

January 11, 2005

***NWSPNC Port Subcommittee Comments on the San Pedro Waterfront
Promenade and Plaza Draft Project Description (December 27, 2004)
Prepared by the Port of Los Angeles***

Summary

As we have stated many times before the master plan proposed for the Bridge to the Breakwater has many exciting elements. We are supportive of the plan to provide more public access to the waterfront via linkages to the community. However, as stated in discussions with Port staff, the PCAC Coordinated Plan Subcommittee (CNPSC) and the Waterfront Steering Committee members, the Northwest San Pedro Neighborhood Council (NWSPNC) has serious reservations about the scale of the proposed development. We view the Bridge to Breakwater project as an open space plan; however, it appears that the Bridge to Breakwater project has primarily become a development plan.

A detailed list of questions and comments related to the options plan developed in August 2004 was provided to the Port of Los Angeles (POLA) and (CPSC) in September 2004. The comments provided below are consistent with the questions and concerns raised by the NWSPNC in September 2004. Based on the project description, it appears that the POLA and the CPSC still have not adequately addressed these questions and concerns in their option planning. These comments do not preclude or limit the NWSPNC from commenting further on the proposed Bridge to Breakwater Project following the publication of the Notice of Environmental Impact Report Preparation.

1. The project description does not provide a project alternative without water cuts, where Harbor Boulevard is not realigned, and the Red Car is not extended to Carbrillo Beach. We would like to know what it would cost to build the Bridge to Breakwater pedestrian promenade and project without these elements. At AW-3, for example, it appears that the primary use for a proposed water cut is for tugboat operations. Does it make economic sense to dredge this area primarily to support tugboat operations?

2. The proposed Maritime Exposition Building is as large as the existing Port building. We are concerned about the size and scale of this proposed building at this waterfront location.
3. We believe that the residential uses proposed at CD2 through CD8, are incompatible with Port operations. As POLA develops 24/7 operations on Terminal Island, cargo off-loading, lights, etc, will impact the residents of these proposed residential parcels. Residential use of these parcels may not be compatible with port operations or the Bridge to Breakwater vision as primarily an open space plan.
4. As stated in the past we have concerns about the location of a second cruise ship terminal at Kaiser Point. Alternatively, without the proposed watercuts, a single, integrated cruise terminal could be built at the existing cruise ship terminal location at the north end of the project. We believe that a signature building should be built at Kaiser Point, not a second cruise ship terminal.
5. The proposed use of Kaiser Point is not bold enough given its prominent location commanding the entryway to the harbor. Any building at this location needs to be dramatic and bold, (e.g. Sydney Opera House, Disney Concert Hall), otherwise the potential for this entry point into the Port of Los Angeles will be lost. As a signature building, the proposed Maritime Exposition Building, for example, could be relocated in this area. Restaurants and other development could be built behind this signature structure through the elimination of Westways and port warehouses, and infilling between the piers. We believe that more creative uses for Municipal Warehouse No.1, and the warehouse structures on Berths 58 – 60 should be explored.
6. We recommend combining EP6, EP7 and part of EP3 to create a single large park to be renamed Cabrillo Park, and not San Pedro Park. Conceptually, it should be considered as a continuation of Cabrillo Beach.
7. Why does the project team believe that the proposed Bridge to Breakwater project can support hotels ED1 through ED 4 and FD-5 and FD-6? What assurances does the community have that if these locations fail under the proposed development plan, they will not be converted into residential units? Alternatively, we would eliminate the hotels/time shares at ED1 through ED4.
8. As written the project description does not discuss every site depicted on the Draft Project Descriptions Figure dated December 21, 2004. We request that a table be prepared linking the proposed or existing development site and the project description.. The project description should also include a brief discussion of phasing for the proposed development and improvements depicted.

Philip Nicolay,
Committee Chair