
4.27 Schools (CEQA)

4.27.1 Introduction

The schools analysis focuses on the project-generated changes in public school enrollment in the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) and the extent to which such changes could cause overcrowding of schools as more fully described in Section 4.27, *Schools* (subsection 4.27.1), of the Draft EIS/EIR. Where the project would have direct impacts on public schools, rather than indirect impacts through changes in enrollment, these effects are analyzed in other sections of the Draft EIS/EIR and this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, which pertain to those impacts and are summarized herein. In particular, the effects of single event noise on schools are evaluated in Section 4.1, *Noise*, of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and discussed below. Technical Report 17, *Schools Technical Report*, of the Draft EIS/EIR, contains information regarding existing conditions associated with public schools in the vicinity of LAX.

4.27.2 General Approach and Methodology

The analysis of schools presented below is based on the general approach and methodology described in Section 4.27, *Schools* (subsection 4.27.2), 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 4.27.3 below), using the same methodology applied to the 1996 baseline analysis.

4.27.3 Affected Environment/Environmental Baseline

The affected environment/environmental baseline related to schools used in this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is the same as described in Section 4.27, *Schools* (subsection 4.27.3), of the Draft EIS/EIR. A discussion of Year 2000 conditions is provided below.

- ◆ As a whole, LAUSD had an enrollment of 667,305 students in 1996/97 school year and 710,007 students in 1999/00 school year, an increase of 42,702 students, or 6.4 percent. Enrollment in the 10 high school clusters decreased from 251,056 in 1996/97 to 246,072 in 1999/00, a decrease of 4,984 students, or 2.0 percent. To offset enrollment impacts, a \$1.82 billion master plan adopted by the Board of Education in 1998³³⁹ calls for construction of 51 new schools, additions to 14 existing schools, 458 new portable classrooms, and changes in some school boundaries. The plan supports about 75,000 additional two-semester seats of capacity. Funding is derived from LAUSD's Proposition BB bond program, the state's School Facility Program, developer fees, and other sources. The current maximum developer fee allowable by state law is \$0.34³⁴⁰ per square foot of new commercial/industrial development.³⁴¹
- ◆ **Table S4.27-1**, Year 2000 School Enrollment and Capacity for LAUSD High School Clusters, presents enrollment and capacity data for the 1999/00 school year. As shown in **Table S4.27-1**, there is a capacity surplus in the schools study area, which is in contrast with a District-wide deficit. The enrollment and capacity data in **Table S4.27-1** are not substantially different from Table 4.27-1, Existing School Enrollment and Capacity for LAUSD High School Clusters in the Draft EIS/EIR as there continues to be a capacity surplus in the schools' study area and a capacity deficit throughout the District. This information does not materially alter the conclusions of the Draft EIS/EIR. Therefore, in order to maintain consistency with the Draft EIS/EIR, and as there are no substantive changes in the year 2000 that affect the findings in this section, 1996/97 continues to serve as the basis for the analysis provided below.

³³⁹ Los Angeles Unified School District, Facilities Master Plan for Construction, May 4, 1998.

³⁴⁰ This is a \$0.01 per-square-foot increase from the maximum developer fees identified in the Draft EIS/EIR.

³⁴¹ Los Angeles Unified School District, Commercial/Industrial Development School Fee Justification Study for Los Angeles Unified School District, September 2002.

4.27 Schools (CEQA)

Table S4.27-1

Year 2000 School Enrollment and Capacity for LAUSD High School Clusters

High School Cluster	1999/00 Enrollment	1999/00 Capacity	Surplus(+)/ Deficit(-)
Venice/Westchester Cluster	16,601	21,126	+4,525
Crenshaw/Dorsey Cluster	18,672	21,581	+2,909
Hamilton/Palisades/University	27,320	32,399	+5,079
Gardena/Washington	26,387	30,799	+4,421
Fairfax/Hollywood/Los Angeles	34,560	40,442	+5,822
Narborne/San Pedro	23,431	27,298	+3,867
Banning/Carson	27,268	29,174	+1,906
Fremont	29,797	33,649	+3,852
Manual Arts	21,314	22,149	+835
Jordon/Locke	20,722	22,611	+1,889
Total Study Area Clusters	246,072	281,228	+35,165
Total District	710,007	589,600	-120,407

Source: Los Angeles Unified School District, [Student Achievement](http://www.lausd.ca.us/lausd/achievement), <http://www.lausd.ca.us/lausd/achievement>; Education Data Partnership, [Ed-Data](http://www.ed-data.k12.ca.us/), <http://www.ed-data.k12.ca.us/>; and Los Angeles Unified School District, [School Needs Analysis](#), January 2001.

4.27.4 Thresholds of Significance

4.27.4.1 CEQA Thresholds of Significance

As stated in Section 4.27, *Schools* (subsection 4.27.4.1), of the Draft EIS/EIR, a significant schools impact would occur if the direct and indirect changes in the environment that may be caused by the particular build alternative would potentially result in the following future condition:

- ◆ Overcrowding of schools in the absence of funding for construction of new or expanded school facilities or other strategies for addressing capacity constraints.

This threshold is utilized because it addresses physical impacts on the environment in accordance with the focus of the CEQA Guidelines.³⁴² While this analysis focuses on enrollment change and the projects potential to cause overcrowding of schools, all decisions about how to mitigate the impacts of changes in enrollment are within the powers of LAUSD, and may include a number of strategies other than constructing new facilities (e.g., year-round school calendars).

4.27.4.2 Federal Standards

As stated in Section 4.27, *Schools* (subsection 4.27.4.2), of the Draft EIS/EIR, the FAA Airport Environmental Handbook does not require that this environmental topic be addressed; therefore, no federal standards apply to the following analysis.

4.27.5 Master Plan Commitments

No Master Plan commitments for schools are proposed. However, the following Master Plan commitments from other environmental disciplines are relevant to this analysis:

- ◆ **C-1. Establishment of a Ground Transportation/Construction Coordination Office (Alternatives A, B, C, and D).**
- ◆ **ST-16. Designated Haul Routes (Alternatives A, B, C, and D).**

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

³⁴² State of California, [Guidelines for the California Environmental Quality Act](#), Sections 15064(e) and 15131.

4.27.6 Environmental Consequences

The following analysis addresses components of project development that may affect school enrollment. Non-enrollment impacts on schools, such as noise, air quality, health risk, and health effects of noise are summarized herein and discussed in detail in their respective sections.³⁴³

4.27.6.1 No Action/No Project Alternative

Effects on enrollment under the No Action/No Project Alternative have not changed from those described in Section 4.27, *Schools* (subsection 4.27.6.1), of the Draft EIS/EIR, with the exception of information pertaining to non-enrollment impacts. Specifically, incremental cancer risks and non-cancer health hazards in 2015 have changed, and additional analysis has been conducted to identify schools newly exposed to temporary classroom disruption due to single event aircraft noise, as described below.

Non-Enrollment Impacts

As shown in Table S4.2-6, No Action/No Project Alternative Listing of Schools Newly Exposed to High Single Event Noise Levels, in Section 4.2, *Land Use* (subsection 4.2.6.1), new analysis conducted for this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR indicates two public schools in the Inglewood Unified School District would be newly exposed to temporary classroom disruption due to single event aircraft noise compared to the 1996 baseline. Compared to Year 2000 conditions, one of these public schools would be exposed to temporary classroom disruption due to single event aircraft noise. For those impacted schools not already considered compatible pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Title 21, mitigation in the form of sound insulation or acquisition and relocation would be provided as further described in Section 4.2, *Land Use* (subsection 4.2.8), of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

As further described in Section 4.24.1, *Human Health Risk Assessment* (subsection 4.24.1.6.1), of the Draft EIS/EIR, incremental cancer risks and non-cancer health hazards would not exceed thresholds for the maximally exposed school child for the interim year or Horizon Year of 2015. This information is included to correct an error in Section 4.27, *Schools* (subsection 4.27.6.1), of the Draft EIS/EIR.

4.27.6.2 Alternatives A, B, and C

The environmental impacts to schools under Alternatives A, B, and C have not changed from those described in Section 4.27, *Schools* (subsection 4.27.6), of the Draft EIS/EIR, with the exception of information pertaining to non-enrollment impacts. Specifically, new analysis has been conducted to identify schools newly exposed to temporary classroom disruption due to single event aircraft noise as described below.

Non-Enrollment Impacts

As shown in Table S4.2-11, Alternative A Listing of Schools Newly Exposed to High Single Event Noise Levels, in Section 4.2, *Land Use* (subsection 4.2.6.2), of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, seven public schools (six within Inglewood Unified School District, one within Lennox School District) would be newly exposed to temporary classroom disruption due to single event aircraft noise compared to the 1996 baseline. Compared to Year 2000 conditions, six of these public schools (not including Morningside High School) would be newly exposed to temporary classroom disruption due to single event aircraft noise.

As shown in Table S4.2-15, Alternative B Listing of Schools Newly Exposed to High Single Event Noise Levels, in Section 4.2, *Land Use* (subsection 4.2.6.3), of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, nine public schools (six within Inglewood Unified School District, two within Lennox School District, and one within LAUSD) would be newly exposed to temporary classroom disruption from single event aircraft noise compared to the 1996 baseline. Compared to Year 2000 conditions, eight of these public schools (not including Morningside High School) would be exposed to temporary classroom disruption due to single event aircraft noise.

³⁴³ For the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternatives A, B, and C, please see Sections 4.1, *Noise*, 4.2, *Land Use*, 4.6, *Air Quality*, 4.24.1, *Human Health Risk Assessment*, and 4.24.2, *Health Effects of Noise*, of the Draft EIS/EIR as well as the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For Alternative D, please see Sections 4.1, *Noise*, 4.2, *Land Use*, 4.6, *Air Quality*, 4.24.1, *Human Health Risk Assessment*, and 4.24.2, *Health Effects of Noise*, of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

4.27 Schools (CEQA)

As shown in Table S4.2-19, Alternative C Listing of Schools Newly Exposed to High Single Event Noise Levels, in Section 4.2, *Land Use* (subsection 4.2.6.4), of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, four public schools within Inglewood Unified School District would be newly exposed to temporary classroom disruption due to single event aircraft noise compared to the 1996 baseline. Compared to Year 2000 conditions, three of these public schools (not including Morningside High School) would be exposed to temporary classroom disruption from single event aircraft noise.

For those impacted schools not already considered compatible pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Title 21, mitigation in the form of sound insulation or acquisition and relocation would be provided. Mitigation Measure MM-LU-4 in Section 4.2, *Land Use*, of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, would reduce impacts to schools from single event noise; however, impacts would remain significant due to high single event noise levels that would still occur when classroom activities take place outdoors.

4.27.6.3 Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan

Project Development

As described in Chapter 3, *Alternatives* (subsection 3.3.2), of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, no residential development or residential acquisition is proposed under Alternative D. Therefore, effects on enrollment would be limited to changes in airport employment. Due to productivity increases (i.e., the production of more economic output per worker), Alternative D would result in a decrease of approximately 2,657 on-airport employees within the schools study area by 2015.³⁴⁴ As each on-airport employee is assumed to represent one household, the number of on-airport employee households within the schools study area would, therefore, decline by approximately 2,657.

Effects on Enrollment

Within the schools study area, the decline in employee households would decrease airport-related enrollment by approximately 1,041 students by 2015 (**Table S4.27-2**, Alternative D 2015, On-Airport Employee Student Generation). Similar to the No Action/No Project Alternative, these reductions in enrollment would be dispersed throughout the schools study area and would be offset by overall forecasted increases in enrollment. As a result, no school closures or alteration of school facilities would be expected as a consequence of the decline in on-airport employment and associated enrollment under Alternative D.

Similar to Alternatives A, B, and C, any new floor area created for non-government users at LAX would still generate fee revenue for LAUSD. School fees for the LAX Master Plan would apply to commercial and industrial space occupied by non-governmental airport tenants. As a preliminary estimate, based on the general level of current plans, school impact fees paid to LAUSD could range from approximately 1.8 to 2 million dollars under Alternative D.³⁴⁵ Although enrollment impacts would be less than significant, payment of school impact fees to LAUSD in accordance with state law, would offset any potential enrollment effects on school facilities for purposes of CEQA.

³⁴⁴ The number of employee households and estimated students generated under Alternative D differs from the No Action/No Project Alternative due to the slightly different aviation activity levels, including passenger volumes, under Alternative D (see Technical Report S-3, *Supplemental Economic Impacts Technical Report*, of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR).

³⁴⁵ This estimate is based on a fee of \$0.34 per square foot of commercial/industrial development, pursuant to LAUSD's Commercial/Industrial Development School Fee Justification Study (September 2002).

Table S4.27-2

Alternative D 2015, On-Airport Employee Student Generation

High School Cluster	New On-Airport Employee Households ¹	Estimated Students Generated ²
Venice/Westchester	-639	-250
Crenshaw/Dorsey	-362	-142
Hamilton/Palisades/University	-344	-135
Gardena/Washington	-326	-128
Fairfax/Hollywood/Los Angeles	-269	-105
Narborne/San Pedro	-201	-79
Banning/Carson	-154	-60
Fremont	-138	-54
Manual Arts	-132	-52
Jordon/Locke	-92	-36
Total Study Area Clusters	-2,657	-1,041
Total District	-3,509	-1,374

¹ Assumes one household per employee. Numbers account for households falling within LAUSD boundaries.

² Based on a student generation rate of 0.39 for all grade levels. Numbers may not total due to rounding.

Source: Hamilton, Rabinovitz & Alschuler, Inc., 2002.

Although LAUSD is projected to absorb the majority of the decline in enrollment associated with on-airport employees (approximately 55 percent), 31 other school districts throughout Los Angeles County would also experience indirect project-related enrollment declines. Due to the concentration of the decline in employee households within LAUSD, and the wide geographic distribution of other changes in employee households, the decline in enrollment in any one of these districts between 1996/97 and 2015 would not be substantial. With approximately 1,100 students³⁴⁶ outside of LAUSD affected, the maximum enrollment decline estimate for any one district between 1996/97 and 2015 would be 225 students in Inglewood Unified School District. It is expected that such decreases in enrollment would occur gradually over time and be more than offset by projected enrollment increases. The estimated decrease in employment and its effect on enrollment is not expected to cause a school closure or the need for new or modified school facilities in any of these districts.

Non-Enrollment Impacts

Full analyses of non-enrollment impacts on schools relative to noise, air quality, traffic, access, health risk, health effects of noise, and other impacts are addressed in their respective sections of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The following discussion provides a summary of these non-enrollment impacts on schools. As shown on Table S51, Alternative D 2015 Listing of Significantly Impacted Noise-Sensitive Uses (Compared to 1996 Baseline Conditions), in Technical Report S-1, *Supplemental Land Use Technical Report*, of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, three public schools in the Inglewood Unified School District (Beulah Payne Elementary School, Hillcrest Continuation School, and Inglewood High School) would be newly exposed to 65 CNEL noise levels in 2015 due to LAX operations compared to 1996 baseline conditions. Compared to Year 2000 conditions, one public school (Beulah Payne Elementary School) would be newly exposed to 65 CNEL noise levels due to LAX operations by 2015.

As shown in Table S4.2-28, Alternative D Listing of Schools Newly Exposed to High Single Event Noise Levels, in Section 4.2, *Land Use* (subsection 4.2.6.5), of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, three public schools in Inglewood Unified School District (Beulah Payne Elementary School, Inglewood High School, and Morningside High School) would be newly exposed to temporary classroom disruption due to single event aircraft noise compared to 1996 baseline conditions. Compared to Year 2000 conditions, three public schools in Inglewood Unified School District (Beulah Payne Elementary School, Clyde Woodworth Elementary School, and Inglewood High School) would be newly exposed to temporary classroom disruption due to single event aircraft noise. For those impacted schools not already

³⁴⁶ The number of employee households and estimated students generated under Alternative D differs from the No Action/No Project Alternative due to the slightly different aviation activity levels, including passenger volumes, under Alternative D (see Technical Report S-3, *Supplemental Economic Impacts Technical Report*, of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR).

4.27 Schools (CEQA)

considered compatible pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Title 21, mitigation in the form of sound insulation or acquisition and relocation would be provided. Mitigation Measure MM-LU-4, Provide Additional Sound Insulation for Schools shown by MM-LU-3 to Be Significantly Impacted by Aircraft Noise (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), in Section 4.2, *Land Use*, of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, would reduce impacts to schools from single event noise impacts; however, impacts would remain significant.

As indicated in Section 4.1, *Noise*, of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, three public schools (Westchester High School, Paseo del Rey Magnet School, and Westchester-Emerson Community Adult School) would be potentially impacted by noise associated with construction activities. Mitigation Measures MM-N-7 through MM-N-11 in Section 4.1, *Noise*, of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR would reduce temporary construction noise impacts on schools. These impacts would also be addressed through Master Plan Commitment C-1, Establishment of a Ground Transportation/Construction Coordination Office (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), which includes provisions for a construction relations liaison officer to work with school districts and notification to school districts in advance of major construction activities. Even with implementation of these measures, construction-related impacts could periodically remain significant.

Incremental cancer risks and non-cancer health hazards would be small for the maximally exposed school child and would not exceed a threshold of significance. With respect to traffic issues that pertain to school access and student safety, Master Plan Commitments C-1, Establishment of a Ground Transportation/Construction Coordination Office (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), and ST-16, Designated Haul Routes (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), would reduce potential impacts on school access and safety to less than significant levels.

4.27.7 Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative impacts to schools 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 4.27, *Schools* (subsection 4.27.7), of the Draft EIS/EIR.

4.27.7.1 Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan

Similar to the No Action/No Project Alternative, there would be a reduction in on-airport employment at LAX due to productivity increases (i.e., the production of more economic output per worker). Alternative D would see a decrease of over 1,000 students in LAUSD and over 1,100 students throughout the other school districts in the region by 2015. These project-related decreases in enrollment would occur over time and be more than offset by enrollment increases associated with other related projects. Although enrollment impacts are considered to be less than significant, any indirect enrollment impacts on schools associated with the project would be mitigated through payment of school impact fees by LAWA or its non-governmental tenants for commercial and industrial development, thereby, avoiding any significant impacts.

The Playa Vista project is considered to be a major contributor to local school enrollment in the project area. The Playa Vista project's impacts on school enrollment would be mitigated through payment of impact fees and the provision of a school facility on the site. Therefore, the cumulative impacts of Alternative D and the Playa Vista project would be less than significant.

The relocation of residents from the Manchester Square and Belford residential areas would result in the potential displacement and closure of LAUSD's 98th Street Elementary School. Considering that the enrollment impacts of Alternative D would be less than significant and offset through payment of school fees and that closure of 98th Street Elementary School would be mitigated through consultation between LAUSD and LAWA which may include a purchase of the property, provision of modular classrooms, or other appropriate measures, the combined cumulative impacts of these projects and Alternative D are considered to be less than significant.

4.27.8 Mitigation Measures

Alternatives A, B, C, and D would not have a significant impact on school enrollment; therefore, no mitigation is required. Master Plan Commitments C-1, Establishment of a Ground Transportation/Construction Coordination Office (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), and ST-16, Designated Haul Routes (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), and Mitigation Measures MM-N-7 through MM-N-11 (see

Section 4.1, *Noise*, of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR) would reduce potential non-enrollment impacts. In addition, Mitigation Measure MM-LU-4, Provide Additional Sound Insulation for Schools Shown by MM-LU-3 to be Significantly Impacted by Aircraft Noise (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), in Section 4.2, *Land Use*, would reduce impacts to schools from single event noise.

4.27.9 Level of Significance After Mitigation

4.27.9.1 Alternatives A, B, and C

Although mitigation measures and Master Plan Commitment C-1 would reduce temporary construction noise impacts on schools, there would be periodic impacts that would remain significant following implementation of mitigation.

Under Alternative B, one public school in the Lennox Elementary School District would be newly exposed to significant outdoor noise levels (75 CNEL or greater) that would remain significant after mitigation.

Single event noise impacts on seven public schools under Alternative A, nine public schools under Alternative B, and four public schools under Alternative C, in the Inglewood Unified and Lennox Elementary School Districts, would remain significant after implementation of mitigation measures due to high single event noise levels that would result in classroom disruption when classroom activities take place outdoors.

For those schools significantly impacted by aircraft noise that are not already considered compatible pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Title 21, impacts would remain significant for an interim period until mitigation in the form of sound insulation or acquisition and relocation is completed.

4.27.9.2 Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan

Similar to Alternatives A, B, and C, although mitigation measures and Master Plan Commitment C-1 would reduce temporary construction noise impacts on schools, there would be periodic impacts that would remain significant following implementation of mitigation.

Under Alternative D, single event noise impacts on three newly exposed public schools in the Inglewood Unified School District would remain significant after implementation of mitigation measures due to high single event noise levels that would result in classroom disruption when classroom activities take place outdoors.

4.27 Schools (CEQA)

This Page Intentionally Left Blank