6. OTHER NEPA/CEQA TOPICS

6.1 The Relationship Between Short-Term Uses and Long-Term Productivity

In accordance with Section 86 of the FAA *Airport Environmental Handbook*, and Section 15126.2 of the State CEQA Guidelines, following is a discussion of short-term uses of the environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity.

Implementation of the LAX Master Plan would result in various impacts associated with construction. These impacts would occur throughout the duration of the construction period and, therefore, are considered temporary, although not short-term. The intensity of the impacts would vary throughout the construction period. The primary construction impacts would include noise, surface transportation, and air quality, including fugitive dust and exhaust emissions from construction equipment and construction-related trips. Construction would also have adverse impacts on land use; community disruption; historic, architectural, archaeological/cultural, and paleontological resources; design, art, and architecture application/aesthetics; hazardous materials; schools; biotic communities; wetlands; and endangered and threatened species of flora and fauna. (Construction impacts are examined in detail in Section 4.20, *Construction Impacts*, of this Final EIS/EIR.) Master Plan commitments and mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce or avoid potentially significant construction impacts; however, these measures would not be sufficient to reduce construction impacts to noise, land use, surface transportation, community disruption, air quality, historic resources, and schools to less than significant levels for some or all of the build alternatives.

The LAX Master Plan is a long-term development plan to guide the growth of passenger and cargo activities at LAX, through 2015. The facilities constructed under the Master Plan would have a lifespan well beyond this timeframe. Implementation of the Master Plan, therefore, would represent a long-term commitment of the land involved to airport uses. This commitment would be consistent with the existing identity of LAX as an aviation facility, which extends back over 80 years. Construction of the improvements proposed under the Master Plan would enhance the existing uses of the site by providing needed additional facilities to accommodate the region's future air transportation needs. Master Plan implementation would contribute to the long-term productivity of the site as the primary, commercial air transportation hub of the Los Angeles region and the dominant U.S. international gateway to the Pacific Rim. The proposed improvements would also provide an opportunity to remedy existing operational and environmental deficiencies associated with the existing LAX facilities and to reduce future impacts that would occur in the absence of the Master Plan.

6.2 Significant Unavoidable Environmental Effects

In accordance with Section 86 of the FAA *Airport Environmental Handbook* and Section 15126.2(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, an EIS/EIR must describe any impacts that would remain significant and unavoidable after the application of proposed mitigation measures. Chapter 4, *Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures*, describes the potential environmental impacts of the LAX Master Plan alternatives, as well as mitigation measures recommended to reduce or avoid significant impacts to the extent feasible. A complete listing of all proposed mitigation measures, as well as project design features and Master Plan commitments that would serve to avoid or reduce adverse effects, is provided in Chapter 5, *Environmental Action Plan*, of this Final EIS/EIR. With implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, most of the impacts associated with the four build alternatives would be reduced to a less than significant level. The adverse impacts listed below cannot be avoided or mitigated to a level that is less than significant.

As described in Chapter 4, *Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Measures,* impacts would occur with implementation of the build alternatives. However, there are opportunities to mitigate environmental impacts as part of the extensive improvements that would be constructed under build conditions. The significant, unavoidable impacts listed below include those

associated with the build alternatives. Impacts pertain to all four build alternatives, unless otherwise noted.

Noise

- Some noise-sensitive areas would be newly exposed to 65+ CNEL from aircraft noise.
- Some noise-sensitive areas currently exposed to 65+ CNEL would experience an increase of 1.5+ dB from aircraft noise.
- Some noise-sensitive areas would be newly exposed to single event noise levels in excess of thresholds established for this impact analysis, as categorized for CEQA purposes only.
- Temporary noise impacts would result from on-airport construction activities.

Land Use

- High noise levels would remain at some residential properties where sound insulation is not feasible.
- Residential and other noise-sensitive land uses may be exposed to high outdoor noise levels.
- Interim impacts would occur to noise sensitive uses exposed to high noise levels in excess of thresholds established for this impact analysis, prior to completion of acquisition or sound insulation.
- Certain schools newly exposed to significant interior noise levels could still be exposed to significant single event noise impacts, as categorized for CEQA purposes only, even after incorporation of MM-LU-4.
- High construction noise levels would occur at residential and noise-sensitive land uses within 600 feet of construction sites.

Surface Transportation

- Temporary impacts would occur due to construction activities.
- Additional vehicle demand would result in significant, unavoidable impacts at the following intersections:
  - La Cienega Boulevard at Century Boulevard.
  - Lincoln Boulevard at Jefferson Boulevard.
  - La Cienega Boulevard at Arbor Vitae Street (Alternatives A, B, and C).
  - Lincoln Boulevard at Marina Freeway (SR 90) (Alternatives A, B, and C).
  - Lincoln Boulevard at Teale Street (Alternatives A, B, and C).
  - Sepulveda Boulevard at La Tijera Boulevard (Alternatives A, B, and C).
  - Lincoln Boulevard at Manchester Avenue (Alternative C).
  - La Tijera Boulevard at Lincoln Boulevard (Alternative C).
  - Imperial Highway at La Cienega Boulevard (Alternative D).
  - Additional vehicle demand would result in a significant, unavoidable impact on one ramp of the Century Boulevard/Sepulveda Boulevard interchange (Alternative C).

Social Impacts

- Airport dependent businesses subject to acquisition may not be able to find suitable relocation sites in the project vicinity (Alternatives B and C).
- Community disruption would occur due to temporary changes in circulation patterns during construction.

Air Quality

- Increased on-airport emissions of NO_X and SO_2 from operational sources.
- Increased off-airport traffic emissions of CO, VOC, NO_X, and PM_{10}.
- Increased emissions of CO, VOC, NO_X, and PM_{10} from construction activities.

- Increased emissions of SO_2 from construction activities (Alternatives A, B, and C).
- Increased ambient air pollutant concentrations of NO_2 (Alternatives A, B, and C), CO (Alternatives A and C), and PM_{10} from on-airport operational and construction activities.

Historic/Architectural and Archaeological/Cultural Resources

- Demolition of the Intermediate Terminal Complex (Alternatives A, B, and C).
- Acquisition and partial or total demolition of the International Airport Industrial District (Alternatives A, B, C, and D).
- Relocation of Hangar One, (Alternative B).
- Acquisition and demolition of the Merle Norman Headquarters Complex (Alternative B).
- LAX Expressway, Split Viaduct alignment, potential encroachment or demolition of the Centinela Adobe property (Alternatives A and C). This impact would only occur if the preferred LAX Expressway alternative is not selected.
- LAX Expressway, Split Viaduct alignment, potential visual and vibration impacts on Randy's Donuts (Alternatives A and C). This impact would only occur if the preferred LAX Expressway alternative is not selected.

Health Effects of Noise (CEQA)

- The health effects of noise are addressed as part of the overall noise analysis. As such, see conclusions above regarding Noise.

Schools

- Schools may be exposed to significant outdoor noise levels (75 CNEL or greater) (Alternative B).
- Periodic construction noise impacts to schools would result from construction activities (Alternatives A, B, C, and D).
- As listed in Tables F4.2-18, F4.2-29, F4.2-38, and F4.2-49, schools would be newly exposed to high single event noise levels that would result in classroom disruption in instances when classroom activities take place outdoors, as categorized for CEQA purposes only (Alternatives A, B, C, and D).
- Interim noise impacts to schools would occur prior to the installation of sound insulation to reduce noise impacts associated with exposure to 65 CNEL or greater, an increase of 1.5 dB within the 65 CNEL or greater, or single event noise levels (Alternatives A, B, C, and D).

Human Health and Safety (CEQA)

- People living in communities near the airport may experience increased incremental chronic non-cancer health hazards for maximally exposed individuals (MEI) in 2015 (Alternatives B and C).
- People living in communities near the airport may experience increased incremental acute non-cancer health hazards for maximally exposed individuals (MEI) in 2015 (Alternatives A, B, and C).

Cumulative Impacts

The four build alternatives would contribute to potentially significant cumulative adverse impacts with respect to relocation of businesses (Alternatives B and C), air quality, hydrology and water quality, archaeological resources, historic resources, human health, wastewater, and solid waste (Alternatives A, B, and C). In many cases, mitigation measures are identified that would reduce potentially significant cumulative effects to a level that is less than significant. However, generally, these measures are outside the jurisdiction of the lead agencies. If these measures are not implemented, cumulative impacts could remain significant.

6.3 Irreversible and Irretrievable Environmental Changes

In accordance with Section 86 of the FAA *Airport Environmental Handbook* and Section 15126.2(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines, this section discusses the irreversible and irretrievable environmental changes

that could occur due to implementation of the LAX Master Plan, such as commitment of various natural, physical, human and fiscal resources. Chapter 4, *Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures*, discusses specific potential changes associated with construction and operation of the build alternatives.

Most of the land proposed to be used for the LAX Master Plan is already dedicated to airport uses. For each of the build alternatives, land outside the existing airport boundaries would be acquired. These acquisition areas are currently in other urban, developed uses, such as residential, commercial, and industrial uses, and would be converted to primarily airport use under the four build alternatives. Vacant land within the northern portion of LAX would be converted to mixed-use development (Westchester Southside under Alternatives A, B, and C and LAX Northside under Alternative D). If no build alternative is implemented, this open area would be converted to developed uses (primarily office and business park use) as LAX Northside.

Implementation of the LAX Master Plan would involve the consumption of building materials during construction, such as aggregate (sand and gravel). This would represent the loss of non-renewable resources, which are generally not retrievable. As discussed in Section 4.17.2, *Natural Resources*, aggregate resources are locally constrained, but regionally available. Their use would not have a project-specific adverse effect upon the availability of these resources.

Construction and operation of the four build alternatives would require energy resources such as electricity, natural gas, and various transportation-related fuels. This would represent the loss of non-renewable resources, which are generally not retrievable. As discussed in Section 4.17.1, *Energy Supply*, these energy resources are not in short supply and their use would not have a project-specific adverse effect upon the availability of these resources.

Implementation of Alternatives A, B, C, and D would result in direct impacts to significant historic resources due to demolition. Alternatives A, B, C, and D would require the demolition or partial demolition of the International Airport Industrial District. Alternatives A, B, and C would require the demolition of the Intermediate Terminal Complex. Both the International Airport Industrial District and the Intermediate Terminal Complex are historically significant at the state and local levels. Alternative B would require the demolition of the Merle Norman Headquarters Complex, which is historically significant at the federal, state, and local levels. Alternatives A and C may require the demolition of the Centinela Adobe and the visual obstruction and indirect alteration (by vibration impacts) of Randy's Donuts, which are historically significant at the federal, state and local levels, if the LAX Expressway Split Viaduct alignment is implemented (this impact would only occur if the preferred LAX Expressway alternative is not selected).

Implementation of the build alternatives would result in the conversion of open areas to developed uses. Much of this open area is on the airfield and is ruderal or disturbed and, therefore, has few flora and fauna species. However, loss of open area adjacent to the sensitive habitat areas in the Los Angeles/El Segundo Dunes is considered a significant impact requiring mitigation. These impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level; however, the loss of open areas would be irreversible.

As indicated in Chapter 2, *Purpose and Need*, the need for additional airport capacity in the Los Angeles region during the 2000-2015 period has been widely acknowledged. At least some portion of the increased regional demand could be met at LAX under certain alternatives if the region is going to sustain its economic growth. In addition, the commitment of the resources identified above would provide an opportunity to remedy existing operational and environmental deficiencies associated with the existing LAX facilities, such as existing ground access. The LAX Master Plan also offers an opportunity to reduce future impacts that would occur in its absence, such as those associated with surface transportation, air quality, and hydrology. These benefits would outweigh the commitment of resources associated with the LAX Master Plan.

6.4 Environmental Effects Found Not to be Significant

In accordance with Section 15128 of the State CEQA Guidelines, an EIR must identify possible effects of a proposed project that were determined not to be significant and were, therefore, not discussed in detail in the EIR. CEQA Guidelines Section 15128 states an EIR "shall contain a statement briefly indicating

the reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and were therefore not discussed in detail in the EIR." Such a statement may be contained in an attached copy of an initial study.

This Final EIS/EIR addresses a full range of environmental issues. No topics or issues identified in the State CEQA Guidelines' Initial Study Checklist, or in the FAA *Airport Environmental Handbook* were eliminated from discussion in the Draft EIS/EIR, which, in conjunction with the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, provide the primary basis of this Final EIS/EIR, as a result of the Initial Study, public scoping process, or other analysis.

This page intentionally left blank.