



1840 S. Gaffey Street, Box 212, San Pedro, CA 90731 310-918-8650 [info@centralsanpedro.org](mailto:info@centralsanpedro.org)  
**Twitter:** @CentralSPNC ~ **Instagram:** @CeSPNC ~ **Facebook:** CentralSanPedroNeighborhoodCouncil  
Website: <https://centralsanpedronc.org/>

---

**PORT RELATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**Monday, May 9, 2022 @ 6:30pm**  
**Zoom Virtual Meeting**

Please join the Zoom Webinar Online at Web  
Address: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82006019154>

Si requiere servicios de traducción, favor de avisar al Concejo Vecinal 3 días de trabajo (72 horas) antes del evento. Por favor contacte CeSPNC Secretaria al (310) 918-8650 o por correo electrónico [info@centralsanpedronc.org](mailto:info@centralsanpedronc.org) para avisar al Concejo Vecinal.

IN CONFORMITY WITH THE SEPTEMBER 16, 2021 ENACTMENT OF CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY BILL 361 (RIVAS) AND DUE TO CONCERNS OVER COVID-19, THE CENTRAL SAN PEDRO NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL MEETING WILL BE CONDUCTED ENTIRELY WITH A CALL-IN OPTION OR INTERNET-BASED SERVICE OPTION.

Every person wishing to address the Board must dial **(833) 548-0282**, and enter **820 0601 9154** and then press # to join the meeting. When prompted by the presiding officer, to provide public input at the Neighborhood Council meeting the public will be requested to dial \*9 or use the Raise Hand option, to address the Board on any agenda item before the Board takes an action on an item. Comments from the public on agenda items will be heard only when the respective item is being considered.

Comments from the public on other matters not appearing on the agenda that are within the Board's jurisdiction will be heard during the General Public Comment period. Please note that under the Brown Act, the Board is prevented from acting on a matter that you bring to its attention during the General Public Comment period; however, the issue raised by a member of the public may become the subject of a future Board meeting. Public comment is limited to 2 minutes per speaker, unless adjusted by the presiding officer of the Board.

**AB 361 Updates:** Public comment cannot be required to be submitted in advance of the meeting, only real-time public comment is required. If there are any broadcasting interruptions that prevent the public from observing or hearing the meeting, the meeting must be recessed or adjourned. If members of the public are unable to provide public comment or be heard due to issues within the Neighborhood Council's control, the meeting must be recessed or adjourned.

Any messaging or virtual background is in the control of the individual board member in their personal capacity and does not reflect any formal position of the Neighborhood Council or the City of Los Angeles.

## **AGENDA**

1. Call to Order/Welcome/Introductions
2. Roll Call
3. Chairman's report
4. Vice Chair report on Port/NCs /Chambers meeting
5. Public Comments on non-agenda items

6. Discussion and possible action on the Waterfront Development SEIR while also considering the potential move of the SP Fish Market to Catalina parking lot.
7. Follow up on the Star Kist Tuna cannery: Motion to request that POLA provide a tour of the site. (Action Item)
8. Update on Fleet Week scheduled for May 26 through May 30.
9. Review and possible action on CIS referred to committee Re: Council file 21-1466 Re: CA Air Resources board and port pollution.
10. Review and possible action on EcoCem letter (see attached version from NWSPNC)
11. Discussion Topic: The transportation sector is the #1 source of greenhouse gas pollution in America, and heavy-duty trucks pump out nearly 25% of the sector's emissions, despite comprising less than 10% of vehicles on the road. And while the U.S. is making progress in improving gas mileage and vehicle charging infrastructure, we're lagging in reducing emissions from the freight and heavy-duty vehicle sector. That's why we need the Biden administration to set the strongest diesel engine standards possible and establish a national zero-emission truck requirement — it will help slash truck pollution, increase the number of zero-emission trucks on the road, and bring health benefits more quickly to the communities that need them most. (Possible Action Item)
12. Items for future consideration
13. Adjournment

***NOTE: Anything on this Agenda Could Result in a Motion***

**Americans with Disabilities Act:** As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability and upon request will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to its programs, services, and activities. Sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability of services, please make your request at least 3 business days (72 hours) prior to the meeting by contacting the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment by calling (213) 978-1551 or email: NCsupport@lacity.org

**Public Posting of Agendas** - Neighborhood Council agendas are posted for public review as follows:

- 1840 S Gaffey Street, San Pedro
- <https://centralsanpedronc.org>
- You can also receive our agendas via email by subscribing to L.A. City's [Early Notification System \(ENS\)](#)

**Notice to Paid Representatives** - If you are compensated to monitor, attend, or speak at this meeting, City law may require you to register as a lobbyist and report your activity. See Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 48.01 et seq. More information is available at [ethics.lacity.org/lobbying](https://ethics.lacity.org/lobbying). For assistance, please contact the Ethics Commission at (213) 978-1960 or [ethics.commission@lacity.org](mailto:ethics.commission@lacity.org)

**Public Access of Records** - In compliance with Government Code section 54957.5, non-exempt writings that are distributed to a majority or all of the board in advance of a meeting may be viewed at our website: <https://centralsanpedronc.org> or at the scheduled meeting. In addition, if you would like a copy of any record related to an item on the agenda, please contact the CeSPNC, Secretary, at (310) 918-8650 or by email at: [info@centralsanpedro.org](mailto:info@centralsanpedro.org)

**Reconsideration and Grievance Process** - For information on the NC's process for board action reconsideration, stakeholder grievance policy, or any other procedural matters related to this Council, please consult the NC Bylaws. The Bylaws are available at our Board meetings and our website <https://centralsanpedronc.org/bylaws-committee/>

Director of Environmental Management  
City of Los Angeles Harbor Department  
425 S. Palos Verdes St.  
San Pedro, CA. 90731

Re: Ecocem NOP

May 5, 2022

Dear Mr. Cannon,  
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Ecocem NOP.

1. Use of waterfront property for uses that are not water dependent

Mixing with gypsum and grinding the product to size specifications does not require use of waterfront property. For years, the Port had to deal with particulate emissions from the coal facility at Kaiser Point and the export terminal on Terminal Island. This included Kaiser having to use a street sweeper full time on Port roads to clean up the spillage from truck transport to and from Kaiser Point. The potential for particulate air emissions in the proposed project, including the manufacturing aspect, can be done elsewhere. If it is done at Berth 191-194, it should be done indoors in covered structures with air scrubbers on all ventilation systems.

2. Air quality, water quality, particulate emissions.

The project will have very large negative air emission impacts. The product will be suctioned out of bulk carriers, transported by conveyor to open storage piles, processed through a crushing plant where it will be mixed with gypsum that has been imported by truck, stored again in open storage piles, then loaded onto 18 wheeled semi trucks and transported to other sites in the Southern California area. Each of these transfers plus the exhaust from the equipment used for operating the plant, will generate small particulates. Wind borne particles from the open storage are also a probability. All transfer and manufacturing points should include covered structures with air scrubbers on all ventilation systems.

Also, the project may have significant negative environmental impacts on water quality and should be included as an identified risk under section 6.10 of the NOP. The following two articles discuss the calcium sulfide and chromium content in blast furnace slag used as the raw materials in this project. We do not cite these articles as proof that there is a problem but do think the matter should be analyzed in the EIR as a significant potential impact. See <https://www.voicesofvallejo.com/fugitive-dust> and <https://www.voicesofvallejo.com/not-so-harmless>.

3. Truck traffic

The project forecasts 35,000 truck trips per year, but those are roundtrips. In counting traffic, each in and out segment counts as a trip, so that means there will be 70,000 truck trips a year, each one going up or down Avalon Boulevard past the new Banning's Landing Park.

How truck traffic impacts are analyzed is also an issue. The NOP says:

"... [the Office of Planning and Research] does not require vehicle miles traveled analysis of commercial truck in CEQA documents. Therefore, **based on OPR verbal guidance, heavy duty truck trips are not included in this transportation analysis**, but are analyzed in other resource areas such as air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise and energy...." NOP, Page 61.  
[emphasis added]

This means that impacts of the 18-wheeler semi-trucks on other traffic, businesses, etc. on Avalon, Harry Bridges, Alameda and other streets is not included and will not be analyzed, nor will such things as the

wear and tear on Wilmington streets. While “vehicle miles traveled” [VMT] is used these days to calculate vehicle traffic impacts, it’s not the only way to calculate impacts. It seems obvious that a traffic study showing the impacts of these 70,000 truck trips per year on traffic, schools, businesses, and visitor serving facilities is needed, including any potential traffic flow modifications and routing issues. Of particular concern is the fact that the trucks must cross the railroad tracks where the street is frequently closed for train movement, exacerbating the truck backlogs and idling that will occur. The analysis should include impact of the trucks on what are called “sensitive receptors” such as people. Right now users of the new Banning’s Landing Park are not included in the list of sensitive receptors in the air quality analysis listed elsewhere in the NOP.

#### 4. Project Alternatives

We suggest that the preferred alternative should be Alternative No. 3, processing offshore. This eliminates the emissions connected with processing, the truck problems from deliveries of gypsum, the heating to remove moisture, and the restocking prior to delivery loading. It also frees up space for more water-dependent use of the project site.

We have another suggestion. We suggest that Ecocem’s alternatives all should include construction of a railroad “industrial side-track” to the site. This would allow for closed hopper rail cars to transport the product from the terminal to other distribution points, such as cement mixing plants that are the likely delivery destinations for the product. Some of these other sites may well have industrial side-tracks of their own. ***If implemented, this one change would drastically reduce the number of truck trips required and may well eliminate them altogether.***

Absent a rail track to the site, the third alternative, manufacturing overseas and only using the site for import and distribution, meets the project objectives while reducing particulate emissions. It eliminates transfers of material from open stacks to and from mixing and milling operations. It would also eliminate the need to transport the gypsum product to mix with the imported product. This alone would reduce the truck trips by an estimated 2,100 per year. Lastly, it would better comply with the long held guideline that waterfront property should be reserved for water-dependent activities. Manufacturing/milling the product is not water dependent. This should be the preferred alternative in the event that rail access is not feasible.

We submit that Alternative 3 best meets the project objectives in the least environmentally impactful way and is the one that should be selected. [Cal. Code Regs. Title 14 Sec. 15126.6, Cal. PRC Secs. 21002, 21081]

Consideration of alternatives at this point in the process matters because a preferred alternative gets the most study. The other alternatives are often dismissed with one or two sentences in the EIR.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

C. Christian Guzman, President  
On behalf of the Northwest San Pedro Neighborhood Council