

---

## 7. OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

### 7.1 Significant Environmental Effects

In compliance with CEQA and the specific requirements of Section 15126.2 of the State CEQA Guidelines, an EIR must include discussion of significant environmental effects, significant environmental effects which cannot be avoided, significant irreversible environmental changes, and growth inducing impacts that would result if the proposed project is implemented. This section identifies impacts that would remain significant and unavoidable after the application of proposed mitigation measures. Section 7.2, below, discusses significant irreversible effects, Section 7.3 discusses growth inducing impacts, and Section 7.4 discusses impacts determined to be less than significant. Chapter 4, *Environmental Impact Analysis*, and Chapter 5, *Cumulative Impacts*, describe the significant environmental impacts of the SPAS alternatives, as well as mitigation measures recommended to reduce or avoid significant impacts. With the implementation of mitigation measures, many of the impacts associated with the alternatives would be mitigated to a level that is less than significant.

The following identifies the impacts that cannot be mitigated to a level that is less than significant. Impacts pertain to all of the alternatives, unless otherwise noted.

#### Air Quality

- ◆ Increased construction-related emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> (all alternatives), and of CO, VOC, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9)
- ◆ Increased construction-related ambient air pollutant concentrations of NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>
- ◆ Increased operational emissions of SO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>
- ◆ Increased operational ambient air pollutant concentrations of NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>
- ◆ Cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative construction-related air quality impacts, based on significant construction-related project impacts summarized above
- ◆ Cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative operational air quality impacts, based on significant operational project impacts summarized above

#### Greenhouse Gases

- ◆ GHG emissions associated with construction and operation
- ◆ Cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative GHG emissions

#### Human Health Risk Assessment

- ◆ Increased incremental acute non-cancer health hazards from operations to people living at or near the fence-line
- ◆ Cumulatively considerable contribution to acute non-cancer hazards (Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 8, and 9)

#### Land Use

- ◆ Certain residential uses and non-residential noise-sensitive facilities affected by aircraft noise would be exposed to high noise levels due to interim impacts prior to completion of noise insulation or land recycling mitigation (Alternatives 1 through 7)
- ◆ Parks and certain residential uses with outdoor private habitable areas would be newly exposed to noise levels of 75 CNEL or higher (Alternatives 1 through 7)
- ◆ Cumulatively considerable contribution to significant future aircraft noise impacts on existing and potential future noise-sensitive uses within the 65 CNEL noise contour (Alternatives 1 through 7)

## 7. Other CEQA Considerations

---

### **Aircraft Noise**

- ◆ Aircraft noise levels would remain higher than accepted thresholds for noise-sensitive uses in some locations until LAX Master Plan noise and land use mitigation measures are fully implemented
- ◆ Parks and certain residential uses with outdoor private habitable areas would be newly exposed to noise levels of 75 CNEL or higher

### **Construction Equipment Noise**

- ◆ Temporary noise impacts would result from use of construction equipment from the specified construction activities at the following locations:

#### Airfield Improvements

- ◆ Saint Bernard High School (Alternatives 1 and 5)
- ◆ Residential uses along the southern edge of Westchester (Alternatives 1 and 5)
- ◆ Park West Apartments northwest on Lincoln Boulevard south of La Tijera Boulevard (Alternatives 1, 5, and 6)

#### Ground Access Improvements

- ◆ Noise-sensitive uses north of Parking Lots C and D and "Jenny Lot" (Alternatives 3 and 4)
- ◆ Remaining residences within Belford (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, and 9)
- ◆ Noise-sensitive uses within Manchester Square (Alternatives 1, 2, 8, and 9)
- ◆ Animo Leadership Charter High School<sup>884</sup> (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 8, and 9)
- ◆ Residential uses within Del Aire (Alternatives 3 and 4)

#### Construction Staging Area A

- ◆ Saint Bernard High School
- ◆ Park West Apartments northwest of Lincoln Boulevard and south of La Tijera Boulevard

#### Construction Staging Area E

- ◆ Remaining residences within Belford

#### Construction Staging Area F

- ◆ Noise-sensitive uses within Manchester Square
- ◆ Animo Leadership Charter High School
- ◆ Cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative construction noise impacts from cumulative projects combined with SPAS improvements

### **Combined Noise Impacts**

- ◆ Cumulatively considerable contribution to combined noise levels (i.e., aircraft noise, road traffic noise, construction-related noise, and transit noise)

---

<sup>884</sup>

At the publication time of the Notice of Preparation for the SPAS Draft EIR, October 2010 (i.e., the baseline year for the EIR impacts analysis), the Animo Leadership Charter High School was located at the northeast corner of Aviation Boulevard and Arbor Vitae Street, across from Manchester Square. This school is, however, proposed to move to a new location in Lennox, approximately 2.5 miles from the current site (see <http://anewhomeforanimoleadership.wordpress.com/abouttheproject/>, accessed on June 16, 2012). It is anticipated that the new facility and relocation will be completed in 2012. At the time of this writing, the school was still at the Arbor Vitae Street location; hence, it is included in the impacts analysis.

### **On-Airport Transportation**<sup>885</sup>

- ◆ Construction-related impacts to the on-airport transportation system (Alternatives 1, 2, 8, and 9)
- ◆ Cumulatively considerable contribution to construction-related impacts to the on-airport transportation system (Alternatives 1, 2, 8, and 9)
- ◆ Cumulatively considerable contribution to World Way South and Center Way (Intersection 9) (Alternatives 1, 2, 4, 8, and 9)

### **Off-Airport Transportation**<sup>886</sup>

- ◆ Temporary impacts to the off-airport transportation system would occur during construction
- ◆ Traffic thresholds for operational traffic would be exceeded when compared to baseline (2010) conditions for the following alternatives:
  - ◆ Alternatives 1 and 2: 1 intersection
  - ◆ Alternative 3: 11 intersections; 1 CMP arterial monitoring intersection
  - ◆ Alternative 4: 2 intersections
  - ◆ Alternatives 8 and 9: 2 intersections
- ◆ Traffic thresholds would be exceeded when compared to future (2025) conditions for the following alternatives:
  - ◆ Alternatives 1 and 2: 39 intersections; 1 CMP arterial monitoring intersection; 3 CMP freeway monitoring stations
  - ◆ Alternative 3: 37 intersections; 2 CMP arterial monitoring intersections; 3 CMP freeway monitoring stations
  - ◆ Alternative 4: 40 intersections; 2 CMP arterial monitoring intersections; 3 CMP freeway monitoring stations
  - ◆ Alternatives 8 and 9: 44 intersections; 1 CMP arterial monitoring intersection; 3 CMP freeway monitoring stations
- ◆ Temporary cumulative impacts to the off-airport transportation system would occur during construction

### **Solid Waste**

- ◆ Cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative solid waste generation and disposal impact if mitigation measure, which is the responsibility of another agency (or agencies), is not fully implemented

---

<sup>885</sup> Significant impacts are identified specific to those alternatives proposing ground access improvements that would impact on-airport traffic within the CTA, including Alternatives 1, 2, 4, 8, and 9. No impacts to CTA traffic would occur under Alternative 3 because under that alternative, the CTA would be closed to private vehicles. While Alternatives 5, 6, and 7 focus on airfield improvements and do not specifically include ground access improvements, selection and approval of one of those alternatives would be paired with ground access improvements proposed under either Alternative 1, 2, 8, or 9. On-airport surface transportation impacts associated with Alternative 5, 6, or 7 are therefore represented by the impacts of those other alternatives.

<sup>886</sup> Similar to above for on-airport transportation, the off-airport transportation impacts associated with Alternative 5, 6, or 7, would depend on which set of ground access improvements from either Alternative 1, 2, 8, or 9 it is paired with.

### 7.2 Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes

In accordance with 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 SPAS, such as commitment of various natural, physical, human, and fiscal resources. Chapter 4, *Environmental Impact Analysis*, discusses specific changes associated with construction and operation of the SPAS alternatives.

Most of the land proposed to be used for the SPAS improvements is already dedicated to airport uses. For each of the alternatives, land outside the existing airport boundaries would be acquired. These acquisition areas are currently in other urban areas with developed uses, such as residential, commercial, and industrial uses, and would be converted to primarily airport use under the SPAS alternatives.

Implementation of any of the SPAS alternatives would involve the consumption of building materials during construction, such as aggregate (sand and gravel), metals (e.g., steel, copper, lead) and petrochemical construction materials (e.g., plastics). This would represent the loss of non-renewable resources, which are generally not retrievable. 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 any of the SPAS 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 4.13.1, *Energy*, 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. To reduce energy consumption, implementation of any of the SPAS alternatives would comply with the City of Los Angeles Green Building Ordinance, which includes various requirements pertaining to energy conservation. In addition, all of the SPAS alternatives would result in irreversible impacts to air quality from emissions of criteria pollutants, toxic air contaminants, and greenhouse gases (GHG). However, project design features and mitigation measures would be incorporated to reduce air quality and GHG impacts.

Project consumption of water during construction and operation of the SPAS alternatives is addressed in Section 4.13.4, *Water Supply*. LAWA would continue to implement and enhance water conservation measures at LAX in fulfillment of LAX Master Plan Commitments W-1, Maximize Use of Reclaimed Water, and W-2, Enhance Existing Water Conservation Program, which would serve to reduce water use under the SPAS alternatives. Although the SPAS alternatives would not result in significant impacts related to water consumption, the SPAS alternatives would result in an irretrievable consumption of water, which is a limited resource.

Implementation of the SPAS alternatives would result in the conversion of open areas to developed uses. Under Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5 through 7, much of this open area is on the airfield and is ruderal or disturbed and, therefore, has few flora and fauna species. In addition, impacts due to the loss of small amounts of habitat in the Los Angeles/El Segundo Dunes for the installation of new navigational aids under Alternatives 1 through 7 would be less than significant after implementation of proposed mitigation. However, impacts from the loss of open areas would be irreversible.

## 7.3 Growth Inducing Impacts

As discussed in Section XIII of the Initial Study for the SPAS Draft EIR Notice of Preparation, none of the SPAS alternatives include residential or business development or would directly induce population growth, and these effects are thus not addressed in detail in this EIR. Additionally, the projected future increase in passenger activity levels at LAX in 2025, the planning horizon year for the SPAS analysis, is the same for all alternatives - 78.9 million annual passengers (MAP), which would occur at that same level even if none of the SPAS alternatives were to be implemented. This projected increase in future passenger activity levels at LAX is consistent with regional growth forecasts, including the adopted 2012 Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Implementation of SPAS may directly or indirectly foster economic growth. As the international gateway to the western United States, LAX has long been a major supporter of the Southern California economy through employment and generation of taxes and other revenue, and by facilitating the efficient movement of people, goods, and services. According to a study completed in 2007 by the Los Angeles Economic Development Corporation (LAEDC), over the course of 2006, an average transoceanic flight traveling round-trip from LAX every day added \$623 million in economic output and sustained 3,120 direct and indirect jobs in Southern California with \$156 million in wages.<sup>887</sup> Given the continued growth in, and reliance on, new large aircraft such as the Airbus A380 by major airlines operating on those long-distance international routes, it is important that LAX be able to effectively accommodate those aircraft. The existing configuration of the north airfield is not designed or well-suited to accommodate these types of aircraft (i.e., Aircraft Design Group (ADG) VI aircraft). With the exception of SPAS Alternative 4, which proposes no airfield improvements other than Runway Safety Area (RSA) improvements, each of the SPAS alternatives includes runway and/or taxiway improvements designed to better accommodate ADG VI aircraft, some to a greater degree such as Alternatives 3 and 5, and others to a lesser degree such as Alternatives 2, 6, and 7. The airfield improvements proposed under the various alternatives are also intended to improve the airport's ability to accommodate ADG V aircraft such as the Boeing 747 and 777 and the Airbus A340, which are widely used for international flights. To the extent that the airfield improvements, as well as terminal and ground access improvements, proposed in the SPAS alternatives enable LAX to better accommodate and encourage increased international travel through the airport, implementation of those alternatives would indirectly foster economic growth in the region.

Construction activity associated with development of improvements proposed under the SPAS alternatives would directly and indirectly foster economic growth over the multi-year construction period in terms of spending by workers and the provision of goods and services in support of construction. The extent of construction-related economic growth would vary by alternative, with Alternative 4 having the least amount of construction activity and associated contribution to economic growth, and Alternative 3 having the greatest amount of construction activity and associated contribution to economic growth. Similarly, the extent to which such construction-related contribution to economic growth would occur on both a local basis and a regional basis would generally be based on the relative amount of construction activity between alternatives.

Economic growth resulting from the project would result in environmental impacts related to increased vehicle travel, increased demands for public services and utilities, and impacts associated with the manufacturing/production of materials. Given the highly urbanized setting of the area around LAX, as well as throughout much of Southern California, and the diverse nature of the improvements to be constructed under the various alternatives, it is not expected that the environmental impacts associated with such economic growth would occur in any one area or be of a specific nature that could be meaningfully addressed within this document, and any further analysis would be speculative.

---

<sup>887</sup> Los Angeles Economic Development Corporation, The Economic Activity Development on Overseas Flights at LAX, August 2007.

## **7.4 Less than Significant Effects**

Section 15128 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR briefly indicate 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. Table 1-1, Summary of Impacts by Topic, identifies the effects of each of the SPAS alternatives that were determined to be less than significant, based on analysis in this EIR. The Initial Study included in the October 2010 LAX SPAS EIR Notice of Preparation, included as Appendix A, *Notice of Preparation/Scoping*, of this EIR, also determined, for the reasons explained therein, that effects on the following resource areas would result in no impact, or less than significant impacts: agricultural resources, geology and soils, mineral resources, population/housing, and recreation.