
4.14 Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers

4.14.1 Introduction

The coastal zone management and coastal barriers analysis addresses the potential for the Master Plan alternatives to affect coastal barriers and coastal zones, as more fully described in Section 4.14, *Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers* (subsection 4.14.1), of the Draft EIS/EIR.

4.14.2 General Approach and Methodology

The analysis of coastal zone management and coastal barriers presented below is based on the general approach and methodology described in Section 4.14, *Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers* (subsection 4.14.2), of the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, the analysis completed for this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR includes consideration of changes to baseline conditions (see Section 4.14.3 below), using the same methodology applied to the 1996 baseline analysis.

4.14.3 Affected Environment/Environmental Baseline

The affected environment/environmental baseline related to coastal zone management and coastal barriers used in this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is the same as described in Section 4.14, *Coastal Zone Management And Coastal Barriers* (subsection 4.14.3), of the Draft EIS/EIR, with the following exceptions identified below that reflect current conditions. The following changes to the affected environment/environmental baseline do not materially alter the conclusions of the Draft EIS/EIR (see Section 4.14.6, *Environmental Consequences*, below).

- ◆ As discussed in Section 4.14, *Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers* (subsection 4.14.3), of the Draft EIS/EIR, any actions within the coastal zone require a formal consistency determination (i.e., whether the action would violate or contradict the policies of the California Coastal Act (CCA)) from the California Coastal Commission (CCC). Based on a recent court case (*Marine Forests Society v. California Coastal Commission* (2002) 104 Cal.App.4th 1232), the structure of the California Coastal Commission was found to violate the "separation of powers" clause of the California Constitution, since the California Coastal Commission serves both an executive and legislative function. On February 20, 2003, Governor Davis approved legislation fixing the terms of Coastal Commissioners and removing the ability of appointing authorities to remove commissioners "at will."
- ◆ Related to coastal access, Sandpiper Street (between Pershing Drive and Vista del Mar) no longer provides vehicular access to the coast as it has been closed for security purposes following the events of September 11, 2001.

4.14.4 Thresholds of Significance

4.14.4.1 CEQA Thresholds of Significance

As stated in Section 4.14, *Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers* (subsection 4.14.4.1), of the Draft EIS/EIR, a significant impact to coastal zone management would occur if the direct and indirect changes in the environment that may be caused by the particular build alternative would potentially result in one or more of the following future conditions:

- ◆ Damage to the overall quality of the coastal zone environment and its natural and artificial resources.
- ◆ Disorderly, unbalanced utilization and conservation of coastal zone resources.
- ◆ Elimination of public access to and along the coast by vehicle, bicycle, or foot; or restriction of public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone.

These thresholds are utilized because they address the aspects of coastal zone management associated with the Master Plan alternatives, namely protection of coastal resources and coastal access. The coastal zone management thresholds were derived from the goals of the CCA that could be affected by the LAX Master Plan. As these goals reflect the aims of the CCA, any activities that would interfere with the goals should be considered to cause a significant impact to coastal zone management. Related

4.14 Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers

impacts to coastal zone management are addressed in Section 4.2, *Land Use*, of the Draft EIS/EIS and this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Impacts to resources within the coastal zone, including Ecologically Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHAs) and federally- or state-listed endangered or threatened species, are addressed in Section 4.10, *Biotic Communities*, and Section 4.11, *Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna*, respectively, of the Draft EIS/EIR and this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

4.14.4.2 Federal Standards

As stated in Section 4.14, *Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers* (subsection 4.14.4.2), of the Draft EIS/EIR, as required by FAA Order 5050.4A and in accordance with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) regulations, a determination must be made as to whether improvements in the coastal zone would be consistent "to the maximum extent practicable" with the approved coastal zone management program. Since there is no approved Local Coastal Program (LCP) for the coastal zone near LAX, the consistency determination must be made using the goals of the CCA. A coastal zone consistency finding is required before the FAA can issue its Record of Decision.

4.14.5 Master Plan Commitments

No Master Plan commitments for coastal zone management are proposed. However, the following Master Plan commitments from another environmental discipline are relevant to this analysis:

- ◆ **LU-3. Comply with City of Los Angeles Transportation Element Bicycle Plan (Alternatives A, B, and C).**
- ◆ **LU-5. Comply with City of Los Angeles Transportation Element Bicycle Plan (Alternative D).**

These commitments are provided in their entirety in Chapter 5, *Environmental Action Plan*, of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

4.14.6 Environmental Consequences

4.14.6.1 No Action/No Project Alternative

The environmental impacts to coastal zone management under the No Action/No Project Alternative have not changed from those described in Section 4.14, *Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers* (subsection 4.14.6.1), of the Draft EIS/EIR. Discussions of potential indirect impacts to sensitive coastal resources during airport operations and coastal access during construction of LAX Northside have been added since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, and are provided below.

Sensitive Resources Within the Coastal Zone

A discussion of indirect impacts to sensitive floral and faunal species within the Los Angeles/EI Segundo Dunes from airport operations is included in Section 4.10, *Biotic Communities*, and Section 4.11, *Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna*, of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As discussed in the aforementioned sections, under the No Action/No Project Alternative, indirect effects from jet exhaust emissions, light emissions, and noise would not affect the EI Segundo blue butterfly or other sensitive floral and faunal species within the Los Angeles/EI Segundo Dunes. This new information pertaining to indirect impacts associated with airport operations does not alter the conclusions of the Draft EIS/EIR.

Coastal Access During Construction

Vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian access to the coast is not expected to be affected by construction activities associated with LAX Northside. Any impacts to coastal access along Westchester Parkway are expected to be minimal. In addition, alternative coastal access would be available. This change does not materially alter the conclusions of the Draft EIS/EIR.

4.14.6.2 Alternatives A, B, and C

The environmental impacts to coastal zone management under Alternatives A, B, and C have not changed from those described in Section 4.14, *Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers* (subsection 4.14.6), of the Draft EIS/EIR, with the exception of revised information pertaining to direct

impacts to sensitive coastal resources and coastal access. In addition, a discussion of potential indirect impacts to sensitive coastal resources during airport operations has been added since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, and is provided below.

Sensitive Resources Within the Coastal Zone

Revised information regarding area of impacts on biological resources as a result of the installation of navigational aids and associated service roads within the Los Angeles/EI Segundo Dunes, an ESHA within the coastal zone, including impacts to habitat occupied by the EI Segundo blue butterfly (Alternatives A and B), is provided in Section 4.10, *Biotic Communities*, and Section 4.11, *Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna*, of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Mitigation measures, modified as necessary to address changes in area of habitat impacted, to reduce impacts to sensitive habitat within the Los Angeles/EI Segundo Dunes to a level that is less than significant are included in Section 4.10 and Section 4.11 of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. This revised information does not materially alter the conclusions in Section 4.14, *Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers* (subsections 4.14.6.2, 4.14.6.3, and 4.14.6.4), of the Draft EIS/EIR.

A discussion of indirect impacts to sensitive floral and faunal species within the Los Angeles/EI Segundo Dunes from airport operations is included in Section 4.10, *Biotic Communities*, and Section 4.11, *Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna*, of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As discussed in the aforementioned sections, under Alternatives A, B, and C, indirect effects from jet exhaust emissions, light emissions, and noise would not significantly affect the EI Segundo blue butterfly or other sensitive floral and faunal species within the Los Angeles/EI Segundo Dunes. This new information pertaining to indirect impacts associated with operations does not alter the conclusions of the Draft EIS/EIR.

Coastal Access

As discussed in Section 4.14.3, *Affected Environment/Environmental Baseline*, Sandpiper Street (between Pershing Drive and Vista del Mar) no longer provides vehicular access to the coast as it has been closed for security purposes following the events of September 11, 2001. However, vehicular access to the coast would still be available via other local roadways. Therefore, the effect of closing Sandpiper Street would not significantly affect vehicular access to the coast. This change does not materially alter the conclusions of the Draft EIS/EIR.

4.14.6.3 Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan

Improvements within the Coastal Zone

Navigational Aids

Alternative D would require changes to navigational aids currently located within the Los Angeles/EI Segundo Dunes. The planned facilities would be similar to existing facilities. The proposed locations of the navigational aids for Alternative D are shown in **Figure S4.14-1**, Location of Proposed Navigational Aids - Alternative D. The impact on native and non-native biological resources as a result of the removal and installation of navigational aids and associated service roads within the Los Angeles/EI Segundo Dunes, an ESHA, and mitigation measures proposed to reduce these effects, are discussed in Section 4.10, *Biotic Communities*, of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The extent to which navigational aids and associated service roads would potentially affect endangered and threatened species in the Los Angeles/EI Segundo Dunes, and the mitigation measures proposed to reduce these effects, are discussed in Section 4.11, *Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna*, of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

The direct impacts to biotic communities and endangered and threatened species of flora and fauna from placement of navigational aids in the Los Angeles/EI Segundo Dunes, and specifically within habitat occupied by the EI Segundo blue butterfly, would be less than significant with implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 4.10, *Biotic Communities*, and Section 4.11, *Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna*, of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The placement of navigational aids within the Los Angeles/EI Segundo Dunes would not affect the goals of the CCA. No significant, adverse impacts to natural or artificial resources would occur. As they are similar to existing uses and located near related development, they would not result in disorderly unbalanced utilization of

4.14 Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers

coastal zone resources. Finally, they would not limit, or interfere with, coastal access. As a result, no significant impact would occur.

In comparison, the No Action/No Project Alternative would not result in any impacts to biotic communities or endangered and threatened species within the coastal zone as the No Action/No Project Alternative would not require changes to navigational aids.

Pershing Drive

Similar to the No Action/No Project Alternative, under Alternative D, the current alignment of Pershing Drive would not be affected and vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian access along Pershing Drive would remain unchanged.

Sensitive Resources within the Coastal Zone

Under Alternative D, installation of navigational aids and associated service roads would directly impact state-designated sensitive habitat within the Los Angeles/El Segundo Dunes. The impact to sensitive habitat would be less than significant with implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 4.10, *Biotic Communities*, and Section 4.11, *Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna*, of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

In comparison, the No Action/No Project Alternative would not result in any direct impacts to state-designated sensitive habitat within the Los Angeles/El Segundo Dunes as the No Action/No Project Alternative would not require changes to navigational aids.

As discussed in Section 4.10, *Biotic Communities*, and Section 4.11, *Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna*, of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, indirect effects from jet exhaust emissions, light emissions, and noise would not significantly affect the El Segundo blue butterfly or other sensitive floral and faunal species within the Los Angeles/El Segundo Dunes. However, construction activities under Alternative D have the potential to result in deposition of fugitive dust within state-designated sensitive habitat, including habitat within the El Segundo blue butterfly Habitat Restoration Area. The potential indirect impacts to state-designated sensitive habitat due to construction activities would be reduced to a level that is less than significant with implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 4.10 and Section 4.11 of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

The indirect impacts to state-designated sensitive habitat associated with Alternative D would be greater than those under the No Action/No Project Alternative, based on the comparative difference in the level of construction activity.

Coastal Access

Several of the policies of the CCA concern the enhancement and maintenance of public coastal access. Primarily because Alternative D would not relocate the functions of the airport's primary passenger activity center (i.e., the CTA) closer to the coast, there would not be any significant impact to coastal access.

Vehicular Access

Vehicles traveling westbound on Westchester Parkway or southbound on Pershing Drive have access to the coast via Manchester Avenue or various residential streets west of Pershing Drive north of the terminus of Westchester Parkway, and via Imperial Highway. Coastal access from the northern portion of the City of El Segundo is provided by Imperial Highway via two access points within the City: Main Street and California Street. Under Alternative D, all of these routes (i.e., Westchester Parkway, Manchester Avenue, Pershing Drive, residential streets west of Pershing Drive north of the terminus of Westchester Parkway, Imperial Highway west of Sepulveda Boulevard, Main Street, and California Street) would remain in their baseline configurations. The only components of Alternative D that would be nearby or enroute to the coast are the LAX Northside development and the west employee parking garage on World Way West. However, neither of these developments would alter the existing coastal access routes, although they would increase the number of vehicles on roadways that provide access to the coast. Any coastal access impacts from either of these facilities would be minimal and would be less than significant.



LEGEND



- | | |
|---|--|
|  Habitat Restoration Area Boundary |  Proposed Navigational Aids |
|  Sand Dunes |  Existing Navigational Aids to remain |
|  El Segundo Blue Butterfly Habitat Restoration Area |  Existing Navigational Aids to be removed |
|  Existing Roadways |  Airport Landside |

Prepared by: Landrum & Brown, April 2003

4.14 Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers

The impacts to vehicular access to the coast under Alternative D, while expected to be minimal, would be greater than those under the No Action/No Project Alternative, which does not include development of the west employee parking garage.

Bicycle Access

Alternative D would not alter existing bicycle access to the coast. In addition, under Master Plan Commitment LU-5, Comply with City of Los Angeles Transportation Element Bicycle Plan (Alternative D), LAWA would comply with municipal bicycle policies and plans and would provide maximum feasible incorporation of bike paths and lanes into the Master Plan circulation systems. In addition, bicycle access and parking facilities would be provided at the GTC, ITC, and major parking lots. Related facilities, such as lockers and showers, would also be provided where feasible to promote employee bicycle use. Thus, similar to the No Action/No Project Alternative, Alternative D would not result in adverse impacts to bicycle access to the coast.

Pedestrian Access

As with the No Action/No Project Alternative, pedestrian access to the coast would continue to be limited under Alternative D. The existing footpath connecting Imperial Avenue and Imperial Highway would not be affected under this alternative. However, the proposed changes in ground access to LAX do not include the provision of new sidewalks. Sidewalks are not currently available along the full length of Imperial Highway under baseline conditions. Pedestrians would continue to be able to walk along the shoulder of Imperial Highway to the coast. Thus, there would be no impact to pedestrian coastal access under Alternative D.

Coastal Access During Construction

Vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian access to the coast is not expected to be significantly affected by construction activities. Any impact to coastal access along Westchester Parkway, Pershing Drive, and Imperial Highway is expected to be minimal. In addition, alternative coastal access would be available; therefore, impacts to coastal access during construction would be less than significant.

Impacts to coastal access during construction under Alternative D, while expected to be minimal, would be greater than those under the No Action/No Project Alternative, which does not include construction of facilities such as the west employee parking garage.

4.14.7 Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative impacts to coastal zone management and coastal barriers associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternatives A, B, or C, in combination with other past, present, and probable future projects, have not changed from those described in Section 4.14, *Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers* (subsection 4.14.7), of the Draft EIS/EIR.

4.14.7.1 Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan

Alternative D would require removing and installing various navigational aids within the Los Angeles/EI Segundo Dunes to accommodate the extension and relocation of runways. Overall, the area of the Los Angeles/EI Segundo Dunes to be occupied by navigational aids under Alternative D would be comparable to that under baseline conditions and would not conflict with the goals of the CCA; therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant. The impact on native and non-native biological resources as a result of the removal and installation of navigational aids and associated service roads within the Los Angeles/EI Segundo Dunes would be reduced to a level that is less than significant with mitigation measures described in Section 4.10, *Biotic Communities*, and Section 4.11, *Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna*, of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

The portions of the Playa Vista property that are located within the coastal zone are now planned to be acquired by a land conservation entity. In that no significant impacts from Alternative D would occur, and the potential for significant impacts to the coastal zone from the Playa Vista project would be addressed and avoided through the CCC review process, no significant cumulative impacts to coastal zone management are expected.

4.14 Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers

4.14.8 Mitigation Measures

With implementation of mitigation measures described in Section 4.10, *Biotic Communities*, and Section 4.11, *Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna*, of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternatives A, B, C, and D would not have a significant impact on the coastal zone/coastal resources. Moreover, Alternatives A, B, C, and D would not have a significant impact on coastal access; therefore, no mitigation is required.