
4. AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT, CONSEQUENCES, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Introduction

This chapter provides a comprehensive assessment of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum (Alternative D), as described in Chapter 3, *Alternatives (Including Proposed Action)*. In addition, supplemental information pertaining to the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternatives A, B, and C is provided herein.

As described in greater detail below, the structure, format, and analytical framework of this chapter are essentially the same as those of Chapter 4, *Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures*, of the Draft EIS/EIR. The most notable difference between this chapter and that of the Draft EIS/EIR is that in most cases where relevant information from the Draft EIS/EIR has not materially changed, such information is cross-referenced herein, and is not repeated from the Draft EIS/EIR. Such is generally the case relative to the respective descriptions of affected environment/environmental baseline conditions for the majority of the 27 environmental disciplines addressed in this chapter. Where there is new information or material changes to the information previously presented in the Draft EIS/EIR, such information is presented herein. The specifics of how the organization of, and analytical framework for, this chapter compare to those of the Draft EIS/EIR are described below.

Organization of the Chapter

As with Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR, each of the 27 environmental disciplines addressed in this chapter is discussed in a separate section using a common organization. Sections are numbered 4.1 through 4.27. Several sections are divided into subsections to simplify and clarify the discussion. Additionally, Section 4.20, *Construction Impacts*, summarizes the construction impacts for all environmental disciplines, although a discussion of construction impacts is provided in each subsection.

The following subjects are addressed in each section:

- ◆ The **Introduction** briefly describes the issues addressed in the analysis and identifies related topics.
- ◆ The **General Approach and Methodology** describes how the issue was approached within the context of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Where there were no material changes to the general approach and methodology used in the Draft EIS/EIR, such is noted and a cross-reference to the relevant section of the Draft EIS/EIR is provided to direct the reader to the complete description. If the analysis completed for the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR used any new methodologies, or revisions to previous methodologies, such differences are described herein. In those instances where the methodology has been revised since preparation of the Draft EIS/EIR, new analysis is provided for the No Action/No Project Alternative, and all four build alternatives. As indicated in the Draft EIS/EIR, instead of limiting the entire environmental analysis to a single study area, discrete study areas were sometimes used depending upon the extent of potential impacts associated with each individual discipline. For many of the environmental disciplines, however, a common study area was appropriate. This study area, referred to as the "Master Plan boundaries," includes the current airport property, and a composite of the area to be acquired under the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP) and the four build alternatives, including for Alternatives A, B, and C, the LAX Expressway alignments. The Master Plan boundaries are depicted in Figure 4-1, Master Plan Boundaries, of the Draft EIS/EIR.
- ◆ The **Affected Environment/Environmental Baseline** presents the affected environment, or baseline conditions, for the environmental discipline in the study area, including relevant activities, facilities and regulations. As indicated above, only a cross-reference to the relevant section(s) of the Draft EIS/EIR is provided for those environmental disciplines where affected environment/environmental baseline conditions have not materially changed. As described in Chapter 3, *Alternatives*, information pertaining to Year 2000 conditions is also provided. The basis for defining the environmental

4. Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures

baseline, and in some cases, an "adjusted environmental baseline," are described below under *Analytical Framework*.

- ◆ The **Thresholds of Significance** are quantitative or qualitative measures used to determine whether a significant environmental impact would occur as a result of the project. For environmental disciplines mandated solely by NEPA, thresholds of significance are not included, as they are not required by NEPA.²¹ In lieu of federal thresholds, this section identifies federal standards that are relevant to the analysis. However, many of the environmental disciplines have no applicable federal standards. For the reader's convenience, the Thresholds of Significance discussion is presented in its entirety, and is not cross-referenced to, or summarized from, the Draft EIS/EIR.
- ◆ **Master Plan Commitments** are specific procedures, plans, policies, or activities proposed to be implemented by LAWA in conjunction with implementation of any of the four build alternatives. These commitments are in addition to proposed mitigation measures, and are intended to reduce or avoid potential adverse impacts of the LAX Master Plan build alternatives. A discussion of Master Plan commitments, and their relationship to proposed mitigation measures, is provided in *Analytical Framework* below. For the reader's convenience, each Master Plan Commitment, as applicable to any or all of the build alternatives, is presented in its entirety within the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, even if it has not changed from what is presented in the Draft EIS/EIR.
- ◆ The **Environmental Consequences** section presents the analysis of impacts for Alternative D in a manner similar to that which was applied to the other alternatives in the Draft EIS/EIR. Similar to the approach described above relative to Affected Environment/Environmental Baseline, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provides cross-references to the relevant sections of the Draft EIS/EIR for the impacts analyses of the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternatives A, B, and C that have not materially changed. In those instances where there is a material change to the Draft EIS/EIR analysis, a discussion of those changes is provided herein. The analysis for Alternative D addresses the environmental consequences for horizon year 2015, and an interim year analysis is provided for selected disciplines, as appropriate, to address construction-related impacts. Potential impacts are compared to the CEQA thresholds of significance to determine whether they would be significant or less than significant, and are compared to federal standards, where appropriate, to assess whether such standards would be exceeded. For purposes of determining significance, potential impacts are compared to Environmental Baseline or Adjusted Environmental Baseline conditions, in accordance with the *State CEQA Guidelines* and as further described below in *Analytical Framework*. For sections mandated solely by NEPA, the impacts of Alternative D, and the other build alternatives if appropriate, are compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative conditions.
- ◆ **Cumulative Impacts** are the impacts of the project in conjunction with past, present, and probable future projects in the area. Similar to above, a complete analysis of the cumulative impacts of Alternative D is provided in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, and cross-references to the appropriate sections of the Draft EIS/EIR are provided for the cumulative impacts analyses of the other alternatives that have not materially changed. In those instances where material changes to the previous analysis have occurred, such changes are described in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.
- ◆ **Mitigation Measures** are specified procedures, plans, policies, or activities recommended in light of, and in direct response to, the significant impacts identified in the *Environmental Consequences* subsections. In some instances, the principal mitigation measure described is a Mitigation Plan that will be formulated with performance standards, lists of feasible mitigation measures, and commitments to implement the mitigation. Similar to Master Plan commitments above, each mitigation measure applicable to any or all of the build alternatives is presented in its entirety, even if it has not changed from what is presented in the Draft EIS/EIR. A comprehensive listing of all mitigation measures recommended to be adopted as part of Master Plan approval is provided in Chapter 5, *Environmental Action Plan*, of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that mitigation measures, as well as Master Plan commitments, are applicable to the extent that the

²¹ FAA Order 5050.4A establishes thresholds for conditions or impacts that normally indicate that an environmental impact statement (as opposed to an environmental assessment) must be prepared for a federal action. As such, these "thresholds of significance" are distinct from, and serve a different purpose than, CEQA thresholds of significance, as they are used in this document.

4. Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures

use of airport revenue to fund such measures and commitments is permissible under federal law and policies.

- ◆ **Level of Significance After Mitigation** is a CEQA determination of the significance of a particular impact after implementation of the proposed mitigation measures. This subsection identifies any significant impacts that cannot be mitigated. These "significant unavoidable impacts" are also listed in Chapter 6, *Significant Unavoidable Environmental Effects*. The level of significance after mitigation is not included for those environmental topics where no significant impacts would occur and, as a result, where no mitigation measures are required. For the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternatives A, B, and C, cross-references to appropriate sections of the Draft EIS/EIR are provided where conclusions regarding level of significance after mitigation have not materially changed.

Analytical Framework

The analytical framework described in the introduction to Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR also applies to this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The discussion of the analytical framework provided in the Draft EIS/EIR addresses the following components of the impacts analysis:

- ◆ Joint NEPA/CEQA document;
- ◆ Program level vs. project level environmental entitlements and analysis;
- ◆ Basis for determining impacts;
- ◆ Formulation of Master Plan commitments and mitigation measures;
- ◆ No Action/No Project Alternative;
- ◆ Definition of the "build" project alternatives; and
- ◆ Relationship of the Draft EIS/EIR and Master Plan to other documents and processes.

Supplemental information clarifying certain aspects of these components is provided below.

Basis for Determining Impacts

In accordance with Section 15125 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, the affected environment (referred to in the Guidelines as the "environmental setting") constitutes the baseline physical conditions by which it was determined whether an impact would be significant. Two baseline conditions were used in the analysis of the LAX Master Plan alternatives. These include the Environmental Baseline, or the physical conditions that existed at the time the Notice of Preparation was published (in this case, physical conditions as of mid-1997 and aviation activities from the most recent, previous year, or 1996), and the Adjusted Environmental Baseline, which reflects environmental baseline conditions on the airport, and future conditions (allowing for regional growth) off-airport.

The Environmental Baseline

Under the 1998 revisions to the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR must describe the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of a proposed project "as they exist at the time the notice of preparation is published...." Furthermore, Section 15125(a) of the 1998 revised State CEQA Guidelines states "[t] his environmental setting will normally constitute the baseline physical conditions by which a lead agency determines whether an impact is significant."

In accordance with these directives, the Draft EIS/EIR normally uses the date of July 1997, the date on which the notice of preparation (NOP) was published, as the baseline date for its environmental analysis. When a full year's worth of data is appropriate for describing the existing environmental setting, data is normally used from 1996 - the last full year before the date of the July 1997 NOP. In certain instances, data from earlier years is used when that is the only available data. In other instances, data from later years (e.g., 1999 or 2000) is used when it is considered to be appropriate to use more recent data. This more recent data is used principally to update the data and to compare more recent circumstances to the 1997 environmental setting.

The Environmental Baseline used for the impacts analysis in the Draft EIS/EIR was also used for the impacts analysis in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In so doing, the basis for the CEQA analysis in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is consistent with that of the Draft EIS/EIR, and is in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines directive that the environmental setting as of when the NOP was published will

4. Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures

normally constitute the baseline physical conditions by which a lead agency determines whether an impact is significant. Consequently, projected future changes anticipated to result from each of the various LAX Master Plan alternatives, including Alternative D, are compared to uniform baseline data, allowing for consistency of comparison (i.e., 'apples' are compared to 'apples'). For updated comparative purposes, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR includes a description of the more current physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the proposed project. The physical conditions occurring at, and around, the LAX Master Plan study area in the Year 2000 are considered to be the most current environmental conditions that are meaningful and relevant to the analysis of the LAX Master Plan. The Year 2000 conditions used within the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provide for a full year's worth of data for environmental conditions, including as influenced by existing airport operations, as they existed prior to the terrorist's attacks of September 11, 2001. Given that the events of September 11th substantially altered the nature and characteristics of operations at LAX, a description of existing environmental conditions that includes the period after that date is not considered to be representative of typical conditions.

The use of Year 2000 conditions within the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is, as noted above, for updated comparative purposes. The Environmental Baseline conditions described in the Draft EIS/EIR, which are referred to in the Supplement to the EIS/EIR as the "1996 baseline" conditions to help more readily distinguish from references to Year 2000 conditions, constitute the primary basis by which all conclusions regarding the significance of impacts are determined for all build alternatives (Alternatives A, B, C, and D). For certain environmental disciplines, an "adjusted environmental baseline" serves as the basis for determining the significance of impacts. In instances where the environmental setting under Year 2000 conditions are materially different from that of 1996 baseline conditions, such differences are described in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, as are also any material differences in the impacts that would result by using the Year 2000 conditions compared to the 1996 baseline conditions. To reiterate, however, conclusions regarding the significance of impacts for any, and all, build alternatives are based on the 1996 baseline or, for certain environmental disciplines, the adjusted environmental baseline.

The Adjusted Environmental Baseline

As described in Chapter 4, the Draft EIS/EIR uses an adjusted environmental baseline with respect to the evaluation of certain impacts, particularly relative to future traffic conditions and associated air quality and noise impacts. The following describes the basis for, and importance of, addressing such impacts using an adjusted environmental baseline.

As described above, the environmental setting that normally constitutes the baseline physical conditions by which a lead agency determines whether an impact is "significant" is defined under the CEQA Guidelines as normally that which exists at the time the NOP is published. There are, however, certain environmental impact analysis disciplines that have developed highly sophisticated methods by which to analyze potential future project-related impacts, including use of computer hardware and software models that analyze substantial amounts of data and information about the potential construction and operation impacts of a proposed project. The ability to successfully manage and properly understand substantial amounts of data can be especially challenging when a proposed project may have potential impacts that, in and of themselves, may be large, but that may still be dwarfed by potential changes in the background environment. Thus, in evaluating environmental impacts related to traffic, air quality and noise, the analysis necessarily focuses on the potential project's cumulative impacts, because the incremental impacts from the project itself are meaningful principally in the context of those cumulative impacts.

CEQA provides specific guidance for this type of cumulative impact analysis. Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines, for example, states that an EIR shall discuss a project's cumulative impacts when the project's incremental effects are "cumulatively considerable," meaning that those incremental effects are considerable "when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects and the effects of probable future projects." See Section 15065(c). In evaluating the pertinent cumulative impacts, the lead agency may consult either a "list of past, present and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts" or a "summary of projections" contained in adopted plans or certified environmental documents. Section 15130(b)(1). The lead agency must then determine whether a proposed project's "contribution" to a "significant cumulative impact" can be rendered "less than cumulatively considerable" and thus "not significant." Section 15130(a)(3). In making this determination, the project's incremental "contribution" is deemed "less than cumulatively considerable" if

4. Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures

the lead agency requires the project to implement or fund its "fair share" of mitigation measures designed to alleviate the cumulative impact. *Id.*

Over time, certain environmental impact analysis disciplines have developed standardized approaches toward how they determine which "probable future projects" and background growth trends and projections should be taken into account and how the cumulative environmental impacts of the proposed project and this other growth should be evaluated. The traffic engineering profession, for example, has developed specific standards and criteria relating to how the capacity of an off-site intersection should be measured, now and in the future, in order to determine the "significance" of a project's added incremental traffic impacts. Any particular intersection in a proposed project's vicinity, of course, may be impacted in the future by the project's incremental impacts, by the cumulative impacts of other projects and background growth, or by a combination of both. In undertaking their analysis, traffic engineers typically use the time horizon for buildout of the proposed project as the appropriate date for determining what future traffic growth will be taken into account in measuring off-site traffic impacts. Thus, for example, where the time horizon for the LAX Master Plan is 2015, the traffic analysts use the same 2015 date in determining what non-project-related traffic growth will be considered in projecting the future cumulative impacts of any given intersection. Once these cumulative impacts are calculated, the traffic analysts quantify which portion of those total future cumulative impacts are due to the proposed project's incremental impacts. By then adjusting the off-site baseline for non-project-related traffic activity to this same projected 2015 background traffic activity level, the non-project-related cumulative traffic impacts are effectively cancelled out, so that only the project's incremental impacts remain to be mitigated and the project's "fair share" of proposed mitigation is thereby established. This analytical method of evaluating these cumulative environmental impacts is commonly referred to as using an "adjusted baseline" approach.

Notably, the "adjusted baseline" methodology is applicable only to off-site conditions, where the extensive cumulative impacts of other future projects are expected to occur. Because any on-site traffic would be generated principally by project-related incremental growth, the "normal" current conditions baseline analysis is used to measure the "significant" on-site traffic impacts. This results in a highly conservative analysis because it assumes that all future on-site traffic activity levels and their impacts are project-caused impacts, even though a measurable portion of such on-site traffic growth over time would doubtless be caused by background growth and other non-project related factors. Because all such future impacts are effectively deemed to be incremental project-related growth, the LAX Master Plan must mitigate all such on-site traffic impacts, not just its arguable "fair share" of such cumulative impacts.

Similar procedures to isolate incremental traffic growth due to the project from all other traffic growth have been in use for many years. Traffic impact analysis policies and guidelines for both the City of Los Angeles and the County of Los Angeles require this "adjusted baseline" approach. Within both the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the noise analysis (Section 4.1) and the air quality analysis (Section 4.6) build upon the cumulative impacts traffic analysis contained in the off-site surface traffic impacts analysis (Section 4.3.2). Consequently, those sections, too, are based on that "adjusted baseline" methodology.

The NEPA environmental impact analysis focuses on comparing the proposed project's (alternative's) impacts to the impacts of the No Action alternative. Comparison to the CEQA baseline or to the adjusted baseline is not required by NEPA, and no NEPA provisions or guidelines address these baseline issues.

Interim Year Analysis

In addition to evaluating the environmental impacts of Alternatives A, B, and C as projected to occur at the horizon year 2015, the Draft EIS/EIR included an interim year analysis evaluating the environmental impacts of each build alternative projected to occur at 2005. Based on several major project features being common to all three build alternatives, such as all having a new west terminal, ring road, LAX Expressway, airfield improvements, expansion of cargo facilities, and development of Westchester Southside, the year 2005 was selected as an interim point in the development phasing program of all three build alternatives to identify and compare environmental impacts projected to occur at that time. Inasmuch as Alternative D does not include any of those major project features that are common to Alternatives A, B, and C, a 2005 interim year analysis was not conducted for Alternative D.

In addition to the 2005 interim year analysis of Alternatives A, B, and C, the Draft EIS/EIR evaluates for certain environmental disciplines construction-related impacts anticipated to occur during other specific

4. Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures

years prior to 2015. The selection of those other "interim" years was based on the when the greatest level and nature of construction-related impacts particular to certain environmental discipline are anticipated to occur. For example, the on-airport surface transportation impacts analysis for Alternatives A, B, and C presented in the Draft EIS/EIR addresses impacts in the years 2004 and 2013 when construction-related impacts are projected to be the greatest, based on the proposed construction phasing program. Relative to construction-related air quality impacts, the year 2004 is identified in the Draft EIS/EIR as the peak year for construction emissions.

Similar to the approach used for the Draft EIS/EIR, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR includes for particular environmental disciplines an evaluation of environmental impacts projected to occur at certain interim years prior to 2015, based on the phasing and construction of Alternative D. Relative to on-airport and off-airport surface transportation impacts, the year 2008 was identified as the peak construction year. Relative to construction-related air quality impacts, the year 2008 is the peak year for on-road traffic emissions due to construction activities; however the year 2013 is identified in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR as being the peak year for combined emissions from all operational sources and construction sources.

Formulation of Master Plan Commitments and Mitigation Measures

As described in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 15126.4 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR "shall describe feasible measures that could minimize significant adverse impacts." Mitigation measures are not required for effects that are not initially determined to be significant. In accordance with this provision, mitigation measures have been developed for the Draft EIS/EIR and for the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, to address significant impacts. Due to the programmatic nature of the LAX Master Plan and the associated environmental analysis, specific mitigation features cannot, in some cases, be identified until additional design is conducted. In those cases, performance standards are specified within the mitigation measure(s), and a range of options for meeting the standard is provided. For some environmental disciplines, a package of mitigation measures is being considered. For those disciplines, a more refined mitigation plan, based in part on public comments, will be presented in the Final EIS/EIR.

In addition to the proposed mitigation measures, Master Plan commitments have been formulated where mitigation measures would not be appropriate. Master Plan commitments were determined to be more appropriate than mitigation measures in some cases: (1) where standards and regulations exist with which compliance is already required by the applicable regulating agency; (2) where impacts would be adverse but not significant; and (3) where design refinements could be incorporated into the project to reduce or avoid potential impacts.

During the formulation of the Mitigation Monitoring Plan by LAWA, the Master Plan commitments and mitigation measures described in Chapter 4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR chosen to be implemented in connection with the LAX Master Plan (the LAX Plan) will be identified and described. Provisions will be made to ensure that those measures are fully enforceable (i.e., zoning conditions, conditions of approval, etc.).

Definition of the "Build" Project Alternatives

Chapter 3, *Alternatives*, of the Draft EIS/EIR describes the process used to identify and evaluate reasonable alternatives that could address the needs and meet the purpose and objectives of the Draft LAX Master Plan. That discussion describes, in detail, the process used in the development of Alternatives A, B, and C, and in defining the No Action/No Project Alternative. Chapter 3, *Alternatives*, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provides a summary of that discussion and adds, in detail, a description of the development of Alternative D.

The components of Alternatives A, B, and C are described in detail in Chapter 3, *Alternatives*, of the Draft EIS/EIR, as well as in Chapter V, *Concept Development*, of the Draft LAX Master Plan. The components of Alternative D are described in detail in Chapter 3, *Alternatives*, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and in Chapter 2, *Alternative D Development and Refinement*, of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum. The environmental impacts of each of the four "build" alternatives found to meet the Master Plan's purpose and objectives are, for Alternatives A, B, and C, analyzed in detail in Chapter 4, *Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures*, of the Draft EIS/EIR, and, for Alternative D, in Chapter 4 of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

4. Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures

LAWA anticipates utilizing the procedures of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, including Section 15225, when it processes the state and local approvals based on the joint EIS/EIR. LAWA further anticipates that the general plan amendment - to be called the LAX Plan, as guided and defined through the LAX Master Plan - that ultimately replaces the 1981 LAX Interim Plan will include a phasing plan, as well as appropriate performance standards and mitigation measures, including various mitigation measures that are identified and evaluated in this chapter. As indicated previously, during the formulation of the Mitigation Monitoring Plan by LAWA, it will be determined which Master Plan commitments and mitigation measures described in this chapter should appropriately be included within the parameters of the LAX Plan and which should be included in other formats that can nonetheless ensure that those measures will be fully enforceable.

- ◆ The project boundaries of the LAX Plan that will amend the City's general plan encompass all of the current boundaries of the 1981 LAX Interim Plan as modified to take into account the proposed acquisition areas that are part of each Master Plan build alternative.
- ◆ With respect to the portion of the LAX Plan boundaries that lie within the coastal zone, none of the Master Plan build alternatives proposes construction within the Los Angeles/EI Segundo Dunes. Rather, under the Master Plan alternatives, all existing policies and ordinances that currently apply to the EI Segundo Dunes would be retained and continue to be implemented within those areas. Under all of the build alternatives, a small amount of disruption within the Los Angeles/EI Segundo Dunes would occur as the result of relocating certain navigation aids. Also, under Alternatives A, B, and C, certain ring road-related improvements would be made to the eastern edge of Pershing Drive, which constitutes the eastern boundary of the coastal zone. These improvements would not intrude into the Los Angeles/EI Segundo Dunes. Under Alternative D, no ring road would be constructed.
- ◆ With respect to the existing Manchester Square residential neighborhood, in July 2000, LAWA approved implementation of a voluntary acquisition and relocation program that is not a part of the LAX Master Plan, but rather is part of the existing Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP), and that the ANMP voluntary acquisition and relocation program will proceed to completion irrespective of whether any Master Plan build alternative is chosen. Both the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the EIS/EIR assume that, for the build alternatives that propose the development of airport uses within the subject area (i.e., Alternatives B, C, and D), acquisition will be completed by the time Master Plan construction occurs in that area, and that the area in question will be fully acquired and the existing residences fully demolished. Removal of the roads, sidewalks, and other infrastructure is not assumed under the voluntary acquisition and relocation program, but is considered to be part of the Master Plan. The No Action/No Project Alternative assumes that the area will remain vacant through 2015, since it would require a change in land use policy to re-plan and re-zone the area to uses other than the existing residential uses. (Under the 1998 revised *State CEQA Guidelines*, the "no project" alternative must assume that "current" plans and policies continue into the future.) One of the Master Plan build alternatives, Alternative A, reasonably projects that, under a separate entitlement process, by the year 2015, the Manchester Square area would recycle into light industrial uses, a use for which there would be considerable demand by that year, and analyzes that use in its cumulative impacts analysis. The remaining three Master Plan build alternatives, Alternatives B, C, and D would incorporate the Master Plan area into the airport boundaries and utilize it as the site for various Master Plan uses.
- ◆ The ANMP voluntary acquisition and relocation program described above also includes the Belford area. Similar to above, both the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR assume that, as to all Master Plan alternatives (including the No Action/No Project Alternative), this voluntary program will be completed within the Belford area by the time Master Plan construction occurs in that area, and that the subject area will be fully acquired and the existing residences fully demolished. Removal of the roads, sidewalks, and other infrastructure is not assumed under the voluntary acquisition and relocation program, but is considered to be part of the Master Plan. The No Action/No Project Alternative assumes that the area will remain vacant through 2015, since it would require a change in land use policy to re-plan and re-zone the area to uses other than the existing residential uses. Master Plan Alternatives A, B, and C would incorporate the Master Plan area into the airport boundaries and utilize it as the site for various Master Plan uses. Alternative D makes no development assumptions for the Belford area, as such assumptions would be speculative at this time but, rather, assumes that the area would remain vacant.

4. Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures

- ◆ Besides voluntary negotiations leading to acquisition, the LAX Master Plan anticipates that properties designated by the various build alternatives as potential acquisition areas, including the Manchester Square and Airport Belford areas, will be acquired by the most appropriate and practical measures available to ensure that the designated areas are vacant and available at a time consistent with the Construction Sequencing Plan. This would potentially include, for example, voluntary acquisition, acquisition of less than a fee, such as a lease or an easement, and public condemnation.
- ◆ With respect to the area that is presently planned and approved for the LAX Northside development, Alternatives A, B, and C include a substantially down-sized and modified development proposal, renamed "Westchester Southside." The approximately 4.5 million square feet of mixed uses currently approved as part of LAX Northside would be scaled down to approximately 2.6 million square feet of uses, including some LAWA administrative offices, light industrial uses acquired and relocated as part of the Master Plan, and other retail, commercial and hotel related uses. Under Alternative D, the original LAX Northside development is assumed; however, as part of Alternative D, the existing trip cap for LAX Northside at buildout would be reduced to limit vehicle trips to a level comparable to that projected for Westchester Southside at buildout. A description of the proposed reduction to the existing trip cap for LAX Northside is provided in Chapter 3, *Alternatives (Including Proposed Action)*, of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR (subsection 3.3.2). As land uses have not been specified to correspond with this cap, for purposes of this analysis (with the exception of the surface transportation analysis), it is assumed that LAX Northside would be fully built out. As a result, many of the impacts associated with LAX Northside under Alternative D are overstated. For example, all of the calculations for the utilities impacts, such as water and energy consumption and wastewater and solid waste generation, for Alternative D are based on the assumed buildout of the 4.5 million square feet of development that are currently entitled although, in actuality, the maximum amount of development that could be achieved under the reduced trip cap would be less than 4.5 million square feet. As such, these types of calculations for Alternative D are considered to be very conservative and the actual impacts would be less than projected.

Relationship of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Master Plan to Other Documents and Processes

Accompanying this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is a series of Appendices and Technical Reports. These documents include information that has been considered in preparing this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and they are incorporated by reference. Similar to how the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is structured and related to the Draft EIS/EIR, the majority of the subject appendices and technical report are based upon the original appendices and technical reports of the Draft EIS/EIR, providing supplemental new information and analyses as appropriate.

As the environmental analysis is further refined, a Final EIS/EIR will be prepared, as well as other important decision-making documents. For example, under the federal Clean Air Act, the FAA must make a determination that the LAX Master Plan conforms to the State Implementation Plan (the "General Conformity" determination). Additional documents, based on the analysis of the EIS/EIR, will be prepared to support that determination once the preferred alternative is selected and prior to FAA's approval of the ALP. This approval, along with all requisite FAA findings and determinations, will be documented in a Record of Decision.

A Project Study Report (PSR) and other documentation was prepared for use by Caltrans in its evaluation of the LAX Expressway and other ground access components of Alternatives A, B, and C that are within the jurisdiction of state and federal transportation agencies. As Alternative D has replaced Alternative C as the LAWA staff's preferred alternative, these efforts have been suspended. In their place, a feasibility study and PSR are currently underway for highway ramp improvements recommended as mitigation of surface transportation impacts associated with Alternative D.

Additional Master Plan-related documentation will be prepared for use by the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission. The ALUC will review the Draft LAX Master Plan alternatives with a view to considering their consistency with the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan administered by the ALUC. Furthermore, under CEQA, a Mitigation Monitoring Plan will be prepared, along with various proposed written findings, for LAWA and other city bodies, including the City Council, to consider and approve in the City's role as co-lead agency as the EIS/EIR is considered and certified.