
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 14-year 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*.) Mitigation Measures would be implemented to reduce or avoid potentially significant construction impacts; however, mitigation would not be sufficient to reduce noise, land use, surface transportation, community disruption, or air quality construction impacts to less than significant levels.

The LAX Master Plan is a 15-year development plan to guide the growth of passenger and cargo activities at LAX. 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*. With implementation of the proposed Mitigation Measures, most of the impacts associated with the three 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 3, *Alternatives (Including Proposed Action)* 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 three build alternatives, unless otherwise noted.

6. Other NEPA/CEQA Topics

Noise

- ◆ Some noise-sensitive areas will be newly exposed to 65+ CNEL from aircraft noise.
- ◆ Some noise-sensitive areas currently exposed to 65+ CNEL will experience an increase of 1.5+ dB from aircraft noise.
- ◆ Temporary impacts due to on-airport construction activities.

Land Use

- ◆ High noise levels would remain at some residential properties where mitigation is not feasible.
- ◆ Residential and other noise-sensitive land uses may be exposed to high outdoor noise levels.
- ◆ Construction-related traffic and roadway modifications would temporarily impede access in some adjacent communities.
- ◆ High construction noise levels at residential and noise-sensitive land uses within 600 feet of construction sites.

Surface Transportation

- ◆ Temporary impacts due to construction activities.
- ◆ Additional vehicle demand through the following six intersections:
 - ▶ La Cienega Boulevard at Arbor Vitae Street
 - ▶ La Cienega Boulevard at Century Boulevard
 - ▶ Lincoln Boulevard at Jefferson Boulevard
 - ▶ Lincoln Boulevard at Marina Freeway (SR 90)
 - ▶ Lincoln Boulevard at Teale Street
 - ▶ Sepulveda Boulevard at La Tijera Boulevard

Social Impacts

- ◆ Businesses would be displaced due to airport acquisitions (Alternatives B and C).
- ◆ Community disruption due to temporary changes in circulation patterns during construction.

Air Quality

- ◆ Increased on-airport emissions of NO_x and SO₂ from operational sources.
- ◆ Increased off-airport traffic emissions of CO, VOC, NO_x, SO₂ and PM₁₀.
- ◆ Increased emissions of CO, VOC, NO_x, SO₂, and PM₁₀ from construction activities.
- ◆ Increased ambient air pollutant concentrations of NO₂ and PM₁₀ from construction activities.

Historic, Architectural, Archaeological, Cultural and Paleontological Resources

- ◆ Demolition of the Intermediate Terminal Complex.
- ◆ Acquisition and demolition of the International Airport Industrial District.
- ◆ Relocation of Hangar One, which would be a significant and unavoidable impact at the state and local levels (Alternative B).

Impacts to the Merle Norman Headquarters Complex (Alternative B).

Health Effects of Noise (CEQA)

- ◆ High noise levels would remain at some residential properties where mitigation is not feasible.
- ◆ Residential and other noise-sensitive land uses may be exposed to high outdoor noise levels.

Human Health and Safety

- ◆ Increased cancer risks for maximally exposed individuals (MEI) in 2005 (potentially unavoidable).
- ◆ Increased non-cancer health hazards in 2015 (potentially unavoidable).

- ◆ LAX Expressway, Split Viaduct alignment, encroachment upon the Centinela Adobe (Alternatives A and C).
- ◆ LAX Expressway, Split Viaduct alignment, visual and vibration impacts on Randy's Donuts (Alternatives A and C).

Schools

- ◆ Schools may be exposed to high levels of outdoor noise (Alternative B).

Cumulative Impacts

The three build alternatives would contribute to potentially significant cumulative adverse impacts with respect to relocation of residences and businesses, air quality, hydrology and water quality, archaeological resources, health and safety, wastewater, and solid waste. 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© 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 three build alternatives. Vacant land within the northern portion of LAX would be converted to mixed-use development (Westchester Southside) under the three build alternatives. 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 three 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 the build alternatives would result in direct impacts to significant historic resources due to demolition. All three build alternatives would require the demolition of the International Airport Industrial District and the demolition of the Intermediate Terminal Complex. Both are historically significant at the state and local level. 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, which is historically significant at the federal, state and local levels, if the LAX Expressway Split Viaduct alignment is implemented. Such impacts are permanent and, thus, are considered irreversible.

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/EI Segundo Dunes is considered a significant impact requiring mitigation pursuant to the California Coastal

6. Other NEPA/CEQA Topics

Act. 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 must be met at LAX 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 Draft 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 as a result of the Initial Study, public scoping process, or other analysis.