: Tomley, Heather; J.	Hower											
Subject: DEIR Review												
Elizabeth -												
I'm sorry that I had to	drop of	f the ca	ll early.	It was t	he issu	e that ]	have b	een conter	nding w	ith.		
The use of a Power Pa as clearly or quickly a prepared a simple sum	oint Sum is I woul nmary th	nmary v ld have lat give:	vas very liked. 7 s an inst	helpful Fo help i ant com	to me, ne, and parisor	but I v l any of L	as not the	able to see at might w	the con	nparative er visibili	elements ty, I have	
Pier B On Dock Support Facility Comparative Feature Summary												
	51-ra		Oliv French			Andreal		Locomotive Layover		Dominguez		
	Avenue Tracks	Pico Avenue	Rall Crossing	Shoemaker Ramps	Add Tracks	Depart Tracks	Pier B Street	Fueling Area	Alameda Corridor	Bridge	Add Track	-RR
12th St. Alternative	Add 4	Realign	Close	Remova	Add 31	Add 5	Realign Widen	& Build	Connect	Widen	Add 1	1.19939-014
L0th St. Alternative	Add 2	Realign	Close	Realign	Add 19	Add 3	Realign Widen	8 Build	Connect	Widen	Add 1	
Oth St. Alternative	C hha	Realigo	Close		AHH Q	Add 3	Realign	8. Build	Connect	Widea	Arid 1	
Chaoges Re. Preferred On another issue, a la see what comparative and find absolutely no proposed elements. T of bonds on the Port's either the Port or oper do a study. I'm not ary consideration.	rge proje investme evidence he DEIR Balance ators. Ye guing for	ect of th ent elen ee of any t micros Sheet, ou may t LAED	is sort w nents co y consid scopicall or the co recall th OC, but I	vill surely uld be in eration of ly exami ost of thi nat I brow do think	y have a wolved of the fi nes aes s projec ught thi t that a	a big pr . Hown nancial thetics, ct relati s issue project	ice tag, ever, I l or econ but the ve to th up relat of this	The abov nave looke nomic com re is no co e economi tive to Tes magnitude	e summ d throug sequence nsiderat c benefi oro and e merits t	ary lets th h the enti es of any o ion of the ts enjoyed they had hat sort o	the reader re DEIR of the impact i by LAEDC f	RR
We there any final ma	rching of	rders gi	ven out	at the en	d of the	e meeti	ng?					
5. St.												
Regards,												
Regards, Bob												

#### 3 Responses to Robert Rodine

2

4 **Response to Comment RR-1:** The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your review of the 5 Draft EIR and your preparation of the summary of the alternatives. Table 1.8-1 also provides

5 Draft EIR and your preparation of the summary of the alternatives. Table 6 a summary of the similarities and differences among the alternatives. **Response to Comment RR-2:** Generally, the financial or economic consequences of a project and sources of funding for the project are outside the scope of the CEQA process, as outlined in Section 15131 of the CEQA Guidelines, which states that economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment.

### 1 **11.2.3.47 Staci Schwartz (SS)**

From: Staci Schwartz <<u>chickenbird77@gmail.com</u>> Date: 1/4/17 6:30 PM (GMT-08:00) To: "Tomley, Heather" <<u>heather.tomley@polb.com</u>> Subject: Rail Facility

Hi Heather,

I think this is a wonderful improvement for the port and as a Long Beach resident, I just wanted to take a moment to express my support. These improvements will benefit our environment and the future success of the port. I am looking forward to watching our port grow and improve.

Warmest regards,

Staci Schwartz Long Beach, 90808

2

#### 3 Response to Staci Schwartz

4 **Response to Comment SS-1:** The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your review of the Draft

5 EIR. Your support for the proposed Project is noted for the record. The comment will be part

6 of the Final EIR; therefore, it is before the decision-makers for their consideration prior to

7 taking any action on the proposed Project.

#### 1 **11.2.3.48 Adam Wolven (AW)**

From: Adam Wolven [mailto:adamwolven@hotmail.com] Sent: Monday, March 13, 2017 12:12 PM To: Tomley, Heather Subject: Concern Regarding Pier B On-Dock Railway Dear Heather Tomley and the Port of Long Beach, I want to express my opposition to current plan to the Pier B on-dock railway expansion plan. I am writing this letter out of concern regarding the health of my neighborhood, friends, and family. I am also writing out of concern for all the surrounding neighborhoods that will be adversely affected by the proposed railway expansion on Pier B. Because outdated diesel locomotives will be grandfathered into use on the dock, AW-1 our neighborhoods and schools will be harmed by the increased pollution. Having lived in the Wrigley for over two years now, I can tell you first hand that the air quality is noticeably worse than my previous neighborhood in Long Beach. Windows, patio furniture, plants, Spanish roof tiles, are all constantly covered with a back soot that comes from the port and 710 freeway. Its part of living in Wrigley, but it would be a tragic misstep to harm the future flourishing or our neighborhoods by making pollution worse. Increased noise pollution is another major concern of mine. For a majority of the year, I sleep with my windows open at night. After moving into the neighborhood I was often curious about a droning sound I'd hear at night that was similar hearing the freeway but slightly louder. I learned that I was hearing nearby AW-2 diesel locomotives. Evidently it is more economical to let them idle overnight than to power them down. You can imagine how irritating it is to listen to diesel engines pollute your community while you are trying to fall asleep. This cost saving strategy for transportation companies is bad for our neighborhoods. I also recently learned that the proposed plan for Pier B on-deck rail would also adversely affect the businesses adjacent to the project and will decrease the long term tax revenue received by the city. As a 7th AW-3 district resident, I fully supports Westpac's opposition to the plan as well. Over the last few years, there has been a lot of discussion for improvement projects for West Long Beach. The railway expansion on Pier B would be a step in the wrong direction. If clean electric locomotives and sound walls were incorporated into the plan, I would feel differently. I would also feel differently if the concerns raised by Westpac were are worked out as well. Though I like the AW-4 idea of decreasing trucks on our freeways, the harm of the pollution and economic detriments would out way any benefits gained. Thanks for taking the time to consider these concerns. Adam Wolven Resident 90806 Wrigley Association - Vice President

2

# 3 Responses to Adam Wolven

**Response to Comment AW-1:** The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your review of the Draft EIR and your comment. The air quality impacts and health risks of the proposed Project and its alternatives were assessed in Section 3.2 of the Draft EIR. The comment does not take issue with the analysis or its conclusions. Please see response to Comment CM-2, above, for an explanation regarding locomotives operating within the Port. Please see response to Comment GSR-2 for a discussion of the potential for the proposed Project to replace many future drayage truck trips with rail transport.

**Response to Comment AW-2:** The noise impacts of the proposed Project and its alternatives were assessed in Section 3.8 of the Draft EIR. The comment does not take issue with the analysis or its conclusions. Noise sources that could be audible in the Wrigley neighborhood include vehicles on I-710, I-405, and Pacific Coast Highway. Diesel locomotive train noise could be emanating from other nearby rail lines such as Union Pacific (UP) CommerceResponses to Comments

Lakewood, UP Lakewood-Long Beach, Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA)
 Watts-Long Beach, and SCRRA Wilmington.

Regarding diesel locomotives, the commenter states: "Evidently it is more economical to let
[them] idle overnight than to power them down...This cost saving strategy for transportation
companies is bad for our neighborhoods."

6 On the contrary, idling a diesel locomotive overnight would be costly and less economical to 7 the operator due to the amount of fuel that would be consumed and the associated cost of 8 fuel used while idle. Since August 2006, SCAQMD Rule 3502 has required Class I freight 9 railroads and switching and terminal freight railroads operating in the district to minimize 10 emissions from the unnecessary idling of a locomotive as follows. Unless a locomotive is equipped with an anti-idling device that is set at 15 minutes or less, engaged, and not 11 tampered with, an operator of a locomotive shall not idle an unattended locomotive for more 12 13 than 30 minutes for any of the following reasons: (a) the crew of the locomotive consist (a 14 lineup or sequence of railroad carriages or cars, with or without a locomotive, that form a unit) 15 has been relieved and the relief crew has not arrived; (b) the crew of the locomotive consist has left for a meal; (c) the locomotive is within the rail yard; (d) the locomotive is queuing for 16 17 fueling, maintenance, or servicing; or (e) maintenance or diagnostics are being conducted on 18 the locomotive that do not require operation of the engine. In addition, the operator of a 19 locomotive shall not idle a trailing locomotive for more than 30 minutes for the following 20 reasons: (a) the dispatcher or vardmaster notifies the operator of a delay that will exceed 30 21 minutes; or (b) there is a locomotive failure or breakdown that will result in delay of more than 22 30 minutes (SCAQMD Rule 3502, Adopted February 3, 2000).

**Response to Comment AW-3:** The proposed Project would not result in significant environmental effects on businesses adjacent to the proposed Project, except for air pollutant emissions for which additional feasible mitigation measures are not currently available. With regard to the comment stating that long-term tax revenue to the City will be decreased, it should be noted that economic issues are not a consideration under CEQA. Your opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be transmitted to the decision-makers.

Response to Comment AW-4: Please see response to Comment CARB-7 regarding zero
 emission locomotives; please also see Master Response – Electrification of Alameda Corridor
 and Zero Emission Locomotives.

32 Incorporation of soundwalls into the plan would not only be infeasible for a project of this scale, 33 but also ineffective to the Wrigley neighborhood located more than 0.6 mile from the Project 34 site. Typically, soundwalls are installed as mitigation when significant impacts from noise 35 levels are expected. The proposed Project to improve the Pier B Rail Yard would not result in 36 significant impacts to ambient noise levels for receptors in the immediate local area; therefore, 37 mitigation measures are not required. The dominant noise sources in the Wrigley 38 neighborhood are I-710, I-405, and Pacific Coast Highway. Noise from the Pier B Rail Yard or 39 the Alameda Corridor would not be discernible above these dominant noise sources. Noise 40 from increased train activity on the Alameda Corridor is projected to be less than 1 dB.

# 1 **11.2.4 Testimony Received at Public Meetings**

2 The POLB held three public meetings to provide information to the community concerning the 3 Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project Draft EIR and to provide an opportunity for public testimony regarding the Draft EIR. A total of 26 speakers provided comments during the 4 January 11, 2017 public meeting for the Draft EIR. There were 25 speakers that gave 5 testimony on January 18, 2017. There were 13 speakers that provided testimony at the 6 7 February 15, 2017 public meeting. Of the total 54 speakers, 5 speakers attended 2 meetings while 2 speakers attended all 3 meetings. Table 11.2-18 presents a list of the speakers that 8 9 provided testimony during each of the public meetings.

# TABLE 11.2-18 TESTIMONY RECEIVED AT PUBLIC MEETINGS FOR THE PIER B ON-DOCK RAIL SUPPORT FACILITY DRAFT EIR

		Comment	Page						
No.	Individual (Organization)	Code	No. ¹						
MEET	MEETING NO. 1 – January 11, 2017, Public Meeting at Silverado Park ("M1")								
1	Andrew Mayorga (Ironworkers Local 1309)	M1AM	11-266						
2	David Hope (Total Terminals International, Pier T)	M1DH	11-266						
3	Elizabeth Warren (Future Ports)	M1EW	11-266						
4	Ted Jimenez (Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters)	M1TJ	11-267						
5	Anthony Otto (Long Beach Container Terminal)	M1AO	11-267						
6	Baron Covarrubias (Ironworkers Local 433)	M1BC	11-267						
7	Otis Cliatt (Pacific Harbor Line)	M1OC	11-267						
8	John Schafer (Local 2375)	M1JS	11-268						
9	Joshua Christensen (Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters)	M1JC	11-268						
10	Jesse Marquez (Coalition for a Safe Environment)	M1JM	11-268						
11	John Tafoya (Carpenters Local 1506)	M1JT	11-269						
12	Levi Javier (Harbor Association of Industry and Commerce)	M1LJ	11-269						
13	Karissa Reyes (LBCC graduate)	M1KR	11-269						
14	Ricardo Ariana (LBCC graduate)	M1RA	11-270						
15	Weston Labar (Harbor Association of Industry and Commerce)	M1WL	11-270						
16	David Pettit (Natural Resources Defense Council)	M1DP	11-270						
17	John Taeleifi (Long Beach resident)	M1JT2	11-270						
18	Revi Castro (Century Villages at Cabrillo)	M1RC	11-271						
19	Emily Quest	M1EQ	11-271						
20	Tommy Faavae (IBEW Local 11)	M1TF	11-271						
21	Lee Wilson (property owner)	M1LW	11-272						
22	Mitchell Ponce (Ironworkers Local 433)	M1MP	11-272						
23	Joel Thuracher (Operating Engineers Local 12)	M1JT3	11-272						

# TABLE 11.2-18 (CONT'D.) TESTIMONY RECEIVED AT PUBLIC MEETINGS FOR THE PIER B ON-DOCK RAIL SUPPORT FACILITY DRAFT EIR

No.	Individual (Organization)	Comment Code	Page No. ¹				
24	Eric lata (Carpenters Union)	M1EI	11-272				
25	Abel Lopez (Laborers of Local 39)	M1AL	11-272				
26	Juan Alcarez (Star program graduate)	M1JA	11-272				
MEETING NO. 2 – January 18, 2017, Public Meeting at POLB IAO ("M2")							
1	David Hope (Total Terminals International, Pier T)	M2DH	11-283				
2	Andy Perez (Union Pacific Railroad)	M2AP	11-283				
3	Ted Jimenez (Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters)	M2TJ	11-283				
4	Steven Mendoza (Ironworkers Local 1309)	M2SM	11-284				
5	John Schafer (Piledrivers Local 2375)	M2JS	11-284				
6	Eddie Rivera (Laborers Local 1309)	M2ER	11-284				
7	David Kelly (Long Beach resident)	M2DK	11-284				
8	Eric Shen (USDOT Southern California Gateway Office of Maritime Administration)	M2ES	11-285				
9	Peter Santillan (Laborers Local 1309)	M2PS	11-285				
10	Anthony Otto (Long Beach Container Terminal)	M2AO	11-285				
11	Alex Lafarga (Laborers Local 1309)	M2AL	11-285				
12	Jim Stewart (Sierra Club Los Angeles Chapter – climate and transportation committees)	M2JS	11-285				
13	Thomas Jelenic (Pacific Merchant Shipping Association)	M2TJ	11-286				
14	Randy Gordon (Long Beach Area Chamber of Commerce)	M2RG	11-286				
15	Craig Holland (Long Beach resident)	M2CH	11-286				
16	Levi Javier (Harbor Association of Industry and Commerce)	M2LJ	11-287				
17	Armando Porras (International Longshoreman Warehouseman's Union Local 13)	M2AP	11-287				
18	Brandon Matson (LA County Business Federation)	M2BM	11-287				
19	Ray Familathe (ILWU International and Coast Longshore Division)	M2RF	11-288				
20	Kevin Donaldson (LAN Logistics)	M2KD	11-288				
21	Lee Wilson (property owner)	M2LW	11-289				
22	Stan Janocha (Superior Electrical Advertising)	M2SJ	11-289				
23	Ricardo Orellana (LBCC graduate, construction apprenticeship)	M2RO	11-289				
24	Vema Boyd (Carpenters Local 1506)	M2VB	11-290				
25	Mitchell Ponce (Ironworkers Local 433)	M2MP	11-290				

### TABLE 11.2-18 (CONT'D.) **TESTIMONY RECEIVED AT PUBLIC MEETINGS** FOR THE PIER B ON-DOCK RAIL SUPPORT FACILITY DRAFT EIR

No.	Individual (Organization)	Comment Code	Page No. ¹				
MEET Long	MEETING NO. 3 – February 15, 2017, Public Meeting at Tepechi Restaurant, 1430 Santa Fe Avenue, Long Beach ("M3")						
1	Gourav Sharma (Business owner)	M3GS	11-297				
2	Lisa Kolieb (representing Superior Electrical Advertising)	M3LK	11-298				
3	Sampson Tang (Chemoil Corporation)	M3ST	11-298				
4	John Solinas (Chemoil and Teamsters Local Union 848)	M3JS	11-299				
5	Paul Collins (West Project Area Council)	МЗРС	11-299				
6	John Donaldson (tenant)	M3JD	11-300				
7	Ric Inlow (SSA, stevedoring company)	M3RI	11-300				
8	Paul Allen (International Transportation Service, container terminal)	МЗРА	11-301				
9	Clara Driscoll (SRM Corporation operates Queens Wharf, Berth 55 Seafoods, Long Beach Sportfishing)	M3CD	11-301				
10	David Hope (Total Terminals International, Pier T, director of rail operations)	M3DH	11-301				
11	Lee Wilson (private property owner)	M3LW	11-301				
12	Jim Stewart (local resident at 1720 Chestnut)	M3JS	11-302				
13	Dan Berns (property owner)	M3DB	11-303				
Note: ¹ Refe	r to this page of this section to view the comment made during the public mee	eting.					

1 The testimony of speakers has been bracketed on each transcript and given a letter code 2 ("M1" for the first public meeting) followed by initials of the commenter (e.g., speaker Joe 3 Smith's comments at the first meeting is given the letter code "M1JS"). The individual 4 comments within the transcript are annotated in the margin using the letter code and 5 consecutive numbering (e.g., M1JS-1, M1JS-2, and so on). The responses to comments use 6 the same annotation to easily correspond with the comment letter. The transcripts of the public

7 meetings, in addition to the responses to comments, are provided on the following pages.
	Dago 1		Dage 2
- [	Page 1		Page 2
	STATE OF CALIFORNIA	1	INDEX
	PORT OF LONG BEACH	2	
		3	SPEAKER: HEATHER TOMLEY, Director of Environmental
		4	Planning
	PIER B ON-DOCK RAIL SUPPORT FACILITY	5	MODERATOR: ALLYSON TERAMOTO, Senior Environmental Specialist
	DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT	7	AUDIENCE: PAGE
		8	Andrew Mayorga 15
	PUBLIC MEETING	9	David Hope 15 Elizabeth Warren 16
	Wednesday, January 11, 2017 Silvarado Park	10	Ted Jimenez 17 Anthony Otto 18
	1545 West 331st Street Long Beach, California	11	Baron Covarrubias 19
		12	Otis Cliatt 20 John Schafer 21
	6:00 P.M.	13	Joshua Christensen 23 Jesse Marcuez 24
		14	John Tafova 27
		15	Levi Javier 27 Karissa Reves 28
		16	Ricardo Ariana 29 Weston LaBar 29
	TAKEN BY: Katherine Henry-Sexton, CSR No. 13662	17	David Pettit. 20
		18	John Taeleifi 32 Revi Castro 33
		19	Emily Quest 35
		20	Tommy Faavae 36
		21	Mitchell Ponce 38
		22	Eric Iata 39
		23	Abel Lopez 39 Juan Alcarez 40
		24	
		25	
+	Page 3		Page 4
ī l	WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 11, 2017, LONG BEACH, CA	- 71	Project, the Port of Long Beach is the lead agency
2	6:10 P.M.		under the California Environmental Quality Act. or
<u>_</u> 1		21	
2		2	CEOA. As the lead agency, we've prepared an
3	* * *	3	CEQA. As the lead agency, we've prepared an
3	* * *	2 3 4	CEQA. As the lead agency, we've prepared an environmental impact report or BIR to analyze the potential impacts from the project
3 4 5	* * * MS. TOMLEY: Good evening and welcome to the rublic meeting for the approach Dier B On Dock Pail	2 3 4 5	CEQA. As the lead agency, we've prepared an environmental impact report or BIR to analyze the potential impacts from the project.
3 4 5 6	* * * MS. TOMLEY: Good evening and welcome to the public meeting for the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail	2 3 4 5 6	CEQA. As the lead agency, we've prepared an environmental impact report or EIR to analyze the potential impacts from the project. As part of this CEQA process, we're
3 4 5 6 7	* * * MS. TOMLEY: Good evening and welcome to the public meeting for the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project. We are now officially	2 3 4 5 6 7	CEQA. As the lead agency, we've prepared an environmental impact report or BIR to analyze the potential impacts from the project. As part of this CEQA process, we're seeking public comments on the draft BIR that was
3 4 5 6 7 8	* * * MS. TOMLEY: Good evening and welcome to the public meeting for the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project. We are now officially opening the public hearing for the EIR. My name is	2 4 5 6 7 8	CEQA. As the lead agency, we've prepared an environmental impact report or BIR to analyze the potential impacts from the project. As part of this CBQA process, we're seeking public comments on the draft BIR that was released on December 15th, 2016, to ensure that the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	* * * MS. TOMLEY: Good evening and welcome to the public meeting for the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project. We are now officially opening the public hearing for the BIR. My name is Heather Tomley, and I'm director for environmental	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	CEQA. As the lead agency, we've prepared an environmental impact report or BIR to analyze the potential impacts from the project. As part of this CEQA process, we're seeking public comments on the draft BIR that was released on December 15th, 2016, to ensure that the public is provided an opportunity to express their
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	* * * MS. TOMLEY: Good evening and welcome to the public meeting for the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project. We are now officially opening the public hearing for the EIR. My name is Heather Tomley, and I'm director for environmental planning for the Port of Long Beach. And thank you	2 4 5 7 8 9 10	CEQA. As the lead agency, we've prepared an environmental impact report or BIR to analyze the potential impacts from the project. As part of this CEQA process, we're seeking public comments on the draft BIR that was released on December 15th, 2016, to ensure that the public is provided an opportunity to express their questions and concerns on the proposed project. The
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	* * * MS. TOMLEY: Good evening and welcome to the public meeting for the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project. We are now officially opening the public hearing for the EIR. My name is Heather Tomley, and I'm director for environmental planning for the Port of Long Beach. And thank you all for coming tonight.	2 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	CEQA. As the lead agency, we've prepared an environmental impact report or BIR to analyze the potential impacts from the project. As part of this CEQA process, we're seeking public comments on the draft BIR that was released on December 15th, 2016, to ensure that the public is provided an opportunity to express their questions and concerns on the proposed project. The comments we receive during the public review period
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2	* * * MS. TOMLEY: Good evening and welcome to the public meeting for the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project. We are now officially opening the public hearing for the EIR. My name is Heather Tomley, and I'm director for environmental planning for the Port of Long Beach. And thank you all for coming tonight. To begin I want to identify, again, that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	CEQA. As the lead agency, we've prepared an environmental impact report or BIR to analyze the potential impacts from the project. As part of this CEQA process, we're seeking public comments on the draft BIR that was released on December 15th, 2016, to ensure that the public is provided an opportunity to express their questions and concerns on the proposed project. The comments we receive during the public review period will be responded to and included in the final BIR,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3	* * * MS. TOMLEY: Good evening and welcome to the public meeting for the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project. We are now officially opening the public hearing for the EIR. My name is Heather Tomley, and I'm director for environmental planning for the Port of Long Beach. And thank you all for coming tonight. To begin I want to identify, again, that to make our presentation as accessible as possible,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CEQA. As the lead agency, we've prepared an environmental impact report or BIR to analyze the potential impacts from the project. As part of this CEQA process, we're seeking public comments on the draft BIR that was released on December 15th, 2016, to ensure that the public is provided an opportunity to express their questions and concerns on the proposed project. The comments we receive during the public review period will be responded to and included in the final BIR, and the Port will also use the comments received
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4	* * * MS. TOMLEY: Good evening and welcome to the public meeting for the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project. We are now officially opening the public hearing for the EIR. My name is Heather Tomley, and I'm director for environmental planning for the Port of Long Beach. And thank you all for coming tonight. To begin I want to identify, again, that to make our presentation as accessible as possible, we have a sign language interpreter and a Spanish	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CEQA. As the lead agency, we've prepared an environmental impact report or BIR to analyze the potential impacts from the project. As part of this CEQA process, we're seeking public comments on the draft BIR that was released on December 15th, 2016, to ensure that the public is provided an opportunity to express their questions and concerns on the proposed project. The comments we receive during the public review period will be responded to and included in the final BIR, and the Port will also use the comments to inform
3 4 5 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5	* * * MS. TOMLEY: Good evening and welcome to the public meeting for the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project. We are now officially opening the public hearing for the EIR. My name is Heather Tomley, and I'm director for environmental planning for the Port of Long Beach. And thank you all for coming tonight. To begin I want to identify, again, that to make our presentation as accessible as possible, we have a sign language interpreter and a Spanish language translation service available. And if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	CEQA. As the lead agency, we've prepared an environmental impact report or BIR to analyze the potential impacts from the project. As part of this CEQA process, we're seeking public comments on the draft BIR that was released on December 15th, 2016, to ensure that the public is provided an opportunity to express their questions and concerns on the proposed project. The comments we receive during the public review period will be responded to and included in the final BIR, and the Port will also use the comments received tonight along with any written comments to inform any changes to be incorporated into the EIR and to
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6	* * * MS. TOMLEY: Good evening and welcome to the public meeting for the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project. We are now officially opening the public hearing for the BIR. My name is Heather Tomley, and I'm director for environmental planning for the Port of Long Beach. And thank you all for coming tonight. To begin I want to identify, again, that to make our presentation as accessible as possible, we have a sign language interpreter and a Spanish language translation service available. And if there is anyone who would like to use either of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CEQA. As the lead agency, we've prepared an environmental impact report or BIR to analyze the potential impacts from the project. As part of this CEQA process, we're seeking public comments on the draft BIR that was released on December 15th, 2016, to ensure that the public is provided an opportunity to express their questions and concerns on the proposed project. The comments we receive during the public review period will be responded to and included in the final BIR, and the Port will also use the comments to inform any changes to be incorporated into the EIR and to let the decisionmakers know of any concerns
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	* * * MS. TOMLEY: Good evening and welcome to the public meeting for the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project. We are now officially opening the public hearing for the BIR. My name is Heather Tomley, and I'm director for environmental planning for the Port of Long Beach. And thank you all for coming tonight. To begin I want to identify, again, that to make our presentation as accessible as possible, we have a sign language interpreter and a Spanish language translation service available. And if there is anyone who would like to use either of those services, please let one of the Port staff	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	CEQA. As the lead agency, we've prepared an environmental impact report or BIR to analyze the potential impacts from the project. As part of this CEQA process, we're seeking public comments on the draft EIR that was released on December 15th, 2016, to ensure that the public is provided an opportunity to express their questions and concerns on the proposed project. The comments we receive during the public review period will be responded to and included in the final BIR, and the Fort will also use the comments to inform any changes to be incorporated into the EIR and to let the decisionmakers know of any concerns expressed by the public. We will not be responding
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	* * * MS. TOMLEY: Good evening and welcome to the public meeting for the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project. We are now officially opening the public hearing for the BIR. My name is Heather Tomley, and I'm director for environmental planning for the Port of Long Beach. And thank you all for coming tonight. To begin I want to identify, again, that to make our presentation as accessible as possible, we have a sign language interpreter and a Spanish language translation service available. And if there is anyone who would like to use either of those services, please let one of the Port staff know, or please come over here to the front of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CEQA. As the lead agency, we've prepared an environmental impact report or BIR to analyze the potential impacts from the project. As part of this CEQA process, we're seeking public comments on the draft EIR that was released on December 15th, 2016, to ensure that the public is provided an opportunity to express their questions and concerns on the proposed project. The comments we receive during the public review period will be responded to and included in the final BIR, and the Port will also use the comments received tonight along with any written comments to inform any changes to be incorporated into the EIR and to let the decisionmakers know of any concerns expressed by the public. We will not be responding to any of the comments presented tonight, but they
3 4 5 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	* * * MS. TOMLEY: Good evening and welcome to the public meeting for the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail support Facility Project. We are now officially opening the public hearing for the BIR. My name is Heather Tomley, and I'm director for environmental planning for the Port of Long Beach. And thank you all for coming tonight. To begin I want to identify, again, that to make our presentation as accessible as possible, we have a sign language interpreter and a Spanish language translation service available. And if there is anyone who would like to use either of those services, please let one of the Port staff know, or please come over here to the front of the room.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	CEQA. As the lead agency, we've prepared an environmental impact report or BIR to analyze the potential impacts from the project. As part of this CEQA process, we're seeking public comments on the draft EIR that was released on December 15th, 2016, to ensure that the public is provided an opportunity to express their questions and concerns on the proposed project. The comments we receive during the public review period will be responded to and included in the final BIR, and the Port will also use the comments received tonight along with any written comments to inform any changes to be incorporated into the EIR and to let the decisionmakers know of any concerns expressed by the public. We will not be responding to any of the comments presented tonight, but they will be incorporated into the response to comments
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	<text></text>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	CEQA. As the lead agency, we've prepared an environmental impact report or BIR to analyze the potential impacts from the project. As part of this CEQA process, we're seeking public comments on the draft EIR that was released on December 15th, 2016, to ensure that the public is provided an opportunity to express their questions and concerns on the proposed project. The comments we receive during the public review period will be responded to and included in the final BIR, and the Port will also use the comments received tonight along with any written comments to inform any changes to be incorporated into the EIR and to let the decisionmakers know of any concerns expressed by the public. We will not be responding to any of the comments presented tonight, but they will be incorporated into the response to comments in the document.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 0 1 2 3 4 5 0 1 2 3 4 5 0 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 2 1 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 2 1 2 2 1 2 2 1 2 2 2 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	* * * MS. TOMLEY: Good evening and welcome to the public meeting for the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project. We are now officially opening the public hearing for the BIR. My name is Heather Tomley, and I'm director for environmental planning for the Port of Long Beach. And thank you all for coming tonight. To begin I want to identify, again, that to make our presentation as accessible as possible, we have a sign language interpreter and a Spanish language translation service available. And if there is anyone who would like to use either of those services, please let one of the Port staff know, or please come over here to the front of the room. The purpose of tonight's meeting is to receive public comments. To begin I'll provide a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CEQA. As the lead agency, we've prepared an environmental impact report or BIR to analyze the potential impacts from the project. As part of this CEQA process, we're seeking public comments on the draft EIR that was released on December 15th, 2016, to ensure that the public is provided an opportunity to express their questions and concerns on the proposed project. The comments we receive during the public review period will be responded to and included in the final BIR, and the Port will also use the comments received tonight along with any written comments to inform any changes to be incorporated into the EIR and to let the decisionmakers know of any concerns expressed by the public. We will not be responding to any of the comments presented tonight, but they will be incorporated into the response to comments in the document. If you'd like to make comments this
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 .0 .1 2 .3 4 .5 .6 7 8 .9 .0 .1 2 .3 4 .5 .7 8 .9 .0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 .0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5	<pre>* * *</pre> MS. TOMLEY: Good evening and welcome to the public meeting for the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project. We are now officially opening the public hearing for the EIR. My name is Heather Tomley, and I'm director for environmental planning for the Fort of Long Beach. And thank you all for coming tonight. To begin I want to identify, again, that to make our presentation as accessible as possible, we have a sign language interpreter and a Spanish language translation service available. And if there is anyone who would like to use either of those services, please let one of the Port staff know, or please come over here to the front of the to com. The purpose of tonight's meeting is to receive public comments. To begin I'll provide a brief presentation summarizing the project,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CEQA. As the lead agency, we've prepared an environmental impact report or BIR to analyze the potential impacts from the project. As part of this CEQA process, we're seeking public comments on the draft EIR that was released on December 15th, 2016, to ensure that the public is provided an opportunity to express their questions and concerns on the proposed project. The comments we receive during the public review period will be responded to and included in the final BIR, and the Port will also use the comments received tonight along with any written comments to inform any changes to be incorporated into the EIR and to let the decisionmakers know of any concerns expressed by the public. We will not be responding to any of the comments presented tonight, but they will be incorporated into the response to comments in the document. If you'd like to make comments this evening, please fill out a speaker card and give it
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 .0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 .0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 .0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 .0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 .0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 .0 1 2 3 4 5 5 6 7 8 9 .0 1 2 3 4 5 5 7 8 9 .0 1 2 3 4 5 5 7 8 9 .0 1 2 3 4 5 5 7 8 9 .0 1 2 3 4 5 5 7 8 9 .0 1 2 3 4 5 5 7 8 9 .0 1 2 3 4 5 5 7 8 9 .0 1 2 3 4 5 5 7 8 9 .0 1 2 3 4 5 5 7 8 9 .0 1 2 3 4 5 7 8 9 .0 1 2 3 4 5 7 8 9 .0 1 2 3 4 5 7 8 9 .0 1 2 3 4 5 5 7 8 9 .0 1 2 3 4 5 5 7 8 9 .0 1 2 3 4 5 7 8 9 .0 1 2 8 9 .0 1 2 3 2 3 5 .0 8 9 .0 1 2 3 .0 1 2 3 .0 1 2 3 .0 1 2 3 .0 1 2 3 .0 2 .0 2 .0 1 2 .0 2 .0 2 .0 2 .0 2 .0	* * * MS. TOMLEY: Good evening and welcome to the public meeting for the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project. We are now officially opening the public hearing for the EIR. My name is Heather Tomley, and I'm director for environmental planning for the Fort of Long Beach. And thank you all for coming tonight. To begin I want to identify, again, that to make our presentation as accessible as possible, we have a sign language interpreter and a Spanish language translation service available. And if there is anyone who would like to use either of those services, please let one of the Port staff know, or please come over here to the front of the toro. The purpose of tonight's meeting is to receive public comments. To begin I'll provide a brief presentation summarizing the project, including the objectives and alternatives and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CEQA. As the lead agency, we've prepared an environmental impact report or EIR to analyze the potential impacts from the project. As part of this CEQA process, we're seeking public comments on the draft EIR that was released on December 15th, 2016, to ensure that the public is provided an opportunity to express their questions and concerns on the proposed project. The comments we receive during the public review period will be responded to and included in the final BIR, and the Port will also use the comments received tonight along with any written comments to inform any changes to be incorporated into the EIR and to let the decisionmakers know of any concerns expressed by the public. We will not be responding to any of the comments presented tonight, but they will be incorporated into the response to comments in the document. If you'd like to make comments this evening, please fill out a speaker card and give it to a member of the Port staff in the back of the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4	* * * MS. TOMLEY: Good evening and welcome to the public meeting for the proposed Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project. We are now officially opening the public hearing for the EIR. My name is Heather Tomley, and I'm director for environmental planning for the Port of Long Beach. And thank you all for coming tonight. To begin I want to identify, again, that to make our presentation as accessible as possible, we have a sign language interpreter and a Spanish language translation service available. And if there is anyone who would like to use either of those services, please let one of the Port staff know, or please come over here to the front of the tow, or please of tonight's meeting is to receive public comments. To begin I'll provide a brief presentation summarizing the project, including the objectives and alternatives and describe the potential impacts with the proposed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	CEQA. As the lead agency, we've prepared an environmental impact report or BIR to analyze the potential impacts from the project. As part of this CEQA process, we're seeking public comments on the draft BIR that was released on December 15th, 2016, to ensure that the public is provided an opportunity to express their questions and concerns on the proposed project. The comments we receive during the public review period will be responded to and included in the final BIR, and the Port will also use the comments received tonight along with any written comments to inform any changes to be incorporated into the EIR and to let the decisionmakers know of any concerns expressed by the public. We will not be responding to any of the comments presented tonight, but they will be incorporated into the response to comments in the document. If you'd like to make comments this evening, please fill out a speaker card and give it to a member of the Port staff in the back of the room. And after the presentation we'll call on

16	Public Mee	tir	IG NO. 1 (M1) Public Hearing
	Page 5		Page 6
1	comments, and each speaker will be given three	1	facility on rail. Trucks would not be used to
2	minutes to provide their comments.	2	deliver containers to the facility. Because the
3	The Port of Long Beach is proposing to	3	facility serves multiple Port terminals and
4	expand and make improvements to the existing Pier B	4	destinations, improvements to the facility would
5	rail facility. This facility is a critical	5	include Port-wide rail shipping efficiencies
5	component to the Port-wide rail infrastructure and	6	allowing benefits to be realized at all Port
7	allows for better, more efficient utilization of the	7	terminals.
8	on-dock rail facilities that are located within the	8	The existing Pier B rail facility is
9	terminals.	9	located in the northern part of the Harbor District
0	With on-dock rail containers are loaded	10	at Pier B near Anaheim Street and the I-710 Preeway.
1	directly onto small segments of multiple railcars	11	The facility is located at a highly industrial area
2	using tracks located within the Port terminals.	12	and does not directly border any residential
3	However, due to the lack of track space and the mix	13	neighborhoods. Currently, the facility provides
ł	of cargo intended for multiple destinations, it's	14	railcar and locomotive storage and staging to
5	not possible to build complete trains within the	15	support efficient operations in the on-dock
	terminals. In addition, the need to store and stage	16	railyards at the Port's marine terminals. Track
7	railcars on the tracks within the terminals as	17	from the facility connects to the Alameda Corridor
	longer train segments are built, limits the amount	18	allowing trains to leave the Fort complex.
•	of active working area to load more cargo onto rail.	19	The objectives of the Pier B project are
)	Therefore, facilities like the Pier B	20	to support the transition to a more efficient, more
Ľ	On-Dock Rail Support Facility are necessary to	21	economically competitive and less polluting freight
	store, sort and assemble the smaller train segments	22	transportation system. In addition, the project
	into full 10,000-foot trains that are ready to leave	23	would promote a mode shift from the movement by
	the Port complex via the Alameda Corridor for their	24	truck to near-dock rail or off-dock rail facilities
5	final destination. All cargo arrives at the	25	to movement by rail directly from the on-dock rail
	Page 7		Page 8
1	facilities at the Port. In addition, the rail car	1	following slides.
2	and locomotive storage, staging and servicing areas	2	The proposed project or the 12th Street
3	would also enable the on-dock railyards to better	3	alternative would be constructed in three phases
1	manage the loading of containers onto railcars.	4	over seven years expanding the rail facility from
5	By providing adequate space to accommodate	5	its existing 12 tracks to a total of 48 tracks.
	departing and arriving trains up to 10,000 feet	6	This additional track would allow more efficient
7	long, rail line congestion can be alleviated	7	assembly of trains and accommodate trains up to
	resulting in a more efficient rail network at the	8	10,000 feet long. The expanded facility would also
	ports. With more cargo transported on trains,	9	include support facilities, including a locomotive
5	congestion on local streets and highways would also	10	layover and fueling area.
	be reduced. The project would also upgrade and	11	The Dominguez Channel rail bridge would be
	modernize existing aging infrastructure. And	12	modified to accommodate one new track. Pier B
	lastly, the closure of the at-grade crossing at 9th	13	Street and Pico Avenue would need to be realigned
1	Street and Pico will improve safety for both	14	and/or widened to provide a sufficient area for
	vehicles and locomotives.	15	expansion of the rail facility.
	The environmental analysis evaluated four	16	Several road closures would occur in the
	alternatives: The 12th Street alternative, which is	17	vicinity, including roads in the City of Los
	the proposed project, is the largest project and	10	Angeles. The 9th Street at-grade crossing would
	best meets the key objectives.	10	also be closed to accommodate the rail expansion at
	The 10th Street alternative is slightly	20	the eastern end of the Pier B facility. Access to
1	reduced. And the 9th Street alternative is further	20	Anabaim Street would be shifted to Anabaim Way at
	second a second second a second a second sec	21	the yestern and of Diar B Ctreat
L	reduced and no protect alremarive would be the	122	and appoint and at that a percent
1	change to the existing facility		In addition the Choemakar ramme and
1 2 3	change to the existing facility.	23	In addition, the Shoemaker ramps and
1 1	reduced, and no project alternative would be no change to the existing facility. I'll walk through in more detail a	23 24	In addition, the Shoemaker ramps and approaches would be removed. The proposed could

Pie	r B EIR Public Meet	tin	<b>G NO. 1 (M1)</b> Public Hearin
	Page 9		Page 10
1	properties would need to be acquired within the	1	departure tracks. Construction would be completed
2	project area.	2	in two phases over approximately three years.
3	The 10th Street alternative is also	3	Road work would be similar to the proposed
4	expected to take approximately seven years for	4	project; however, there would be fewer road
5	construction. In this alternative the facility	5	closures, and the Shoemaker ramps would not be
6	would have fewer arrival, departure and yard tracks	6	removed or realigned. Utility work would be similar
7	expanded from the existing 12 to a total of 34	7	to that for the proposed project, but a smaller area
8	tracks. Given the reduced footprint, less road	8	would be affected. There would be fewer property
9	construction would be necessary.	9	acquisitions under the 9th Street alternative. 56
10	Road work would be similar to the proposed	10	total properties would be affected, of which 10 are
11	project. However, the Shoemaker ramps would be	11	privately owned.
12	re-configured to maintain the connection between	12	Also, with this alternative the number of
13	Anaheim Street and downtown via Harbor Avenue.	13	railcars and trains that could be accommodated would
14	Potential property acquisitions for 10th Street	14	be less than under the proposed project.
15	alternative would be similar to the 12th Street	15	Under the no project alternative no
16	alternative, but fewer in number. 72 properties	16	improvements would be made to the existing Pier B
17	could be affected, of which 26 are privately owned.	17	on-dock rail support facility. The existing Pier B
18	The number of railcars and trains that could be	18	facility would continue to operate as it does today.
19	accommodated would be less than under the proposed	19	The current yard has two main line tracks, ten yard
20	project.	20	tracks and no arrival and departure tracks. An
21	In the 9th Street alternative the new	21	estimated five to seven trains per day would depart
22	tracks would be constructed between Pier B Street	22	the rail facility which reflects operations at
22	and 9th Street. The alternative would add nine	22	capacity. Once the existing facility reaches its
24	tracks, expanding from the existing 12 to a total of	22	limit of the ability to handle train movements, the
25	21 tracks, which would include three new arrival and	25	remaining direct intermodal cargo that's not
20	Dage 11	20	Dage 12
	accommodated by on-dock railwards would be	1	matter sulfur oxides and toxic air contaminants
-	transported by truck to a near-dock or downtown		that affect human health.
4	railward and loaded onto destination trains.	4	Further off-site ambient pollutant
2	Under the no project alternative the	2	concentrations are expected to be significantly
4	existing at-grade crossing located 9th Street and	4	impacted from construction of the proposed project
5	Dico Avenue would remain in place and Dier B Street	2	The analysis identified the notential for
0	would not be improved. In addition the ne project	2	avgedances laid of Couth Coast his Cuality
7	alternative would not regult in any property		Management District regional air quality management
8	alternative would not result in any property	8	Management District regional air quality management
9	acquisition of business relocations.	9	chresholds for criteria pollutants, specifically
10	the environment from the processed product. For the	10	Rev groephouse grees the total approximation
11	ene environment from the proposed project. For the	11	ror greenhouse gases the total annualized
12	proposed 12th Street alternative, impacts that were	12	greenouse gas emissions generated from the proposed
13	minimum as significant and unavoldable arter	13	project construction and operation are [[] expected
14	micryation are to air quarity and greenhouse gases.	14	to be above the south coast Air Quality Management
15	For air quality direct air emissions from	15	District's significance threshold of 10,000 metric
16	construction and operations associated with the	16	cons or carbon dioxide equivalents per year for
17	proposed project are expected to exceed the South	17	industrial land uses.
18	coast Air Quality Management District's daily	18	The significant and unavoidable impacts
19	emissions thresholds of significance for carbon	19	identified remain after the implementation of
20	monoxide and nitrogen oxides. Direct air emissions	20	mitigation measures. Mitigation measures applied to
21	from construction and operation of the proposed	21	air quality and greenhouse gas emissions include:
22	project are also expected to make a cumulatively	22	Application of best management practices and engine
23	considerable and unavoidable contribution to a	23	emission standards to reduce emissions from
24	significant impact for volatile organic compounds,	24	construction activities. In addition, to address
25	carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, particulate	25	cumulative impacts, the Port would contribute
			1.000 (characteristics)

ieı	свеік Public Me	eti	<b>NG NO. 1 (IVI1)</b> Public Hearing	J
Ť	Page 13	П	Page 14	1
	funding to the Community Grants Program,	1	when the final EIR document is available.	
2	approximately \$177,500.	2	Once final, the Port's governing body, the	
	To reduce greenhouse gases, various	3	Board of Harbor Commissioners, will consider	
	sustainability features will be incorporated into	4	certifying that the BIR was prepared in accordance	
	the proposed project's design. In addition,	5	with the requirements of CEQA and whether the	
	requirements for recycling and re-use of materials	6	project will be approved.	
	during construction and operations will be required.	7	The draft EIR document is available on the	
	Tree planting will be done in the area, and	8	Port's website at the link provided on the slide.	
	employees at the project site will be encouraged to	9	Tonight the public will have an opportunity to	
	carpool.	10	provide verbal comments on the merits of the	
	The Port will also make a contribution to	11	proposed project and the draft EIR document. You	
	the Community Grants Program to fund greenhouse gas	12	may speak tonight or hand in your written comments	
	emissions reduction projects, approximately in the	13	or both.	
	amount of \$1.4 million.	14	We strongly encourage you to also submit	
	The draft EIR was released by the Port for	15	your comments in writing. Written comments will be	
	public review and comment on December 15, 2016. We	16	accepted through four p.m. on Monday. February 13	
	are currently within the 60-day public review and	17	2017. To submit written comments on the draft EIR.	
	comment period with comments due to the Port by	10	please send them to me at the Port of Long Beach at	
	Pebruary 13th, 2017. At the end of this	10	the address listed on the slide. And comments can	
	presentation I'll provide the contact information	19	also be sent via e-mail to heather.tomlev@polb.com.	
	and addrage to submit written commonte	20	At this time well take speaker comments	
	And address to submit written comments.	21	At this time we'll take speaker comments.	
	active conclusion of the public review and	22	As previously mentioned, we have a sign language	
	the comments submitted and will sublish then in the	23	incerprecer and spanish language cransiación	
	the comments submitted and will publish them in the	24	services available. And if you wish to provide your	
	final EIK. All commenters will also be notified	25	comments and have not yet filled out a speaker card,	
	Page 15		Page 16	
	please see a member of the Port staff to complete a	1	MR. HOPE: David Hope, and I'm the director	
	card. For those who have completed a speaker card,	2	of rail operations at Pier T. Total Terminals	
	we'll call each of you up by name; and each speaker	3	International supports the Port of Long Beach in its	M1
	is limited to three minutes at the podium. The	4	endeavors to improve the efficient movement of	
	microphone is located here at the front of the room.	5	freight and increase rail capacity through	
	With that I will start going through in	6	improvements to Port infrastructure. Thank you very	
	the order I have them here. I'll be tested on	7	much.	
1	pronunciation, so I apologize in advance. Andrew	8	MS. WARREN: Good evening. My name is	
18	Mayorga, followed by David Hope and followed by	9	Elizabeth Warren. I'm the executive director of	
	Elizabeth Warren.	10	future ports, and thank you for the opportunity to	
	MR. MAYORGA: My name is Andrew Mayorga.	11	speak this evening. First, I want to applaud the	
	I'm a business agent with Ironworkers Local 1309	12	Port staff for producing and releasing this	
1	here in Long Beach representing 2,500 members of	13	document. We've given it a cursory review, and	
	this region. We're just here in support of this	14	we'll have more in-depth comments to come at the	
3	project. A greener Port is always good for the	15	next hearing and in writing.	
	future. Projects like this create a lot of	MA	ΔM On behalf of future ports and its members,	
	opportunity, not only for a green project, but to	17	who are all community members and industry stake	M1E
	put a lot of people in Long Beach to work. And	18	holders as well, we are pleased to provide some	
	that's why our unit is here in support of it. Thank	19	initial comments in support of this project. The	
1	you.	20	common ground we share with the Port is to move	
	MS. TOMLEY: David Hope.	21	cargo in the most efficient way possible, and that's	
	MR. HOPE: My name is David Hope, and I'm	22	why this added infrastructure is so important in	
	the director of rail operations at Pier T.	23	order to move cargo by rail in support of the	
	COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, you have to get	24	on-dock marine terminals.	
	closer to the microphone.	25	Future Ports agrees with the concepts and	
31 · · ·		1.000		1

11-266 Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project

Pie	Public M	eeti	ng No. 1 (M1) Public Hearing	а
	Page 17		Page 18	7
1	goals and objectives as outlined by the Port. It's	1	trained certified carpenters involved in the	1
2	not only important to our communities to get the	2	infrastructure that creates a greener port, also	
3	containers on rail, we also need to keep our Port	3	local carpenter jobs, local labor, and also to	
4	competitive. Port of Long Beach is the busiest	4	earn a livable wage, we strongly support this	
5	seaport in the US. And at a time when shippers are	5	project.	L M1TJ
6	looking for reasons to abandon southern California	6	We're talking about an obvious improvement	(Cont'd)
7	ports, we certainly need to do everything we can to	7	for our environment. And it's obvious we're going	
8	keep our goods movement industry here in southern	8	to be creating some good projects here that are	
9	California and keep the cargo and the hundreds of	9	going to sustain local hires. We're strongly in	
10	thousands of jobs supported by that cargo here and	10	support of that project. And have a good evening.	<b>'</b>
11	not diverting it to other regions or to other	[ M1	EW Thank you.	
12	countries.	(Co	nt'd)	r l
13	We also support greening the Port.	13	is Anthony Otto. I'm the president of Long Beach	
14	Modernizing the Port and greening the Port go hand	14	Container Terminal. For those who don't know, Long	
16	in hand. This project is another example of how the	15	Beach Container Terminal is the operator of the new	
16	Port of Long Beach can modernize and go green at the	15	terminal, which is commonly referred to as Middle	
17	same time. So this project is a key component and	17	Harbor Redevelopment Project.	
10	is critical to the future development of the Port of	10	Our new terminal is the first near zero	
10	Long Beach and we expect to fully support this	10	amiggions container operation in the nation and hy	-M1AO
19	project Thank you again for the opportunity	19	far is the most or is the most environmentally	
20	MC TOMERY. Next up is Ted Timener Anthony	20	friendly and cleanest container terminal on this	
21	offe and Baron Covermbian	21	planet. Our terminal is hald to the most stringent	
22	otto and paron covariablas.	22	pranet. Our terminar is held to the most stringent	
23	MR. JIMENEZ: Good evening. My name is Tea	23	environmental mitigation measures ever seen within	
24	Jimenez, regional counsel, carpenter representative,	<b>I</b> ¥₩ I	the smipping industry, and Let has embraced and	
25	representing carpenters out of Los Angeles. To have	25	even surpassed those commitments.	-
	Page 1 <u>9</u>		Page 20	
1	I'm here tonight to support the Pier B	1	MR. COVARRUBIAS: Hello. My name is Baron	
2	rail yard. The Pier B rail yard is the critical	2	Covarrubias. I'm with the ironworkers, Local 433,	
3	component of the Middle Harbor Redevelopment Project	3	I have a few brothers and sisters here from the	
4	because it provides the badly needed rail	4	ironworkers to support this project. I believe it	
5	infrastructure necessary to keep the on-dock rail	5	will be a great opportunity to, like people were	
6	running efficiently. Without the Pier B rail yard,	6	saying ahead of me, to create jobs for the	
7	it will be impossible for the Middle Harbor to reach	7	community. In fact, this is how I got my shot at	-M1BC
8	its on-dock rail through-put potential due to the	8	the ironworkers. I was able to qualify because of	
9	limitation of the surrounding ports infrastructure	9	my zip code. So bringing union jobs to the	
10	resulting in an artificial limitation of the	10	community will be a great opportunity for those	
11	terminal's capacity.	M	looking to find a career and a trade. Thank you.	
12	The maximization of loading rail cargo on	, 12	MS. TOMLEY: Next up is Otis Cliatt, John	
13	dock is important because for every container we	13	Schufer, I believe, and Joshua Christensen.	
14	can't load, it needs to be trucked from the Port to	14	MR. CLIATT: Good evening. My name is Otis	
15	nearby, and in some cases not so nearby inland	15	Cliatt. I'm a president of the Pacific Harbor Line.	
16	railyards increasing congestion and emissions on	16	And I'd like to say that we are a proud partner of	
17	local roadways. Without the Pier B rail yard, we	17	the Port of Long Beach and also a proud partner of	
18	will have eroded the capacity of the Port to load	18	Green Ports. Pacific Harbor Line was the first	
19	more of this cargo on dock. And that's just not	19	railroad in the country to have the entire fleet	MILOO
20	acceptable.	20	Tier 2-plus, which means that we are not only	MITUC
21	This project has already been delayed for	21	environmentally friendly, but we also spent our	
22	several years, and it is now an environmental	22	money to show that we're environmentally friendly.	
23	imperative that this project proceed with no further	23	Our company vehicles, the majority of	
24	delay. We support it wholly. Thank you.	24	them, are hybrid vehicles as well to go along with	
25	MS. TOMLEY: Baron Covarrubias.	25	the clean port process. Our employees, we employ 25	

Pier B EIR Public Meeting No. 1 (M1)					
- 10	Page 21		Page 22		
1	percent of our workforce are Veterans. And over 70	1	First of all, I want to speak in total		
2	percent of our workforce live within 30 miles of the	2	favor of this project. I think it's an integral		
3	Port. So with all of the numbers that I've talked	3	part, really the key to modernizing a Port that has		
4	about and discussed, we are an integral part of this	4	been in existence for over a hundred years and has		
5	Port.	5	been critical to providing jobs and benefits not		
6	And taking a look at the Pier B rail	6	only to Long Beach and San Pedro and Los Angeles,		
7	project will do nothing but enhance the output of	7	but really to southern California.		
8	the Port of Long Beach. If you look at the last ten	8	Again, 40 percent of the nation's GDP goes		
9	years and this magnificent chart, map, that's	M	through these two ports, and we benefit from that.		
10	over here on the wall, I think everyone should take	10	The one thing to comment that I wanted to make		
11	a look at that. If you look at the amount of funds	11	particularly on the BIR is that what's stated I		
12	that have been spent on the infrastructure, and if	12	know it's mandated, but there isn't enough study or	M1.IS	
13	you also take a look at the number of reductions	13	statement about the environmental impacts of having	(Cont'd)	
14	that have been made on the environmental side, I	14	good paying jobs close to home that include health		
15	will say that Pacific Harbor Line as far as on an	15	benefits and pensions. We live in a world of		
16	employee basis we have grown over 20 percent on our	16	inequity that's going on everywhere; but having a		
17	employee base with the number of improvements that	17	good paying job that a local resident can take to		
18	have been made. And we will continue to grow with	18	where they don't have to travel that far is		
19	the continued improvements that have been made.	19	invaluable and should be considered just as much as		
20	so we're in full support of the Pier B	20	noise and air and anything else that goes through		
21	railyard on-dock project. Thank you.	21	Lhere.		
22	Schafer I'm the business manager of bridge dock	22	arendfather joined Local 2329 as a diver and he		
23	and road builders local 2375 part of the southwest	-M1	belowd nut the nover lines and day lines to Terminal		
24	regional council of carpenters.	24	Island. My father worked for Connolly Bisente [sic]		
40	Dage 22	20	Dogo 24	_	
4	for over 20 years in the rock marry to build the	- 2	rage 24		
2	shoring that is necessary for a lot of these docks	2	stuff, and give these people here of Long Beach the		
2	to go through. My brother worked on Ports O'Call in	2	opportunity to learn a trade and to train them		
4	Santa Monica Pier. I worked on bridges, including	4	properly and to be able to be successful in life.		
5	the 105 and the blue line. There's a lot of pride	5	And that's what we're about, helping your		
6	that you can take out of that.	6	people that live in this area here be successful and	M1.JC	
7	Most of our residents and members come		be able to buy a house and be able to buy a car and	(Cont'd)	
8	from the local area. It is important that you		$\mathbf{n}_{go}^{(2)}$ on vacation and be able to enjoy the lives not		
9	realize this project will include jobs that have	9	just at work and at home, but to be able to enjoy		
10	respect and give respect to a lot of people that	10	what God has given us in this world and seeing the		
11	need it. So I encourage you to get this project	11	great creations. Again, I'm in full support of this		
12	done, approved and done as quickly as possible.	12	project. Thank you for your time.		
13	Thank you.	13	MS. TOMLEY: Next up is Jesse Marquez,		
14	MS. TOMLEY: Joshua Christensen.	14	followed by John Tafoya and Levi Javier.		
15	MR. CHRISTENSEN: Good evening. My name is	15	MR. MARQUEZ: Good evening. Thank you for		
16	Joshua Christensen. I'm from the Southwest Regional	16	having this meeting here in Long Beach in the		
17	Council of Carpenters, and I'm here to show my	17	community. My name is Jesse Marquez. I'm a		
18	support of this project and to please put this	18	long-time harbor resident. I'm the executive		
19	through. As carpenters we commit to hold to a high	19	director of the Coalition for a safe environment		
20	standard of construction and building. And that's	- MP1	JC dquartered in Wilmington, but we do have many	M1.IM-	
21	what you're going to get from us and what you'll get	21	residents in Long Beach and throughout the Harbor.		
22	from all these other tradesmen that are out there.	22	we do have some concerns we'd like to see		
23	we put our neart and soul into this	23	being addressed. Number one being is that we		
24	project with price and along comes with it a good	24	support a rail support; we support modernization of		
25	paying jow, which is what we ask for. We'll also	25	rais projects. But we also want them to have a ho		
Kus	ar Court Reporters & Legal Services,	Inc	. 6 (21 - 24	)	

1

Pie	Public M	leet	ing No. 1 (M1) Public Hearing	
	Page 25	;	Page 26	
1	net increase of environmental impacts. That means a	1	don't stay in Long Beach. They will go on to	
2	no net increase of any air quality impacts, noise	-M1	Alameda Corridor and travel north. So we have	IJM-5
3	impacts, you know, traffic congestion impacts.	3,	Wilmington, Carson, all the way up to LA where there	Cont'd)
4	Those are priority considerations.	4	are noise and vibration impacts. So those have to	oone u,
5	To tell us in advance the significant	- M-1	be included as part of the indirect impact	
6	impacts you cannot mitigate is not acceptable. We	6	assessment.	
7	want to be able to look at what are all the	7	Also, the risk assessment we do know	
8	alternatives. Even if we're using the Harbor Tier	8	that different types of cargo comes in, and we'd	
9	2-plus, well, if we have to do a diesel train, then	9	like to have some idea what percentage is hazardous	
10	we want it to be a Tier 4 train. If there is an	10	materials cargo and what percentage is toxic	
11	alternative of natural gas that's lower emissions,	111	chemical cargo. Why? In case there is a	
12	then we want natural gas or a hybrid electric/	12	defailment. Derailments happen all the time, the	
13	natural gas. Our highest priority would be for a	13	recent on all the way up to the Watson [sic] line.	
14	zero emissions type train such as an electric train.	14	And there have been numerous derailments there, but	11JM-6
15	There was no electric train assessment done included	15	you don't see them talked about, but they do exist.	
16	as an alternative to the Harbor line.	16	We also want to make sure when you do a	
17	I can show you pictures of a Harbor line	17	risk assessment plan that it is inclusive that	
18	train with black smoke coming out of its smokestack,	M٩	includes this type of derailment and includes other	
19	and it wasn't going uphill or pulling anything. If	19	natural disasters such as earthquakes, tsunamis and	
20	I can photograph it going down the street, then	20	even like a helicopter that crashed in the Harbor.	
21	there's something wrong.	21	The helicopter can also crash on railroad tracks and	
22	Also, we want to make sure that according	22	also on top of a train as well.	
23	to CEQA you also look and assess all direct impacts	L 123	We also want to see the impact on local	
24	and all indirect. So although you show the whole	24	Musinesses. You said you're probably going to be	1JM-7
25	project being here in Long Beach, well, those trains	25	purchasing, so we want to make sure we see a local	
	Page 27		Page 28	
1	business impact assessment so that, you know, when	1	impacts on the South Gate and Harbor business	
		M1	IM-7	
2	you block or close a street, they don't lose their	. M1	JMETITIES.	
2	you block or close a street, they don't lose their business and have to relocate because of that.	. M1	John There are several points that our members	
2 3 4	you block or close a street, they don't lose their business and have to relocate because of that. So we want to make sure that you have an	. M1 (0 4	Jord There are several points that our members pointed out that they wanted to bring to tonight's	
2 3 4 5	you block or close a street, they don't lose their business and have to relocate because of that. So we want to make sure that you have an emergency preparedness plan or assessment, as well	. M1 (9 4 M1	pointed out that they wanted to bring to tonight's meeting. Number one, they support the transition to IM.8.	
2 3 4 5 6	you block or close a street, they don't lose their business and have to relocate because of that. So we want to make sure that you have an emergency preparedness plan or assessment, as well as a community and business evacuation plan and	. M1 (0 4 - M1	JMmZnities. cont'd) There are several points that our members pointed out that they wanted to bring to tonight's meeting. Number one, they support the transition to JMm38 efficient, more economically competitive and	
2 3 4 5 6 7	you block or close a street, they don't lose their business and have to relocate because of that. So we want to make sure that you have an emergency preparedness plan or assessment, as well as a community and business evacuation plan and health impact assessment to be completed. Thank	- M1 (9 4 - M1 7	JMmZnities. cont'd) There are several points that our members pointed out that they wanted to bring to tonight's meeting. Number one, they support the transition to JMmo8 efficient, more economically competitive and less polluting freight transport system as	
2 4 5 6 7 8	you block or close a street, they don't lose their business and have to relocate because of that. So we want to make sure that you have an emergency preparedness plan or assessment, as well as a community and business evacuation plan and health impact assessment to be completed. Thank you.	- M1 4 - M1 7 8	Joint out that they wanted to bring to tonight's pointed out that they wanted to bring to tonight's meeting. Number one, they support the transition to JAmose efficient, more economically competitive and less polluting freight transport system as envisioned in the 2016 California Sustainable	11.1
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	you block or close a street, they don't lose their business and have to relocate because of that. So we want to make sure that you have an emergency preparedness plan or assessment, as well as a community and business evacuation plan and health impact assessment to be completed. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. John Tafoya.	- M1 4 - M1 7 9	John There are several points that our members pointed out that they wanted to bring to tonight's meeting. Number one, they support the transition to JAM Be efficient, more economically competitive and less polluting freight transport system as envisioned in the 2016 California Sustainable Preight Action Plan; to promote a mode shift from	l1LJ
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10	<pre>you block or close a street, they don't lose their business and have to relocate because of that. So we want to make sure that you have an emergency preparedness plan or assessment, as well as a community and business evacuation plan and health impact assessment to be completed. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. John Tafoya. MR. TAFOYA: John Tafoya, carpenters union, Leach a strength of the strength of the strength So the strength of the strength of the strength of the strength So the strength of the</pre>	- M1 4 7 8 9 10	Johnson on the both oute and marker business jointed out that they wanted to bring to tonight's meeting. Number one, they support the transition to JMmoR efficient, more economically competitive and less polluting freight transport system as envisioned in the 2016 California Sustainable Preight Action Plan; to promote a mode shift from container ship by truck to near-dock or off-dock (Co	l1LJ nt'd)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<pre>you block or close a street, they don't lose their business and have to relocate because of that. So we want to make sure that you have an emergency preparedness plan or assessment, as well as a community and business evacuation plan and health impact assessment to be completed. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. John Tafoya. MR. TAFOYA: John Tafoya, carpenters union, Local 1506. On behalf of over 44,000 union</pre>	- M1 4 - M1 7 8 9 10 11	Jormmunities. cont'd) There are several points that our members pointed out that they wanted to bring to tonight's meeting. Number one, they support the transition to JMmSe efficient, more economically competitive and less polluting freight transport system as envisioned in the 2016 California Sustainable Preight Action Plan; to promote a mode shift from container ship by truck to near-dock or off-dock facilities to container ship by rail from the	l1LJ nt'd)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<pre>you block or close a street, they don't lose their business and have to relocate because of that. So we want to make sure that you have an emergency preparedness plan or assessment, as well as a community and business evacuation plan and health impact assessment to be completed. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. John Tafoya. MR. TAFOYA: John Tafoya, carpenters union, Local 1506. On behalf of over 44,000 union carpenters we support this project. We've heard all the merium chieve of this project.</pre>	- M1 4 7 8 10 11	Jormmunities. (cont'd) There are several points that our members pointed out that they wanted to bring to tonight's meeting. Number one, they support the transition to JMmSe efficient, more economically competitive and less polluting freight transport system as envisioned in the 2016 California Sustainable Preight Action Plan; to promote a mode shift from container ship by truck to near-dock or off-dock facilities to container ship by rail from the on-dock and supporting railyards.	l1LJ nt'd)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<pre>you block or close a street, they don't lose their business and have to relocate because of that. So we want to make sure that you have an emergency preparedness plan or assessment, as well as a community and business evacuation plan and health impact assessment to be completed. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. John Tafoya. MR. TAFOYA: John Tafoya, carpenters union, Local 1506. On behalf of over 44,000 union carpenters we support this project. We've heard all the positive things of this project going forward, form reactive completees the project of the project going forward, form reactive completees the project going forward. form reactive completees the project going forward, form reactive completees the project going forward. form reactive completees the project going forward.</pre>	M1 4 7 8 9 10 11 12	Jorden and the body of the form of the formation of the f	l1LJ int'd)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<pre>you block or close a street, they don't lose their business and have to relocate because of that. So we want to make sure that you have an emergency preparedness plan or assessment, as well as a community and business evacuation plan and health impact assessment to be completed. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. John Tafoya. MR. TAFOYA: John Tafoya, carpenters union, Local 1506. On behalf of over 44,000 union carpenters we support this project. We've heard all the positive things of this project going forward, from positive environmental impacts to job</pre>	M1 4 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Jormmunities. (ont'd) There are several points that our members pointed out that they wanted to bring to tonight's meeting. Number one, they support the transition to JMmode efficient, more economically competitive and less polluting freight transport system as envisioned in the 2016 California Sustainable Freight Action Plan; to promote a mode shift from container ship by truck to near-dock or off-dock facilities to container ship by rail from the on-dock and supporting railyards. Lastly, to provide additional Port rail capability to support and maximize on-dock	l1LJ int'd)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<pre>you block or close a street, they don't lose their business and have to relocate because of that. So we want to make sure that you have an emergency preparedness plan or assessment, as well as a community and business evacuation plan and health impact assessment to be completed. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. John Tafoya. MR. TAFOYA: John Tafoya, carpenters union, Local 1506. On behalf of over 44,000 union carpenters we support this project. We've heard all the positive things of this project going forward, from positive environmental impacts to job creations. So in a nutshell, we completely support bids project. Thenk we be</pre>	M1 4 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Jormmunities. (ont'd) There are several points that our members pointed out that they wanted to bring to tonight's meeting. Number one, they support the transition to JMmode efficient, more economically competitive and less polluting freight transport system as envisioned in the 2016 California Sustainable Preight Action Plan; to promote a mode shift from container ship by truck to near-dock or off-dock facilities to container ship by rail from the on-dock and supporting railyards. Lastly, to provide additional Port rail capability to support and maximize on-dock intermodal operations to a targeted goal of 30 to 35 parameter of capationers here to be with	l1LJ int'd)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<pre>you block or close a street, they don't lose their business and have to relocate because of that. So we want to make sure that you have an emergency preparedness plan or assessment, as well as a community and business evacuation plan and health impact assessment to be completed. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. John Tafoya. MR. TAFOYA: John Tafoya, carpenters union, Local 1506. On behalf of over 44,000 union carpenters we support this project. We've heard all the positive things of this project going forward, from positive environmental impacts to job creations. So in a nutshell, we completely support this project. Thank you. MN. TOMLEY. Thenk you. MN. TAFOYA: The positive the start of the positive the positive the start of the positive the start of the positive the start of the positive the p</pre>	M1 4 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Jormmunities. (ont'd) There are several points that our members pointed out that they wanted to bring to tonight's meeting. Number one, they support the transition to Meds efficient, more economically competitive and less polluting freight transport system as envisioned in the 2016 California Sustainable Preight Action Plan; to promote a mode shift from container ship by truck to near-dock or off-dock facilities to container ship by rail from the on-dock and supporting railyards. Lastly, to provide additional Port rail capability to support and maximize on-dock intermodal operations to a targeted goal of 30 to 35 percent of containers handled by on-dock rail. Our members fully compart this project and had been to be the second	l1LJ int'd)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<pre>you block or close a street, they don't lose their business and have to relocate because of that. So we want to make sure that you have an emergency preparedness plan or assessment, as well as a community and business evacuation plan and health impact assessment to be completed. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. John Tafoya. MR. TAFOYA: John Tafoya, carpenters union, Local 1506. On behalf of over 44,000 union carpenters we support this project. We've heard all the positive things of this project going forward, from positive environmental impacts to job creations. So in a nutshell, we completely support this project. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. Levi Javier, forlwards by Mariana haves and Airward Airward.</pre>	M12 4 4 7 8 9 10 11 11 13 14 15 16 17	Jormmunities. (M) There are several points that our members pointed out that they wanted to bring to tonight's meeting. Number one, they support the transition to M of the set of the several points that our members pointed out that they wanted to bring to tonight's meeting. Number one, they support the transition to M of the set of the several points that our members pointed out that they wanted to bring to tonight's meeting. Number one, they support the transition to M of the set of the several points that our members pointed out that they wanted to bring to tonight's meeting. Number one, they support and maximize on-dock intermodal operations to a targeted goal of 30 to 35 percent of containers handled by on-dock rail. Our members fully support this project and look forward to find doperations.	l1LJ nt'd)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<pre>you block or close a street, they don't lose their business and have to relocate because of that. So we want to make sure that you have an emergency preparedness plan or assessment, as well as a community and business evacuation plan and health impact assessment to be completed. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. John Tafoya. MR. TAFOYA: John Tafoya, carpenters union, Local 1506. On behalf of over 44,000 union carpenters we support this project. We've heard all the positive things of this project going forward, from positive environmental impacts to job creations. So in a nutshell, we completely support this project. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. Levi Javier, followed by Karissa Reyes and Ricardo Ariana. MS. TOMLEY. Healto the set is the support to the support health of the super is them? Support the support is the support of the support the support. Thank you. Levi Javier, followed by Karissa Reyes and Ricardo Ariana. Support the support is the support the support the support is the support is the support the support the support is the support is the support the support the support is the support is the support the support the support is the support is</pre>	M1 4 4 7 8 9 10 11 12 14 15 16 17 18	Johnson on the botch outer and marker business jointed out that they wanted to bring to tonight's meeting. Number one, they support the transition to JMmoR efficient, more economically competitive and less polluting freight transport system as envisioned in the 2016 California Sustainable Preight Action Plan; to promote a mode shift from container ship by truck to near-dock or off-dock facilities to container ship by rail from the on-dock and supporting railyards. Lastly, to provide additional Port rail capability to support and maximize on-dock intermodal operations to a targeted goal of 30 to 35 percent of containers handled by on-dock rail. Our members fully support this project and look forward to its final draft. Thank you.	l1LJ nt'd)
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<pre>you block or close a street, they don't lose their business and have to relocate because of that. So we want to make sure that you have an emergency preparedness plan or assessment, as well as a community and business evacuation plan and health impact assessment to be completed. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. John Tafoya. MR. TAFOYA: John Tafoya, carpenters union, Local 1506. On behalf of over 44,000 union carpenters we support this project. We've heard all the positive things of this project going forward, from positive environmental impacts to job creations. So in a nutshell, we completely support this project. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. Levi Javier, followed by Karissa Reyes and Ricardo Ariana. MR. JAVIER: Hello. My name is Levi Javier. </pre>	M 1 2 4 4 4 7 8 9 10 11 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Jormmunities. cont'd) There are several points that our members pointed out that they wanted to bring to tonight's meeting. Number one, they support the transition to JMmoR efficient, more economically competitive and less polluting freight transport system as envisioned in the 2016 California Sustainable Preight Action Plan; to promote a mode shift from container ship by truck to near-dock or off-dock facilities to container ship by rail from the on-dock and supporting railyards. Lastly, to provide additional Port rail capability to support and maximize on-dock intermodal operations to a targeted goal of 30 to 35 percent of containers handled by on-dock rail. Our members fully support this project and look forward to its final draft. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Next up is Karissa Reyes.	l1LJ nt'd)
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<pre>you block or close a street, they don't lose their business and have to relocate because of that. So we want to make sure that you have an emergency preparedness plan or assessment, as well as a community and business evacuation plan and health impact assessment to be completed. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. John Tafoya. MR. TAFOYA: John Tafoya, carpenters union, Local 1506. On behalf of over 44,000 union carpenters we support this project. We've heard all the positive things of this project going forward, from positive environmental impacts to job creations. So in a nutshell, we completely support this project. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. Levi Javier, followed by Karissa Reyes and Ricardo Ariana. MR. JAVIER: Hello. My name is Levi Javier. I am with the Harbor Association of Industry and Commerce. Bor the past 42 weres with WIC we heard to commerce.</pre>	A 12 4 4 7 8 9 10 11 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	Jormmunities. cont'd) There are several points that our members pointed out that they wanted to bring to tonight's meeting. Number one, they support the transition to Mode efficient, more economically competitive and less polluting freight transport system as envisioned in the 2016 California Sustainable Preight Action Plan; to promote a mode shift from container ship by truck to near-dock or off-dock facilities to container ship by rail from the on-dock and supporting railyards. Lastly, to provide additional Port rail capability to support and maximize on-dock intermodal operations to a targeted goal of 30 to 35 percent of containers handled by on-dock rail. Our members fully support this project and look forward to its final draft. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Next up is Karissa Reyes. I'm a recent for the updraft from the applications of the series of the trainers of	l1LJ nt'd)
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>you block or close a street, they don't lose their business and have to relocate because of that. So we want to make sure that you have an emergency preparedness plan or assessment, as well as a community and business evacuation plan and health impact assessment to be completed. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. John Tafoya. MR. TAFOYA: John Tafoya, carpenters union, Local 1506. On behalf of over 44,000 union carpenters we support this project. We've heard all the positive things of this project going forward, from positive environmental impacts to job creations. So in a nutshell, we completely support this project. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. Levi Javier, followed by Karissa Reyes and Ricardo Ariana. MR. JAVIER: Hello. My name is Levi Javier. I am with the Harbor Association of Industry and Commerce. For the past 42 years with HAIC we have hean the collective wrice an advance.</pre>	4 4 7 8 9 10 11 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Jormmunities. (ont'd) There are several points that our members pointed out that they wanted to bring to tonight's meeting. Number one, they support the transition to Mrote efficient, more economically competitive and less polluting freight transport system as envisioned in the 2016 California Sustainable Preight Action Plan; to promote a mode shift from container ship by truck to near-dock or off-dock facilities to container ship by rail from the on-dock and supporting railyards. Lastly, to provide additional Port rail capability to support and maximize on-dock intermodal operations to a targeted goal of 30 to 35 percent of containers handled by on-dock rail. Our members fully support this project and look forward to its final draft. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Next up is Karissa Reyes. I'm a recent graduate from the workforce development	l1LJ nt'd)
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>you block or close a street, they don't lose their business and have to relocate because of that. So we want to make sure that you have an emergency preparedness plan or assessment, as well as a community and business evacuation plan and health impact assessment to be completed. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. John Tafoya. MR. TAFOYA: John Tafoya, carpenters union, Local 1506. On behalf of over 44,000 union carpenters we support this project. We've heard all the positive things of this project going forward, from positive environmental impacts to job creations. So in a nutshell, we completely support this project. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. Levi Javier, followed by Karissa Reyes and Ricardo Ariana. MR. JAVIER: Hello. My name is Levi Javier. I am with the Harbor Association of Industry and Commerce. For the past 42 years with HAIC we have been the collective voice, an advocate, for the Harbor Ensiness Community. We are a propertion.</pre>	M 2 C 4 4 7 8 9 10 11 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Jormmunities. cont'd) There are several points that our members pointed out that they wanted to bring to tonight's meeting. Number one, they support the transition to Mode efficient, more economically competitive and less polluting freight transport system as envisioned in the 2016 California Sustainable Preight Action Plan; to promote a mode shift from container ship by truck to near-dock or off-dock facilities to container ship by rail from the on-dock and supporting railyards. Lastly, to provide additional Port rail capability to support and maximize on-dock intermodal operations to a targeted goal of 30 to 35 percent of containers handled by on-dock rail. Our members fully support this project and look forward to its final draft. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Next up is Karissa Reyes. I'm a recent graduate from the workforce development Engram at LECC, which work hand in hand with the	l1LJ int'd)
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<pre>you block or close a street, they don't lose their business and have to relocate because of that. So we want to make sure that you have an emergency preparedness plan or assessment, as well as a community and business evacuation plan and health impact assessment to be completed. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. John Tafoya. MR. TAFOYA: John Tafoya, carpenters union, Local 1506. On behalf of over 44,000 union carpenters we support this project. We've heard all the positive things of this project going forward, from positive environmental impacts to job creations. So in a nutshell, we completely support this project. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. Levi Javier, followed by Karissa Reyes and Ricardo Ariana. MR. JAVIER: Hello. My name is Levi Javier. I am with the Harbor Association of Industry and Commerce. For the past 42 years with HAIC we have been the collective voice, an advocate, for the Harbor Business Community. We are a nonprofit industrial and commencial incommendation.</pre>	M 2 G 4 4 7 8 9 10 11 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 1 18 19 20 21 18 19 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 10 11 12 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 10 11 12 12 16 17 18 19 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Jormmunities. (ont'd) There are several points that our members pointed out that they wanted to bring to tonight's meeting. Number one, they support the transition to Mode efficient, more economically competitive and less polluting freight transport system as envisioned in the 2016 California Sustainable Preight Action Plan; to promote a mode shift from container ship by truck to near-dock or off-dock facilities to container ship by rail from the on-dock and supporting railyards. Lastly, to provide additional Port rail capability to support and maximize on-dock intermodal operations to a targeted goal of 30 to 35 percent of containers handled by on-dock rail. Our members fully support this project and look forward to its final draft. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Next up is Karissa Reyes. I'm a recent graduate from the workforce development PLAS. That has opened this opportunity to start my	l1LJ int'd)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 24	<pre>you block or close a street, they don't lose their business and have to relocate because of that. So we want to make sure that you have an emergency preparedness plan or assessment, as well as a community and business evacuation plan and health impact assessment to be completed. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. John Tafoya. MR. TAFOYA: John Tafoya, carpenters union, Local 1506. On behalf of over 44,000 union carpenters we support this project. We've heard all the positive things of this project going forward, from positive environmental impacts to job creations. So in a nutshell, we completely support this project. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. Levi Javier, followed by Karissa Reyes and Ricardo Ariana. MR. JAVIER: Hello. My name is Levi Javier. I am with the Harbor Association of Industry and Commerce. For the past 42 years with HAIC we have been the collective voice, an advocate, for the Harbor Business Community. We are a nonprofit industrial and commercial trade association which serves as a main voice on trade and tranegoursetion.</pre>	M 1 ( 4 4 7 8 9 10 11 12 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Jormmunities. (M) There are several points that our members pointed out that they wanted to bring to tonight's meeting. Number one, they support the transition to MnS& efficient, more economically competitive and less polluting freight transport system as envisioned in the 2016 California Sustainable Freight Action Plan; to promote a mode shift from container ship by truck to near-dock or off-dock facilities to container ship by rail from the on-dock and supporting railyards. Lastly, to provide additional Port rail capability to support and maximize on-dock intermodal operations to a targeted goal of 30 to 35 percent of containers handled by on-dock rail. Our members fully support this project and look forward to its final draft. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Next up is Karissa Reyes. MS. REYES: My name is Karissa Reyes. I'm a recent graduate from the workforce development PLAS. That has opened this opportunity to start my career as an ironworker, Local 433. And I would lowe to start by building our cirv of Long Reach	l1LJ int'd)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	<pre>you block or close a street, they don't lose their business and have to relocate because of that. So we want to make sure that you have an emergency preparedness plan or assessment, as well as a community and business evacuation plan and health impact assessment to be completed. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. John Tafoya. MR. TAFOYA: John Tafoya, carpenters union, Local 1506. On behalf of over 44,000 union carpenters we support this project. We've heard all the positive things of this project going forward, from positive environmental impacts to job creations. So in a nutshell, we completely support this project. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. Levi Javier, followed by Karissa Reyes and Ricardo Ariana. MR. JAVIER: Hello. My name is Levi Javier. I am with the Harbor Association of Industry and Commerce. For the past 42 years with HAIC we have been the collective voice, an advocate, for the Harbor Business Community. We are a nonprofit industrial and commercial trade association which serves as a main voice on trade and transportation</pre>	M 4 4 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 1 12 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 18 19 20 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21	<pre>Jormminities. cont'd) There are several points that our members pointed out that they wanted to bring to tonight's meeting. Number one, they support the transition to Mass efficient, more economically competitive and less polluting freight transport system as envisioned in the 2016 California Sustainable Preight Action Plan; to promote a mode shift from container ship by truck to near-dock or off-dock facilities to container ship by rail from the on-dock and supporting railyards. Lastly, to provide additional Port rail capability to support and maximize on-dock intermodal operations to a targeted goal of 30 to 35 percent of containers handled by on-dock rail. Our members fully support this project and look forward to its final draft. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Next up is Karissa Reyes. I'm a recent graduate from the workforce development PLAS. That has opened this opportunity to start my career as an ironworker, Local 433. And I would love to start by building our city of Long Beach,</pre>	l1LJ int'd)

### Chapter 11 Responses to Comments

## Port of Long Beach

Pie	T B EIR Public M	eef	ing No. 1 (M1) Public Hearing	
	Page 29		Page 30	
1	making our ports more efficient as well as more	N/11	both environmental impacts done on a positive note,	
2	environmentally friendly, which I'm in all favor	2	but it also has efficiency impacts both for the	
3	for.		trucking community as well as the rail community.	
4	MS. TOMLEY: Ricardo Ariana.	4	We're expecting to see continued growth in the	
5	MR. ARIANA: Hi. My name is Ricardo Ariana.	5	container volumes that go through the ports and the	
6	I'm a recent graduate of a construction	6	San Pedro Bay. And efficient movement of that cargo	
7	apprenticeship program at Long Beach City College.	7	having 30 percent of it go to the inland part of the	434/1
8	Improvements, expansion and industrial construction	rên	country via rail does nothing but benefit our	
9	requires a scale of workforce. One way to get this	9	position competitively over the decades to come.	ont a)
10	scale of workforce for the proposed project is	10	Currently our biggest competitor in that	
11	supporting our construction career apprenticeship at	11	market is Port of Prince Rupert in Canada, and they	
12	Long Beach City College. I hope to get the	12	have a very efficient rail system to Chicago; and we	
13	opportunity to work at one of these projects. Thank	13	need to be able to compete with them to continue	
14	you for your time, and have a good evening.	14	that. So for many different reasons the Harbor	
15	MS. TOMLEY: Next up is Weston LaBar,	15	Association of Industry and Commerce fully supports	
16	followed by David Pettit and John Taeleifi.	16	this project. Thank you.	
17	MR. LaBAR: Thank you. Good evening. I'm	17	MR. PETTIT: Good evening. My name is David	
18	Wes LaBar. I'm here tonight as the executive	18	Pettit from the Natural Resources Defense Council.	
19	director of the Harbor Association of Industry and	19	We think in general this is a great project. More	
20	Commerce. As you all heard, we support this project	20	on-dock rail is better, and I'd like to see this in	
21	very much so. I do a lot of work in supply chain	- 21	operation. Although I do think that in dealing with $ M$	11DP-'
22	optimization and efficiency of cargo movement here	22	the draft EIR, that the comments my friend, Jesse	
23	in the ports.	23	Marquez, made a few moments ago need to be taken	
24	And one of the major things is reducing	24	seriously. And we'll send in a more detailed letter	
25	truck congestion within the terminals. That has	25	that will incorporate some of the things Jesse said	
	Page 31		Page 32	
1	and other facts about sensitive receptors in the	1	happy to follow up with you and provide some	
2	area that I think need to be looked at carefully.	2	clarification.	
3	I do have two questions based on my	3	Next is John Taeleifi, and I apologize for	
4	reading of the draft BIR, and maybe we can talk	4	completely butchering your last name	
5	later if you don't want to get into it tonight. One	5	T-A-E-L-E-I-F-I.	
6	is, I'm curious about what assumptions, if any, have	6	MR. TABLEIFI: Coming down the aisle.	
7	been made in terms of the traffic counts and air	7	MS. TOMLEY: Next up will be Emily Quest.	
8	pollution analysis what assumptions have been	8	ONT O, MR. TAELEIFI: Thank you for the	
9	made about the SCIG project? Will it be	9	opportunity. My name is John Taeleifi, and I'm a	
10	operational? Will it not be? Is there some year	10	resident here in west Long Beach, a long-time	
11	you think it will be in operation? Because if SCIG	11	advocate of benefits to Long Beach and the Harbor	
12	doesn't exist, that's going to have an effect on	12	area. I want to share that for years now we've been	
13	traffic.	13	advocating and promoting on-dock rail. And finally,	
14	And secondly I should know this, but	14	it's come.	
15	don't whether this project will accept containers	15	So from my position I am wholly in support	
16	that originate in the Port of LA. In other words,	16	of moving forward with this provided, of course,	
17	can those containers be schlepped over to Long Beach	17	there's some concerns that we have to kind of edge	11JT2
18	and put on rail at this project, the Pier B project.	18	out, some of these things as what Jesse may have	
19	That, again, I think makes a difference in terms of	19	brought to the table. But I think the possibility	
20	sort of the overall flow of traffic and air	20	of having this project go forward would provide	
21	pollution in the area.	21	tremendous for-industry benefit; and certainly	
22	So if we could discuss those at some time,	22	because of its proximity to west Long Beach, I'm	
23	that will be good. Thank you. But in general we	23	going to be yelling for benefits coming to west Long	
24	support this project.	24	Beach.	
25	MS. TOMLEY: Thank you, David. We'll be	25	So I look forward to seeing some really	
Kus	ar Court Reporters & Legal Services,	Inc	. 8 (29 - 32)	

	er B EIR Public	we	eting NO. 1 (NI1) Public Hearin	g
	Page 33	M	1JT Page 34	MADO
1	solid progress moving forward, and see you all again		efficient. And of course, in terms of air quality	MIRC
2	at the next session. Thank you.	2	we're severely concerned about that.	(Cont'
3	MS. TOMLEY: Emily Quest, followed by Revi	3	I did want to speak to what John Taeleifi	
4	Castro, R-E-V-I it looks like.	4	was saying in regards to community benefits. I was	
5	MR. CASTRO: That's okay. I have terrible	5	pleased to see that community grants are going to be	
6	writing. Thank you so much. My name is Revi	6	part of the project. I'd love to see	
7	Castro. I'm a director at Century Villages at	7	transformational projects used for the community	
8	Cabrillo, and pleased to be here tonight for the	8	grant. You know, we don't have a bank or a grocery	
9	hearing.	9	store. There's not healthy food at all where we	
0	I just wanted to speak to the fact that	10	are. It's a real desert in many ways. Also, the	
.1	the Century Village is, of course, a sensitive	11	Pacific Coast Highway in Anaheim, of course, is not	
2	receptor. We have 500 veterans on our site and 1100	12	accessible by bike, are not walkable. And our	
.3	children and families. Of course, we're close to	13	residents are really isolated there on the west	
.4	Cabrillo High School as well as Hudson Elementary,	14	side.	-M1RC
5	about a quarter of a mile from the on-dock rail	_ 1/1-1	RC-1 of course, it's former Naval housing. And	
6	support facilities. So we appreciate the	16	as a permanent support of housing provider, we take	
7	opportunity to weigh in on the EIR. We haven't had	17	what land we can get. We're very pleased to have	
8	a chance as a team to look at it in any detail.	18	it. In fact, we're building another 120 units for	
9	Keep in mind that we have a lot of	19	veterans with mental illness as well as more	
:0	children and families that are very close to this	20	families. So it's just making sure that we're	
1	heavy industrial area. And of course, we're opposed	21	sensitive that there are very poor people that are	
2	to this gig for a variety of reasons; but we're in	22	formerly homeless that are living there. So I'm all	
3	support of on-dock rail along with our environmental	23	for jobs and carpenters and steelworkers and things	
4	advocates like Jesse Marguez and our communities for	24	like that, but being sensitive to the community.	
:5	environmental justice and others because it is	25	I definitely got the card for the	
1	Page 35		Page 36	
1	president of the Pacific Harbor line because I		girls, our football team I'd like to see every	r I
2	understand he employs veterans, and I wanted to talk	- 141	single one of those kids that we know has asthma and	
3	to him. So thank you so much again for the	3	Cont'd) at Cabrillo High School, that we have the	
- 1				
4	opportunity.	4	funding somehow for an inhaler. We just went to the	
4	opportunity. MS. TOMLEY: IS Emily Quest here? Then	4	funding somehow for an inhaler. We just went to the pharmacy on Long Beach Boulevard and Willow, and	
4 5 6	opportunity. MS. TOMLEY: Is Emily Quest here? Then Tommy Paavae and Lee Wilson.	4 5 6	funding somehow for an inhaler. We just went to the pharmacy on Long Beach Boulevard and Willow, and they said \$200 for the rescue inhalers. I said,	
4 5 6 7	opportunity. MS. TOMLEY: Is Emily Quest here? Then Tommy Paavae and Lee Wilson. MS. QUEST: I'm sorry. I got a little	4 5 6 7	funding somehow for an inhaler. We just went to the pharmacy on Long Beach Boulevard and Willow, and they said \$200 for the rescue inhalers. I said, "Why is this so much money?" And they said, "The	
4 5 6 7 8	opportunity. MS. TOMLEY: Is Emily Quest here? Then Tommy Faavae and Lee Wilson. MS. QUEST: I'm sorry. I got a little intimidated by everybody with jobs here. It's	4 5 6 7 8	funding somehow for an inhaler. We just went to the pharmacy on Long Beach Boulevard and Willow, and they said \$200 for the rescue inhalers. I said, "Why is this so much money?" And they said, "The price fluctuates, and maybe it's closer to the	
4 5 7 8 9	opportunity. MS. TOMLEY: Is Emily Quest here? Then Tommy Paavae and Lee Wilson. MS. QUEST: I'm sorry. I got a little intimidated by everybody with jobs here. It's wonderful. I'm a mom. I live right over here on	4 5 6 7 8 9	funding somehow for an inhaler. We just went to the pharmacy on Long Beach Boulevard and Willow, and they said \$200 for the rescue inhalers. I said, "Why is this so much money?" And they said, "The price fluctuates, and maybe it's closer to the beginning of the year." And I'm thinking this is	M1FC
4 5 7 8 9	opportunity. MS. TOMLEY: Is Emily Quest here? Then Tommy Faavae and Lee Wilson. MS. QUEST: I'm sorry. I got a little intimidated by everybody with jobs here. It's wonderful. I'm a mom. I live right over here on Gale. And my dad was a construction worker in Long	4 5 7 8 9 10	funding somehow for an inhaler. We just went to the pharmacy on Long Beach Boulevard and Willow, and they said \$200 for the rescue inhalers. I said, "Why is this so much money?" And they said, "The price fluctuates, and maybe it's closer to the beginning of the year." And I'm thinking this is just baloney.	_M1EG
4 5 7 8 9 .0	opportunity. MS. TOMLEY: Is Emily Quest here? Then Tommy Faavae and Lee Wilson. MS. QUEST: I'm sorry. I got a little intimidated by everybody with jobs here. It's wonderful. I'm a mom. I live right over here on Gale. And my dad was a construction worker in Long Beach for my whole life, and that's the only time	4 5 7 8 9 10 11	funding somehow for an inhaler. We just went to the pharmacy on Long Beach Boulevard and Willow, and they said \$200 for the rescue inhalers. I said, "Why is this so much money?" And they said, "The price fluctuates, and maybe it's closer to the beginning of the year." And I'm thinking this is just baloney. The poor have just so much money, and I	_M1EG (Cont'd
4 5 7 8 9 0 1 2	opportunity. MS. TOMLEY: Is Emily Quest here? Then Tommy Faavae and Lee Wilson. MS. QUEST: I'm sorry. I got a little intimidated by everybody with jobs here. It's wonderful. I'm a mom. I live right over here on Gale. And my dad was a construction worker in Long Beach for my whole life, and that's the only time with the union that we did have good health	4 5 7 8 9 10 11	funding somehow for an inhaler. We just went to the pharmacy on Long Beach Boulevard and Willow, and they said \$200 for the rescue inhalers. I said, "Why is this so much money?" And they said, "The price fluctuates, and maybe it's closer to the beginning of the year." And I'm thinking this is just baloney. The poor have just so much money, and I just wanted to put that in. Sometimes, you know, we	_M1EG (Cont'd
4 5 6 7 8 9 .0 .1 .2 .3	opportunity. MS. TOMLEY: Is Emily Quest here? Then Tommy Faavae and Lee Wilson. MS. QUEST: I'm sorry. I got a little intimidated by everybody with jobs here. It's wonderful. I'm a mom. I live right over here on Gale. And my dad was a construction worker in Long Beach for my whole life, and that's the only time with the union that we did have good health insurance. So I hear what everybody here is saying.	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	funding somehow for an inhaler. We just went to the pharmacy on Long Beach Boulevard and Willow, and they said \$200 for the rescue inhalers. I said, "Why is this so much money?" And they said, "The price fluctuates, and maybe it's closer to the beginning of the year." And I'm thinking this is just baloney. The poor have just so much money, and I just wanted to put that in. Sometimes, you know, we all have to live with this. And also, when military	_M1EG (Cont'd
4 5 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4	opportunity. MS. TOMLEY: Is Emily Quest here? Then Tommy Faavae and Lee Wilson. MS. QUEST: I'm sorry. I got a little intimidated by everybody with jobs here. It's wonderful. I'm a mom. I live right over here on Gale. And my dad was a construction worker in Long Beach for my whole life, and that's the only time with the union that we did have good health insurance. So I hear what everybody here is saying. I also would like to make kind of a point	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	funding somehow for an inhaler. We just went to the pharmacy on Long Beach Boulevard and Willow, and they said \$200 for the rescue inhalers. I said, "Why is this so much money?" And they said, "The price fluctuates, and maybe it's closer to the beginning of the year." And I'm thinking this is just baloney. The poor have just so much money, and I just wanted to put that in. Sometimes, you know, we all have to live with this. And also, when military personnel comes to recruit our sons, they ask them,	_M1EG (Cont'd
4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5	opportunity. MS. TOMLEY: Is Emily Quest here? Then Tommy Paavae and Lee Wilson. MS. QUEST: I'm sorry. I got a little intimidated by everybody with jobs here. It's wonderful. I'm a mom. I live right over here on Gale. And my dad was a construction worker in Long Beach for my whole life, and that's the only time with the union that we did have good health insurance. So I hear what everybody here is saying. I also would like to make kind of a point of view that only a mom would say; and that is, at	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	funding somehow for an inhaler. We just went to the pharmacy on Long Beach Boulevard and Willow, and they said \$200 for the rescue inhalers. I said, "Why is this so much money?" And they said, "The price fluctuates, and maybe it's closer to the beginning of the year." And I'm thinking this is just baloney. The poor have just so much money, and I just wanted to put that in. Sometimes, you know, we all have to live with this. And also, when military personnel comes to recruit our sons, they ask them, "Do you have asthma?" And my other son is in the	_M1EC (Cont'd
4 5 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6	opportunity. MS. TOMLEY: Is Emily Quest here? Then Tommy Faavae and Lee Wilson. MS. QUEST: I'm sorry. I got a little intimidated by everybody with jobs here. It's wonderful. I'm a mom. I live right over here on Gale. And my dad was a construction worker in Long Beach for my whole life, and that's the only time with the union that we did have good health insurance. So I hear what everybody here is saying. I also would like to make kind of a point of view that only a mom would say; and that is, at Cabrillo High School our kids have a lot of asthma.	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	funding somehow for an inhaler. We just went to the pharmacy on Long Beach Boulevard and Willow, and they said \$200 for the rescue inhalers. I said, "Why is this so much money?" And they said, "The price fluctuates, and maybe it's closer to the beginning of the year." And I'm thinking this is just baloney. The poor have just so much money, and I just wanted to put that in. Sometimes, you know, we all have to live with this. And also, when military personnel comes to recruit our sons, they ask them, "Do you have asthma?" And my other son is in the service, and I would hate to think that any of the	_M1EG (Cont'd
4 5 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	opportunity. MS. TOMLEY: Is Emily Quest here? Then Tommy Faavae and Lee Wilson. MS. QUEST: I'm sorry. I got a little intimidated by everybody with jobs here. It's wonderful. I'm a mom. I live right over here on Gale. And my dad was a construction worker in Long Beach for my whole life, and that's the only time with the union that we did have good health insurance. So I hear what everybody here is saying. I also would like to make kind of a point of view that only a mom would say; and that is, at Cabrillo High School our kids have a lot of asthma. And as a mom, not all of our kids are bringing their	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	funding somehow for an inhaler. We just went to the pharmacy on Long Beach Boulevard and Willow, and they said \$200 for the rescue inhalers. I said, "Why is this so much money?" And they said, "The price fluctuates, and maybe it's closer to the beginning of the year." And I'm thinking this is just baloney. The poor have just so much money, and I just wanted to put that in. Sometimes, you know, we all have to live with this. And also, when military personnel comes to recruit our sons, they ask them, "Do you have asthma?" And my other son is in the service, and I would hate to think that any of the	_M1EG (Cont'd
4 5 6 7 8 9 .0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8	opportunity. MS. TOMLEY: Is Emily Quest here? Then Tommy Faavae and Lee Wilson. MS. QUEST: I'm sorry. I got a little intimidated by everybody with jobs here. It's wonderful. I'm a mom. I live right over here on Gale. And my dad was a construction worker in Long Beach for my whole life, and that's the only time with the union that we did have good health insurance. So I hear what everybody here is saying. I also would like to make kind of a point of view that only a mom would say; and that is, at Cabrillo High School our kids have a lot of asthma. And as a mom, not all of our kids are bringing their inhalers. So sometimes I'll say, "Hey, I know you.	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 16 18	funding somehow for an inhaler. We just went to the pharmacy on Long Beach Boulevard and Willow, and they said \$200 for the rescue inhalers. I said, "Why is this so much money?" And they said, "The price fluctuates, and maybe it's closer to the beginning of the year." And I'm thinking this is just baloney. The poor have just so much money, and I just wanted to put that in. Sometimes, you know, we all have to live with this. And also, when military personnel comes to recruit our sons, they ask them, "Do you have asthma?" And my other son is in the service, and I would hate to think that any of the EQCacts we do here would make our sons and daughters not be able to sign up for the United	_M1EG (Cont'd
4 5 6 7 8 9 .0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9	opportunity. MS. TOMLEY: Is Emily Quest here? Then Tommy Faavae and Lee Wilson. MS. QUEST: I'm sorry. I got a little intimidated by everybody with jobs here. It's wonderful. I'm a mom. I live right over here on Gale. And my dad was a construction worker in Long Beach for my whole life, and that's the only time with the union that we did have good health insurance. So I hear what everybody here is saying. I also would like to make kind of a point of view that only a mom would say; and that is, at Cabrillo High School our kids have a lot of asthma. And as a mom, not all of our kids are bringing their inhalers. So sometimes I'll say, "Hey, I know you. You have asthma. Who here has their inhalers?" And	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 ► M 18 19	funding somehow for an inhaler. We just went to the pharmacy on Long Beach Boulevard and Willow, and they said §200 for the rescue inhalers. I said, "Why is this so much money?" And they said, "The price fluctuates, and maybe it's closer to the beginning of the year." And I'm thinking this is just baloney. The poor have just so much money, and I just wanted to put that in. Sometimes, you know, we all have to live with this. And also, when military personnel comes to recruit our sons, they ask them, "Do you have asthma?" And my other son is in the service, and I would hate to think that any of the EQacts we do here would make our sons and daughters not be able to sign up for the United States military. Thank you.	_M1EG (Cont'd
4 5 7 8 9 .0 .1 2 .3 4 5 6 .7 .8 9 .0 .1 2 .3 4 .5 .6 .7 8 .9 .0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 .0 .1 .2 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 .0 .1 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 .0 .1 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5	opportunity. MS. TOMLEY: Is Emily Quest here? Then Tommy Faavae and Lee Wilson. MS. QUEST: I'm sorry. I got a little intimidated by everybody with jobs here. It's wonderful. I'm a mom. I live right over here on Gale. And my dad was a construction worker in Long Beach for my whole life, and that's the only time with the union that we did have good health insurance. So I hear what everybody here is saying. I also would like to make kind of a point of view that only a mom would say; and that is, at Cabrillo High School our kids have a lot of asthma. And as a mom, not all of our kids are bringing their inhalers. So sometimes I'll say, "Hey, I know you. You have asthma. Who here has their inhalers?" And it's hard enough for me to get my own kid to put it	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 16 16 18 18 19 20	funding somehow for an inhaler. We just want to the pharmacy on Long Beach Boulevard and Willow, and they said \$200 for the rescue inhalers. I said, "Why is this so much money?" And they said, "The price fluctuates, and maybe it's closer to the beginning of the year." And I'm thinking this is just baloney. The poor have just so much money, and I just wanted to put that in. Sometimes, you know, we all have to live with this. And also, when military personnel comes to recruit our sons, they ask them, "Do you have asthma?" And my other son is in the service, and I would hate to think that any of the EQacts we do here would make our sons and daughters not be able to sign up for the United States military. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Tommy Faavae, followed by Lee	_M1EG (Cont'd
4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 2 5 7 8 9 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	<pre>opportunity. MS. TOMLEY: Is Emily Quest here? Then Tommy Faavae and Lee Wilson. MS. QUEST: I'm sorry. I got a little intimidated by everybody with jobs here. It's wonderful. I'm a mom. I live right over here on Gale. And my dad was a construction worker in Long Beach for my whole life, and that's the only time with the union that we did have good health insurance. So I hear what everybody here is saying. I also would like to make kind of a point of view that only a mom would say; and that is, at Cabrillo High School our kids have a lot of asthma. And as a mom, not all of our kids are bringing their inhalers. So sometimes I'll say, "Hey, I know you. You have asthma. Who here has their inhalers?" And it's hard enough for me to get my own kid to put it in his backpack.</pre>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 16 18 18 19 20 21	funding somehow for an inhaler. We just want to the pharmacy on Long Beach Boulevard and Willow, and they said \$200 for the rescue inhalers. I said, "Why is this so much money?" And they said, "The price fluctuates, and maybe it's closer to the beginning of the year." And I'm thinking this is just baloney. The poor have just so much money, and I just wanted to put that in. Sometimes, you know, we all have to live with this. And also, when military personnel comes to recruit our sons, they ask them, "Do you have asthma?" And my other son is in the service, and I would hate to think that any of the EQects we do here would make our sons and daughters not be able to sign up for the United States military. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Tommy Faavae, followed by Lee Wilson.	_M1EG (Cont'd
4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 .5 6 .7 .8 9 0 1 2 .3 4 .5 .6 7 .8 9 .0 1 2 .3 4 .5 .6 7 8 9 .0 1.2 .5 .6 .7 8 .9 .0 .1 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5	<pre>opportunity. MS. TOMLEY: Is Emily Quest here? Then Tommy Faavae and Lee Wilson. MS. QUEST: I'm sorry. I got a little intimidated by everybody with jobs here. It's wonderful. I'm a mom. I live right over here on Gale. And my dad was a construction worker in Long Beach for my whole life, and that's the only time with the union that we did have good health insurance. So I hear what everybody here is saying. I also would like to make kind of a point of view that only a mom would say; and that is, at Cabrillo High School our kids have a lot of asthma. And as a mom, not all of our kids are bringing their inhalers. So sometimes I'll say, "Hey, I know you. You have asthma. Who here has their inhalers?" And it's hard enough for me to get my own kid to put it in his backpack. Sometimes I see plans for these kinds of</pre>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 16 18 19 20 21 22	funding somehow for an inhaler. We just went to the pharmacy on Long Beach Boulevard and Willow, and they said \$200 for the rescue inhalers. I said, "Why is this so much money?" And they said, "The price fluctuates, and maybe it's closer to the beginning of the year." And I'm thinking this is just baloney. The poor have just so much money, and I just wanted to put that in. Sometimes, you know, we all have to live with this. And also, when military personnel comes to recruit our sons, they ask them, "Do you have asthma?" And my other son is in the service, and I would hate to think that any of the ECOnects we do here would make our sons and daughters not be able to sign up for the United States military. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Tommy Faavae, followed by Lee Wilson. MR. FAAVAE: Good evening. My name is Tommy	_ M1EG (Cont'd
4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 2 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 2 3	<pre>opportunity. MS. TOMLEY: Is Emily Quest here? Then Tommy Faavae and Lee Wilson. MS. QUEST: I'm sorry. I got a little intimidated by everybody with jobs here. It's wonderful. I'm a mom. I live right over here on Gale. And my dad was a construction worker in Long Beach for my whole life, and that's the only time with the union that we did have good health insurance. So I hear what everybody here is saying. I also would like to make kind of a point of view that only a mom would say; and that is, at Cabrillo High School our kids have a lot of asthma. And as a mom, not all of our kids are bringing their inhalers. So sometimes I'll say, "Hey, I know you. You have asthma. Who here has their inhalers?" And it's hard enough for me to get my own kid to put it in his backpack. Sometimes I see plans for these kinds of projects where people are doing different things for</pre>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 16 18 19 20 21 22 23	funding somehow for an inhaler. We just went to the pharmacy on Long Beach Boulevard and Willow, and they said \$200 for the rescue inhalers. I said, "Why is this so much money?" And they said, "The price fluctuates, and maybe it's closer to the beginning of the year." And I'm thinking this is just baloney. The poor have just so much money, and I just wanted to put that in. Sometimes, you know, we all have to live with this. And also, when military personnel comes to recruit our sons, they ask them, "Do you have asthma?" And my other son is in the service, and I would hate to think that any of the ECONCTS we do here would make our sons and daughters not be able to sign up for the United States military. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Tommy Faavae, followed by Lee Wilson. MR. FAAVAE: Good evening. My name is Tommy Faavae. I represent IBEW, electrical workers, Local	M1EG (Cont'd
4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 5 1 2 3 5 1 2 3 1 2 3 5 1 2 3 5 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 2 3	<pre>opportunity. MS. TOMLEY: Is Emily Quest here? Then Tommy Faavae and Lee Wilson. MS. QUEST: I'm sorry. I got a little intimidated by everybody with jobs here. It's wonderful. I'm a mom. I live right over here on Gale. And my dad was a construction worker in Long Beach for my whole life, and that's the only time with the union that we did have good health insurance. So I hear what everybody here is saying. I also would like to make kind of a point of view that only a mom would say; and that is, at Cabrillo High School our kids have a lot of asthma. And as a mom, not all of our kids are bringing their inhalers. So sometimes I'll say, "Hey, I know you. You have asthma. Who here has their inhalers?" And it's hard enough for me to get my own kid to put it in his backpack. Sometimes I see plans for these kinds of projects where people are doing different things for our community. And I'd just like to point out that</pre>	4 5 6 7 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 18 18 19 20 21 22 21 22 23 24	funding somehow for an inhaler. We just went to the pharmacy on Long Beach Boulevard and Willow, and they said \$200 for the rescue inhalers. I said, "Why is this so much money?" And they said, "The price fluctuates, and maybe it's closer to the beginning of the year." And I'm thinking this is just baloney. The poor have just so much money, and I just wanted to put that in. Sometimes, you know, we all have to live with this. And also, when military personnel comes to recruit our sons, they ask them, "Do you have asthma?" And my other son is in the service, and I would hate to think that any of the EQects we do here would make our sons and daughters not be able to sign up for the United States military. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Tommy Faavae, followed by Lee Wilson. MR. FAAVAE: Good evening. My name is Tommy Faavae. I represent IBEW, electrical workers, Local 11, affiliated with the building trades in LA and	_M1EG (Cont'd
4 5 6 7 8 9 .0 .1 2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 .0 1 2 3 4 .5	opportunity. MS. TOMLEY: Is Emily Quest here? Then Tommy Faavae and Lee Wilson. MS. QUEST: I'm sorry. I got a little intimidated by everybody with jobs here. It's wonderful. I'm a mom. I live right over here on Gale. And my dad was a construction worker in Long Beach for my whole life, and that's the only time with the union that we did have good health insurance. So I hear what everybody here is saying. I also would like to make kind of a point of view that only a mom would say; and that is, at Cabrillo High School our kids have a lot of asthma. And as a mom, not all of our kids are bringing their inhalers. So sometimes I'll say, "Hey, I know you. You have asthma. Who here has their inhalers?" And it's hard enough for me to get my own kid to put it in his backpack. Sometimes I see plans for these kinds of projects where people are doing different things for our community. And I'd just like to point out that our baseball team, our water polo team. boys and	4 5 6 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 18 18 19 20 21 22 21 22 23 24 23	funding somehow for an inhaler. We just went to the pharmacy on Long Beach Boulevard and Willow, and they said \$200 for the rescue inhalers. I said, "Why is this so much money?" And they said, "The price fluctuates, and maybe it's closer to the beginning of the year." And I'm thinking this is just baloney. The poor have just so much money, and I just wanted to put that in. Sometimes, you know, we all have to live with this. And also, when military personnel comes to recruit our sons, they ask them, "Do you have asthma?" And my other son is in the service, and I would hate to think that any of the EQuets we do here would make our sons and daughters not be able to sign up for the United States military. Thank you. MS. TOMLEY: Tommy Faavae, followed by Lee Wilson. MR. FAAVAE: Good evening. My name is Tommy Faavae. I represent IBEW, electrical workers, Local 11, affiliated with the building trades in LA and orange County. I wholeheartedly support the EIR	_ M1EG (Cont'd

1

oi e	Public Meeting No. 1 (M1) Public Meeting					
10	Dage 37		Page 38			
	Faye 5/	8	Faye So			
-	a long time here in Long Reach in both ports. It's	1	his family. What's the timing? So although this			
4	good to see both the El community local residents	2	might be a fantastic project it does negatively			
3	and the building trades come up and speak on moving	3	impact people and other than just detting			
4	this forward I think this is going to create	-M¹	TE something in the mail or an e-mail we haven't heard			
5	it's just going to be a multiplier in jobs. I'll	(Cor	<b>11</b> ² <b>(d)</b>			
0	keen it at that I'll and my comments with we	0	when will the Commission annrove this? What are the	(Cont'd)		
<i>_</i>	wholeheartedly support this Thank you		steps? When will the tenants be contacted about			
8	MR WILSON. My name is Lee Wilson I	8	relocation? When will property owners be contacted			
9	hannen to own one of the nieces of property that	9	about a formed numbers? Those dates are very very			
10	will have to be acquired. I've had multiple	10	important to our people			
11	meetings met with you and met with Noel This has	11	So I would encourage staff to answer those			
12	been handing over property owners and business	12	very mickly and reach out I'd like to have some			
13	owners now for over seven years since the plan was	13	more information before we face each other again on			
14	first nublished in 2009. That's a long time	14	the 19th Thank you			
15	Rut I would encourage staff to start	15	MS TOMLEY. Thank you very much I don't			
10	immediately opening a dialogue with the stake	10	have any other speaker cards, so what I'd like to do			
1/	holders that are going to be negatively affected by	- 1/	WILLW			
18	losing their businesses and/or property or both	18	comment who has not filled out a speaker card to			
19	I've read almost the complete draft RIR. It talks	19	please come forward if you'd like to make a comment.			
20	about 33 pieces of private property the 36 that	20	MR PONZI · Good evening My name is			
22	will be acquired. None of those are very high. So	21	Mitchell Ponce. I represent the ironworkers of			
24	I would encourage you to contact everybody who's	22	Local 433 here in Los Angeles and throughout the	M1MP		
23	going to be affected.	23	ports here. We are in favor of this project. As	10/10/10/		
59	I have a 25-year tenant in my building	24	you heard from some of our members here, it puts a			
60	Page 20	20	Page 40			
	lot of people to work in the community and weire	M1[	MP	M4 A1		
1	hoping that this BIR goes through Thank you	(Cor	t;d) Thank you			
2	MR JORL THURACHER [sic] . Good evening	4	MR ALCAREZ (sic): Hello my name is Juan	Contra)		
3	I'm Joel Thuracher I'm a business representative	3	Alcarez I'm a Long Beach resident and graduate			
4	for the operating engineers local 12. We cover all	4	also of the Star program. Right now I'm currently			
2	of southern California and southern Nevada. I	5	working for the Port of Long Beach. I know it's	11JA		
0	represent the numbers that live and work in the	_M1	fantastic for this project to pass. It would be a			
	surrounding area of the Harbor, and we too are in	0	wonderful project for the whole environment and			
0	support of this project	0	community Thank you			
9	MR INTA [sic]. Good evening My name is	10	MS_TOMLEY: Thank you very much. If there			
11	Bric lata, for the carbenters union. And we're all	11	are no further comments, we will now close the			
12	for this project. I'm a union man a family man	1.0	nublic hearing. I'd like to thank everybody for			
12	And we have the technology and the manbower to get	-M1	Coming out tonight and making comments. We really			
14	it done safely and on time. Thank you, and have a	14	appreciate your input and participation in the			
15	good one.	15	process. As a reminder, if you'd like to submit			
16	MS. TOMLEY: I'm giving it a few seconds to	16	written comments, please send them to the address			
17	see if anybody else want to stand up. If that's the	17	listed on the slide. And thank you, again, everyone			
1.8	oh, okay.	1.8	for participating. Have a good night.			
19	MR. LOPEZ: How you doing? My name is Abel	19				
20	Lopez. I'm here representing the laborers, Local	20	(Proceeding concluded at 7:00 p.m.)			
21	39. I'm a Jordan High School graduate, went to the	21				
22	Star program, graduated, and went straight to the	-M	1AL			
23	trades. And from the looks of all this, all the	23				
24	plans look great. I'm working with the MacArthur	24				
25	company. Everything looks great. And if everything	25				
	ar Court Reporters & Legal Carridad	Inc	10 (27 - 40)			
cua	ar court reporters a negar services,	THO	. 10 (57 = 40)			

1

1



# *Responses to Testimony Received at the January 11, 2017, Public Meeting at Silverado Park*

4 Response to Comment M1AM: Thank you for your comment and your support of the 5 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 6 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

**Response to Comment M1DH:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the
 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific
 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

10 **Response to Comment M1EW:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 11 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 12 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

13 **Response to Comment M1TJ:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 14 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 15 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

16 **Response to Comment M1AO:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 17 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 18 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA. **Response to Comment M1BC:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

4 **Response to Comment M1OC:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 5 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 6 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

7 Response to Comment M1JS: Thank you for your comment and your support of the proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

10 **Response to Comment M1JC:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 11 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 12 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

13 **Response to Comment M1JM-1:** The comment expresses support for modernization of rail 14 facilities, but generally requests that there be no net increase in environmental impacts, such 15 as air quality emissions, noise impacts, or traffic congestion. The comment is general in nature, and does not identify any issue with the Draft EIR. Therefore, no response is required. 16 17 Nonetheless, the Port provides this response. With regard to air quality, please see Master 18 Responses –Electrification of Alameda Corridor and Zero Emissions as well as the responses 19 to Comments CARB-7 and CARB-8. Regarding noise impacts, see Master Response - Noise 20 and Vibration Associated with Trains. Regarding traffic congestion, Draft EIR Chapter 3.5 21 thoroughly addresses the issue of traffic congestion, and concludes that the proposed Project 22 would have no significant impacts. In fact, the primary purpose of the proposed Project is to 23 replace dravage truck trips from the terminals served by the Pier B Rail Yard, which truck trips 24 create congestion, with train trips, which do not create such congestion.

**Response to Comment M1JM-2:** A description of the significant, unmitigable impacts of the proposed Project is required to be included in the EIR. CEQA authorizes the approval of projects that have such impacts, provided the lead agency weighs the impacts against the project benefits and adopts a statement pursuant to CEQA Guideline 15093 explaining the overriding considerations that justify proceeding with the project. The Port has identified and imposed measures, where feasible, to mitigate such impacts. Some impacts, however, may not be capable of being eliminated, reduced, or offset.

Response to Comment M1JM-3: Regarding the comment on Tier 4 emission standards,
 please see Response to CARB 7. Regarding electrification and zero emissions, please see
 Master Response - Electrification of Alameda Corridor and Zero Emissions.

35 **Response to Comment M1JM-4:** The commenter references photographing black smoke 36 from a PHL train. The photograph was not submitted, and the location or date of the 37 observation is not provided. PHL has been recognized as having one of the cleanest 38 locomotive fleets in North America as a result of converting its fleet to clean diesel locomotives 39 that achieve "Tier 3-plus" ultra-low emission standards. In March 2017, PHL began a 40 demonstration of a locomotive developed by Progress Rail that is expected to meet EPA Tier 41 4 emission standards. However, even with the cleaner trains used by PHL, it is possible for 42 the trains to produce black smoke. Black smoke results from unburnt fuel in the exhaust 43 system, which is commonly observed when the engine is initially under a heavy load - fuel is 44 injected faster than air can be inducted to combust it. As the throttle position increases, more 45 fuel is injected into the cylinder faster than more air is inducted. A malfunctioning (over-fueling)

injector pump or worn injector nozzles can also result in an over-rich fuel mixture. Because
 the specific details about the situation were not provided, no further response can be provided.

3 Response to Comment M1JM-5: Air quality impacts, including those related to locomotive 4 travel within the SCAB and out to the state line, have been taken into account in the impact 5 analysis (see, e.g., Appendix A1-4). These emissions are discussed in Draft EIR Section 3.2.

6 The Draft EIR addresses the potential offsite noise impacts of Project trains within the 7 Alameda Corridor on pages 3.8-19 through 3.8-20, 3.8-26 through 3.8-27, 3.8-32, and 3.8-38 8 of the Draft EIR. Vibration impacts within the Alameda Corridor are addressed on pages 9 3.8-27, 3.8-33, and 3.8-39 of the Draft EIR. Cumulative noise and vibration impacts within the 10 Alameda Corridor are addressed on page 3.8-40 of the Draft EIR.

**Response to Comment M1JM-6:** The Draft EIR includes extensive analysis of the potential of risks associated with hazardous materials (see Draft EIR, Chapter 3.9). CEQA does not require the consideration of future events that are not "reasonably foreseeable," such as a helicopter crashing on top of a train. A detailed response to the concern regarding hazardous materials handling within the Pier B Rail Yard is provided in response to Comment LF-4.

16 **Response to Comment M1JM-7:** The Draft EIR contained analysis regarding how the 17 proposed Project and its alternatives would impact the environment of businesses located in 18 the vicinity. In addition, in the Land Use Chapter, the Draft EIR identified properties that could 19 potentially be within the project footprint. At this time, the proposed Project is in the planning 20 process, and no final construction plans or decisions regarding possible acquisitions of any 21 privately held interests in properties have been made. Additionally, the effects of acquisition 22 and relocation are considered primarily economic and social: therefore, in and of themselves, 23 they would not appear to raise significant environmental impacts (CEQA Guidelines Section 24 15382). Nevertheless, the potential acquisition of land is being considered in this EIR in the 25 interests of a full and timely disclosure. Potential Project acquisitions are addressed in Section 3.6.4 of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response - Property Acquisition, 26 27 Compensation, and Relocation.

Response to Comment M1JM-8: The EIR discusses a range of emergency preparedness
 plans and responsible parties. Please see EIR Section 3.9.1.2. The proposed Project's
 potential impact on emergency response and evacuations was assessed in Impact Haz-4 in
 Section 3.9.2.1. The Draft EIR included a Health Risk Assessment (see Chapter 3.2).

32 **Response to Comment M1JT:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 33 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 34 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

35 **Response to Comment M1LJ:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 36 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 37 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

Response to Comment M1KR: Thank you for your comment and your support of the
 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific
 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

41 **Response to Comment M1RA:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 42 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 43 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA. **Response to Comment M1WL:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

**Response to Comment M1DP-1:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the proposed Project. Your comment asks what assumptions, if any, were made in terms of traffic counts and air quality analysis about the SCIG project. The cumulative impact analysis in the Draft EIR was prepared with the assumption that the SCIG project could occur at some time in the future; that project was identified as a related project, as shown in Table 2.1-1 of the Draft EIR. However, it is not possible to accurately predict if or when that project would be operational.

11 **Response to Comment M1DP-2:** The comment asks whether the proposed Project would accept containers that originate in the Port of Los Angeles and if those containers can be 12 13 transported to the Pier B Rail Yard for transport by rail. While the proposed Pier B On-Dock 14 Rail Support Facility is primarily intended to accept containers from, and support, the on-dock 15 rail yards at the Port of Long Beach marine terminals, improvements to the facility would also improve overall shipping efficiencies at the Port of Long Beach and the Port of Los Angeles. 16 17 When operational, the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility would provide ability to move cargo more efficiently and ease rail congestion within the San Pedro Bay Ports rail network, 18 19 from which both the POLA and POLB would benefit. However, the Pier B On-Dock Rail 20 Support Facility will not ordinarily handle containers from Port of Los Angeles terminals. PHL, 21 the switching rail line that serves the two Ports, would be the primary operator of the Pier B 22 On-Dock Rail Support Facility. On occasion, PHL could potentially move train segments 23 containing containers from the Port of Los Angeles to assemble into complete trains at the 24 Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility.

25 **Response to Comment M1JT2:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 26 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature, and does not reference any specific 27 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

28 Response to Comment M1RC-1: Century Villages is identified in the Draft EIR as a sensitive 29 receptor (#143 in Table 3.2-4 on page 3.2-12; the location is shown in Figure 3.2-2 on page 30 3.2-13). Predicted impacts specific to this location were extracted from the Draft EIR and Final EIR analyses, and are summarized here. Table 11.2-19 shows the highest modeled criteria 31 32 pollutant and health risk impacts at Century Villages associated with the mitigated proposed 33 Project. The table shows that the peak 1-hour NO₂ concentration would exceed the federal threshold during project construction. A discussion of the types of health effects that may be 34 35 associated with NO_x and NO₂ exposure is provided on pages 3.2-48 and 3.2-49 of the Draft 36 EIR. All other criteria pollutant and health risk impacts during construction and operation would 37 be less than significance thresholds at this location.

The peak federal 1-hour NO₂ impact of 192  $\mu$ g/m³ would occur during Phase 3 of construction. 38 Emissions from Project construction would contribute only about 8 percent to this impact; the 39 40 background concentration would contribute the remaining 92 percent. Moreover, this 41 predicted concentration is conservative and would occur very infrequently, if at all, because 42 the analysis assumes all construction equipment would operate simultaneously during worst 43 case meteorological conditions (i.e., low wind speed, optimum wind direction, and very stable 44 atmosphere), concurrent with the highest observed background concentrations measured at 45 the Superblock monitoring station over a 3-year period. Accordingly, most of the 1-hour NO₂ concentrations during Project construction would be much lower than the peak value, as 46

	Chapter 11
Responses to Comments	Port of Long Beach
	_

evidenced by the much lower annual average NO₂ concentration, which is an average of all
 1-hour concentrations during the worst-case year.

Furthermore, the proposed Project may produce operational criteria pollutant and health impacts that are less than the values presented in the Draft and Final EIR by replacing many future drayage truck trips with rail transport. The potential air quality benefit associated with fewer drayage truck trips was conservatively not quantified in this EIR (although the impact of the additional rail transport *was* quantified). Please see response to Comment GSR-2 for a discussion of this potential air quality benefit. The replacement of truck trips from the terminals served by the Pier B Rail Yard with rail transport would be particularly beneficial to Century

10 Villages given its proximity to the Terminal Island freeway.

Г

TABLE 11.2-19 MODELED AIR POLLUTANT IMPACTS NEAR CENTURY VILLAGES AT CABRILLO (MITIGATED PROPOSED PROJECT)									
Descript	tion	Modeled Impact ¹	Significance Threshold	Significant?					
Criteria Pollutants during Construction ²									
	1-Hour (state)	277	339	No					
NO ₂	1-Hour (federal)	192	188	Yes					
	Annual	52.5	57.0	No					
<u> </u>	1-Hour	4,007	23,000	No					
0	8-Hour	3,174	10,000	No					
DM	24-Hour	0.3	10.4	No					
PIVI10	Annual	0.01	1.0	No					
PM _{2.5}	24-Hour	0.09	10.4	No					
	Criteria Po	ollutants during Ope	ration ³						
	1-Hour (state)	224	339	No					
NO ₂	1-Hour (federal)	171	188	No					
	Annual	51.5	57.0	No					
<u> </u>	1-Hour	3,912	23,000	No					
0	8-Hour	3,104	10,000	No					
DM	24-Hour	0.03	2.5	No					
r IVI10	Annual	0.0009	1.0	No					
PM _{2.5}	24-Hour	0.04	2.5	No					

### TABLE 11.2-19 (CONT'D) MODELED AIR POLLUTANT IMPACTS NEAR CENTURY VILLAGES AT CABRILLO (MITIGATED PROPOSED PROJECT)

Description	Modeled Impact ¹	Significance Threshold	Significant?
Health Risks	s (Construction + Op	peration) ⁴	
Individual Cancer Risk	3.8 × 10-6	10 × 10-6	No
Chronic Hazard Index	0.00006	1.0	No
8-Hour Chronic Hazard Index	0.0002	1.0	No
Acute Hazard Index	0.04	1.0	No

Notes:

¹ NO₂ and CO impacts are the modeled project increment plus observed background. All other impacts are the modeled project increment.

² The highest impacts from all three phases of construction are shown.

³ The highest impacts from all three operational analysis years (2020, 2025, 2035) are shown.

⁴ Health risk values reflect residential exposure assumptions and include emissions from both construction and operation.

1 **Response to Comment M1RC-2:** Qualifying organizations are eligible to apply for assistance

2 under the Port of Long Beach Mitigation Grants Program that would be funded by the

3 proposed Project if it is approved. Thank you for your comment and the information on your

4 organization.

5 Response to Comment M1EQ: Cabrillo High School was one of the sensitive receptors 6 evaluated in the EIR. Based on the health risk analysis in the EIR, the maximum health 7 impacts of the proposed Project with mitigation are below significance thresholds for all 8 receptors evaluated including sensitive receptors. Qualifying organizations are eligible to 9 apply for assistance under the Port of Long Beach Mitigation Grants Program that would be 10 funded by this Project, if it is approved.

11 **Response to Comment M1TF:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 12 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 13 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

14 **Response to Comment M1LW-1:** Please see responses to Comments WT-1 through WT-5. 15 The Port has also provided responses to the commenter's tenant. See responses to 16 Comments LLI-1 to LLI-30. As explained in the referenced responses, at this time, the 17 proposed Project is in the planning process, and no final construction plans or decisions 18 regarding possible acquisitions of any privately held interests in properties have been made. 19 Following completion of environmental review, if the proposed Project is approved, final plans 20 would be developed, and the property acquisition process would begin after the Port takes all 21 necessary legal steps relating to that acquisition. Please also see Master Response -22 Property Acquisition, Compensation, and Relocation.

Response to Comment M1MP: Thank you for your comment and your support of the proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

- 1 **Response to Comment M1JT3:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 2 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific
- 3 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.
- Response to Comment M1EI: Thank you for your comment and your support of the proposed
   Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific section of the
   Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.
- **Response to Comment M1AL:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the
   proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific
   section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.
- 10 **Response to Comment M1JA:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 11 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 12 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

### Chapter 11 Responses to Comments

#### Port of Long Beach

Tet. I	5 EIK		Public Me	etin
	Page 1		Pa	ge 2
	STATE OF CALIFORNIA	1	INDEX	
	CARLE OF COMPLETENCE	2		
	PORT OF LONG BEACH	3	SPEAKER: HEATHER TOMLEY, Director of Environ	mental
		4	Planning	
		5	MODERATOR: ALLYSON TERAMOTO, Senior Environm	ental
		6	Specialist	
	PIER B ON-DOCK RAIL SUPPORT FACILITY	7	AUDIENCE: P	AGE
		8	David Hope	15
	DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT	9	Andy Perez Ted Jimenez	15
		10	Steven Mendoza John Schafer	17
	DIDITIO MERTINO	11	Eddie Rivera	19
	POBLIC MEETING	12	David Kelly Bric Shen	20
	Wednesday, January 18, 2017	13	Peter Santillan	22
	4801 Airport Plaza Drive	14	Max Lafarga	22
		15	Jim Stewart	24
	Long Beach, California	16	Randy Gordon	27
		17	Loui Juder	20
	6100 P.M.	18	Armando Porras	31
		19	Ray Familathe	32
		20	Kevin Donaldson	35
		21	Stan Janocha	39
		22	Ricardo Orellana Vema Boyd	40
TAK	EN BY: Katherine Henry-Sexton, CSR No. 13662	23	Mitchell Ponce	41
		24		
		25		
-	Page 3		Pa	ae 4
	WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 18, 2017, LONG BEACH, CA		facility project, the Port of Long Beach is the	e lead
2	6:07 P.M.		agency under the California Environmental Quali	ity
5		2	Act or CBOA. As the lead agency, we've prepare	ed an
4		Ĩ	environmental impact report or RIR to analyze !	the
2	MS. TOMLEY: Good evening and welcome to the	-	potential impacts from the project. As part of	f the
o mubi	lic meeting for the proposed Pier B on-dock rail	2	CROA process we're seeking public comments on	the
- anna	our facility . Neire now officially opening the	0	draft DTD that was valapsed on December 15 201	16 50
/ Supp	lic hearing. We re now officially opening the		ansure that the public is provided an encortant	
8 bapt	the nearing. Wy name is nearing formery, and i'm	8	ensure chac che public is provided al opporculi	
			emercan their montions and concerns on the nuclear	ILY LO
9 dire	a Deach and I want to there are all for and	9	express their questions and concerns on the pro-	oposed
9 dire	g Beach. And I want to thank you all for coming	9 10	express their questions and concerns on the pro- project.	oposed
9 dire 0 Long 1 out	g Beach. And I want to thank you all for coming tonight.	9 10 11	express their questions and concerns on the propert. The comments we receive during the pub	posed
9 dire 0 Long 1 out 2	g Beach. And I want to thank you all for coming tonight. To begin, I want to identify again that we	9 10 11 12	express their questions and concerns on the pro- project. The comments we receive during the put review period will be responded to and included	blic d in
9 dire 0 Long 1 out 2 3 hav	g Beach. And I want to thank you all for coming tonight. To begin, I want to identify again that we we to make our presentation as accessible as	9 10 11 12 13	express their questions and concerns on the pro- project. The comments we receive during the put review period will be responded to and included the final BIR. We will not be responding to th	blic d in
9 dire 0 Long 1 out 2 3 hav 4 pos	g Beach. And I want to thank you all for coming tonight. To begin, I want to identify again that we we to make our presentation as accessible as ssible, we have sign language interpretation and	9 10 11 12 13 14	express their questions and concerns on the pro- project. The comments we receive during the put review period will be responded to and included the final BIR. We will not be responding to th comments presented tonight. The Port will also	blic d in he o use
9 dire 0 Long 1 out 2 3 hav 4 pos 5 Spa	g Beach. And I want to thank you all for coming tonight. To begin, I want to identify again that we we to make our presentation as accessible as asible, we have sign language interpretation and anish language translation services available. If	9 10 11 12 13 14 15	express their questions and concerns on the pro- project. The comments we receive during the put review period will be responded to and included the final BIR. We will not be responding to th comments presented tonight. The Port will also the comments received tonight along with any we	blic blic d in he o use ritten
9 dire 0 Long 1 out 2 3 hav 4 pos 5 Spa 6 the	g Beach. And I want to thank you all for coming tonight. To begin, I want to identify again that we we to make our presentation as accessible as ssible, we have sign language interpretation and anish language translation services available. If ere's anybody that would like to use either of	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	express their questions and concerns on the pro- project. The comments we receive during the put review period will be responded to and included the final BIR. We will not be responding to th comments presented tonight. The Port will also the comments received tonight along with any we comments to inform any changes to be incorporate	blic blic d in he o use ritten ted
9 dire 0 Long 1 out 2 3 hav 4 pos 5 Spa 6 the 7 the	g Beach. And I want to thank you all for coming tonight. To begin, I want to identify again that we we to make our presentation as accessible as saible, we have sign language interpretation and anish language translation services available. If ere's anybody that would like to use either of ese services, please let one of the Port staff	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	express their questions and concerns on the pro- project. The comments we receive during the pul- review period will be responded to and included the final BIR. We will not be responding to th comments presented tonight. The Port will also the comments received tonight along with any we comments to inform any changes to be incorporat into the EIR and to let the decision-makers know	blic d in he o use ritten ted ow of
9 dirs 0 Loni 1 out 2 3 hav 4 pos 5 Spa 6 the 7 the 8 kno	g Beach. And I want to thank you all for coming tonight. To begin, I want to identify again that we We to make our presentation as accessible as saible, we have sign language interpretation and anish language translation services available. If ere's anybody that would like to use either of ese services, please let one of the Fort staff ow at this time.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	express their questions and concerns on the pro- project. The comments we receive during the pul- review period will be responded to and included the final BIR. We will not be responding to th comments presented tonight. The Port will also the comments received tonight along with any we comments to inform any changes to be incorporat into the BIR and to let the decision-makers know any concerns expressed by the public.	blic blic d in he o use ritten ted ow of
9 dirs 0 Loni 1 out 2 3 hav 4 poi 5 Spa 6 the 7 the 8 kno	g Beach. And I want to thank you all for coming tonight. To begin, I want to identify again that we We to make our presentation as accessible as saible, we have sign language interpretation and anish language translation services available. If ere's anybody that would like to use either of ese services, please let one of the Port staff ow at this time. The purpose of tonight's meeting is to	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	express their questions and concerns on the pro- project. The comments we receive during the pul- review period will be responded to and included the final BIR. We will not be responding to the comments presented tonight. The Port will also the comments received tonight along with any we comments to inform any changes to be incorporate into the BIR and to let the decision-makers know any concerns expressed by the public. If you'd like to make comments this	blic blic d in he o use ritten ted ow of
9 dirs 0 Loni 1 out 2 3 hav 4 pos 5 Spa 6 the 7 the 8 kno 9 0 rec	g Beach. And I want to thank you all for coming tonight. To begin, I want to identify again that we we to make our presentation as accessible as saible, we have sign language interpretation and anish language translation services available. If ere's anybody that would like to use either of ese services, please let one of the Port staff ow at this time. The purpose of tonight's meeting is to ceive public comments. And to begin I'll provide	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	express their questions and concerns on the pro- project. The comments we receive during the pul- review period will be responded to and included the final BIR. We will not be responding to the comments presented tonight. The Port will also the comments received tonight along with any we comments to inform any changes to be incorporate into the BIR and to let the decision-makers know any concerns expressed by the public. If you'd like to make comments this evening, please fill out a speaker card and give	blic d in he o use ritten ted ow of
9 dire 0 Long 1 out 2 3 hav 4 pos 5 Spi 6 the 7 the 8 kno 9 10 rec 11 a 1	settor for environmental planning at the Port of g Beach. And I want to thank you all for coming tonight. To begin, I want to identify again that we we to make our presentation as accessible as sabble, we have sign language interpretation and anish language translation services available. If ere's anybody that would like to use either of ese services, please let one of the Port staff ow at this time. The purpose of tonight's meeting is to ceive public comments. And to begin I'll provide orief presentation summarizing the project	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	express their questions and concerns on the pro- project. The comments we receive during the pul- review period will be responded to and included the final BIR. We will not be responding to the comments presented tonight. The Port will also the comments received tonight along with any we comments to inform any changes to be incorporate into the BIR and to let the decision-makers know any concerns expressed by the public. If you'd like to make comments this evening, please fill out a speaker card and give to a member of the Port staff. After the	oposed blic d in he o use ritten ted ow of
9 dira 0 Long 1 out 2 3 hav 4 pos 5 Spa 6 the 7 the 8 kno 9 0 rec 1 a 1 2 inc	sector for environmental planning at the Port of g Beach. And I want to thank you all for coming tonight. To begin, I want to identify again that we we to make our presentation as accessible as sabble, we have sign language interpretation and anish language translation services available. If ere's anybody that would like to use either of ese services, please let one of the Port staff ow at this time. The purpose of tonight's meeting is to ceive public comments. And to begin I'll provide orief presentation summarizing the project cluding the objectives and alternatives and	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	express their questions and concerns on the pro- project. The comments we receive during the pul- review period will be responded to and included the final BIR. We will not be responding to the comments presented tonight. The Port will also the comments received tonight along with any we comments to inform any changes to be incorporat into the BIR and to let the decision-makers known any concerns expressed by the public. If you'd like to make comments this evening, please fill out a speaker card and give to a member of the Port staff. After the presentation we will call on those who have	blic d in he o use ritten ted ow of
9 dira 0 Long 1 out 2 3 hav 4 pos 5 Spi 6 the 7 the 8 kno 9 1 a 1 2 inc 3 des	sector for environmental planning at the Port of g Beach. And I want to thank you all for coming tonight. To begin, I want to identify again that we we to make our presentation as accessible as sabble, we have sign language interpretation and anish language translation services available. If ere's anybody that would like to use either of ese services, please let one of the Port staff ow at this time. The purpose of tonight's meeting is to ceive public comments. And to begin I'll provide brief presentation summarizing the project cluding the objectives and alternatives and scribe the potential impacts associated with the	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22 23	express their questions and concerns on the pro- project. The comments we receive during the pul- review period will be responded to and included the final BIR. We will not be responding to the comments presented tonight. The Port will also the comments received tonight along with any we comments to inform any changes to be incorporat into the BIR and to let the decision-makers known any concerns expressed by the public. If you'd like to make comments this evening, please fill out a speaker card and give to a member of the Port staff. After the presentation we will call on those who have submitted a speaker card to make comments. Back	blic d in he o use ritten ted ted ve it
9 dira 9 dira 10 Long 11 out 12 13 hav 14 pos 15 Spi 15 Spi 16 the 17 the 18 know 19 10 rec 11 a t 12 inc 13 des 14 pos 15 Spi 16 the 17 the 18 the 19 the 19 the 10 t	sector for environmental planning at the port of g Beach. And I want to thank you all for coming tonight. To begin, I want to identify again that we we to make our presentation as accessible as sabble, we have sign language interpretation and anish language translation services available. If ere's anybody that would like to use either of ese services, please let one of the Port staff ow at this time. The purpose of tonight's meeting is to ceive public comments. And to begin I'll provide brief presentation summarizing the project cluding the objectives and alternatives and scribe the potential impacts associated with the opject.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 23 24	express their questions and concerns on the pro- project. The comments we receive during the pul- review period will be responded to and included the final BIR. We will not be responding to the comments presented tonight. The Port will also the comments received tonight along with any we comments to inform any changes to be incorporat into the BIR and to let the decision-makers known any concerns expressed by the public. If you'd like to make comments this evening, please fill out a speaker card and give to a member of the Port staff. After the presentation we will call on those who have submitted a speaker card to make comments. Eac speaker will be limited to three minutes at the	blic d in he o use ritten ted ow of ve it ch e

	Public Meeti	na	No. 2 (M2)
Pie	er B EIR		Public Meeting
	Page 5		Page 6
1	The Port of Long Beach is proposing to	1	facility serves multiple Fort terminals and
2	expand and make improvements to the existing Pier B	2	destinations, improvements to the facility would
3	component to the Bert wide pail network and allows	3	allowing benefits to be realized at all part
4	for a better and more efficient utilization of the	4	allowing benefics to be realized at all Port
5	on dock rail facilities that are located within the	5	The evicting Dier D rail facility is
6	towningle	6	located in the northern part of the Warbor District
	With on-dock rail containers are located		ar Diar D maar Anakaim Croast and the 1-710 Presuou
8	directly onto small segmente of multiple railcare	8	The facility is located in a highly industrial area
	using tracks located within the Port terminals.		and does not directly border any residential
11	However, due to the lack of track space and the mix	1.	neighborhoods. Currently the facility provides
12	of cargo intended for multiple destinations, it's	12	railcar and locomotive storage and staging to
12	not possible to build complete trains within the	12	support efficient operations in the on-dock
1.5	terminal. In addition, the need to store and stage	1.5	railwards at the Port's marine terminals. Track
19	railcars on the tracks within the terminals as	14	from the facility connects to the Alameda Corridor
16	longer train segments are built limits the amount of	16	allowing trains to leave the Port complex.
17	active working area to load more cargo onto rail.	17	The objectives of the proposed Pier B
10	Therefore, facilities like the Pier B	10	project are to support the transition to a more
10	on-dock rail support facility are necessary to	10	efficient, more economically competitive and less
20	store, sort and assemble the smaller train segments	20	polluting freight transport system. In addition,
21	into full 10,000-foot trains that are ready to leave	21	the project would promote a mode shift from the
22	the Port complex via the Alameda Corridor for their	22	movement by truck to near-dock or off-dock
23	final destination. All cargo arrives at the	23	facilities to movement by rail directly from the
24	facility on rail. Trucks would not be used to	24	on-dock rail facilities at the Port.
25	deliver containers to the facility. Because the	25	The addition of railcar and locomotive
	Page 7		Page 8
1	storage staging and servicing areas would also	1	alternative would be constructed in three phases
2	enable the on-dock railyards to better manage the	2	over seven years expanding the rail facility from
3	loading of containers onto railcars. By providing	3	its existing 12 tracks to a total of 48 tracks.
4	adequate space to accommodate arriving and departing	4	This additional track would allow more efficient
5	trains up to 10,000 feet long, rail line congestion	5	assembly of trains and accommodate trains up to
6	can be alleviated resulting in more efficient rail	6	10,000 feet long. The expanded facility would also
7	network at the ports.	7	include support facilities including a locomotive
8	With more cargo transported on trains,	8	layover and fueling area.
9	congestion on local streets and highways would also	9	The Dominguez Channel rail bridge would be
10	be reduced. The project would also upgrade and	10	modified to accommodate one new track. Pier B
11	modernize existing aging infrastructure. And	11	Street and Pico Avenue would need to be realigned
12	lastly, the closure of the at-grade crossing at 9th	12	and/or widened to provide a sufficient area for
13	Street and Pico will improve safety for both	13	expansion of the rail facility. Several road
14	vehicles and locomotives.	14	closures would occur in the vicinity including roads
15	The environmental analysis evaluated four	15	in the City of Los Angeles.
16	alternatives: The 12th Street alternative, which is	16	The 9th Street at-grade crossing would
17	the proposed project, is the largest project and	17	also be closed to accommodate the rail expansion at
18	best meets the key objectives. A 10th Street	18	the eastern edge of the Pier B facility. Access to
19	alternative is slightly reduced. A 9th Street	19	Anaheim Street would be shifted to Anaheim Way at
20	alternative is further reduced. And a no project	20	the western end of Pier B Street. In addition, the
21	alternative would be no change to the existing	21	Shoemaker ramps and approaches would be removed.
22	facility. I'll walk through a more detailed	22	The proposed project would affect 94 properties, of
23	description of each of the alternatives in the	23	which 36 privately owned properties would need to be
24	following slides.	24	acquired within the project area.
25	The proposed project or 12th Street	25	The 10th Street alternative is also

Kusar Court Reporters & Legal Services, Inc.

2 (5 - 8)

	r B EIR FUDIC MEEU	ny	Public Meetin
Τ	Page 9		Page 10
1	expected to take approximately seven years for	1	project; however, there would be fewer road
2	construction. In this alternative the facility	2	closures, and the Shoemaker ramps would not be
3	would have fewer arrival departure and yard tracks	3	removed or realigned. Utility work would also be
	expanded from 12 to a total of 34 tracks. Given the	4	similar to that for the proposed project but a
5	reduced footprint, less road reconstruction would be	5	smaller area would be affected.
s	necessary.	6	There would be fewer property acquisitions
7	Road work would be similar to the proposed	7	under the 9th Street alternative. 56 total
	project. However, the Shoemaker ramps would be	8	properties would be affected of which 18 are
9	re-configured to maintain the connection between	9	privately owned. Also, with this alternative the
0	Anaheim Street and downtown via Harbor Avenue.	10	number of railcars and trains that could be
	Potential property acquisitions for the 10th Street	11	accommodated would be less than under the proposed
2	alternative would be similar to the 12th Street	12	project.
3	alternative, but fewer in number. 72 properties	13	Under the no project alternative no
	could be affected, of which 26 are privately owned.	14	improvements would be made to the existing Pier B
	The number of railcars and trains that could be	15	rail facility. The existing Pier B facility could
	accommodated would be less than under the proposed	16	continue to operate as it does today. The current
	project.	17	yard has two main line tracks, ten yard tracks and
3	In the 9th Street alternative the new	18	no arrival and departure tracks. An estimated five
	tracks would be constructed between Pier B Street	19	to seven trains per day would depart the rail
	and 9th Street. The alternative would add nine	20	facility, which reflects operations at capacity.
	tracks expanding from 12 to a total of 21 tracks,	21	Once the existing facility reaches the
2	which would include three new arrival and departure	22	limit of its ability to handle train movements, the
	tracks. Construction would be completed in two	23	remaining direct intermodal cargo that's not
	phases over approximately three years.	24	accommodated by on-dock railyards would be
	Road work would be similar to the proposed	25	transported by truck to near-dock or downtown
+	Page 11		Page 12
	railvards to be loaded onto destination trains.		Further, off-site ambient pollutant
	Under the ne project alternative the		
2 E -	ONDEL CHE NO DIOIECT SICEINSCIVE CHE	2	concentrations are expected to be significantly
4	existing at-grade crossing located at 9th Street and	2	concentrations are expected to be significantly impacted from construction at the proposed project.
	existing at-grade crossing located at 9th Street and Pico Avenue would remain in place, and Pier E Street	2	concentrations are expected to be significantly impacted from construction at the proposed project. The analysis identified the potential for
3	existing at-grade crossing located at 9th Street and Pico Avenue would remain in place, and Pier B Street would not be improved. In addition, the no project	2 3 4	concentrations are expected to be significantly impacted from construction at the proposed project. The analysis identified the potential for exceedances of South Coast Air Guality Management
	existing at-grade crossing located at 9th Street and Pico Avenue would remain in place, and Pier B Street would not be improved. In addition, the no project alternative would not result in any property	2 3 4 5	concentrations are expected to be significantly impacted from construction at the proposed project. The analysis identified the potential for exceedances of South Coast Air Quality Management District regional air mulity thresholds for
	existing at-grade crossing located at 9th Street and Pico Avenue would remain in place, and Pier B Street would not be improved. In addition, the no project alternative would not result in any property accusition or business relocations.	2 3 4 5 6 7	concentrations are expected to be significantly impacted from construction at the proposed project. The analysis identified the potential for exceedances of South Coast Air Quality Management District regional air quality thresholds for criteria pollutants, specifically nitrogen dioxide
3 4 5 5 7	existing at-grade crossing located at 9th Street and Pico Avenue would remain in place, and Pier B Street would not be improved. In addition, the no project alternative would not result in any property acquisition or business relocations.	2 3 4 5 6 7	concentrations are expected to be significantly impacted from construction at the proposed project. The analysis identified the potential for exceedances of South Coast Air Quality Management District regional air quality thresholds for criteria pollutants, specifically nitrogen dioxide.
5 7 3 3	existing at-grade crossing located at 9th Street and Pico Avenue would remain in place, and Pier B Street would not be improved. In addition, the no project alternative would not result in any property acquisition or business relocations. The EIR evaluates potential impacts for the environment from the proposed project. For the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 0	concentrations are expected to be significantly impacted from construction at the proposed project. The analysis identified the potential for exceedances of South Coast Air Quality Management District regional air quality thresholds for criteria pollutants, specifically nitrogen dioxide. For greenhouse gases, the total annualized greenhouse gas emissions generated from the procoded
5 7 3 9	existing at-grade crossing located at 9th Street and Pico Avenue would remain in place, and Pier B Street would not be improved. In addition, the no project alternative would not result in any property acquisition or business relocations. The EIR evaluates potential impacts for the environment from the proposed project. For the proposed 12th Street alternative impacts that were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	concentrations are expected to be significantly impacted from construction at the proposed project. The analysis identified the potential for exceedances of South Coast Air Quality Management District regional air quality thresholds for criteria pollutants, specifically nitrogen dioxide. For greenhouse gases, the total annualized greenhouse gas emissions generated from the proposed project construction and greation are expected to
5 5 7 3 9 0 0	existing at-grade crossing located at 9th Street and Pico Avenue would remain in place, and Pier B Street would not be improved. In addition, the no project alternative would not result in any property acquisition or business relocations. The EIR evaluates potential impacts for the environment from the proposed project. For the proposed 12th Street alternative impacts that were identified as significant and unavoidable after	2 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	concentrations are expected to be significantly impacted from construction at the proposed project. The analysis identified the potential for exceedances of South Coast Air Quality Management District regional air quality thresholds for criteria pollutants, specifically nitrogen dioxide. For greenhouse gases, the total annualized greenhouse gas emissions generated from the proposed project construction and operation are expected to be above the South Coast Air Quality Management
2	existing at-grade crossing located at 9th Street and Pico Avenue would remain in place, and Pier B Street would not be improved. In addition, the no project alternative would not result in any property acquisition or business relocations. The EIR evaluates potential impacts for the environment from the proposed project. For the proposed 12th Street alternative impacts that were identified as significant and unavoidable after mitigation are to air mality and graphenes gates	2 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	concentrations are expected to be significantly impacted from construction at the proposed project. The analysis identified the potential for exceedances of South Coast Air Quality Management District regional air quality thresholds for criteria pollutants, specifically nitrogen dioxide. For greenhouse gases, the total annualized greenhouse gas emissions generated from the proposed project construction and operation are expected to be above the South Coast Air Quality Management District significance threshold of 10 000 metric
233455577339901122	existing at-grade crossing located at 9th Street and Pico Avenue would remain in place, and Pier B Street would not be improved. In addition, the no project alternative would not result in any property acquisition or business relocations. The EIR evaluates potential impacts for the environment from the proposed project. For the proposed 12th Street alternative impacts that were identified as significant and unavoidable after mitigation are to air quality and greenhouse gases.	2 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	concentrations are expected to be significantly impacted from construction at the proposed project. The analysis identified the potential for exceedances of South Coast Air Quality Management District regional air quality thresholds for criteria pollutants, specifically nitrogen dioxide. For greenhouse gases, the total annualized greenhouse gas emissions generated from the proposed project construction and operation are expected to be above the South Coast Air Quality Management District significance threshold of 10,000 metric tons cathon dioxide equivalent par year for
2 3 3 5 5 7 3 3 9 0 1 2 3 3	existing at-grade crossing located at 9th Street and Pico Avenue would remain in place, and Pier B Street would not be improved. In addition, the no project alternative would not result in any property acquisition or business relocations. The EIR evaluates potential impacts for the environment from the proposed project. For the proposed 12th Street alternative impacts that were identified as significant and unavoidable after mitigation are to air quality and greenhouse gases. For air quality the direct air emissions from constructions and onerstions accordance with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	concentrations are expected to be significantly impacted from construction at the proposed project. The analysis identified the potential for exceedances of South Coast Air Quality Management District regional air quality thresholds for criteria pollutants, specifically nitrogen dioxide. For greenhouse gases, the total annualized greenhouse gas emissions generated from the proposed project construction and operation are expected to be above the South Coast Air Quality Management District significance threshold of 10,000 metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent per year for industrial land uses
	existing at-grade crossing located at 9th Street and Pico Avenue would remain in place, and Pier B Street would not be improved. In addition, the no project alternative would not result in any property acquisition or business relocations. The EIR evaluates potential impacts for the environment from the proposed project. For the proposed 12th Street alternative impacts that were identified as significant and unavoidable after mitigation are to air quality and greenhouse games. For air quality the direct air emissions from construction and operations associated with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	concentrations are expected to be significantly impacted from construction at the proposed project. The analysis identified the potential for exceedances of South Coast Air Quality Management District regional air quality thresholds for criteria pollutants, specifically nitrogen dioxide. For greenhouse gases, the total annualized greenhouse gas emissions generated from the proposed project construction and operation are expected to be above the South Coast Air Quality Management District significance threshold of 10,000 metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent per year for industrial land uses.
	existing at-grade crossing located at 9th Street and Pico Avenue would remain in place, and Pier B Street would not be improved. In addition, the no project alternative would not result in any property acquisition or business relocations. The EIR evaluates potential impacts for the environment from the proposed project. For the proposed 12th Street alternative impacts that were identified as significant and unavoidable after mitigation are to air quality and greenhouse games. For air quality the direct air emissions from construction and operations associated with the proposed project are expected to exceed the AQMD, Gouth Ocat hir Quality Management District	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	concentrations are expected to be significantly impacted from construction at the proposed project. The analysis identified the potential for exceedances of South Coast Air Quality Management District regional air quality thresholds for criteria pollutants, specifically nitrogen dioxide. For greenhouse gases, the total annualized greenhouse gas emissions generated from the proposed project construction and operation are expected to be above the South Coast Air Quality Management District significance threshold of 10,000 metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent per year for industrial land uses. The significant and unavoidable impacts
	existing at-grade crossing located at 9th Street and Pico Avenue would remain in place, and Pier B Street would not be improved. In addition, the no project alternative would not result in any property acquisition or business relocations. The EIR evaluates potential impacts for the environment from the proposed project. For the proposed 12th Street alternative impacts that were identified as significant and unavoidable after mitigation are to air quality and greenhouse games. For air quality the direct air emissions from construction and operations associated with the proposed project are expected to exceed the AQMD, South Coast Air Quality Management District, daily	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	concentrations are expected to be significantly impacted from construction at the proposed project. The analysis identified the potential for exceedances of South Coast Air Quality Management District regional air quality thresholds for criteria pollutants, specifically nitrogen dioxide. For greenhouse gases, the total annualized greenhouse gas emissions generated from the proposed project construction and operation are expected to be above the South Coast Air Quality Management District significance threshold of 10,000 metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent per year for industrial land uses. The significant and unavoidable impacts identified remain after the implementation of
	existing at-grade crossing located at 9th Street and Pico Avenue would remain in place, and Pier B Street would not be improved. In addition, the no project alternative would not result in any property acquisition or business relocations. The EIR evaluates potential impacts for the environment from the proposed project. For the proposed 12th Street alternative impacts that were identified as significant and unavoidable after mitigation are to air quality and greenhouse gases. For air quality the direct air emissions from construction and operations associated with the proposed project are expected to exceed the AQMD, South Coast Air Quality Management District, daily emissions thresholds of significance for carbon	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	concentrations are expected to be significantly impacted from construction at the proposed project. The analysis identified the potential for exceedances of South Coast Air Quality Management District regional air quality thresholds for criteria pollutants, specifically nitrogen dioxide. For greenhouse gases, the total annualized greenhouse gas emissions generated from the proposed project construction and operation are expected to be above the South Coast Air Quality Management District significance threshold of 10,000 metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent per year for industrial land uses. The significant and unavoidable impacts identified remain after the implementation of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures applied to one mealtment of measures applied to
	existing at-grade crossing located at 9th Street and Pico Avenue would remain in place, and Pier B Street would not be improved. In addition, the no project alternative would not result in any property acquisition or business relocations. The EIR evaluates potential impacts for the environment from the proposed project. For the proposed 12th Street alternative impacts that were identified as significant and unavoidable after mitigation are to air quality and greenhouse gases. For air quality the direct air emissions from construction and operations associated with the proposed project are expected to exceed the AQMD, South Coast Air Quality Management District, daily emissions thresholds of significance for carbon monoxide and nitrogen oxides. Direct air emissions	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	concentrations are expected to be significantly impacted from construction at the proposed project. The analysis identified the potential for exceedances of South Coast Air Quality Management District regional air quality thresholds for criteria pollutants, specifically nitrogen dioxide. For greenhouse gases, the total annualized greenhouse gas emissions generated from the proposed project construction and operation are expected to be above the South Coast Air Quality Management District significance threshold of 10,000 metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent per year for industrial land uses. The significant and unavoidable impacts identified remain after the implementation of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures applied to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions include the
	existing at-grade crossing located at 9th Street and Pico Avenue would remain in place, and Pier B Street would not be improved. In addition, the no project alternative would not result in any property acquisition or business relocations. The EIR evaluates potential impacts for the environment from the proposed project. For the proposed 12th Street alternative impacts that were identified as significant and unavoidable after mitigation are to air quality and greenhouse gases. For air quality the direct air emissions from construction and operations associated with the proposed project are expected to exceed the AQMD, South Coast Air Quality Management District, daily emissions thresholds of significance for carbon monoxide and nitrogen oxides. Direct air emissions	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	concentrations are expected to be significantly impacted from construction at the proposed project. The analysis identified the potential for exceedances of South Coast Air Quality Management District regional air quality thresholds for criteria pollutants, specifically nitrogen dioxide. For greenhouse gases, the total annualized greenhouse gas emissions generated from the proposed project construction and operation are expected to be above the South Coast Air Quality Management District significance threshold of 10,000 metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent per year for industrial land uses. The significant and unavoidable impacts identified remain after the implementation of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures applied to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions include the application of best management practices and engine
∠ 3 5 5 5 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 8 5 5 7 8 9 0	existing at-grade crossing located at 9th Street and Pico Avenue would remain in place, and Pier B Street would not be improved. In addition, the no project alternative would not result in any property acquisition or business relocations. The EIR evaluates potential impacts for the environment from the proposed project. For the proposed 12th Street alternative impacts that were identified as significant and unavoidable after mitigation are to air quality and greenhouse gases. For air quality the direct air emissions from construction and operations associated with the proposed project are expected to exceed the AQMD, South Coast Air Quality Management District, daily emissions thresholds of significance for carbon monoxide and nitrogen oxides. Direct air emissions from construction and operation of the proposed project are also expected to make a cumulatively	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	concentrations are expected to be significantly impacted from construction at the proposed project. The analysis identified the potential for exceedances of South Coast Air Quality Management District regional air quality thresholds for criteria pollutants, specifically nitrogen dioxide. For greenhouse gases, the total annualized greenhouse gas emissions generated from the proposed project construction and operation are expected to be above the South Coast Air Quality Management District significance threshold of 10,000 metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent per year for industrial land uses. The significant and unavoidable impacts identified remain after the implementation of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures applied to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions include the application of best management practices and engine emission standards to reduce emissions from
< 3 4 5 5 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 5 7 8 9 0 1	existing at-grade crossing located at 9th Street and Pico Avenue would remain in place, and Pier B Street would not be improved. In addition, the no project alternative would not result in any property acquisition or business relocations. The EIR evaluates potential impacts for the environment from the proposed project. For the proposed 12th Street alternative impacts that were identified as significant and unavoidable after mitigation are to air quality and greenhouse gases. For air quality the direct air emissions from construction and operations associated with the proposed project are expected to exceed the AQMD, South Coast Air Quality Management District, daily emissions thresholds of significance for carbon monoxide and nitrogen oxides. Direct air emissions from construction and operation of the proposed project are also expected to make a cumulatively considerable and unavoidable contribution to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	concentrations are expected to be significantly impacted from construction at the proposed project. The analysis identified the potential for exceedances of South Coast Air Quality Management District regional air quality thresholds for criteria pollutants, specifically nitrogen dioxide. For greenhouse gases, the total annualized greenhouse gas emissions generated from the proposed project construction and operation are expected to be above the South Coast Air Quality Management District significance threshold of 10,000 metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent per year for industrial land uses. The significant and unavoidable impacts identified remain after the implementation of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures applied to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions include the application of best management practices and engine emission standards to reduce emissions from construction activities.
434557890123855789112	existing at-grade crossing located at 9th Street and Pico Avenue would remain in place, and Pier B Street would not be improved. In addition, the no project alternative would not result in any property acquisition or business relocations. The EIR evaluates potential impacts for the environment from the proposed project. For the proposed 12th Street alternative impacts that were identified as significant and unavoidable after mitigation are to air quality and greenhouse gases. For air quality the direct air emissions from construction and operations associated with the proposed project are expected to exceed the AQMD, South Coast Air Quality Management District, daily emissions thresholds of significance for carbon monoxide and nitrogen oxides. Direct air emissions from construction and operation of the proposed project are also expected to make a cumulatively considerable and unavoidable contribution to the significant impact for volatile organic compounds,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	concentrations are expected to be significantly impacted from construction at the proposed project. The analysis identified the potential for exceedances of South Coast Air Quality Management District regional air quality thresholds for criteria pollutants, specifically nitrogen dioxide. For greenhouse gases, the total annualized greenhouse gas emissions generated from the proposed project construction and operation are expected to be above the South Coast Air Quality Management District significance threshold of 10,000 metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent per year for industrial land uses. The significant and unavoidable impacts identified remain after the implementation of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures applied to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions include the application of best management practices and engine emission standards to reduce emissions from construction activities. In addition to address cumulative impacts,
	existing at-grade crossing located at 9th Street and Pico Avenue would remain in place, and Pier B Street would not be improved. In addition, the no project alternative would not result in any property acquisition or business relocations. The EIR evaluates potential impacts for the environment from the proposed project. For the proposed 12th Street alternative impacts that were identified as significant and unavoidable after mitigation are to air quality and greenhouse gases. For air quality the direct air emissions from construction and operations associated with the proposed project are expected to exceed the AQMD, South Coast Air Quality Management District, daily emissions thresholds of significance for carbon monoxide and nitrogen oxides. Direct air emissions from construction and operation of the proposed project are also expected to make a cumulatively considerable and unavoidable contribution to the significant impact for volatile organic compounds, carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, particulate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	concentrations are expected to be significantly impacted from construction at the proposed project. The analysis identified the potential for exceedances of South Coast Air Quality Management District regional air quality thresholds for criteria pollutants, specifically nitrogen dioxide. For greenhouse gases, the total annualized of greenhouse gas emissions generated from the proposed project construction and operation are expected to be above the South Coast Air Quality Management District significance threshold of 10,000 metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent per year for industrial land uses. The significant and unavoidable impacts identified remain after the implementation of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures applied to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions from construction activities. In addition to address cumulative impacts, the Port will contribute funding to the Community
	existing at-grade crossing located at 9th Street and Pico Avenue would remain in place, and Pier B Street would not be improved. In addition, the no project alternative would not result in any property acquisition or business relocations. The EIR evaluates potential impacts for the environment from the proposed project. For the proposed 12th Street alternative impacts that were identified as significant and unavoidable after mitigation are to air quality and greenhouse gases. For air quality the direct air emissions from construction and operations associated with the proposed project are expected to exceed the AQMD, South Coast Air Quality Management District, daily emissions thresholds of significance for carbon monoxide and nitrogen oxides. Direct air emissions from construction and operation of the proposed project are also expected to make a cumulatively considerable and unavoidable contribution to the significant impact for volatile organic compounds, carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, particulate matter, sulfur oxides and toxic air contaminants	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	concentrations are expected to be significantly impacted from construction at the proposed project. The analysis identified the potential for exceedances of South Coast Air Quality Management District regional air quality thresholds for criteria pollutants, specifically nitrogen dioxide. For greenhouse gases, the total annualized of project construction and operation are expected to be above the South Coast Air Quality Management District significance threshold of 10,000 metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent per year for industrial land uses. The significant and unavoidable impacts identified remain after the implementation of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures applied to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions include the application of best management practices and engine emission standards to reduce emissions from construction activities. In addition to address cumulative impacts, the Port will contribute funding to the Community grants Program. Approximately \$177,500 would be

	r B EIR Public Meet	ing	No. 2 (M2) Public Meeting
Т	Page 13		Page 14
	sustainability features will be incorporated into	1	certifying that the EIR was prepared in accordance
	the proposed project's design. In addition,	2	with the requirements of CEQA and whether the
	requirements for recycling and re-use of materials	3	project will be approved.
L	during construction and operations will be required.	4	The draft BIR document is available at the
	Tree planting will be done in the area, and	5	link provided, and tonight the public will have an
L	employees at the project site will be encouraged to	6	opportunity to provide verbal comments on the merits
	carpool.	7	of the proposed project and the draft BIR document.
	The Port will also make a contribution to	8	You may speak tonight or hand in your written
L	the Community Grant Program to fund greenhouse gas	9	comments or both. We strongly encourage you to also
	emissions reduction projects in the amount of	10	submit your comments in writing. Written comments
	approximately \$1.4 million.	11	will be accepted through 4 p.m. on Monday, February
	The draft EIR was released by the Port for	12	13.
	public review and comment on December 15, 2016.	13	To submit written comments on the draft
	We're currently within the 60-day public review and	14	EIR please send them to me at the Port of Long Beach
	comment period with comments due to the Port by	15	at the address listed. And comments can also be
	February 13, 2017. At the end of the presentation	16	sent via e-mail at the e-mail address listed.
	I'll provide the contact information and addresses	17	At this time we'll take speaker comments.
	to submit written comments.	18	And as previously mentioned, we have sign language
	At the conclusion of the public review and	19	interpretation and Spanish language translation
	comment period, we'll provide responses to all of	20	services available if you need either of those
	the comments submitted and will publish them in the	21	services. If you wish to provide comments and have
	final EIR. All commenters will also be notified	22	not vet filled out speaker card, please see a member
	when the final EIR document is available.	22	of the Port staff outside of the room to complete a
	Once final, the Port's governing body, the	24	card. And for those who have completed a speaker
	Board of Harbor Commissioners will consider	25	card, we'll call each by name. Each speaker is
╞	Dage 15	20	Page 16
	Fage 15		I have been with Union Pacific Railroad
	front of the room.	-	for ten years and have attended hundreds of
	We will get started with that. The first	2	community meetings Port tours lunch dinner
	mublic comment is from David Hope, and then andy	3	community meetings, rore cours, randit, armer
L .	public comment is from bavia nope, and chen Anay		meetings and weekend meetings One of the most
	Perez and Ted Jimenez	4	meetings and weekend meetings. One of the most
	Perez and Ted Jimenez.	5	meetings and weekend meetings. One of the most frequent things I hear from the community is the meed for on-dock rail. This includes the
	Perez and Ted Jimenez. MR. HOPE: Good evening. My name is David	4 5 6	meetings and weekend meetings. One of the most frequent things I hear from the community is the need for on-dock rail. This includes the Environmental Justice Community and our neighbors
	Perez and Ted Jimenez. MR. HOPE: Good evening. My name is David Hope, and I'm the director of rail operations at Pier T. Toll Terminals International supports the	4 5 6 7	meetings and weekend meetings. One of the most frequent things I hear from the community is the need for on-dock rail. This includes the Environmental Justice Community and our neighbors (Con
	Perez and Ted Jimenez. MR. HOPE: Good evening. My name is David Hope, and I'm the director of rail operations at Pier T. Toll Terminals International supports the	4 5 6 7 <b>M2</b>	meetings and weekend meetings. One of the most frequent things I hear from the community is the need for on-dock rail. This includes the Environmental Justice Community and our neighbors We now have our chance to enhance and We now have our chance to enhance and
	Perez and Ted Jimenez. MR. HOPE: Good evening. My name is David Hope, and I'm the director of rail operations at Pier T. Toll Terminals International supports the Port of Long Beach in its endeavors to improve the	4 5 7 <b>M2</b> 9	meetings and weekend meetings. One of the most frequent things I hear from the community is the need for on-dock rail. This includes the Environmental Justice Community and our neighbors We now have our chance to enhance and expand the use of on-dock rail with the proposed for D roil preject. Union Datific Delivard is
	Perez and Ted Jimenez. MR. HOPE: Good evening. My name is David Hope, and I'm the director of rail operations at Pier T. Toll Terminals International supports the Port of Long Beach in its endeavors to improve the efficient movement of freight and increase rail canacity through improvements to Part	4 5 7 . <b>M2</b> 9 10	meetings and weekend meetings. One of the most frequent things I hear from the community is the need for on-dock rail. This includes the Environmental Justice Community and our neighbors We now have our chance to enhance and expand the use of on-dock rail with the proposed Pier B rail project. Union Pacific Railroad is proud the support this project. Mod there were for
	Perez and Ted Jimenez. MR. HOPE: Good evening. My name is David Hope, and I'm the director of rail operations at Pier T. Toll Terminals International supports the Port of Long Beach in its endeavors to improve the efficient movement of freight and increase rail capacity through improvements to Port infrast purchase.	4 5 6 7 . <b>M2</b> 9 10 11	meetings and weekend meetings. One of the most frequent things I hear from the community is the need for on-dock rail. This includes the Environmental Justice Community and our neighbors We now have our chance to enhance and expand the use of on-dock rail with the proposed Pier B rail project. Union Pacific Railroad is proud to support this project. And thank you for
	Perez and Ted Jimenez. MR. HOPE: Good evening. My name is David Hope, and I'm the director of rail operations at Pier T. Toll Terminals International supports the Port of Long Beach in its endeavors to improve the efficient movement of freight and increase rail capacity through improvements to Port infrastructure. Thank you very much.	4 5 6 7 . <b>M2</b> [ 10 11 12	meetings and weekend meetings. One of the most frequent things I hear from the community is the need for on-dock rail. This includes the Environmental Justice Community and our neighbors We now have our chance to enhance and expand the use of on-dock rail with the proposed Pier B rail project. Union Pacific Railroad is proud to support this project. And thank you for allowing me to speak.
	Perez and Ted Jimenez. MR. HOPE: Good evening. My name is David Hope, and I'm the director of rail operations at Pier T. Toll Terminals International supports the Port of Long Beach in its endeavors to improve the efficient movement of freight and increase rail capacity through improvements to Port infrastructure. Thank you very much. MR. PEREZ: Good evening Port of Long Peach.	4 5 6 7 . <b>M2</b> [ 10 11 12 13	meetings and weekend meetings. One of the most frequent things I hear from the community is the need for on-dock rail. This includes the Environmental Justice Community and our neighbors We now have our chance to enhance and expand the use of on-dock rail with the proposed Pier B rail project. Union Pacific Railroad is proud to support this project. And thank you for allowing me to speak. MR. JIMENEZ: Good evening. My name is
	Perez and Ted Jimenez. MR. HOPE: Good evening. My name is David Hope, and I'm the director of rail operations at Pier T. Toll Terminals International supports the Port of Long Beach in its endeavors to improve the efficient movement of freight and increase rail capacity through improvements to Port infrastructure. Thank you very much. MR. PEREZ: Good evening Port of Long Beach. My name is Andy Perez, and I'm the director	4 5 6 7 . <b>M2[</b> 10 11 12 13 14	meetings and weekend meetings. One of the most frequent things I hear from the community is the need for on-dock rail. This includes the Environmental Justice Community and our neighbors We now have our chance to enhance and expand the use of on-dock rail with the proposed Pier B rail project. Union Pacific Railroad is proud to support this project. And thank you for allowing me to speak. MR. JIMENEZ: Good evening. My name is Ted Jimenez. I'm a Southwest Regional Council of
	Perez and Ted Jimenez. MR. HOPE: Good evening. My name is David Hope, and I'm the director of rail operations at Pier T. Toll Terminals International supports the Port of Long Beach in its endeavors to improve the efficient movement of freight and increase rail capacity through improvements to Port infrastructure. Thank you very much. MR. PEREZ: Good evening Port of Long Beach. My name is Andy Perez, and I'm the director of Port Affairs for Union Pacific Railroad, and also	4 5 6 7 . <b>M2[°][</b> 10 11 12 13 14 15	meetings and weekend meetings. One of the most frequent things I hear from the community is the need for on-dock rail. This includes the Environmental Justice Community and our neighbors We now have our chance to enhance and expand the use of on-dock rail with the proposed Pier B rail project. Union Pacific Railroad is proud to support this project. And thank you for allowing me to speak. MR. JIMENEZ: Good evening. My name is Ted Jimenez. I'm a Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters representative out of Los Angeles. It's
	Perez and Ted Jimenez. MR. HOPE: Good evening. My name is David Hope, and I'm the director of rail operations at Pier T. Toll Terminals International supports the Port of Long Beach in its endeavors to improve the efficient movement of freight and increase rail capacity through improvements to Port infrastructure. Thank you very much. MR. PEREZ: Good evening Port of Long Beach. My name is Andy Perez, and I'm the director of Port Affairs for Union Pacific Railroad, and also a 7th District home owner. I'm happy to be here	4 5 6 7 . <b>M2</b> [ 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	meetings and weekend meetings. One of the most frequent things I hear from the community is the need for on-dock rail. This includes the Environmental Justice Community and our neighbors We now have our chance to enhance and expand the use of on-dock rail with the proposed Pier B rail project. Union Pacific Railroad is proud to support this project. And thank you for allowing me to speak. MR. JIMENEZ: Good evening. My name is Ted Jimenez. I'm a Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters representative out of Los Angeles. It's obvious here that with the infrastructure that's
	Perez and Ted Jimenez. MR. HOPE: Good evening. My name is David Hope, and I'm the director of rail operations at Pier T. Toll Terminals International supports the Port of Long Beach in its endeavors to improve the efficient movement of freight and increase rail capacity through improvements to Port infrastructure. Thank you very much. MR. PEREZ: Good evening Port of Long Beach. My name is Andy Perez, and I'm the director of Port Affairs for Union Pacific Railroad, and also a 7th District home owner. I'm happy to be here tonight to say a few things about the proposed Pier	4 5 6 7 M ² [ 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	meetings and weekend meetings. One of the most frequent things I hear from the community is the need for on-dock rail. This includes the Environmental Justice Community and our neighbors We now have our chance to enhance and expand the use of on-dock rail with the proposed Pier B rail project. Union Pacific Railroad is proud to support this project. And thank you for allowing me to speak. MR. JIMENEZ: Good evening. My name is Ted Jimenez. I'm a Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters representative out of Los Angeles. It's obvious here that with the infrastructure that's being approved, that the project is going to create
	Perez and Ted Jimenez. MR. HOPE: Good evening. My name is David Hope, and I'm the director of rail operations at Pier T. Toll Terminals International supports the Port of Long Beach in its endeavors to improve the efficient movement of freight and increase rail capacity through improvements to Port infrastructure. Thank you very much. MR. PEREZ: Good evening Port of Long Beach. My name is Andy Perez, and I'm the director of Port Affairs for Union Pacific Railroad, and also a 7th District home owner. I'm happy to be here tonight to say a few things about the proposed Pier B rail project.	4 5 6 7 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	meetings and weekend meetings. One of the most frequent things I hear from the community is the need for on-dock rail. This includes the Environmental Justice Community and our neighbors We now have our chance to enhance and expand the use of on-dock rail with the proposed Pier B rail project. Union Pacific Railroad is proud to support this project. And thank you for allowing me to speak. MR. JIMENEZ: Good evening. My name is Ted Jimenez. I'm a Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters representative out of Los Angeles. It's obvious here that with the infrastructure that's being approved, that the project is going to create a greener Port. It's almost a no brainer. You want
	Perez and Ted Jimenez. MR. HOPE: Good evening. My name is David Hope, and I'm the director of rail operations at Pier T. Toll Terminals International supports the Port of Long Beach in its endeavors to improve the efficient movement of freight and increase rail capacity through improvements to Port infrastructure. Thank you very much. MR. PEREZ: Good evening Port of Long Beach. My name is Andy Perez, and I'm the director of Port Affairs for Union Pacific Railroad, and also a 7th District home owner. I'm happy to be here tonight to say a few things about the proposed Pier B rail project. Union Pacific Railroad is a proud partner	4 5 6 7 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 - <b>V12</b>	meetings and weekend meetings. One of the most frequent things I hear from the community is the need for on-dock rail. This includes the Environmental Justice Community and our neighbors We now have our chance to enhance and expand the use of on-dock rail with the proposed Pier B rail project. Union Pacific Railroad is proud to support this project. And thank you for allowing me to speak. MR. JIMENEZ: Good evening. My name is Ted Jimenez. I'm a Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters representative out of Los Angeles. It's obvious here that with the infrastructure that's being approved, that the project is going to create a greener Port. It's almost a no brainer. You want to be able to maximize the possibilities of being
	Perez and Ted Jimenez. MR. HOPE: Good evening. My name is David Hope, and I'm the director of rail operations at Pier T. Toll Terminals International supports the Port of Long Beach in its endeavors to improve the efficient movement of freight and increase rail capacity through improvements to Port infrastructure. Thank you very much. MR. PEREZ: Good evening Port of Long Beach. My name is Andy Perez, and I'm the director of Port Affairs for Union Pacific Railroad, and also a 7th District home owner. I'm happy to be here tonight to say a few things about the proposed Pier B rail project. Union Pacific Railroad is a proud partner of the Port of Long Beach and the Pacific Harbor	4 5 6 7 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	meetings and weekend meetings. One of the most frequent things I hear from the community is the need for on-dock rail. This includes the Environmental Justice Community and our neighbors We now have our chance to enhance and expand the use of on-dock rail with the proposed Pier B rail project. Union Pacific Railroad is proud to support this project. And thank you for allowing me to speak. MR. JIMENEZ: Good evening. My name is Ted Jimenez. I'm a Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters representative out of Los Angeles. It's obvious here that with the infrastructure that's being approved, that the project is going to create a greener Port. It's almost a no brainer. You want to be able to maximize the possibilities of being number one in the world in receiving all the
	Perez and Ted Jimenez. MR. HOPE: Good evening. My name is David Hope, and I'm the director of rail operations at Pier T. Toll Terminals International supports the Port of Long Beach in its endeavors to improve the efficient movement of freight and increase rail capacity through improvements to Port infrastructure. Thank you very much. MR. PEREZ: Good evening Port of Long Beach. My name is Andy Perez, and I'm the director of Port Affairs for Union Pacific Railroad, and also a 7th District home owner. I'm happy to be here tonight to say a few things about the proposed Pier B rail project. Union Pacific Railroad is a proud partner of the Port of Long Beach and the Pacific Harbor Line. All of us are committed to safety, the	4 5 6 7 <b>M2</b> [ 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 20 21	meetings and weekend meetings. One of the most frequent things I hear from the community is the need for on-dock rail. This includes the Environmental Justice Community and our neighbors We now have our chance to enhance and expand the use of on-dock rail with the proposed Pier B rail project. Union Pacific Railroad is proud to support this project. And thank you for allowing me to speak. MR. JIMENEZ: Good evening. My name is Ted Jimenez. I'm a Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters representative out of Los Angeles. It's obvious here that with the infrastructure that's being approved, that the project is going to create a greener Port. It's almost a no brainer. You want to be able to maximize the possibilities of being number one in the world in receiving all the containers that come in through here in southern
	Perez and Ted Jimenez. MR. HOPE: Good evening. My name is David Hope, and I'm the director of rail operations at Pier T. Toll Terminals International supports the Port of Long Beach in its endeavors to improve the efficient movement of freight and increase rail capacity through improvements to Port infrastructure. Thank you very much. MR. PEREZ: Good evening Port of Long Beach. My name is Andy Perez, and I'm the director of Port Affairs for Union Pacific Railroad, and also a 7th District home owner. I'm happy to be here tonight to say a few things about the proposed Pier B rail project. Union Pacific Railroad is a proud partner of the Port of Long Beach and the Pacific Harbor Line. All of us are committed to safety, the communities in which we operate in, green port	4 5 6 7 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 20 21 22	meetings and weekend meetings. One of the most frequent things I hear from the community is the need for on-dock rail. This includes the Environmental Justice Community and our neighbors We now have our chance to enhance and expand the use of on-dock rail with the proposed Pier B rail project. Union Pacific Railroad is proud to support this project. And thank you for allowing me to speak. MR. JIMENEZ: Good evening. My name is Ted Jimenez. I'm a Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters representative out of Los Angeles. It's obvious here that with the infrastructure that's being approved, that the project is going to create a greener Port. It's almost a no brainer. You want to be able to maximize the possibilities of being number one in the world in receiving all the containers that come in through here in southerm california.
	Perez and Ted Jimenez. MR. HOPE: Good evening. My name is David Hope, and I'm the director of rail operations at Pier T. Toll Terminals International supports the Port of Long Beach in its endeavors to improve the efficient movement of freight and increase rail capacity through improvements to Port infrastructure. Thank you very much. MR. PEREZ: Good evening Port of Long Beach. My name is Andy Perez, and I'm the director of Port Affairs for Union Pacific Railroad, and also a 7th District home owner. I'm happy to be here tonight to say a few things about the proposed Pier B rail project. Union Pacific Railroad is a proud partner of the Port of Long Beach and the Pacific Harbor Line. All of us are committed to safety, the communities in which we operate in, green port goals, increasing efficiency and improving the high	4 5 6 7 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 20 21 22 23	meetings and weekend meetings. One of the most frequent things I hear from the community is the need for on-dock rail. This includes the Environmental Justice Community and our neighbors We now have our chance to enhance and expand the use of on-dock rail with the proposed Pier B rail project. Union Pacific Railroad is proud to support this project. And thank you for allowing me to speak. MR. JIMENEZ: Good evening. My name is Ted Jimenez. I'm a Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters representative out of Los Angeles. It's obvious here that with the infrastructure that's being approved, that the project is going to create a greener Port. It's almost a no brainer. You want to be able to maximize the possibilities of being number one in the world in receiving all the containers that come in through here in southern california. I represent through our southwest 47,000
	Perez and Ted Jimenez. MR. HOPE: Good evening. My name is David Hope, and I'm the director of rail operations at Pier T. Toll Terminals International supports the Port of Long Beach in its endeavors to improve the efficient movement of freight and increase rail capacity through improvements to Port infrastructure. Thank you very much. MR. PEREZ: Good evening Port of Long Beach. My name is Andy Perez, and I'm the director of Port Affairs for Union Pacific Railroad, and also a 7th District home owner. I'm happy to be here tonight to say a few things about the proposed Pier B rail project. Union Pacific Railroad is a proud partner of the Port of Long Beach and the Pacific Harbor Line. All of us are committed to safety, the communities in which we operate in, green port goals, increasing efficiency and improving the high value international and domestic cargo safety	4 5 6 7 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 20 21 22 23 24	meetings and weekend meetings. One of the most frequent things I hear from the community is the need for on-dock rail. This includes the Environmental Justice Community and our neighbors We now have our chance to enhance and expand the use of on-dock rail with the proposed Pier B rail project. Union Pacific Railroad is proud to support this project. And thank you for allowing me to speak. MR. JIMENEZ: Good evening. My name is Ted Jimenez. I'm a Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters representative out of Los Angeles. It's obvious here that with the infrastructure that's being approved, that the project is going to create a greener Port. It's almost a no brainer. You want to be able to maximize the possibilities of being number one in the world in receiving all the containers that come in through here in southern California. I represent through our southwest 47,000 brothers. It's a large family. And in southern

1

Pie	Public Meet	ting	No. 2 (M2) Public Meeting	
	Page 17		Page 18	
1	everybody in that brotherhood and sisterhood. With	1	Regional Council of Carpenters. I live in San	
2	that in mind, our carpenters are paid a livable	2	Pedro. And most importantly I think for this	
3	wage. They have a healthcare plan, and they also	3	comment, I'm speaking in favor of the on-dock rail	
4	have a retirement where they can retire with	4	facility.	
5	dignity. And being really close to that, we're	- M2	I'm a third generation pile driver. My	
6	blessed. But that needs to continue.	0	grandfather started in 1929 to help build the power	
7	So we strongly approve this project		lines and gas lines to Terminal Island to get this	
8	knowing that we're going to supply this project with	8	thing started. My father worked on the Long Beach	
9	well-trained, certified, qualified carpenter	9	breakwater, and my brothers and I all worked in the	
10	members. Thank you.	10	harbor for extensive periods of time and something	
11	MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. Next comment is	11	near and dear.	
12	Steven Mendoza followed by John Schafer and Eddie	12	I am also very, very familiar with what's	
13	Rivera.	13	going on with Port. And this facility, as stated	
14	MR. MENDOZA: Good evening, everybody. My	14	before, is critical to making this port and keeping	2JS
15	name is Steven Mendoza. I'm a business agent and	15	this port relevant for the next century of activity	nťd)
16	laborer with 1309 here in the Long Beach area. I'm	16	that's going through there. 40 percent of all of	
17	a 26-year member. I believe this project we're	17	the nation's GDP goes through these two ports. In	
18	in favor of this project. I believe this project is	- M2	Sider to be done efficiently and clean as possible,	
10	a pathway to our youth for careers to be very	10	to get it going through trains and getting it going	
19	successful. I mean, projects like this that I've	20	through the most efficient way possible will ensure	
20	worked on in the past has been my pathway to my	20	jobs that count, jobs that really get to the heart	
21	successful career. Let's give these kids a chance	21	of the matter when it comes to an empity to getting	
22	MR. SCHAFER, Good evening, My name is	22	to benefits pension, you name it, will create a	
23	John Schafer I'm a 30-year member of nile drivers	43	negitive environmental impact that ign't negegarily	
24	Local 2275 which is affiliated with the Couthwest	M2	JS	
25	hotal 2010, which is allitated with the both west	25	Included In what a required by state documents	
	Page 19		Page 20	
1	cousy, unfortunatery.	1	definitely is going to beln not only on the	
2	important for you gue to consider . and I think	2	frequence but greating good working jobs like he	
3	important for you guys to consider. And I think	3	Treeways, but creating good working jobs, tike ne	
4	it's very, very important for you to consider in			2ER
5	support of this presidet as other presidets that are	4	said I believe he said seven years to come in the	2ER nťd)
~	support of this project as other projects that are	4	said I believe he said seven years to come in the future. So it starts now. Build it, build it	2ER nťd)
6	support of this project as other projects that are going to be coming down the pike. You mentioned the	4 5 6	said I believe he said seven years to come in the future. So it starts now. Build it, build it right, build it right the first time. And let's	2ER nťd)
6 7	support of this project as other projects that are going to be coming down the pike. You mentioned the ten or 11 that are in the process.	4 5 6 <b>M</b> 2	said I believe he said seven years to come in the future. So it starts now. Build it, build it right, build it right the first time. And let's maye forward with it. Thank you very much.	2ER nťd)
6 7 8	support of this project as other projects that are going to be coming down the pike. You mentioned the ten or 11 that are in the process. Please consider the fact that this port	4 5 6 – M2 (Çőn	said I believe he said seven years to come in the future. So it starts now. Build it, build it right, build it right the first time. And let's move forward with it. Thank you very much. MR. KELLY: Good evening. My name is David t'd)	2ER nťd)
6 7 8 9	support of this project as other projects that are going to be coming down the pike. You mentioned the ten or 11 that are in the process. Please consider the fact that this port has been in service for 100 years and deserves the	4 5 6 (Con 9	said I believe he said seven years to come in the future. So it starts now. Build it, build it right, build it right the first time. And let's move forward with it. Thank you very much. MR. KELLY: Good evening. My name is David terry. Thank you for letting me be here tonight.	2ER nťd)
6 7 8 9 10	support of this project as other projects that are going to be coming down the pike. You mentioned the ten or 11 that are in the process. Please consider the fact that this port has been in service for 100 years and deserves the respect of becoming relevant and being redeveloped	4 5 6 7 <b>M2</b> (Con 9 10	said I believe he said seven years to come in the future. So it starts now. Build it, build it right, build it right the first time. And let's more forward with it. Thank you very much. MR. KELLY: Good evening. My name is David total for the second se	2ER nťd)
6 7 8 9 10 11	support of this project as other projects that are going to be coming down the pike. You mentioned the ten or 11 that are in the process. Please consider the fact that this port has been in service for 100 years and deserves the respect of becoming relevant and being redeveloped in the 21st and 22nd century because it is going to	4 5 6 (Con 9 10 11	said I believe he said seven years to come in the future. So it starts now. Build it, build it right, build it right the first time. And let's more forward with it. Thank you very much. MR. KELLY: Good evening. My name is David t'd, Thank you for letting me be here tonight. I'm a resident of Long Beach. I support the project. I drive the 710 Preeway daily. I see this	2ER nťd)
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	support of this project as other projects that are going to be coming down the pike. You mentioned the ten or 11 that are in the process. Please consider the fact that this port has been in service for 100 years and deserves the respect of becoming relevant and being redeveloped in the 21st and 22nd century because it is going to have a positive effect, not only on my children, but	4 5 6 (Con 9 10 11 12	said I believe he said seven years to come in the future. So it starts now. Build it, build it right, build it right the first time. And let's move forward with it. Thank you very much. MR. KELLY: Good evening. My name is David t'd). I'm a resident of Long Beach. I support the project. I drive the 710 Freeway daily. I see this is a means to reduce traffic or at least keep it	2ER nťd)
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	support of this project as other projects that are going to be coming down the pike. You mentioned the ten or 11 that are in the process. Please consider the fact that this port has been in service for 100 years and deserves the respect of becoming relevant and being redeveloped in the 21st and 22nd century because it is going to have a positive effect, not only on my children, but all of our children that want to stay in the Harbor	4 5 6 (Con 10 11 12 13	said I believe he said seven years to come in the future. So it starts now. Build it, build it right, build it right the first time. And let's move forward with it. Thank you very much. S MR. KELLY: Good evening. My name is David t'd) Kelly. Thank you for letting me be here tonight. I'm a resident of Long Beach. I support the project. I drive the 710 Preeway daily. I see this is a means to reduce traffic or at least keep it where it's at. It's much more efficient, and going	2ER nťd)
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	support of this project as other projects that are going to be coming down the pike. You mentioned the ten or 11 that are in the process. Please consider the fact that this port has been in service for 100 years and deserves the respect of becoming relevant and being redeveloped in the 21st and 22nd century because it is going to have a positive effect, not only on my children, but all of our children that want to stay in the Harbor area. Thank you very much for your time.	4 5 6 (Con 9 10 11 12 13 14	said I believe he said seven years to come in the future. So it starts now. Build it, build it right, build it right the first time. And let's maye forward with it. Thank you very much. WR. KELLY: Good evening. My name is David t'd) WR. KELLY: Good evening. My name is David t'd) I'm a resident of Long Beach. I support the project. I drive the 710 Preeway daily. I see this is a means to reduce traffic or at least keep it where it's at. It's much more efficient, and going to reduce the amount of pollution we get from the	2ER nťd)
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	support of this project as other projects that are going to be coming down the pike. You mentioned the ten or 11 that are in the process. Please consider the fact that this port has been in service for 100 years and deserves the respect of becoming relevant and being redeveloped in the 21st and 22nd century because it is going to have a positive effect, not only on my children, but all of our children that want to stay in the Harbor area. Thank you very much for your time. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. Next up is Eddie	4 5 6 (Con 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	said I believe he said seven years to come in the future. So it starts now. Build it, build it right, build it right the first time. And let's maye forward with it. Thank you very much. MR. KELLY: Good evening. My name is David (d) Kefly. Thank you for letting me be here tonight. I'm a resident of Long Beach. I support the project. I drive the 710 Freeway daily. I see this is a means to reduce traffic or at least keep it where it's at. It's much more efficient, and going to reduce the amount of pollution we get from the freeway.	2ER nťd)
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	support of this project as other projects that are going to be coming down the pike. You mentioned the ten or 11 that are in the process. Please consider the fact that this port has been in service for 100 years and deserves the respect of becoming relevant and being redeveloped in the 21st and 22nd century because it is going to have a positive effect, not only on my children, but all of our children that want to stay in the Harbor area. Thank you very much for your time. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. Next up is Eddie Rivera followed by David Kelly and Eric Shen.	4 5 6 (Con 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	said I believe he said seven years to come in the future. So it starts now. Build it, build it right, build it right the first time. And let's move forward with it. Thank you very much. MR. KELLY: Good evening. My name is David (d) Kelly. Thank you for letting me be here tonight. I'm a resident of Long Beach. I support the project. I drive the 710 Freeway daily. I see this is a means to reduce traffic or at least keep it where it's at. It's much more efficient, and going to reduce the amount of pollution we get from the freeway. Standards are not enforced on the	2ER nťd) 2DK
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	support of this project as other projects that are going to be coming down the pike. You mentioned the ten or 11 that are in the process. Please consider the fact that this port has been in service for 100 years and deserves the respect of becoming relevant and being redeveloped in the 21st and 22nd century because it is going to have a positive effect, not only on my children, but all of our children that want to stay in the Harbor area. Thank you very much for your time. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. Next up is Eddie Rivera followed by David Kelly and Eric Shen. MR. RIVERA: Good evening, everybody. My	4 5 6 (Con 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>said I believe he said seven years to come in the future. So it starts now. Build it, build it right, build it right the first time. And let's move forward with it. Thank you very much.</li> <li>MR. KELLY: Good evening. My name is David t'd, Kelly. Thank you for letting me be here tonight. I'm a resident of Long Beach. I support the project. I drive the 710 Freeway daily. I see this is a means to reduce traffic or at least keep it where it's at. It's much more efficient, and going to reduce the amount of pollution we get from the freeway. Standards are not enforced on the truckers. Lots of unburned fuel is spilled on that</li> </ul>	2ER nťd) 2DK
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	support of this project as other projects that are going to be coming down the pike. You mentioned the ten or 11 that are in the process. Please consider the fact that this port has been in service for 100 years and deserves the respect of becoming relevant and being redeveloped in the 21st and 22nd century because it is going to have a positive effect, not only on my children, but all of our children that want to stay in the Harbor area. Thank you very much for your time. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. Next up is Eddie Rivera followed by David Kelly and Eric Shen. MR. RIVERA: Good evening, everybody. My name is Eddie Rivera. I'm a 20-year member of the	4 5 6 (Con 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	said I believe he said seven years to come in the future. So it starts now. Build it, build it right, build it right the first time. And let's move forward with it. Thank you very much. MR. KELLY: Good evening. My name is David Kefly. Thank you for letting me be here tonight. I'm a resident of Long Beach. I support the project. I drive the 710 Freeway daily. I see this is a means to reduce traffic or at least keep it where it's at. It's much more efficient, and going to reduce the amount of pollution we get from the freeway. Standards are not enforced on the truckers. Lots of unburned fuel is spilled on that freeway, and I can smell it. The noise is much less	2ER nťd) 2DK
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	support of this project as other projects that are going to be coming down the pike. You mentioned the ten or 11 that are in the process. Please consider the fact that this port has been in service for 100 years and deserves the respect of becoming relevant and being redeveloped in the 21st and 22nd century because it is going to have a positive effect, not only on my children, but all of our children that want to stay in the Harbor area. Thank you very much for your time. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. Next up is Eddie Rivera followed by David Kelly and Eric Shen. MR. RIVERA: Good evening, everybody. My name is Eddie Rivera. I'm a 20-year member of the Laborers Local 1309 here in Long Beach. And we	4 5 6 (Con 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	said I believe he said seven years to come in the future. So it starts now. Build it, build it right, build it right the first time. And let's move forward with it. Thank you very much. MR. KELLY: Good evening. My name is David Kefly. Thank you for letting me be here tonight. I'm a resident of Long Beach. I support the project. I drive the 710 Preeway daily. I see this is a means to reduce traffic or at least keep it where it's at. It's much more efficient, and going to reduce the amount of pollution we get from the freeway. Standards are not enforced on the truckers. Lots of unburned fuel is spilled on that freeway, and I can smell it. The noise is much less from freight trains. If we're going to compensate	2ER nťd) 2DK
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	support of this project as other projects that are going to be coming down the pike. You mentioned the ten or 11 that are in the process. Please consider the fact that this port has been in service for 100 years and deserves the respect of becoming relevant and being redeveloped in the 21st and 22nd century because it is going to have a positive effect, not only on my children, but all of our children that want to stay in the Harbor area. Thank you very much for your time. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. Next up is Eddie Rivera followed by David Kelly and Eric Shen. MR. RIVERA: Good evening, everybody. My name is Eddie Rivera. I'm a 20-year member of the Laborers Local 1309 here in Long Beach. And we strongly support the project considering all the	4 5 6 (Con 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	said I believe he said seven years to come in the future. So it starts now. Build it, build it right, build it right the first time. And let's move forward with it. Thank you very much. MR. KELLY: Good evening. My name is David Kefly. Thank you for letting me be here tonight. I'm a resident of Long Beach. I support the project. I drive the 710 Preeway daily. I see this is a means to reduce traffic or at least keep it where it's at. It's much more efficient, and going to reduce the amount of pollution we get from the freeway. Standards are not enforced on the truckers. Lots of unburned fuel is spilled on that freeway, and I can smell it. The noise is much less from freight trains. If we're going to compensate the trucks, we'll have to widen the 710 by three	2ER nťd) 2DK
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	support of this project as other projects that are going to be coming down the pike. You mentioned the ten or 11 that are in the process. Please consider the fact that this port has been in service for 100 years and deserves the respect of becoming relevant and being redeveloped in the 21st and 22nd century because it is going to have a positive effect, not only on my children, but all of our children that want to stay in the Harbor area. Thank you very much for your time. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. Next up is Eddie Rivera followed by David Kelly and Eric Shen. MR. RIVERA: Good evening, everybody. My name is Eddie Rivera. I'm a 20-year member of the Laborers Local 1309 here in Long Beach. And we strongly support the project considering all the positives that can come from it, not only for our	4 5 6 (Con 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	said I believe he said seven years to come in the future. So it starts now. Build it, build it right, build it right the first time. And let's maye forward with it. Thank you very much. MR. KELLY: Good evening. My name is David Kefly. Thank you for letting me be here tonight. I'm a resident of Long Beach. I support the project. I drive the 710 Freeway daily. I see this is a means to reduce traffic or at least keep it where it's at. It's much more efficient, and going to reduce the amount of pollution we get from the freeway. Standards are not enforced on the truckers. Lots of unburned fuel is spilled on that freeway, and I can smell it. The noise is much less from freight trains. If we're going to compensate the trucks, we'll have to widen the 710 by three lanes in either direction, taking land out, tax	2ER nťd) 2DK
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	support of this project as other projects that are going to be coming down the pike. You mentioned the ten or 11 that are in the process. Please consider the fact that this port has been in service for 100 years and deserves the respect of becoming relevant and being redeveloped in the 21st and 22nd century because it is going to have a positive effect, not only on my children, but all of our children that want to stay in the Harbor area. Thank you very much for your time. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. Next up is Eddie Rivera followed by David Kelly and Eric Shen. MR. RIVERA: Good evening, everybody. My name is Eddie Rivera. I'm a 20-year member of the Laborers Local 1309 here in Long Beach. And we strongly support the project considering all the positives that can come from it, not only for our apprenticeship, apprentices that could log hours	4 5 6 (Con 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 20	said I believe he said seven years to come in the future. So it starts now. Build it, build it right, build it right the first time. And let's maye forward with it. Thank you very much. MR. KELLY: Good evening. My name is David Kefly. Thank you for letting me be here tonight. I'm a resident of Long Beach. I support the project. I drive the 710 Preeway daily. I see this is a means to reduce traffic or at least keep it where it's at. It's much more efficient, and going to reduce the amount of pollution we get from the freeway. Standards are not enforced on the truckers. Lots of unburned fuel is spilled on that freeway, and I can smell it. The noise is much less from freight trains. If we're going to compensate the trucks, we'll have to widen the 710 by three hanes in either direction, taking land out, tax revenue, increasing the tax burden on us because the	2ER nťd) 2DK
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	support of this project as other projects that are going to be coming down the pike. You mentioned the ten or 11 that are in the process. Please consider the fact that this port has been in service for 100 years and deserves the respect of becoming relevant and being redeveloped in the 21st and 22nd century because it is going to have a positive effect, not only on my children, but all of our children that want to stay in the Harbor area. Thank you very much for your time. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. Next up is Eddie Rivera followed by David Kelly and Eric Shen. MR. RIVERA: Good evening, everybody. My name is Eddie Rivera. I'm a 20-year member of the Laborers Local 1309 here in Long Beach. And we strongly support the project considering all the positives that can come from it, not only for our apprenticeship, apprentices that could log hours working on this, but obviously the heavy loaded	4 5 6 (Con 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 20 20 22 23	said I believe he said seven years to come in the future. So it starts now. Build it, build it right, build it right the first time. And let's maye forward with it. Thank you very much. MR. KELLY: Good evening. My name is David Kerly. Thank you for letting me be here tonight. I'm a resident of Long Beach. I support the project. I drive the 710 Preeway daily. I see this is a means to reduce traffic or at least keep it where it's at. It's much more efficient, and going to reduce the amount of pollution we get from the freeway. Standards are not enforced on the truckers. Lots of unburned fuel is spilled on that freeway, and I can smell it. The noise is much less from freight trains. If we're going to compensate the trucks, we'll have to widen the 710 by three hanes in either direction, taking land out, tax revenue, increasing the tax burden on us because the construction of highways is fat more expensive than	2ER nťd) 2DK
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 23 24	support of this project as other projects that are going to be coming down the pike. You mentioned the ten or 11 that are in the process. Please consider the fact that this port has been in service for 100 years and deserves the respect of becoming relevant and being redeveloped in the 21st and 22nd century because it is going to have a positive effect, not only on my children, but all of our children that want to stay in the Harbor area. Thank you very much for your time. MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. Next up is Eddie Rivera followed by David Kelly and Eric Shen. MR. RIVERA: Good evening, everybody. My name is Eddie Rivera. I'm a 20-year member of the Laborers Local 1309 here in Long Beach. And we strongly support the project considering all the positives that can come from it, not only for our apprenticeship, apprentices that could log hours working on this, but obviously the heavy loaded freeways that surround this area definitely need the	4 5 6 (Con 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 20 22 23 24	said I believe he said seven years to come in the future. So it starts now. Build it, build it right, build it right the first time. And let's maye forward with it. Thank you very much. MR. KELLY: Good evening. My name is David Kerly. Thank you for letting me be here tonight. I'm a resident of Long Beach. I support the project. I drive the 710 Preeway daily. I see this is a means to reduce traffic or at least keep it where it's at. It's much more efficient, and going to reduce the amount of pollution we get from the freeway. Standards are not enforced on the truckers. Lots of unburned fuel is spilled on that freeway, and I can smell it. The noise is much less from freight trains. If we're going to compensate the trucks, we'll have to widen the 710 by three lanes in either direction, taking land out, tax revenue, increasing the tax burden on us because the construction of highways is fat more expensive than rail. Thank you, and I support the project.	2ER nťd) 2DK
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	<pre>support of this project as other projects that are going to be coming down the pike. You mentioned the ten or 11 that are in the process.</pre>	4 5 6 (Con 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 20 22 23 24 25	said I believe he said seven years to come in the future. So it starts now. Build it, build it right, build it right the first time. And let's maye forward with it. Thank you very much. MR. KELLY: Good evening. My name is David to make you for letting me be here tonight. I'm a resident of Long Beach. I support the project. I drive the 710 Preeway daily. I see this is a means to reduce traffic or at least keep it where it's at. It's much more efficient, and going to reduce the amount of pollution we get from the freeway. Standards are not enforced on the truckers. Lots of unburned fuel is spilled on that freeway, and I can smell it. The noise is much less from freight trains. If we're going to compensate the trucks, we'll have to widen the 710 by three lanes in either direction, taking land out, tax revenue, increasing the tax burden on us because the construction of highways is fat more expensive than rail. Thank you, and I support the project. MS. TOMLEY: Next up is Bric Shen followed	2ER nťd) 2DK

1

Pie	Public Meet	ing	No. 2 (M2) Public Meeting
	Page 21		Page 22
1	by Peter Santillan and Anthony Otto.	1	Otto and Alex Lafarga.
2	MR. SHEN: Good evening. My name is Bric	1 2	MR. SANTILLAN: Good evening. My name is
3	Shen. I am the director of Southern California	3	Peter Santillan. I'm the business manager of the
4	Gateway Office of Maritime Administration within	4	Laborers Local 1309, and I'm here as a laborer and
5	USDOT. Our agency's main mission is to foster a	5	also as a building trades representative with the
6	maritime business, as well as intermodal business.	6	other brothers and sisters in the room.
7	In the Southern California Gateway office there are	7	We are in agreement with the efficiencies
8	40 water seaports including Los Angeles, Long Beach,	8	that this project will create, the traffic that will
9	San Diego and the Port of Hueneme.	9	be alleviated on that freeway, the 710 corridor.
10	The ports of railway in Long Beach are the	10	And we're here to ask that this project move
11	most critical gateway to the rest of the nation.	11	forward, and we're in support of the project. Thank
12	And I also want to point out that the Port of Long	12	you.
13	Beach is also a designated strategic commercial	-M2	ES MR. OTTO: Evening. My name is Anthony
14	seaport and handles military outloads. And all of	14	Otto. I'm the president of Long Beach Container
15	the operations will go through your rail	15	Terminal. For those who don't know, Long Beach
16	infrastructure.	16	Container Terminal is the operator of the newest
17	While I cannot, our agency at this point,	17	container terminal Port of Long Beach commonly
18	we cannot comment on our position on your proposed	18	referred to as the Middle Harbor Redevelopment
19	project, we do look forward to working with you once	19	Project M2AO
20	your proposed project is approved. Our agency will	20	The new terminal is the first near-zero
21	be delighted to work with you to make this project	21	emission container terminal in the country, and it
22	however form it's approved to become competitive for	22	is by far the cleanest and most environmentally
23	future Federal grants as well as possible Federal	23	friendly container terminal on this planet. I'm
24	loan opportunities. Thank you.	24	here tonight to speak on behalf not to speak on
25	MS. TOMLEY: Peter Santillan and Anthony	25	behalf, but in support of the Pier B railyard.
	Page 23		Page 24
1	It is a critical component of the success	1	Now, coming from a few different
2	of the Middle Harbor Redevelopment Project, an	2	directions, as a business representative I would
3	investment that we have all made. Without the	3	love to see this project being built. I would love
4	Pier B railyard it will be impossible to reach its	4	to see the man hours. It can put people to work,
5	on-dock throughput potential due to the limitations	5	create good jobs. It can support families, bring
6	of the surrounding ports' rail infrastructure	6	the protections, the pensions and the health and
7	resulting in an artificial limitation of the	7	welfare to provide for these people.
8	terminal's capacity.	8	As a resident of Long Beach, I also
9	The maximization of loading off rail cargo	M2	ADD applaud it because, like the other gentleman said,
10	on-dock is important because for every container	(Cor	it opens up the freeways. It's going to create a
11	that we don't load, it's another container that hits	11	"greener environment for the places where we live.
12	the freeways and local roadways increasing	12	Laudable, it's a great goal to shoot for. (Cont'd)
13	congestion and emissions. Without the Pier B	13	And just as a citizen who is in the area,
14	railyard, we will have eroded the capacity of the	14	I support any aggressive attempt to grow the ports
15	Port to load more of this cargo on-dock.	15	and the commerce and make the area just more of a
16	This project has already been delayed for	16	powerhouse, just to get everything out of those
17	several years. So I believe it's an environmental	17	ports that we can.
18	imperative for it to proceed without any further	18	So when I look at this project that's
19	delay, and we support it. Thank you.	19	accomplishing all three of those things, addressing
20	MR. LAFARGA: Hello. I'm Alex Fargo with	20	all three of the different issues that I look at,
21	Laborers Local 1309, and we represent about 3,000	21	all I can do is say I stand firmly in support of
22	members working in the Long Beach area. Like a lot	- M2	AL Thank you.
23	or my union brothers and sisters here, I echo the	23	MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. Next up is Jim
24	sentiment that we want to push forward with this	24	Stewart followed by Thomas Jelenic and Randy Gordon.
	-		

Kusar Court Reporters & Legal Services, Inc.

6 (21 - 24)

Pie	Public Mee	etin	g No. 2 (M2) Public Meeting
	Page 25		Page 26
1	representing the climate and transportation	1	so we want you to have that as a mitigation   M2   S_2
2	committees of the Sierra Club Los Angeles Chapter.	2	requirement in this project, if that's at all (Cont'd)
3	And we're really pleased to be part of the	3	possible.
4	blue/green alliance in support of this project with	4	And the other thing that I want to mention
5	our union brothers and sisters for all the points	5	also is that I hope you can have the construction
5	that have been made so far.	6	vehicles that are used. Like I hope you know, one
7	And as a resident of west Long Beach who	-7	of the worst sources of air quality emissions in
8	lives about a mile from this facility, I have a	HW	2 JS-1 this area is off-road vehicles. So that we are
9	question in terms of the train whistles. And I'm	l (d	going) to ask you again as another mitigation to have
10	wondering if it's possible maybe with the closure of	10	all the vehicles that are constructing this to be
11	this, you know, at-grade crossing, and if there are	11	the cleanest possible vehicles because, as I said
12	any other at-grade crossings that we can close as a	12	before, we can't stand any more pollution in this
13	result of this project, then those of us that live	13	area. And we're really depending upon you to put in
14	in that area could sleep better at night. And so	14	that kind of work to help us breathe better here.
15	that's one of the things that I'll be submitting as	15	Thank you.
15	a comment for this.	16	MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. Thomas Jelenic
17	And then the other thing that I wanted to	17	followed by Andy Gordon and Craig Holland.
18	raise is this issue of clean locomotives. I mean,	18	MR. JELENIC: Thank you for the opportunity
19	I'm hoping that it's possible for you to put the	19	to comment this evening. My name is Thomas Jelenic
20	screws on our railroad people here to give us clean	20	with the Pacific Merchant Shipping Association.
21	locomotives. We are suffering here in this Long	ΗM	Z JAR Zupports the Port of Long Beach and its
22	Beach area. As you know, the Port's area is the	22	proposal for the Pier B on-dock support facility.
23	worst air quality in the whole region. And part of	23	This needed infrastructure will allow for
24	that is because the locomotives are not at the	24	cargo to use more on-dock railyards and container
25	cleanest possible standard that they could be. And	25	terminals. By using on-dock rail, the Port will
	Page 27		Page 28
1	eliminate truck trips reducing pollution and	1	proposed on-dock rail support facility project
2	congestion while improving efficiency and	2	continues down that path.
3	competitiveness at the Port of Long Beach's	3	We know the competition remains fierce
4	container terminals. Construction of this project	4	among ports throughout the world. By allowing such
5	will also create needed jobs and economic benefit to	5	improvements at our Port will continue to retain
5	our community.	(Co	The nesses and jobs with infrastructure improvements
7	The Fort should move forward with this	(CØ	is up as Pier B project.
8	facility is completed, the scoper the community will	8	workers to assemble longer trains within the Port
9	gain the benefits of improved air guality and	9	moving cargo faster while minimizing truck traffic
10	reduced traffic Thank you	10	on local roads. In fact, as addressed in the EIR (Cont'd)
11	MR GORDON, Good evening My name is Randy	1	each on-dock rail train saves 750 truck trins
12	Gordon, and I'm president and CEO of the Long Reach	12	between the Port and the off-dock railvards. The
14	Area Chamber of Commerce. Tonight I'm here on	14	construction of Pier B on-dock rail project alone
14	behalf of the Chamber and our 1,000 member	14	would support more than 1,100 jobs. These are many
15	businesses to support the enhancement of the	15	of the same benefits.
17	existing Pier B rail facility. I will be brief, but	17	This project for the Port and businesses
1.8	speaking to the economic benefits of this project	18	is much needed, supporting the local economy and
19	and highlighting the undeniable economic generator	<b>Η</b> Μ2	RG ensuring the Port remains competitive worldwide.
20	of our community, which is our Port.	20	Thank you for allowing me to give comments tonight.
21	As such, our Port continues to be	21	MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. Craig Holland
22	recognized worldwide as the premiere leader in	22	followed by Levi Javier and Armando Porras.
23	environmental stewardship, technology and green	23	MR. HOLLAND: Good evening. My name is
24	policies. We all know that we are the envy of most	24	Craig Holland. I've spent a career as a Port - M2CH
25	ports in the country, if not the world. This	25	engineer, consulting engineer, and still work for a
Kus	- ar Court Reporters & Legal Services,	Inc	. 7 (25 - 28)

16	er B EIR Public Mee	tin	g No. 2 (M2) Public Meetin	a
	Page 29		Page 30	Ĩ
1	consulting company that does much business with the	1	grabbed our attention, which includes support the	
2	Port. But I'm here tonight as a resident of Long	2	transition to a more efficient, more economically	
3	Beach.	3	competitive and less polluting freight	
4	I first moved to Long Beach in 1974, and I	4	transportation system as envisioned in the 2016	
5	can tell you anecdotally I can tell the difference	5	California Sustainable Freight Action Plan, also	
6	in the improvement of the air quality downwind of	6	promote a mode shift from containers shipped by	
7	the Port. And I very much believe from my technical	ă I-	A2CH to near-dock and/or on-dock facilities for	
0	background as well as my experience here as a	(Ć	ontroduners shipped by rail from the on-dock and	
0	resident that this project will be beneficial to the	10	supporting railwards Finally to provide	
9	anvironment and I'm vary much in favor of it	9	additional Port rail canability to support and	
.0	I also know the importance of the Port and	10	maximize on dock intermedal operations to a targeted	
.1	I also know the importance of the port and	11	maximize on-dock intermodal operations to a targeted	
.2	these projects to the employment figures here in the	12	goal of 30 to 35 percent of containers handled by	
.3	city and hope very much that it's approved. Thank 🤳	13	on-dock rail.	
.4	you.	14	Although I don't live at Long Beach, I	(Cont
5	MR. JAVIER: Hello. My name is Levi Javier,	15	went to Cal State Long Beach. My father was an	
6	and I am part of the Harbor Association of Industry	16	engineer at City of Long Beach starting in 1978.	
7	and Commerce. For the past 42 years the HAIC has	17	Our family has a long history of being with the	
8	been the collective voice and advocate for the	18	Port. We used to go fishing off Pier E back in the	
9	harbor business community. We are a nonprofit	19	olden days. Back then you could literally see the	
0	industrial and commercial trade association which	20	smog hovering over the Port. On summer days it	
1	serves as a voice on trade transportation and	21	would literally be like a rustic red, and you could	
2	packing for South Bay and Harbor business	22	feel it burn in your lungs. And we made a lot of	
3	communities.	23	progress since those good old days.	
4	We support this project wholeheartedly.	24	But still, going down the freeway the	
5	And there's three points on the EIR that specially	25	other day, you can still feel the pollution on the	
-	Page 31	+	Page 32	-
1	freeways. So anything that we can do to minimize	_1	With that, I'll go and let the other	
2	the pollution, noise, traffic, just as a citizen I'm,	M	<b>2</b> members talk. And then my international president	
3	100 percent for that. And this project directly	(Co	nt'd) San Francisco will have the opportunity to	
4	addresses that. Thank you.	4	speak. Thank you.	
5	MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. Armando Porras	5	MR. MATSON: Good evening. My name is	
6	followed by Brandon Matson and Ray Pamilathe. Sorry	6	Brandon Matson, here tonight on behalf of the LA	
7	I butchered that.	7	County Business Federation, which represents over	
0	MR. FAMILATHE: Ray Fam-i-lat-av, to help	0	160 business and trade associations that represent	
0	you with that.	0	325.000 employers with more than four million	
9	MR. PORRAS: I'm kind of happy with the way	10	employees throughout the region.	
1	you pronounced my name. Thank you. It's not easy	10	The Port of Long Beach is a vital senset	
T	Tim the vice president of International Long-	11	of the nation's according and is a significant ish	
2	Warehousements linion Local 12, how in the next of	12	greater for couthern California as us all how	
3	Natenouseman's onton, local 13, nere in the Port of	13	and us much loss our parts sensitivity mile	
	DA/Dong Beach, and we support this project. We're	14	And we must keep our ports competitive. This type	
4	penind the project. I hear brothers and sisters	15	or intrastructure improvement is critical to being	M2
4		16	competitive and helps to retain businesses and jobs	
4 5 6	talking here and individuals throughout the		in southern California.	
4 5 6 7	talking here and individuals throughout the community who are speaking of supporting it. I just	17		
4 5 7 8	talking here and individuals throughout the community who are speaking of supporting it. I just want to echo their words.	17 - M	2AP In fact, trade flowing through the Port of	
4 5 6 7 8 9	talking here and individuals throughout the community who are speaking of supporting it. I just want to echo their words. Anything that provides jobs, progress in	17 - M 19	2AP In fact, trade flowing through the Port of Long Beach sustains more than 300,000 jobs in	
4 5 6 7 8 9	talking here and individuals throughout the community who are speaking of supporting it. I just want to echo their words. Anything that provides jobs, progress in this area which is going to sprinkle and spread to	17 19 20	2AP In fact, trade flowing through the Port of Long Beach sustains more than 300,000 jobs in southern Colorado. Moreover, this project alone	
4 5 6 7 8 9 0	talking here and individuals throughout the community who are speaking of supporting it. I just want to echo their words. Anything that provides jobs, progress in this area which is going to sprinkle and spread to the rest of the area, I'm in true support. I	17 19 20 21	2AP In fact, trade flowing through the Port of Long Beach sustains more than 300,000 jobs in southern Colorado. Moreover, this project alone supports more than 1,100 jobs. In addition, a	
4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2	talking here and individuals throughout the community who are speaking of supporting it. I just want to echo their words. Anything that provides jobs, progress in this area which is going to sprinkle and spread to the rest of the area, I'm in true support. I represent 6,800 members and can tell you right now	17 19 20 21 22	2AP In fact, trade flowing through the Port of Long Beach sustains more than 300,000 jobs in southern Colorado. Moreover, this project alone supports more than 1,100 jobs. In addition, a redeveloped Pier B railyard would allow cargo to	
4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3	talking here and individuals throughout the community who are speaking of supporting it. I just want to echo their words. Anything that provides jobs, progress in this area which is going to sprinkle and spread to the rest of the area, I'm in true support. I represent 6,800 members and can tell you right now when this project came out and we started hearing	17 19 20 21 22 23	In fact, trade flowing through the Port of Long Beach sustains more than 300,000 jobs in southern Colorado. Moreover, this project alone supports more than 1,100 jobs. In addition, a redeveloped Pier B railyard would allow cargo to move fatter and minimize the trucks on local roads	
4 5.6 7.8 9 0 1 2 3 4	talking here and individuals throughout the community who are speaking of supporting it. I just want to echo their words. Anything that provides jobs, progress in this area which is going to sprinkle and spread to the rest of the area, I'm in true support. I represent 6,800 members and can tell you right now when this project came out and we started hearing about it, we were happy to recognize to be working	17 19 20 21 22 23 24	In fact, trade flowing through the Port of Long Beach sustains more than 300,000 jobs in southern Colorado. Moreover, this project alone supports more than 1,100 jobs. In addition, a redeveloped Pier B railyard would allow cargo to move fatter and minimize the trucks on local roads helping to reduce congestion. And specifically,	
4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5	talking here and individuals throughout the community who are speaking of supporting it. I just want to echo their words. Anything that provides jobs, progress in this area which is going to sprinkle and spread to the rest of the area, I'm in true support. I represent 6,800 members and can tell you right now when this project came out and we started hearing about it, we were happy to recognize to be working in those gates. We support it.	17 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	In fact, trade flowing through the Port of Long Beach sustains more than 300,000 jobs in southern Colorado. Moreover, this project alone supports more than 1,100 jobs. In addition, a redeveloped Pier B railyard would allow cargo to move fatter and minimize the trucks on local roads helping to reduce congestion. And specifically, each on-dock rail train saves about 750 truck trips	

Pie	Public Me	etii	ng No. 2 (M2) Public Meetin	q
	Page_33		Page 34	-
1	between the Port and off-dock railyards M2BM	1	opportunity.	1
2	We appreciate the opportunity to (Gont'd)	2	You know, last year in 2016 I attended the	
3	you tonight to highlight a few aspects of the	3	inaugural ceremony of the Panama Canal. My union	
4	project that would be beneficial for our region.	4	represents the Panama Canal pilots. So I spent a	
5	Thank you so much.	5	bit of time down in Panama. And I can tell you as	
6	MS. TOMLEY: And then the last comment is	6	we're here talking today about the possibility of	
7	from Ray Familathe you just told me how to	7	approving this rail project that will allow the Port	
8	pronounce it. Sorry.	8	of Long Beach to grow for many years to come, the	
9	MR. FAMILATHE: I'll help you, Fam-i-lat-ay.	9	Panama Canal and other maritime interests are	
10	I'm Ray Familathe. I'm the international	10	working just as hard because those big ships that	
11	vice-president of the ILWU international union, and	11	were built, they want them to go through the Canal.	
12	I also represent the coast longshore division. I	12	We want them to come here to Long Beach.	
13	represent 29 ports on the west coast of the United	13	I think there's enough opportunity for everybody in	H M2RF
14	States, and my members are longshoremen, marine	14	the maritime industry, but it's essential for the	(Cont'd
15	clerks and foremen.	15	Port of Long Beach to approve this project. I know	
16	Los Angeles Port of Long Beach is one of	16	there's concerns. I think the railroad has heard	
17	the most significant vital ports. We've heard all	17	many of the concerns from the community. I think	
18	the numbers about the importance of the large	₩	2 Revire vital concerns, but I also think that all	
19	percentage of cargo that moves through our ports,	19	the partners on this project know what it's going to	
20	but there's more than that. You know, Long Beach is	20	take to get it approved. And working together with	
21	vital to the entire country. You've heard labor	21	the community, labor, and especially dealing with	
22	concerns. This is going to mean a lot of jobs for	22	the environmental concerns, will create that	
23	not just my organization, but other union	23	win/win.	
24	organizations that will be affected here. It's	24	The people down in Panama right now are	
25	essential to my members to have this work	25	working night and day to make sure those big ships	
	Page 35		Page 36	-
1	go through the Canal. And working with you in the	1	health and our nation's national defense.	
2	Port of Long Beach, I hope that we're going to work	2	The reason I'm here today is I feel	
3	just as hard to keep our market share and keep my	3	there's not been enough consideration on what would	
4	members working. Without the Port of Long Beach	4	happen to the private businesses that currently	
5	approving this project, I think we'd be headed into	- 5	occupy the site. The BIR has not adequately	
6	a very, very bad spot as far as future	- M2	Assessed the needs of the people who will be most	
7	opportunities. So please, vote this project up.	Cor	t'd).	
8	For workers it's a win, for the environment taking	8	dealing with numbers on a piece of paper. We're	
9	those trucks off that dangerous freeway, being the	9	making decisions that affect real people, people	
10	710, and all the environmental concerns, please,	10	that have real families, people and countless of	
11	support this project. Thank you.	11	others relying on them and the work they do, and	
12	MS. TOMLEY: Thank you, Mr. Pamilathe. Next	12	people who can provide permanent jobs and have for	
13	comment is from Kevin Donaldson followed by Lee	13	generations.	
14	Wilson.	14	With limited time to prepare, having only	WIZKL
15	MR. DONALDSON: Good evening. My name is	1 15	heard about the project and associated meetings	(Cont'd
16	Kevin Donaldson. I'm the operations manager for	16	through a press release, it's difficult to convev in	
17	Land Logistics located at 1520 West 11th Street. We	17	words how our business would be adversely affected.	
18	are one of the many businesses that would be	1.8	We are not a company that can be just thrown in any	
19	displaced as a result of the proposed project. My	19	location. The services we provide and customers we	
20	family has occupied this location for over 25 years	Ln	Supposent have taken decades to cultivate and can	
21	spanning several generations. Our business	21	only be properly serviced within the heavyweight	
22	specializes in oversize import and export handling	22	corridor where alternative locations are limited at	
22	services for some of the country's leading	22	the best.	
24	manufacturers as well as the US military. We take	24	There are very few businesses in the	
25	pride in what we do contributing to the economic	25	country that can do what we do, and our location is	
25		25		<b>1</b>
Kus	ar Court Reporters & Legal Services,	Inc	. 9 (33 - 36	)

Pie	r B EIR Public Me	eti	ng No. 2 (M2) Public Meetin	a
	Page 37		Page 38	
1	essential to our operation. The private businesses	1 1	So I would ask and I have spoken with	
2	and property owners who occupy the proposed site	2	quite a bit of staff already that the	
3	should be part of the planning process. We deserve	2	stakeholders, the people who are going to be	
4	more than a press release. We deserve more than		directly impacted now, we're not saying we're not	
5	three minutes of allotted time. The Port is what it	( <b>Q</b>	in favor of improving the Port; but when you lose	
6	is today with the help of companies like us, and we	6	businesses, you lose income, you lose property and	
7	hope to be part of the future. Thanks for your	7	it's not your decision, that is a negative impact to	
8	time.	8	lives and to families.	
9	MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. Lee Wilson.	9	So as we move forward, I would I ask the	
10	MR. WILSON: My name is Lee Wilson. My	10	staff and the Port have a sensitivity to people who	
11	family has had people working in the Port for over	11	are going to be greatly impacted and encourage open	
12	100 years. My great grandparents moved to Long	12	communication and ready and viable and important	M2I W/
13	Beach when it was Willmore City, and we have been	13	responses to questions in a timely fashion. Just	(Cont'd)
14	proud supporters of the Port for over 130 years.	14	have the sensitivity that when businesses like the	(Cont u)
15	I own a piece of property that will be	15	young man that just spoke are facing having to be	
16	impacted. I have a tenant who's been in there	16	relocated, that is not an easy thing to look for	
17	providing services to the country and to the Federal	17	especially for a business that's been in the same	
18	Government for over 25 years. Our building has	18	location for over 25 years.	
19	supported the Port and prospered with the Port for	19	So that's all I really have to say. I	
20	over 50 years. So you know, I'm speaking here for	-M2	LWW be actively involved and will continue to	
21	all the stakeholders and I'm surprised that more	21	monitor everything going on, but just have that in	
22	are not here that are going to lose their	22	the back of your minds when you make business	
23	property and lose their businesses and maybe their	23	decisions. We are business people, and we can live	
24	livelihoods. This is not all "green" for a lot of	24	with that; but we are private property owners and	
25	people. Okay?	25	have private property rights, private property	
	Page 39		Page 40	
1	business owners. And I'm surprised that there	NA	Disney, for Starbucks, for McDonald's. And we have	
2	aren't more stakeholders here. I think they need to		a lot of clients come in with a railyard right	
3	be contacted directly and communicated with	3	behind us. Nothing in the BIR lets us know what	
4	directly. Thank you.	4	you're going to do to mitigate the train tracks from	
5	MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. We don't have any	5	the backyard. We'll have train tracks probably 50	
6	more speaker cards at this point. So what I would	6	feet from the back of our business.	_M2SJ
7	like to offer up if there's anybody in the audience	7	You know, it's going to open us up to	(Cont'd)
8	that would like to speak, if you would like to come	8	lawsuits from employees who get sick, who have noise	
9	up to the podium at this time? Be sure to state	9	pollution, et cetera. So I'd like to see something	
10	your name.	10	that's going to let us know how you're going to	
11	MR. JANOCHA: Good evening. My name is Stan	11	handle the problems we're going to encounter having	
12	Janocha. I'm the owner of Superior Electrical	12	this railyard so close to my business. Thank you.	
13	Advertising. We're located in the old Coke bottling	13	MR. ORELLANA: Ricardo Orellana. Good	
14	plant on Anaheim Street and Santa Fe Avenue. Our	14	evening. Once again, I'm Ricardo Orellana. I'm a	
15	building and our property is over 100,000 square	15	recent graduate of a construction apprenticeship	
16	reet. This railyard is going to be directly behind	16	program at Long Beach City College. I'm here in	
17	our business. The 12th Street is our backyard. We	17	representation of my class. And we're in support of	
18	exit and enter off onto 12th Street. And we're	- M1	all configurations and expansions and enhancements.	-M2RO
19	going to have a 48-line rail system directly behind	19	I hope to earn the opportunity to work at	
20	us with trains coupling and uncoupling all day and	20	one or these proposed projects as an ironworker	
21	all night long.	21	apprentice. I have former classmates that are	
22	we employ 135 employees, about 40 of those	22	currently pursuing apprenticeships in ironwork,	
23	are Long Beach residents. And this would not be a	23	carpentry, plumbing, electrical, et cetera. Please	
24	very good it just wouldn't be right for us with	24	approve this project so we can all get to work.	
25	the cilents that we serve. We build signs for	25	Thank you for your time. Have a good	
Kus	ar Court Reporters & Legal Services,	Inc	. 10 (37 - 40	)

1

Le	r B EIR FUDIC MCCU		give 2 (M2) Public Meetin
T	Page 41		Page 42
ł	evening.	1	presence tonight and your interest in the Pier B
l	MR. BOYD: Good evening. My name is Vema	2	on-dock rail support facility project. We're now
l	Boyd. I'm an apprentice with the carpenters Local	3	closing the public hearing. Hope you all have a
	Union 1506. I'm in favor of this project. It will	4	great night and a safe ride home.
l	provide jobs, economic growth, cut down on traffic.	5	5
l	It will show that we're becoming a green state.	6	(Proceeding adjourned at 7:00 p.m.)
	However, a lot of people who when it gives us jobs,	-M	ихив
	it will help us build. And I like building a city,	8	
	and I like building a state. And I just want you	9	2
	guys to approve this project.	10	2
l	MS. TOMLEY: Thank you. Oh, one more.	11	1
l	MR. PONCE: Good evening. My name is	12	2
	Mitchell Ponce, and I represent the ironworkers,	13	A
	Local 433. As you heard, one of our hope-to-be	14	1
	members here is in support. I represent over 4,500	15	š
	members of the ironworkers, and we're in favor of	16	5
	this project. Many of them live in the Long Beach	17	M2MP
	area, and a lot of them will be working on these	18	3
l	projects. So we're in full support on behalf of the	19	9
l	members of the ironworkers. Thank you.	20	2
	MS. TOMLEY: Anyone else? Great. Thank you	21	1
	all. This concludes the evening's public meeting.	22	2
	As a reminder, if you'd like to submit written	23	3
	comments, please send them to the address that we	24	1
l	now have up on the screen. We appreciate your	25	5
t	Page 43		
		1	
l	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE		
l			
	I declare under penalty of perjury under		
	the laws of the State of California that the		
	foregoing is true and correct and that this		
	declaration was executed on the 23rd day of		
	January, 2017.		
	K. Henry Sex Hom	1	
		1	
	Katherine Henry-Sexton CSR No. 13662	1	
		1	
		1.5	
		1 3	
		1.3	
l			

#### 1 *Responses to Testimony Received at the January 18, 2017, Public Meeting at the Port* 2 *of Long Beach Interim Administrative Office*

3 Response to Comment M2DH: Thank you for your comment and your support of the 4 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 5 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

Response to Comment M2AP: Thank you for your comment and your support of the
proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific
section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

Response to Comment M2TJ: Thank you for your comment and your support of the
 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific
 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

12 **Response to Comment M2SM:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 13 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 14 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

15 **Response to Comment M2JS:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 16 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 17 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

18 **Response to Comment M2ER:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 19 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 20 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

21 **Response to Comment M2DK:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 22 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 23 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

Response to Comment M2ES: Thank you for your comment. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

27 Response to Comment M2PS: Thank you for your comment and your support of the 28 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 29 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

30 **Response to Comment M2AO:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 31 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 32 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

Response to Comment M2AL: Thank you for your comment and your support of the
 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific
 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

Response to Comment M2JS-1: The proposed Project would close one existing at-grade
 crossing at 9th Street. No other at-grade crossings are encountered by trains leaving the Pier
 B Rail Yard and traveling northwesterly to the entrance of the Alameda Corridor, and train
 horns are not sounded.

Response to Comment M2JS-2: Please see response to Comment CARB-7 for a discussion
 of the line haul and switch locomotives that would service the Project. Please see the Master
 Response – Electrification of Alameda Corridor and Zero Emissions Locomotives. Operational

emissions of NO_x would exceed SCAQMD thresholds for all analysis years, in large part due to yard locomotive operations. The proposed Project already incorporates many regulations and CAAP measures that reduce air pollutant impacts, as discussed in Section 3.2.2. There are no additional feasible mitigation measures identified for Project operation at present; however, to keep pace with emerging emission reduction technologies, a mandatory 5-year technology review would be made part of the proposed Project as a Special Condition (see Section 6.3.2).

**Response to Comment M2JS-3:** Air pollutant emissions from construction equipment are
addressed via air quality Mitigation Measures AQ-1, AQ-2, and AQ-3 on page 3.2-35 of the
Draft EIR. The measures would require diesel construction trucks to meet EPA 2010
standards, and off-road diesel construction equipment to meet Tier 4 standards, restrict idling,
and be maintained according to manufacturer's specifications.

13 **Response to Comment M2TJ:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 14 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 15 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

Response to Comment M2RG: Thank you for your comment and your support of the
 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific
 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

19 **Response to Comment M2CH:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 20 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 21 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

Response to Comment M2LJ: Thank you for your comment and your support of the proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

25 **Response to Comment M2AP:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 26 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 27 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

28 **Response to Comment M2BM:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 29 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 30 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

31 **Response to Comment M2RF:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 32 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 33 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

34 Response to Comment M2KD: Please see responses to Comments LLI-1 through LLI-30. 35 At this time, the proposed Project is in the planning process, and no final construction plans 36 or decisions regarding possible acquisitions of any privately held interests in properties have 37 been made. Following completion of environmental review, the Board of Harbor Commissioners will consider the certification of the Final EIR. If the Board certifies the Final 38 39 EIR, and approves the proposed Project or one of its alternatives, final plans would be 40 developed. The Port would then need to take the necessary step to begin the property 41 acquisition process. Stakeholders, such as the Port tenants and property owners, have been 42 included in the planning process via the EIR scoping meetings and public review period. This 43 particular meeting was one of three public meetings during the review period. Stakeholders 44 had the ability to submit written comments. Lan Logistics submitted such comments and the

1 Port has responded to the comments. The Port would continue to engage the business

2 community, property owners, and Port tenants if the decision is made to move forward with

3 the proposed Project. Please also see Master Response – Property Acquisition, 4 Compensation, and Relocation.

5 **Response to Comment M2LW:** Please see responses to Comments WT-1 through WT-5. 6 The Port has also provided responses to the commenter's tenant (see responses to 7 Comments LLI-1 to LLI-30). At this time, the proposed Project is in the planning process, and 8 no final construction plans or decisions regarding possible acquisitions of any privately held 9 interests in properties have been made. Following completion of environmental review, final 10 plans would be developed, and the property acquisition process would begin. Please also see 11 Master Response – Property Acquisition, Compensation, and Relocation. With regard to the 12 notification issue, see Master Response – CEQA Notification. The owners of properties that 13 may be affected by the proposed Project were notified of the completion of the Draft EIR, and 14 will receive notification of future potential actions.

15 **Response to Comment M2SJ:** Please see responses to Comments SEA-1 to SEA-21. The 16 commenter's business is located in the former Coca Cola bottling plant, which is an industrial 17 property in an area zoned for industrial uses. The Draft EIR addresses the potential traffic, 18 noise, air quality, and public health and safety impacts of the proposed Project, and it identifies 19 appropriate measures to mitigate potentially significant impacts of the proposed Project. The 20 comment does not identify potential impacts of the proposed Project that were not addressed 21 in the Draft EIR, nor does it identify any flaws in the analyses presented therein. Please see 22 Master Response – Property Acquisition, Compensation, and Relocation.

Response to Comment M2RO: Thank you for your comment and your support of the proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

Response to Comment M2VB: Thank you for your comment and your support of the
 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific
 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

29 Response to Comment M2MP: Thank you for your comment and your support of the 30 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 31 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

### Chapter 11 Responses to Comments

### Port of Long Beach

	lic Meeting Pier	DEI	K 110342
		1	INDEX
	STATE OF CALIFORNIA	2	INDEX
	PORT OF LONG BEACH	3	SPEAKED MATTHEW APMS Assistant Director of
		4	Environmental Planning
		5	MODER LTOR. ALL MOON TER LMOTO Carine Facility
	PIER B ON-DOCK RAIL SUPPORT FACILITY	6	MODERATOR: ALLYSON TERAMOTO, Senior Environmental Specialist
	DRAFT FAR TROAD (FAIT & R. O. CT. DEDORT	7	AUDIENCE DAGE
	DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT	8	AUDIENCE: PAGE
		9	Lisa Kolieb 17
	PUBLIC MEETING	10	John Solinas 22
		11	Paul Collins 23
	Wednesday, February 15, 2017	12	Ric Inlow 27
	Tepechi Birrieria Restaurant	13	Clara Driscoll 30
	Long Beach, California	14	David Hope 31
		15	Jim Stewart 36
	11:30 A.M.	16	Dan Berns 37
		17	
		18	
		19	
		20	
		21	
		22	
	TAKEN BY: Katherine Henry-Sexton, CSR No. 13662	23	
		24	
		25	
			Page 2
L	WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2017, LONG BEACH, CA	1	again want to thank you all for coming. We'll go on
2	11:38 A.M.	2	the fly here. To begin, I want to identify the sign
8		3	language and Spanish language interpreters
1		4	available. And with that I will get started.
5	MR. ARMS: All right, everyone. I think	5	The purpose of this public meeting is to
5	we're going to get started. Hopefully, you all got	6	accept public comment on the proposed project. I
1	some food and something to drink. Can you even	7	will provide a brief presentation summarizing the
3	attempt to hear me in the back? Thank you, all.	8	project including the objectives and alternatives
,	Thanks for coming and joining us to hear about the	9	and describe the potential impacts associated with
)	Pier B project. This is an official public hearing,	10	the project. At this time the proposed project is
Ľ	so we do have a court reporter here that will be	11	in the planning phases, the environmental review
2	recording the testimony. And we do have Spanish and	12	phase. And no final construction plans,
5	sign language interpretation if anybody needs that.	13	right-of-way mapping or decisions regarding possible
	No? All right. The Port staff is here if you do	14	acquisition of privately held properties has been
	need it.	15	made. If the project is approved, that process will
5	If you want to speak today, make sure you	16	begin after the project approval.
1	grab a speaker's card and hand it to Allyson. If	17	For the Pier B On-Dock Support Facility
3	you want to put a comment on the speaker card,	18	Project, the Port of Long Beach is the lead agency
,	that's great; you can go ahead and do that too.	19	under the California Environment Quality Act, or
)	With that, it's a little bit of an unusual	20	CEQA. As the lead agency, we have prepared an
	venue, but we'll make it work here. Good morning	21	environmental impact report, or EIR, to analyze the
2	and welcome to the public meeting for the proposed	22	potential impacts of the project. As part of the
8	Pier B On-Dock Rail facility project. My name is	23	CEQA process, we are seeking public comment on the
1	Matt Arms. I'm the assistant director of	24	draft EIR that was released on December 15, 2016. to
	environmental planning at the Port of Long Beach. I	25	ensure that the public is provided an opportunity to
2	Dec. 2		Page 4
2	Page 5		rage 4

Pul	blic Meeting Public Meet	B EI	R 110842
1	express their questions and concerns about the	1	the lack of space and the mix of cargo intended for
2	proposed project.	2	multiple destinations, it is not possible to build
3	The comment we receive during the public	3	complete trains within any one terminal. In
4	review period will be responded to and included in	4	addition, the need to store and stage railcars on
5	the final EIR. The Port will also use comments	5	the tracks within the terminals as longer train
6	received today along with any written comments to	6	segments are built limits the amount of active
7	inform any changes to be incorporated into the EIR	7	working area to load more cargo onto rail.
8	and to let the decision-makers know of any concerns	8	Therefore, the facilities like the Pier B
9	the public may have.	9	on-dock rail support facility are necessary to
0	If you would like to make comments today,	10	store, sort and assemble the smaller train segments
1	please fill out a speaker card and give it to a	11	into larger full 10,000-foot trains that are ready
2	member of Port staff outside this door here.	12	to leave the Port complex via Alameda Corridor for
3	Allyson, I think, is collecting them. After the	13	the final destinations. All cargo arrives at this
4	preparation we will call on those people that have	14	on-dock rail support facility via train or rail.
5	speaker cards to make comments. Each speaker will	15	Trucks will not be used to deliver containers to the
5	be limited to three minutes.	16	rail facility. Because the facility serves multiple
1	The Port of Long Beach is proposing to	17	Port terminals at both ports and destinations,
B	expand and make improvements to the existing Pier B	18	improvements to the facility would improve
2	ran facility. This facility is a critical	19	system-wide rail snipping efficiencies allowing for
	component to the Port-wide rail minastructure and	20	The quisting Digs D soil facility is
1	anows for better, more encient utilization of the	21	Inc existing Pier B fail facility is
2	terminal. With on-dock rails containers are loaded	22	at Diar D near Anahaim Street and I 710 Freeway
3 A	directly onto small comments of multiple cars using	23	The facility is located in a highly industrial area
5	tracks located within the terminal. However, due to	25	and does not directly border any residential
	Page 5	-	Page 6
1	neighborhoods. Currently the facility provides	1	The project would also upgrade and
2	railcar and locomotive storage and staging to	2	modernize existing aging infrastructure And
3	support efficient operations in the on-dock rail	3	lastly the closure of the at-grade crossing at 9th
4	vards at the Port's marine terminals. Track from	4	Street and Pico will improve safety for both
5	the facility connects to the Alameda Corridor	5	vehicles and locomotives.
6	allowing trains to leave the Port complex.	6	The environmental analysis evaluated four
7	The objectives of the Pier B project are	7	alternatives for the project: The 12th Street
в	to support the transition to a more efficient, more	8	Alternative, which is the proposed project is the
9	economically competitive and less polluting freight	9	largest project and best meets key objectives; a
0	transport system. In addition, the project would	10	10th Street alternative, which is slightly reduced;
1	promote a mode shift from movement by truck to dock	11	a 9th Street alternative, which is further reduced;
2	excuse me in addition, the project will promote	12	and a no-project alternative, which would be no
3	a mode shift from movement by truck to near-dock or	13	change to the existing facility.
4	off-dock facilities to movement by rail directly	14	I'll walk through each of the alternatives
5	from the on-dock rail facilities at the Port.	15	in the following slides:
6	The addition of railcar and locomotive	16	The proposed project, or 12th Street
7	storage and staging and servicing areas would also	17	alternative, will be constructed in three phases
B	enable the on-dock rail yards to better manage the	18	over approximately seven years expanding the rail
9	loading of containers onto railcars. By	19	facility from an existing 12 tracks to a total of 48
0	accommodating arriving and departing trains up to	20	tracks. The additional track would allow for more
1	10,000 feet long, rail line congestion can be	21	efficient assembly of trains and accommodate
2	alleviated resulting in a more efficient rail	22	approximately 17 trains per day up to 10,000 feet
3	network at the Ports. With more cargo transported	23	long. The expanded facility would also include
4	on trains, congestion on local streets and highways	24	support facilities, including locomotive layover and
5	would also be reduced.	25	fueling area.
	Page 7		Page 8

ul	Dic Meeting Public Meeting	B EI	R 1108427
1	The Dominguez Channel rail bridge would be	1	would be similar to the proposed project: however.
2	modified to accommodate one new track. Pier B	2	the Shoemaker ramps would be re-configured to
3	Street and Pico Avenue would need to be realigned	3	maintain a connection between Anaheim Street and
4	and widened to provide for sufficient area of	4	Downtown via Harbor Avenue.
5	expansion of the rail facility. Several road	5	Potential property acquisition for the
6	closures would occur in the vicinity, including	6	10th Street alternative would be similar to the 12th
7	roads in the City of Los Angeles. The 9th Street	7	Street, but fewer in number, 72 properties could be
8	at-grade crossing would also be closed to	8	affected, of which 26 are privately owned within the
9	accommodate the rail expansion at the eastern edge	9	cities of Long Beach and Los Angeles
0	of the Pier B facility Access to Anaheim Street	10	In the 9th Street alternative the new
1	would be shifted to Anabeim Way at the western end	11	tracks would be constructed between Pier B Street
2	of Pier B Street In addition the Shoemaker ramps	12	and 9th Street. The alternative would add nine
3	and approaches would be removed	13	tracks expanding from 12 to a total of 21 tracks
4	The proposed project could affect 94	14	which would include three new arrival and departure
5	properties of which 36 are privately owned	15	tracks Also with this alternative the number of
6	properties in the City of Long Beach and Los	16	railcars and trains that could be accommodated would
7	Angeles and they would need to be acquired within	17	he less than under the proposed project
0	the project area	10	Construction would be completed in two
0	The 10th Street alternative is also available	10	phases over approximately three years. Read work
2	to take approximately says there for construction	19	mases over approximately three years. Koad work
	to take approximately seven years for construction.	20	there are would be forwar and closures and the
1	in this alternative the facility would have fewer	21	there are would be rewer road closures, and the
2	arrival, departure and yard tracks expanding from	22	Shoemaker ramps would not be removed or reanghed.
3	the existing 12 to a total of 34. The number of	23	There would be fewer property acquisitions
4	railcars and trains that could be accommodated would	24	under the 9th Street alternative. 56 total
5	be less than under the proposed project. Road work	25	properties would be affected, of which 18 are
	rage 9		rage to
1	privately owned.	1	identified as significant and unavoidable after
2	Under the no project alternative no	2	mitigation are to air quality and greenhouse gases.
3	improvements would be made to the existing Pier B	3	Emissions of carbon monoxide and nitrogen oxides
4	rail facility. The existing Pier B rail facility	4	from project construction and operations exceed
5	could continue to operate as it does today. The	5	South Coast Air Quality Management District, AQMD,
6	current yard has two main line tracks, ten yard	6	regional air quality thresholds. In addition,
7	tracks and no arrival and departure tracks. An	7	volatile organic compounds, carbon monoxide,
8	estimated five to seven trains per day would depart	8	nitrogen oxides, particulate matter, sulfur oxides
9	the rail system, which reflects operations at	9	and contaminants that affect human health also pose
0	capacity.	10	a significant cumulative impact as a result of
1	Once the existing facility reaches the	11	various projects in the area.
2	limit of its ability to handle train movements, the	12	Further, off-site ambient pollutant
3	remaining direct intermodal cargo that is not	13	concentrations are expected to be significantly
4	accommodated by the on-dock rail yards would be	14	impacted from construction of the proposed project.
5	transported by truck to a near-dock or downtown rail	15	The analysis identified the potential for
6	yard to be loaded onto destination trains.	16	exceedances of AQMD regional air quality thresholds
7	Under the no project alternative the	17	for criteria pollutants specifically, nitrogen
8	existing at-grade crossing located at 9th Street and	18	dioxide.
9	Pico Avenue would remain in place, and Pier B Street	19	The total annualized greenhouse gas
0	would not be improved. In addition, the no project	20	emissions generated from the proposed project
1	alternative would not result in any property	21	construction and operation are expected to be above
2	acquisition or business relocations.	22	the AQMD significance threshold of 10,000 metric
3	The EIR evaluates the potential impacts to	23	tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year for
4	the environment from the proposed project. For the	24	industrial land uses.
5	proposed 12th Street alternative, impacts that were	25	The significant and unavoidable impacts
	D 11		Dec. 12

2/15	/2017 Public Meeti	nç	I No. 3 (M3)						
Public Meeting Pier B EIR 1108427									
1	identified remain after the implementation of	1	days from the original date. We request that						
2	mitigation measures. Mitigation measures applied to	2	comments be submitted by four p.m. on March 13th,						
3	air quality and greenhouse gases include the	3	2017. At the end of the presentation I will provide						
4	application of best management practices and engine	4	the contact information and address for submitting						
5	emission standards to reduce emissions from	5	written comments.						
6	construction activities. In addition, to address	6	At the conclusion of the public review and						
7	cumulative impacts, the Port will contribute funding	7	comment period, we will provide responses to all						
8	to the Community Grants Program of approximately	8	comments submitted and will publish them in the						
9	\$177,500.	9	final EIR. All commenters will also be notified						
10	To reduce greenhouse gases, various	10	when the final EIR document is available for review.						
11	sustainable features will be incorporated into the	11	Once final, the Port's governing body, the Board of						
12	proposed project design. In addition, requirements	12	Harbor Commissioners, will consider certifying that						
13	for recycling and reuse of materials during	13	the EIR was prepared in accordance with requirements						
14	construction and operation will be required. Tree	14	of CEQA and whether the project will be approved.						
15	planting will be done in the area, and employees at	15	As a reminder, if the project is approved,						
16	the project site will be encouraged to carpool.	16	it is at that point when a process and schedule						
17	The Port will also make a contribution to	17	regarding property acquisition will be developed.						
18	the Community Grants Program to fund greenhouse gas	18	The draft EIR document is available on the						
19	emissions reduction projects at a level of	19	Port's website at the links shown. Immediately						
20	approximately \$1.4 million.	20	after this presentation the public will have an						
21	The Draft EIR was released by the Port for	21	opportunity to provide verbal comments on the merits						
22	public review and comment on December 15th, 2016.	22	of the proposed project and the draft EIR document.						
23	The original 60-day review and comment period was	23	You may speak today or hand in your written comments						
24	set to end on February 13th, 2017. However, we have	24	or both. We strongly encourage you to also submit						
25	since extended the comment period an additional 28	25	your comments in writing. Written comments will be						
-	Page 13		Page 14						
1	accepted through four p.m. on March 13th, 2017. To	1	AUDIENCE: For those people who have just						
2	submit written comments on the draft EIR, please	2	come in, there's some comment cards on this table or						
3	send them to Heather Tomley, director of	3	that table.						
4	environmental planning at the Port of Long Beach.	4	MS. TERAMOTO: After Mr. Sharma is Lisa						
5	4801 Airport Plaza Drive, Long Beach, California.	5	Kolieb and Sampson Tang.						
6	Comments can also be sent to her via e-mail.	6	MR. SHARMA: Hi, my name is Gourav Sharma.						
7	At this time we will take speaker	7	We own two businesses in the west side, Taurus						
8	comments. As previously mentioned, we have a signed	8	Engineering and one of them over by Haze and one						
9	language interpreter and Spanish language	9	over by Harbor. We've got serious concerns, mainly						
10	translation service available if anybody needs them.	10	for our employees with regards to the air pollution						
11	If you wish to provide comments and have not yet	11	and noise pollution caused by both the project						
12	nined out a speaker card, please see a member of	12	construction and the project ongoing.						
13	Point staff to complete a card. For those who have	13	so we rearry want to know what the Port						
14	by name. Each speaker card, we will call you up each	14	will be doing to initigate nearin fisks to our						
15	at the podium. But I think it's going to be	15	who work within the buildings and within the						
17	difficult	17	offices. We have a lot of business with sustamers						
1.2	MS TOMI EV: We really need to have need	1.9	who are in the downtown area. We take multiple						
19	up here because we need to have the court reporter	19	trips every day to downtown and back and also for						
20	hear the testimony. So it has to he up here	20	commutes for a lot of our employees. So access to						
21	MR ARMS: So please come up so the court	21	downtown will be severely restricted as with Pier B						
22	reporter can be sure to get your comments With	22	our customers who are located down there						
23	that we will open it up to public comment	23	We also want to know how this will affect						
24	MS. TERAMOTO: I will call names off three	24	the traffic that's on PCH and on Anabeim We do M3CS_2						
25	at a time. First off is Gourav Sharma.	25	business between our two sites, and that's also a						
	Page 15		Page 16						
			4 (13 - 16)						
	Vi icov								
	Keeping Your Word Is	s Oi	ur Business ³⁴⁴						

/15	/2017 PUDIIC Meet		GNO. 3 (M3)	7		
Pub	nc Meeting Pier	BE	IK 110842			
1	concern for us and how that's going to be affected.	1	will be done for businesses in the area.	Mail		
2	Thank you very much. M3GS-3	2	Contributing to a fund does something for the	WJLK-		
3	MR. ARMS: Lisa Kolieb. (Cont'd)	3	greater good, but not to the people who are actually	(Cont		
4	MS. KOLIEB: Hi, my name is Lisa Kolieb.	4	on the ground and next to this project.	1		
5	I'm an attorney at the law firm of Akerman, and I'm	5	In addition, the transportation impacts			
6	here on behalf of Superior Electrical Advertising.	6	are not fully analyzed. As you mentioned before as			
7	Superior has significant concerns about the project	7	well, with the closure of the ramps to the bridge,	M3LK		
8	as well as the adequacy of the EIR. We will be	8	there's not going to be regular access to the			
9	submitting a comment letter by the deadline, but	9	downtown area. And that's a big problem for this			
0	I'll give you kind of a highlight overview now.	10	client as well as many of the other businesses in			
1	Basically, the impacts to my clients'	11	the area.	,		
2	operations are going to be so extreme that they are	M12	SLK-1 Also, there's a section on land use and	1		
3	not going to be able to operate there. And the	13	compatibility, and it says this is compatible			
4	impacts on the adjacent properties have not been	14	because it's a for use [sic]. Well, it's not	Mark		
5	adequately analyzed in the EIR. The EIR seems to	15	compatible with the businesses there that are there			
6	really focus on the 94 few properties that are	16	on site because of the air quality, because of			
7	actually going to be taken by either eminent domain	17	noise. As my client mentioned in a previous			
8	or otherwise purchased, rather than focusing on the	18	meeting, even in this hearing the train whistles is	1		
9	other adjoining neighbors that would still be there	19	very, very distracting. Imagine when you have 48			
0	after the project moves forward.	20	rail lines how much louder that's going to be, how	10.00070377		
1	So in terms of actual impact areas of	21	much more distracting. So there's the noise, the	⊢M3Lł		
2	specific concern air quality, of course to the	22	vibration analysis. These things just don't seem to			
3	employees who are going to end up with health risks	-23	be sufficiently analyzed as they relate to the			
4	The FIR even speaks about the health risks and then	M	3LK-2 adjoining and neighboring properties	J.		
5	doesn't do anything to specifically address what	25	And then just generally about the project			
	Page 17	1	Page 18			
	description I don't think that it is sufficient in	1	COURT REPORTER: Im come. Im having	-		
1	description, I don't think that it is sufficient in	1	touckle hearing			
2	the way that it analyzes what's actually happening	2	trouble nearing.	1		
	on the ground. We know that it's going to be a rail	1	MR. TANG: "Chemon understands the overview			
9	facility, but what will be happening? There's going	13L	K-6			
5	to be coupling and uncoupling. What exactly are	5	is known as "the project" to reconfigure, expand and			
0	each of the things that are happening operationally	0	enhance the existing Pier B rail facility to support			
7	so each of those operations can be sufficiently	1	more sufficient use of on-dock rail and to act as a			
8	analyzed in terms of noise impact, vibration air,	8	critical juncture in the Port's rail network.			
9	air quality.	9	However, Chemoil opposes the project with multiple			
0	When you have a very general description	10	objections."			
1	of what the project operations are, it's very hard	11	Objection one is because the Project has			
2	to understand. And it's impossible to sufficiently	12	deficient utility corridor. The objection says,			
3	analyze all the impacts. So we ask you do a better	131	"The Project is to enhance utilities. As a utility	M3ST		
\$	analysis and provide a better description in the	14	operator transporting much required fuel to supply	Cont		
5	actual project description section, and then move it	15	cruise ships and container vessels, the Project does	1.50.10		
5	out for the rest of the project. So more to come,	16	not and will not enhance the Chemoil operations. In			
7	but that's my three minutes.	17	contrary, the Project will negatively and			
8	MS. TERAMOTO: Sampson Tang. And the next	18	significantly impact Chemoil's operation by shutting			
9	three speakers will be John Solinas, Paul Collins	19	down operations due to the removal and relocation of			
0	and John Donaldson.	20	existing 20-inch, 12-inch and eight-inch pipelines"			
1	MR. TANG: Hi, my name is Sampson Tang. I'm	21	those are three pipelines that will be affected			
2	the supplies manager for Chemoil Corporation. On	22	because of this project. "The proposed utility			
3	behalf of Chemoil, Vice President Vince Godfrey	Ŋ	corridors are not yet finalized and have significant			
4	wrote a letter, and I'd like to read it out for you	24	deficiencies to guarantee relocation for Chemoil's			
5	guys.	25	pipelines and for all impacted utility lines to the	1		
	Page 19		Page 20			
2/15	2/15/2017 Public Meeting No. 3 (M3)					
------	-------------------------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--
Put	Public Meeting Pier B EIR 1108427					
1	Project." - M3ST-1 (Cont'd)	1	employee who is also a Long Beach resident who M3ST-4			
2	Objection two, this project will	2	strongly opposes this project and does not want to (Cont'd)			
3	significantly affect the union jobs. "Chemoil has a	3	see 10,000-foot trains in her community.			
4	total of 27 union employees working at either the	4	Objection five: There's no evidence for			
5	Carson Terminal and/or the Long Beach Terminal. The	5	motorists and rail safety improvements. This study			
6	Project will directly and significantly impact their	6	needs to be significantly re-reviewed, and Chemoil - M3ST-5			
7	jobs due to the relocation of the existing pipelines	7	does not view this claim as valid until an analysis			
8	as named above. Chemoil uses existing pipelines on	8	is conducted to prove its validity.			
9	a daily basis to connect both terminals together to	M3	<b>ST-2</b> The last objection the Project is to			
10	load and offload tanker vessels. Without the	10	reduce congestion to the local streets and highways.			
11	pipelines Chemoil will not be able to run its	11	"The draft EIR for the Project fails to explain how - M3ST-6			
12	operation and compete with local and international	12	traffic congestion is reduced on local streets and			
13	competitors who will most likely take advantage of	13	nighways. There are no studies conducted and			
14	the opportunity to fuel cruise sings and container	14	"With many objections, the Termsters Local			
16	Reach "	16	Union 848 Chemoil and the Long Beach residents are			
17	And we've got a representative from the	17	submitting their opposition to the Project "			
18	Teamsters who will speak on behalf of the Teamsters	18	Thank you for your time. Sorry I ran over			
19	Objection three "This Project will cost	19	time.			
20	\$15 million. The cost expenditure will hurt	20	MS. TERAMOTO: John Solinas.			
21	Chemoil's businesses and significantly impact	21	MR. SOLINAS: My name is John Solinas. I'm			
22	Chemoil's bottom line. With the existence of the	22	here representing Chemoil and the Teamsters Local			
23	Project, Chemoil will have limited funding allocated	23	Union 848. We went ahead and put a little thing M3JS			
24	for any future capital expenditures."	24	here, a little letter together here, in regards to			
25	Objection four: We have a Chemoil 7- M3ST-4	25	the rail part project. It's addressed to Ms.			
	Page 21		Page 22			
1	Tomley, so I'll go ahead and read it.	1	a great amount of air pollution, and a lot of people			
2	And basically it says, Teamsters Local	2	work outside here on the west side. And we've just			
3	Union 848 supports Chemoil Terminals Corporation in	3	gone through the Port becoming a green port with the			
4	opposing the Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility	4	trucks and clearing our air up much better than it			
5	Project. We understand how critical the pipelines	5	was in past years. And now we're talking about			
6	are to Chemoil's operations and to the Port of Long	6	making it much dirtier again.			
7	Beach. We strongly oppose the project for its	· IVI	<b>J</b> The small amount of money that the Port			
8	negative impact on jobs of union members whose	8	has offered and they ve offered as, you know, to			
9	families and kids will depend on Chemoil for their	9	-M3PC-2			
11	well will be affected. The members' jobs also	11	this is not going to even cover one of their			
12	depend on transportation of containers which will	12	treatments			
13	be affected by the Pier B Rail Project "	13	We're opposed because of the vibration			
14	That's on behalf of Teamsters Local Union	14	This whole area is in a liquefaction zone, and			
15	848 and Chemoil. All right.	15	putting that much weight for all these train cars in			
16	MS. TERAMOTO: Next speaker, Paul Collins,	16	that area is going to cause vibration across Anaheim			
17	MR. COLLINS: Paul Collins. I think I can	17	Street. It's going to cause undermining foundations			
18	speak loudly enough. Can everyone hear me back	18	and stuff in existing properties over time. Anyone - M3PC-3			
19	there? My name is Paul Collins. I'm the chairman	19	who has worked or been near a large rail yard like			
20	for the West Project Area Council, which is the	20 7 P	the one in downtown Long Beach knows how noisy these			
21	local business group for the industrial part of West	21	things are. They're extremely noisy. And to have			
22	Long Beach.	22	that extra noise all day long for all the businesses			
23	We are opposing this project for many	23	in west side is going to be detrimental.			
24	reasons, primarily because of the pollution it will	24	The other thing we really object to is our			
25	cause. Their own draft EIR says it's going to cause	25	access to the Port and our access to downtown Long			
	Page 23		Page 24			
	1.7		6 (21 - 24)			
	KUSAF Keeping Your Word Is Our Business ^{5M}					

Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project 11-299

2/15 Put	2/15/2017 Public Meeting No. 3 (M3) Public Meeting 1108427					
1	Beach Right now we go right up Santa Fe 9th	1	the whole process But really what concerns me is I	1		
2	Street, over the bridge and we're downtown or in	2	wake up every morning not knowing if my company is			
3	the Port in five minutes. And now it's going to be	3	soing to exist in a year or two. Fye been here			
4	a 25- to 30-minute jount for everyone and it's	M	Presena odd years 47 years old started it you			
5	a 25- to 50-initiate jatin for everyone, and it's	- (C	ont'd) in late 180s each 190s. The a tenant but			
6	going to nurt the access. Most of the businesses in	6	Know, in fate oos, early 90s. This a tenant, out			
2	the west side have direct access to the various	2	The a tenant to a private business bunding owner.			
6	terminals in the Port and do daily business with	6	All of the options, with the exception of			
0	tnem.		the do-nothing act, would affect me in some way. We			
9	I noticed during this last process during	9	are the biggest if we're not the biggest, we're			
10	the year twice on Sundays I saw teams taking traffic	10	one of the biggest warehouses that transloads heavy,			
11	counts on 9th Street. They were doing it on Sunday	11	large, dangerous, sensitive cargo. If we're not the			
12	in the middle of the afternoon when there's very	12	closest, we're one of the closest. We make a			
13	little traffic counts. I have serious concerns	13	two-mile trek. That's all we have to do to get from	⊱M3JD-1		
14	because I go daily to downtown and into the Port,	14	the Port to get to our place. We're talking about			
15	and I've never seen traffic counts being done during	- 15/5 -	Frates the side of this room, heavier, ten times			
16	the day. They were done on Sundays, which I think	16	heavier than this room. We're talking about small			
17	is not right.	17	crates with sensitive shock meters on them that if			
18	So the west side PAC, we had our recent	18	you put those on a container and you bump a rail or			
19	meeting. And I would say all the businesses that	19	you hump a train, they're all going to go off. That			
20	showed up in that meeting were very much against	20	cargo can't go on a train.			
21	this proposal. Thank you.	21	We are limited to using trucks to move			
22	MR. ARMS: John Donaldson.	22	this cargo trucks, not just trucks, but trucks			
23	MR. DONALDSON: Hi. Basically, I was going	23	with airbags to move this cargo to our central			
24	to get up here with this presentation on everything	24	location. If we're forced out of this location, not			
25	I saw that just basically goes through the EIR and	25	only does it remove my ability to keep my rates			
	Page 25		Page 26	,		
1	adjusted, you know, where I can compete: but my	1	MR. INLOW: Can everybody hear me? My name	ā		
2	turnaround time nothing has been said about	2	is Ric Inlow. I work for SSA. We're a stevedoring			
3	what's going to happen with the big cargo that can't	3	company in the Port of Long Beach. I represent two			
4	go on trains. You know, I watch the video of the	_ M3	of the major steamship terminals that would be			
5	trains going underneath the ground and I just see a	60	ont'd) affected or that has been affected for the last 25			
6	crate exploding. I mean, that's the size of the	6	years with the inadequacy of the Port infrastructure			
7	crate we have	7	here for moving the on-dock rail			
8	Lhave over 60 000 square feet of floor	1 8	It's important to let all these people			
9	that I have machines on and I have had for 15	9	know the concerns that for every train that departs			
10	years We do a lot of military work. You know my	10	this on-dock area down here, there's about 300			
11	main thing is I'm looking at predictions in here	11	trucks that come off the 710 Anaheim PCH			
12	that say there's less than two nercent vacancy	12	combined. So to increase that volume through the			
13	available in the area for relocation. Lunderstand	13	norts via the on-dock rail makes the most sense	14001		
14	that's going to change as construction goes on	HM	3JD-2 for all the concerns with regards to	-M3RI		
15	maybe you can put up a building close by or	15	traffic with records to cleaner air - because the			
16	comawhere also. But right new if I have to tall my	16	locomotives that work down have for the DUI have all	v		
10	somewhere else. But right now if I have to tell my	10	reduced amission becometing. Therefore BHL have all	8		
20	from none? My answer is I don't have a job a year of two	1	ling haul locomotives that as ant as the main			
18	nom now? My answer is I don't know. I don't know	18	me naul locomotives that go out on the main			
19	because I can't move rive miles away. I can't.	1 13	ranways or the class one ranways.			
20	MR. ARMS: SOTY, It's at the end of the	20	so for me, like I said, 25 years I've been			
21	three minutes.	21	asking the Port for an infrastructure that			
22	MR. DONALDSON: I'll end there.	22	adequately supports what we try to do in our			
23	MR. ARMS: Thank you.	23	terminals in the Port of Long Beach. The Port of LA			
24	MS. TERAMOTO: Ric Inlow, Paul Allen and	24	has continued to build infrastructure on their side.			
25	Clara Driscoll.	25	That makes it very difficult for us to compete with	4		
_	Page 27		Page 28	-		
			7 (25 - 29	3)		
	Kusar Keeping Your Word	ls O	ur Business™			

2/15 Put	2/15/2017 Public Meeting No. 3 (M3) Public Meeting Pier B EIR 1108427					
1	them. So I ask you to approve this for all the	1	also mentioned, in the Port of Los Angeles they're			
2	beneficial factors that come with regards to less	MZ	Retting ahead of us. And customers are looking to - M3PA			
3	trucks on the freeways and the local streets. Thank	oŋt	head towards where the rail can be supported. So (Cont'd)			
4	you.	4	ITS is in favor of this project.			
5	MS. TERAMOTO: Paul Allen.	5	MS. DRISCOLL: My name is Clara Driscoll.			
6	MR. ALLEN: My name is Paul Allen. I work	6	I'm with SRM Corporation which operates the Queen's			
7	for International Transportation Service, one of the	7	Wharf, Berth 55 Seafoods and the Long Beach sport			
8	container terminals down in the Port of Long Beach.	8	fishing, all of which are very consumer oriented,			
9	ITS, as we're commonly known as, is in favor of the	9	public access kinds of businesses. We are			
10	Pier B rail yard for the same reasons that Ric Inlow	10	obviously, concerned because we're at 555 Pico. So			
11	just mentioned.	11	all of the alternatives other than the no action			
12	We also have customers regularly asking	12	will affect our business M3CD-1			
13	us, 'Can you support our rail?' They want to move	13	And basically we seem to have train tracks			
14	more containers by rail. And we want to be able to	14	coming through the majority of our parking lot which			
15	provide that service, but things get so backed up	- M.	<b>BPA</b>			
17	down in the Port at our terminals that we need to	17	kind of possible accommodations can be made with			
19	will help the flow of traffic in and out of the	19	abyjously this would impact our business			
19	area	19	negatively			
20	We'll also assist in our flexibility to	20	The other thing that we're very very			
21	help get the rail trains out of our vard so we can	21	concerned about, of course, is the access to the			
22	continue to service more customers. It's a regular	22	business for the community. We are one of the few			
23	thing when we go out and market to try and attract	23	businesses that actually is welcoming in the			
24	more people into the Port of Long Beach. The	24	community to use the Port of Long Beach. We are the			
25	question about the rail always comes up. And as Ric	25	one access to sport fishing as granted under the			
	Page 29		Page 30			
1	Tidelines Act and the grant to the Port of Long	1	is Total Terminals International. We support the			
2	Beach. So somewhere there has to be a sport fishing	2	Rog of Long Beach in its endeavors to improve the			
3	operation. And of course, we can't possibly know,		efficient movement of freight and increase rail			
4	like I said, what kinds of accommodations may be	4	capacity through improvements to Port			
5	made in the future on that particular issue.	5	infrastructure. Thank you.			
6	The other problem is, obviously, we have a	6	MS. TERAMOTO: Lee Wilson.			
7	restaurant with outdoor seating. So as the train	7	MR. WILSON: I don't know how you got my			
8	tracks come on top of us, this is, obviously, going	8 3 C	name because I didn't submit a card, but I did come			
9	to be a pollution, vibration and noise problem for	A	prepared to speak. I've had immediate family who			
10	our restaurant. So therefore, we are opposed to the	10	have been working in the Port for over 100 years and			
11	plan as currently written. Thank you.	11	are still working there. We're not anti-Port.			
12	MS. IEKAMOTO: The last three speaker cards	12	of Long Reach couthern Colifernic on the United			
14	stawart	14	States			
15	MR HOPE: My name is David Hope. I'm the	15	Juant to go on record but and it's a			
16	director of rail operations at Pier T. Port of Long	16	hig "but "			
17	Beach.	17	COURT REPORTER: Hold on please Let the			
18	COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. I can't hear	18	trucks or plane go by.			
19	you. You'll have to come up here.	19	MR. WILSON: First of all, I don't know why			
20	MR. ARMS: We want to make sure we have all	20	the Port would pick this venue. It is absolutely			
21	your words.	21	embarrassing to be sitting here. All right.			
22	MR. HOPE: This is my third time, so she	22	(Applause.)			
23	should have or you should have anyway, my name is	27	BDH Let's just review the last			
24	David Hope, and I'm the director of rail operations	24	eight-and-a-half years. Eight-and-a-half years ago,			
25	at the Port of Long Beach at Pier T. And my company	25	August 19th, the Port published ANOC [sic]. That's			
	Page 31		Page 32			
	8 (29 - 32)					
	Kusar [*] Keeping Your Word Is Our Business ^{5M}					

2/15 Put	blic Meeting Public Meet	BEI	gNO. 3 (M3) R 1108427
1	eight-and-a-half years ago. On August 18th I had a	1	neighbors. But when your neighbor is the Port of
2	piece of property with an infinite number of	2	Long Beach, they are the big elephant in the room. M3I W-3
3	potential buyers worldwide, and we had solicitations	3	and they go where they want and do what they want. (Cont'd)
4	all the time. Since ANOC was published, that	4	They have been totally insensitive for years, and
5	infinite number shrunk the next day from that 18th	5	that is continuing.
6	of August to the 19th to one buyer, and that's the	6	They can't tell us today and I'll
7	Port. This is a piece of property that's been in	7	submit questions, but there's a lot of things going
8	our family since 1965.	8	on. I want to know what's going on with the Port's
9	We have a tenant who's already spoken	- M	3 tredit ating. They've been over-budget on their
10	that's been in that building for over 20 years with	10	Generations of temporary building, on the
11	his family. Since the 19th immediately I suffered	11	construction of the new administration building and M3LW-4
12	financial damages. And when the Port sits up here	12	the bridge. The word on the street is their credit
13	and says, 'Well, after the approval of the EIR,	13	rating is being looked at. Is that going to prevent
14	we'll start talking to tenants and businesses and	14	the construction? Are they going to have the funds
15	property owners.' Well, they should have been	15	to even build this project?
16	talking to us eight-and-a-half years ago.	16	They should be talking to the businesses
17	I've requested a public meeting not a	17	and the property owners that they're impacting.
18	public meeting. I have requested a stakeholders	18	Here's a tenant that we have supported for over 25
19	meeting of private businesses and private property	19	years sometimes sacrificially. My lease terms M3LW-
20	that are going to be consumed by this project. They	20	aren't current. I've had to keep him in the
21	held one five years ago. For whatever reason during	-M	building or I have a worthless piece of property.
22	the public comment period, they don't want to hold	22	The Port has turned that footprint of property into
23	another one. I find that very, very heavy handed.	23	a ghost town because they are the largest builder.
24	As a private property owner, we have legal	24	If there are any other impacted businesses - M3LW-6
25	rights. Normally they protect you from your	25	and property owners I have a list of all of them.
	Page 55	-	Page 34
1	I'll share their addresses because I will convene a	1	MR. STEWART: HI, I'm Jim Stewart, and I
2	meeting of the impacted stakeholders. I think the	2	live in West Long Beach here just at 1/20 Chestnut.
3	Port should be very willing to do that, and they	3	And I am one to speak on benalf of all the Long
4	should provide an appropriate venue to hold that	+ A	<b>13LW-6</b> air pollution in the whole error in other
5	was no communication. And the only communication I	6	(Cont'd) chully the whole State. We have the worst - M3JS-
7	have notten since August 18th was when I reached out	7	pollution and it primarily comes from the ports
8	proactively and requested that	8	although there is some from refineries here
9	And that's still the case They don't	9	I hope that this project in fact I
10	want to talk to us. It's going to destroy 15 or 20	10	would like to support this project of it's going to
11	iobs for my tenant. Where does he so? And the	11	reduce the pollution from all those trucks. So it's
12	length of time for him to even relocate is multiple	3L.\	Assential that this FIR show how the pollution will M3.15-2
13	years. Why is the Port absorbing the time and	13	be reduced if these trains are able to replace the
14	wasting it?	14	thousands of trucks that are killing us every day in
15	MR. ARMS: I'm sorry, you're only allowed	15	this area.
16	three minutes.	16	The project must require only the cleanest
17	MR. WILSON: Okay. Well, I took Kevin's	17	locomotives. We don't allow any more dirty filthy
18	three minutes. I'd like the Port to show some	18	polluting, you know, locomotives into this areaM3.IS-3
19	sensitivity to the people whose lives they are going	19	And they should study electrification. We should
20	to destroy financially. And they have not. Senior	20	have really clean locomotives, just perfect, without
21	executives have told me that the Commission wants	M3T	any pollution at all. And they should extend the
22	people to be communicated with and dealt with in a	22	Alameda Corridor so that the electrification could
23	professional manner. That has not happened for	23	continue on outside of the LA area, which is already M3JS-
24	eight-and-a-half years. Thank you.	24	the second most polluted area after us.
25	MR. ARMS: Dr. Jim Stewart.	25	And then the final point is the noise.
	Page 35		Page 36
_			

1       All of us who live in West Long Beack know that the       project. And have a good afternoon.         2       project require not min whistles. That's possible.       (Proceeding concluded at 12:30 p.m.)         3       Market a clear path from this on-dock train in the harmed Corridor. We don't need any more train the train whistles from this on-dock train the train whistles from this on-dock train the train whistles from this in       ****         3       And I actually have some petitions from       9         4       MR ARMS: That is all of the public speaker       9         5       cards we have. Ar there ary - all right. Since       9         6       we don't have a card, please state your name.       9         7       MR. ARMS: Shan Berns, property owner in the area. And Im just curious how the Port is going to about financing this project, if fis not selling       9         9       MR. ARMS: So with that, this concludes       9         12       MR. ARMS: So with that, this concludes       14         13       I declares under penalty of perjury under       14         14       the laws of the faste of Call formain that this declaration was executed on the 32st day of Percury, 3017.       Page 38         14       Address More on the Side of Call formain that this declaration was executed on the 32st day of Percury, 3017.       Page 38         15       Atthering Menry-Bencon       Page 38 <th>2/15 Pul</th> <th>/2017 Public Meet lic Meeting Pier</th> <th>tingNo. 3 (M3) BEIR</th> <th>1108427</th>	2/15 Pul	/2017 Public Meet lic Meeting Pier	tingNo. 3 (M3) BEIR	1108427
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 Page 39	2/15 Put 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 22 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 22 23 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 22 23 24 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 20 12 21 12 10 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 10 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 10 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 10 11 12 12 11 11 12 12 11 11 12 12 11 11	All of us who live in West Long Beach know that the train whistles keep us awake all night. And it's yery, very frustrating; and that it's time that this project require no train whistles. That's possible. We can have a clear path from this on-dock rail into the Alameda Corridor. We don't need any more train whistles here. That should be a guaranteed requirement. And I actually have some petitions from West Long Beach residents, if you'd like to sign, and T1I submit them as part of our public comment that we eliminate the train whistles from this in the future. Thank you. MR. ARMS: That is all of the public speaker cards we have. Are there any all right. Since we don't have a card, please state your name. MR. BERNS: Dan Berns, property owner in the area. And I'm just curious how the Port is going to go about financing this project, if it's not selling bonds or if it's internal or whatever. Thank you. MR. ARMS: So with that, this concludes today's public meeting. As a reminder, if you would like to submit written comments, please send them to the address shown on the slide. We appreciate your presence today and your interest in the Pier B Page 37	Ing No. 3 (M3)         B EIR         1 project. And have a good afternoon.         3 (Proceeding concluded at 12:30         ****         *3J S-5         6 (Cont'd)         7         8         9         10         11         12         13         14         15         16         17         *****         *****         *****         *****         *****         *****         *****         *****         *****         *****         *****         *****         *****         *****         *****         *****         *****         *****         *****         *****         *****         *****         ****         ****         ****         ****         ****         ****         ****         ****         ****         **** <t< th=""><th>1108427 ) p.m.) Page 38</th></t<>	1108427 ) p.m.) Page 38
	17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24			

# Responses to Testimony Received at the February 15, 2017, Public Meeting at Tepechi Restaurant

3 **Response to Comment M3GS-1:** Thank you for your comments. It appears that the businesses referenced by the commenter are located at 1335 W. Cowles Street and 2000 W. 4 Cowles Street. (Note, the transcription references "Haze" but it appears the commenter was 5 6 referencing "Hayes" Avenue.) This is several blocks north of the proposed Project boundary. 7 The Port of Long Beach acknowledges your concern for your employees with regards to air 8 pollution and noise. These environmental resources were evaluated in Sections 3.2 and 3.8 9 of the Draft EIR. Mitigation measures for air quality impacts were included, in part, to mitigate potential health effects to employees, including those who work outdoors. However, there are 10 11 no additional feasible mitigation measures identified for proposed Project operation.

The predicted air quality impacts specific to the commenter's business locations were extracted from the Draft EIR analysis, and are summarized herein. The closest receptor points to these locations that were evaluated by the dispersion model for the EIR are located about 60 feet north of the 1335 W. Cowles Street location, and about 350 feet southwest of the 2000 W. Cowles Street location (substantially closer to the proposed Project site and, therefore, a very conservative representation of the impacts at 2000 W. Cowles Street).
Table 11.2-20 shows the highest modeled criteria pollutant and health risk impacts at 1335

19 W. Cowles Street associated with the mitigated proposed Project. The table shows that the 20 peak federal 1-hour NO₂ concentration would exceed the threshold during project 21 construction. A discussion of the types of health effects that may be associated with  $NO_x$  and 22 NO₂ exposure is provided on pages 3.2-48 and 3.2-49 of the Draft EIR. All other criteria 23 pollutant and health risk impacts during construction and operation would be less than the 24 thresholds at this location. The peak federal 1-hour NO₂ impact of 215  $\mu$ g/m³ would occur 25 during Phase 3 of construction. Emissions from Project construction would contribute only 26 about 18 percent to this impact: the background concentration would contribute the remaining 27 82 percent.

28 Table 11.2-21 shows the highest modeled criteria pollutant and health risk impacts at 2000 29 W. Cowles Street associated with the mitigated proposed Project. The table shows that the 30 peak federal 1-hour NO₂ concentration would exceed the threshold during both project 31 construction and operation. As mentioned previously, these results are probably overstated 32 for 2000 W. Cowles Street because the nearest modeled receptors were 350 feet closer to the proposed Project site than this location. All other criteria pollutant and health risk impacts 33 during construction and operation would be less than the thresholds at this location. The peak 34 federal 1-hour NO₂ impact of 232 µg/m³ during construction would occur during Phases 1 and 35 36 2. Emissions from Project construction would contribute only about 24 percent to this impact; 37 the background concentration would contribute the remaining 76 percent. The peak federal 1-hour NO₂ impact of 202 µg/m³ during operation would occur in the 2020 analysis year. The 38 39 impact would gradually decline after 2020 due primarily to cleaner locomotives, reaching a 40 value of 192 µg/m³ by 2035. Emissions from proposed Project operation would contribute only 41 about 13 percent to the 2020 impact; the background concentration would contribute the 42 remaining 87 percent. The geographical extent of significant NO₂ impacts during the 43 operational period of the proposed Project with the refined boundary (as described in Section 10.1 44 of the Final EIR) is shown in Figures 11.2-1 through 11.2-5 in response to Comment AQMD-45 5.

Г

TABLE 11.2-20 MODELED AIR POLLUTANT IMPACTS NEAR 1335 W. COWLES STREET (MITIGATED PROPOSED PROJECT)							
	Description	Modeled Impact ¹	Significance Threshold	Significant?			
	Crite	eria Pollutants during	g Construction ²				
	1-Hour (state)	302	339	No			
NO ₂	1-Hour (federal)	215	188	Yes			
	Annual	53.0	57.0	No			
<u> </u>	1-Hour	4,059	23,000	No			
0	8-Hour	3,209	10,000	No			
DM	24-Hour	0.6	10.4	No			
F IVI10	Annual	0.04	1.0	No			
PM _{2.5}	24-Hour	0.2	10.4	No			
	Cr	iteria Pollutants duri	ng Operation ³				
	1-Hour (state)	266	339	No			
NO ₂	1-Hour (federal)	182	188	No			
	Annual	52.5	57.0	No			
<u> </u>	1-Hour	3,974	23,000	No			
0	8-Hour	3,155	10,000	No			
DM	24-Hour	0.08	2.5	No			
F IVI10	Annual	0.02	1.0	No			
PM _{2.5}	24-Hour	0.008	2.5	No			
Health Risks (Construction + Operation) ⁴							
Individual Cancer Risk		0.7 × 10-6	10 × 10 ⁻⁶	No			
Chronic H	azard Index	0.002	1.0	No			
8-Hour Ch	ronic Hazard Index	0.005	1.0	No			
Acute Haz	ard Index	0.04	1.0	No			

Notes:

¹ NO₂ and CO impacts are the modeled project increment plus observed background. All other impacts are the modeled project increment.

 2   $\,$  The highest impacts from all three phases of construction are shown.

³ The highest impacts from all three operational analysis years (2020, 2025, 2035) are shown.

⁴ Health risk values reflect occupational exposure assumptions and include emissions from both construction and operation.

TABLE 11.2-21 MODELED AIR POLLUTANT IMPACTS NEAR 2000 W. COWLES STREET (MITIGATED PROPOSED PROJECT)							
	Description	Modeled Impact ¹	Significance Threshold	Significant?			
	Crite	eria Pollutants during	g Construction ²				
	1-Hour (state)	321	339	No			
NO ₂	1-Hour (federal)	232	188	Yes			
	Annual	55.8	57.0	No			
<u> </u>	1-Hour	4,135	23,000	No			
0	8-Hour	3,285	10,000	No			
DM	24-Hour	1.7	10.4	No			
PIVI10	Annual	0.2	1.0	No			
PM _{2.5} 24-Hour		0.6	10.4	No			
	Cr	iteria Pollutants duri	ng Operation ³				
	1-Hour (state)	287	339	No			
NO ₂	1-Hour (federal)	202	188	Yes			
	Annual	54.9	57.0	No			
<u> </u>	1-Hour	3,991	23,000	No			
00	8-Hour	3,163	10,000	No			
DM	24-Hour	0.1	2.5	No			
F IVI10	Annual	0.02	1.0	No			
PM _{2.5}	24-Hour	0.1	2.5	No			
	Heal	th Risks (Construction	on + Operation) ⁴				
Individual Cancer Risk		2.4 × 10-6	10 × 10 ⁻⁶	No			
Chronic Ha	azard Index	0.007	1.0	No			
8-Hour Ch	ronic Hazard Index	0.02	1.0	No			
Acute Haz	ard Index	0.06	1.0	No			

Notes:

¹ NO₂ and CO impacts are the modeled project increment plus observed background. All other impacts are the modeled project increment.

² The highest impacts from all three phases of construction are shown.

³ The highest impacts from all three operational analysis years (2020, 2025, 2035) are shown.

⁴ Health risk values reflect occupational exposure assumptions and include emissions from both construction and operation.

The predicted 1-hour NO₂ concentrations in Tables 11.2-20 and 11.2-21 are conservative and would occur very infrequently, if at all, because the analysis assumes worst-case meteorological conditions (i.e., low wind speed, optimum wind direction, and very stable atmosphere) concurrent with the highest observed background concentration measured at the Superblock monitoring station over a 3-year period. The construction concentration further

1 assumes all construction equipment would operate simultaneously during these worst-case

- 2 conditions. Accordingly, most of the 1-hour NO₂ concentrations during proposed Project
- 3 construction and operation would be much lower than the peak values, as evidenced by the 4 much lower annual average  $NO_2$  concentrations, which are averages of all 1-hour 5 concentrations during the worst approximately approximately average.
- 5 concentrations during the worst-case year.

6 Furthermore, the proposed Project may produce operational criteria pollutant and health 7 impacts that are less than the values presented in the Draft EIR by replacing many future 8 drayage truck trips with rail transport. The potential air quality benefit associated with fewer drayage truck trips was not quantified in this EIR (although the impact of the additional rail 9 10 transport was quantified). Please see response to Comment GSR-2 for more discussion of 11 this potential air quality benefit. Noise impacts were found to be less than significant at all of 12 the closest noise-sensitive receptors. The comment does not raise any particular issue with 13 regard to the analysis in the Draft EIR. Therefore, no further response is necessary.

Response to Comment M3GS-2: Shoreline Drive and West Anaheim Street connect the
 Project area to Downtown Long Beach, and will continue to do so. Please see Master
 Response – Street Closures, Access to Downtown Long Beach, and Public Services Access.

17 **Response to Comment M3GS-3:** A full traffic impact analysis was conducted for all 18 alternatives. In 2035 for the Project versus the No Project assuming cumulative traffic growth, 19 the traffic model indicates that the LOS on Anaheim Street and Pacific Coast Highway would 20 operate within acceptable levels of service (refer to the Draft EIR Tables 3.5-13 and 3.5-19). According to the analysis, average daily traffic volumes on Pacific Coast Highway east of 21 22 Santa Fe Avenue would increase slightly (by less than 1 percent, from 41,270 to 41,673), 23 while traffic volumes on Santa Fe Avenue south of Pacific Coast Highway would decrease 24 significantly (by 32 percent, from 16,101 without the Project to 12,197 with the Project). 25 Anaheim east of Santa Fe Avenue would increase by 20 percent (from 32,564 without the 26 Project to 40.741 with the Project); however, Santa Fe Avenue north of Anaheim would 27 experience a 43 percent reduction in traffic (from 10.462 without the Project to 7.327 with the 28 Project). Cowles Street is located approximately 1,600 feet north of the proposed Project, and 29 runs in an east-west direction. The commenters' two sites are located about 0.5 miles apart 30 on Cowles Street between Judson and Fashion Avenue. It is not expected that traffic or travel 31 between the commenters' two sites would be affected by the proposed Project.

- Response to Comment M3LK-1: Please see responses to Superior Electrical's written
   Comments SEA-1 through SEA-21.
- Response to Comment M3LK-2: Please see response to Superior Electrical's written
   Comments SEA-11.

Response to Comment M3LK-3: Please see response to Superior Electrical's written
 Comments SEA-12 and also see Master Response – Street Closures, Access to Downtown
 Long Beach, and Public Services Access.

39 **Response to Comment M3LK-4:** Please see response to Comment SEA-13.

40 Response to Comment M3LK-5: Please see response to Comment SEA-18. Modern trains
 41 have horns rather than whistles; whistling is associated with steam engines. The use of train
 42 horns would increase in proportion to the increase in the number of trains leaving Pier B, as

43 train horns are a safety feature. Train horns are discussed in Section 3.8.4 (Train Horn Noise).

- 1 Response to Comment M3LK-6: Please see responses to Comments SEA-7 to SEA-10.
- 2 The 58-page Project description describes Pier B rail facilities and operations in sufficient
- 3 detail to support the environmental impact analysis. Section 1.3.3 discusses the use of the
- 4 various tracks in the rail yard.
- 5 Response to Comment M3LK-7: Please see responses to Comments SEA-7 to SEA-10,
   6 and M3LK-6.
- 7 **Response to Comment M3ST-1:** Please see response to Comment CTC-1.
- 8 **Response to Comment M3ST-2:** Please see response to Comment CTC-2.
- 9 **Response to Comment M3ST-3:** Please see response to Comment CTC-3.
- 10 **Response to Comment M3ST-4:** Please see response to Comment CTC-4.
- 11 **Response to Comment M3ST-5:** Please see response to Comment CTC-5 and Master
- 12 Response Street Closures, Access to Downtown Long Beach, and Public Services Access.
- 13 **Response to Comment M3ST-6:** Please see response to Comment CTC-6.
- 14 **Response to Comment M3JS:** Please see response to Comment T848-1.
- Response to Comment M3PC-1: The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your comment and
   concern about pollution.
- 17 The EIR has evaluated the proposed expansion of the Pier B Rail Yard to enable more cargo
- 18 to be transported by rail. The proposed Project could replace many future drayage truck trips
- 19 with train transport, the beneficial effects of which were not quantified in the air quality
- 20 analysis. Please see the response to Comment GSR-2 for a discussion of drayage trucks.
- Response to Comment M3PC-2: The Port of Long Beach acknowledges your comment for
   the record. Please see response to Comment WPAC-2.
- Response to Comment M3PC-3: Please see responses to Comments WPAC-3 and WPAC 4.
- Response to Comment M3PC-4: Please see responses to Comments WPAC-6 through
   WPAC-8. Please also see Master Response Street Closures, Access to Downtown Long
   Beach, and Public Services Access.
- Response to Comment M3PC-5: Traffic count equipment is almost always installed on and removed from roadways on Sunday afternoons due to low traffic volumes. This minimizes risk of injury to the equipment installers. The equipment typically collects a week's worth of data, and the days that represent the highest average volumes are used when conducting the traffic analysis. As explained in the Draft EIR on pages 3.5-6 and 3.5-7, as well as Appendix B, at B-27 through B-34, the volume counts included a.m. and p.m. weekday peak hours as well as weekday mid-day.
- 35 **Response to Comment M3JD-1:** The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your comments.
- 36 Mr. Donaldson, President and CEO of Lan Logistics, Inc., submitted a detailed letter which 37 expanded upon the concerns he raised at this meeting. Please see responses to Comments
- 38 LLI-1 through LLI-30. Please also see Master Response Property Acquisition,
- 39 Compensation, and Relocation.
- 40 **Response to Comment M3JD-2:** Please see response to Comment M3JD-1.

1 **Response to Comment M3RI:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 2 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific

3 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

4 **Response to Comment M3PA:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 5 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 6 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

**Response to Comment M3CD-1:** SRM Corporation submitted a more detailed comment
letter containing the comments raised at the hearing and other comments. Please see
response to Comments SRM-1 through SRM-9, as well as the responses to Berth 55 Landing
of Long Beach, Inc. Comments B55-1 through B55-5.

**Response to Comment M3CD-2:** Access to sport fishing granted under the Tidelines Act [sic] and grant to POLB would continue to be available from the existing wharf. The grant under the Tidelands Act gave POLB control of the tidelands. Please see response to Comment M3CD-1.

15 **Response to Comment M3CD-3:** Please see response to Comments M3CD-1 and SRM-1.

16 **Response to Comment M3DH:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 17 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 18 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

**Response to Comment M3LW-1:** Please see responses to Comments WT-1 through WT-5. The Port has also provided responses to the comments of the commenter's tenant. See responses to Comments LLI-1 to LLI-30. The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your comments and your long-term tenure in the Harbor District.

23 **Response to Comment M3LW-2:** Please see response to Comment WT-4.

Response to Comment M3LW-3: The comment refers to the commenter's desire to hold a
 meeting of private persons. The comment does not raise any environmental issues and
 requires no response.

- Response to Comment M3LW-4: The comment relates to the commenter's perception of
   the Port's credit rating. It does not relate to the Draft EIR or environmental issues and requires
   no response.
- 30 **Response to Comment M3LW-5:** Please see responses to Comments WT-1 through WT-5.
- 31 **Response to Comment M3LW-6:** Please see response to Comment WT-5.
- Response to Comment M3LW-7: Please see responses to Comments WT-1 through WT-4.
   Please also see Master Response Property Acquisition, Compensation, and Relocation.
- 34 **Response to Comment M3LW-8:** Please see responses to Comments WT-2 and WT-5. The
- 35 Port of Long Beach will continue to communicate with stakeholders for the proposed Project
- 36 in a timely manner, insofar as possible.
- 37 Response to Comment M3JS-1: The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your comments
   38 concerning air pollution from the ports and refineries in the area.
- 39 Response to Comment M3JS-2: The EIR has evaluated the proposed expansion of the Pier 40 B Rail Yard to enable more cargo to be transported by rail. The proposed Project could replace

many future drayage truck trips by transporting containers by train. Please see response to
 Comment GSR-2 for a discussion of drayage trucks.

- Response to Comment M3JS-3: Conversion of the locomotive fleet, with regard to the Class
   I trains and PHL trains, to electric or fuel cell propulsion, is currently not feasible. Please see
   response to Comment CARB-7 and Master Response Electrification of Alameda Corridor
   and Zero Emission Locomotives.
- **Response to Comment M3JS-4:** The Alameda Corridor serves inbound and outbound trains
  from the two Class I railroads that enter and depart from the SPBP. The corridor was
  developed to create a fully grade-separated rail facility between the ports and downtown Los
  Angeles. Since the corridor has been completed, further grade separation projects have been
  and are continuing to be built along the UPRR and BNSF main lines to the east of Downtown
  Los Angeles. Regarding electrification of the rail lines, see Master Response Electrification
  of Alameda Corridor and Zero Emission Locomotives.
- 14 The commenter's suggestion regarding the extension of the Alameda Corridor is noted for the 15 record. That is beyond the scope of the proposed Project.
- 16 **Response to Comment M3JS-5:** The comment states that train whistles are keeping West 17 Long Beach residents "awake all night." Modern trains have horns rather than whistles;
- 18 whistling is associated with steam engines. The use of train horns would increase in proportion
- 19 to the increase in the number of trains leaving Pier B, as train horns are a safety feature that
- 20 is required. It is possible that West Long Beach residents are referring to horn noise from any
- of the many other railroad lines in the surrounding area. There is no way that the proposed
- 22 Project can guarantee that no more train horns will be used due to safety regulations.
- Response to Comment M3DB: The commenter asks how the proposed Project would be financed. Such financial issues are outside the scope of the CEQA process, as outlined in Section 15131 of the CEQA Guidelines.

#### 26 **11.2.5 Additional Written Comments Received**

The POLB received written comments on the Speaker Request Cards at each of the three public meetings. These comments have been transcribed verbatim in this section, and responses to these written comments are provided below.

### Responses to Written Comments on Speaker Cards Received at Public Meeting No. 1 – January 11, 2017

- 32 **Comment SC-1 (Karissa Reyes and Ricardo Orellana):** Local jobs for the unions and all 33 trades and the work development program at LBCC.
- 34 **Response to Comment SC-1:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the proposed
- 35 Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific section of the 36 Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.
- 37 **Comment SC-2 (Revi Castro):** 2,000 residents and workers reside at Century Villages at 38 Cabrillo close to the On-Dock Rail Support Facility.
- 39 **Response to Comment SC-2:** The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your comments.
- 40 Please see responses to Comments M1RC-1 and M1RC-2.

- 1 **Comment SC-3 (Lee Wilson):** Concerned about timely and complete communication.
- 2 **Response to Comment SC-3:** The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your comments.
- 3 Throughout the environmental review process, the Port has strived to meet or exceed the
- 4 public involvement requirements of CEQA. In August 2009, the Port publicly announced and
- 5 advertised the Notice of Preparation of an EIR and released its Initial Study for the Project. In
- 6 September 2009, the Port held two public scoping meetings on the Project to solicit public and 7 agency recommendations on the scope of its environmental review. Upon completion of its
- 8 environmental review, the Port made the Draft EIR available for public review and comment,
- 9 a process in which the current commenter participated. Following release of the Draft EIR,
- 10 public hearings were held on January 11 and 18 and February 15, 2017. The Port will continue
- 11 to communicate with stakeholders for this Project in a timely manner, insofar as possible.
- 12 Please also see response to Comment WT-5.
- 13 Comment SC-4 (Sergio Palmier): Carpenters Local 1506 Carpenters Los Angeles and 14 myself support this Project.
- Response to Comment SC-4: Thank you for your comment and your support of the proposed
   Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific section of the
   Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.
- 18 **Comment SC-5 (Vema Boyd):** We support this measure.
- 19 **Response to Comment SC-5:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the proposed 20 Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific section of the
- 21 Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.
- 22 **Comment SC-6 (Jess Marroguin):** Support the Project.
- Response to Comment SC-6: Thank you for your comment and your support of the proposed
   Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific section of the
   Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.
- 26 **Comment SC-7 (Elvia Ayala):** Support on Project.
- Response to Comment SC-7: Thank you for your comment and your support of the proposed
   Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific section of the
   Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.
- 30 Comment SC-8 (Deonte Brown): I think it's a very good idea. It will make our life for transport 31 our goods way more faster. Who every came up with this idea, I say grate job from Deonte 32 and Waren Brown.
- Response to Comment SC-8: Thank you for your comment and your support of the proposed
   Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific section of the
   Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.
- Comment SC-9 (Abel Lopez): On dock rail I am for this Project because it will give more
   people opportunity to work.
- 38 **Response to Comment SC-9:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the proposed
- 39 Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific section of the 40 Draft EIR: therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.
  - Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Project **11-311**

- Comment SC-10 (Juan Alcarea): On dock rail I am for this Project because it'll bring more
   work for the City I am in.
- 3 **Response to Comment SC-10:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 4 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific
- 5 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

## *Responses to Written Comments on Speaker Cards Received at Public Meeting No. 2 – January 18, 2017*

8 Comment SC-11 (David Kelly): Support rail.

9 Response to Comment SC-11: Thank you for your comment and your support of the
 10 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific
 11 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

12 **Comment SC-12 (Lee Wilson):** Concerns regarding communication with stakeholders.

Response to Comment SC-12: The Port of Long Beach thanks you for your comments and
 will continue to communicate with stakeholders for this Project in a timely manner, insofar as
 possible. Please see response to Comment WT-5.

16 **Comment SC-13 (Ricardo Orellana):** Representation of MC3 pre-apprenticeship at LBCC, 17 all for and in support of all reconfigurations expensures [sic] and enhancements.

18 Response to Comment SC-13: Thank you for your comment and your support of the

19 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 20 section of the Draft EIR: therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

21 **Comment SC-14 (Pete P. Loera):** In favor of the Project.

Response to Comment SC-14: Thank you for your comment and your support of the proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

25 **Comment SC-15 (Aaron Contreras):** I support this Project.

26 **Response to Comment SC-15:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 27 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 28 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

29 **Comment SC-16 (Miguel Gomez):** Local Union 1506 support this Project.

30 **Response to Comment SC-16:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 31 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 32 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

33 **Comment SC-17 (Roy Chang):** Carpenters Local 1506 supports this Project.

34 **Response to Comment SC-17:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 35 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 36 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

37 Comment SC-18 (Aaron Thompson): Carpenters Local Unions and affiliates support this
 38 Project.

- 1 Response to Comment SC-18: Thank you for your comment and your support of the
- 2 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific
- 3 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.
- 4 **Comment SC-19 (John Tafoya):** Carpenters Local Unions is in full support of this Project.
- 5 **Response to Comment SC-19:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 6 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific 7 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.
- 8 **Comment SC-20 (Jacob Lopez):** Carpenters Union 2361, we support this Project.

9 **Response to Comment SC-20:** Thank you for your comment and your support of the 10 proposed Project. The comment is general in nature and does not reference any specific

11 section of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required under CEQA.

### Responses to Written Comments on Speaker Cards Received at Public Meeting No. 3 – February 15, 2017

- 14 Comment SC-21 (Dan Berns): I think the 9th Street proposal is the best alternative. If not, 15 the 10th Street proposal is the second-best alternative. The 12th Street proposal is unworkable.
- 16 The Shoemaker Bridge MUST remain along with the north and south connection from the 17 industrial area in an out of the port – on the west side of Freeway and river.
- 18 The crossing of 9th Street and Pico Avenue must remain to allow for business into and out of
- the port and the City. Loss of these connect will hurt businesses on the west side. This shouldbe the Port's responsibility, not the City's.
- Response to Comment SC-21: The commenter's preferences for the alternatives are noted
   for the record.

23 Disposition of the Shoemaker bridge and access ramps will be determined by actions taken 24 by the COLB or Caltrans in response to separate projects that are not within control of the 25 Port of Long Beach. The Shoemaker ramps will either be removed by Caltrans as part of its 26 I-710 project improvements or by the COLB as part of the replacement of Shoemaker Bridge. 27 Either project could occur in advance of the proposed improvements to the Pier B Rail Yard. 28 The 12th Street Alternative is based on the assumption that the ramps would be removed. Both the 10th and 9th Street alternatives could be constructed with the Shoemaker ramps 29 remaining; the 10th Street Alternative would realign the ramp terminal points, whereas the 9th 30 31 Street ramps could remain as they are under the 9th Street Alternative. Please see Master Response – Street Closures, Access to Downtown Long Beach, and Public Services Access. 32

- The existing 9th Street at-grade rail crossing would be eliminated under any of the three Project alternatives. This at-grade crossing delays local vehicle traffic during train arrivals, departures, and assembly. The at-grade crossing also poses a potential for train/vehicle conflicts. Eliminating the 9th Street at-grade rail crossing would thus have both traffic circulation and safety benefits.
- 38 Comment SC-22 (Dan Berns): How (will the Project be) funded?
- 39 **Response to Comment SC-22:** Please see response to Comment M3DB.

This page intentionally left blank.