1.0 INTRODUCTION AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document is a Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) for the Midfield Satellite Concourse (MSC) North Project (MSC North Project) and future phase(s) of the MSC Program at Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). LAX is owned and operated by the City of Los Angeles, whose Board of Airport Commissioners oversees the policy, management, operation, and regulation of LAX, as well as LA/Ontario International Airport, Van Nuys Airport, and LA/Palmdale Regional Airport. Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) is a self-supporting administrative department of the City of Los Angeles charged with administering the day-to-day operations of LAX. This Draft EIR has been prepared by LAWA as the lead agency in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

An Initial Study was prepared in February 2013 which identified the resource areas that could be subject to significant impacts from the proposed MSC North Project and future phase(s) of the MSC North Program and that would require incorporation of mitigation measures where feasible. Based on a preliminary review of the project site and in consideration of the proposed activities associated with the proposed MSC North Project and future phase(s) of the MSC Program, LAWA determined that potentially significant effects may occur in Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Human Health Risk Assessment, Public Services, Transportation/Traffic, and Mandatory Findings of Significance. As a result, these resources are evaluated further in this Draft EIR.

LAWA determined that impacts related to Aesthetics, Agricultural and Forestry Resources, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Recreation, and Utilities and Service Systems have been found to be less than significant through the analysis in the Initial Study and are not proposed for further analysis (see **Appendix A**). Federal, State, regional, and local agencies, as well as the public were afforded the opportunity to comment on the findings of the Initial Study through the 30-day scoping period associated with circulation of the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for this EIR. During the NOP public comment period, LAWA received a request to analyze the potential impacts of aircraft noise from changes to taxi routes that would occur as a result of the proposed MSC North Project; thus, taxiway noise is also evaluated in this Draft EIR. No other areas of controversy during the NOP public comment period were identified. Therefore, no other topics are evaluated further in this Draft EIR.

1.1 Summary of the Proposed Project

The MSC Program consists of a new multi-level concourse located within the western portion of the airfield west of the existing Tom Bradley International Terminal (TBIT) and associated passenger processing space in a proposed Central Terminal Processor (CTP) that would be located in the Central Terminal Area (CTA) of LAX. The MSC Program also includes conveyance systems connecting the MSC and CTP as well as a new taxilane, taxiway, and apron and utilities required to serve the MSC. The facility would be capable of serving both international and domestic flights, and would provide LAWA with the flexibility to accommodate existing demand for aircraft gates while modernizing other terminals at LAX, rehabilitating apron and taxilane pavement within the CTA, and reducing reliance on the West Remote Gates/Pads.

Upon completion of the MSC Program, the concourse could accommodate up to 29 aircraft gates for Airplane Design Group (ADG) III to ADG VI aircraft. ADG III aircraft correspond to narrowbody jets (for example, the Boeing 737) and ADG VI aircraft correspond to the largest jet aircraft, often referred to as new large aircraft (NLA) such as the Boeing 747-800 and the Airbus A380. The full MSC Program concourse would occupy a footprint with approximate dimensions of 2,400 feet in length (north-south) by 140 to 160 feet in width (east-west). The MSC Program facility, including the concourse building and associated apron areas, would encompass approximately 60 acres in the western portion of the airfield and 6 acres in the CTA for the CTP.

Due to the size and scale of the MSC Program, LAWA proposes to develop the MSC Program in phases. Phase I ("MSC North Project") of the MSC Program is the construction of the northern portion of the multi-story MSC facility and associated improvements. The MSC North Project is intended to improve the terminal operations, concessions facilities, and overall passenger experience at LAX. The facility would be designed to serve both domestic and international traffic. The MSC North Project would provide LAWA with the flexibility to accommodate demand for aircraft gates while modernizing other terminals at LAX, rehabilitating apron and taxilane pavement within the CTA, and reduce reliance on the West Remote Gates/Pads. Later phase(s) would involve the development of the remaining components of the MSC Program described above and are referred to herein as the future phase(s) of the MSC Program.

Components associated with the MSC North Project include: 1) a concourse of up to 11-gates and associated facilities; 2) improvements to taxiways and taxilanes; 3) ramp tower or Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) supplemental airport traffic control tower to control aircraft movement around the concourse facility and associated airfield; and 4) utilities that support the MSC North Project. The MSC North Project site, including the concourse building and associated apron areas, would encompass approximately 36 acres in the western portion of the airfield.

Enabling projects needed to implement the MSC North Project include demolition and relocation of existing structures, removal of five remain overnight (RON) aircraft parking spaces, removal and relocation of FAA navigational aids (beacon and antenna array), and removal and/or relocation of existing utility lines.

The MSC North Project is analyzed on a project-level in this EIR; the future phase(s) of the MSC Program is analyzed at a programmatic level in this EIR.

1.2 Relationship to Existing Plans and Documents

The LAX Master Plan[1], approved by the City of Los Angeles City Council in December 2004, is the strategic framework for future development at LAX. The main components of the LAX Master Plan include the modernization of the runway and taxiway system, redevelopment of the terminal area, access improvements to LAX, and enhancement of passenger safety, security,

[1] City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles World Airports, Taking Flight for a Better Future, Los Angeles International Airport Final Master Plan, April 2004.

and convenience. The LAX Master Plan was the subject of a joint Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) completed in January 2005.[2] The City of Los Angeles City Council certified the Final EIR as complying with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) issued a Record of Decision on the Final EIS in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The approved LAX Master Plan includes the development of the "West Satellite Concourse". Subsequent to the release of the Final EIR/EIS, the West Satellite Concourse was renamed the Midfield Satellite Concourse (MSC). The LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR assessed the MSC at a programmatic level under CEQA, meaning that additional project level CEQA review is required before LAWA can construct and operate one or more components of the MSC Program.

The LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR provided descriptions of the environmental conditions in and around LAX, analyzed the potential impacts of the proposed improvements on the physical environment, and recommended mitigation measures to address potential impacts. The main elements of the MSC Program, including the addition of new aircraft gates and the addition of an adjacent taxilane, are on the approved Airport Layout Plan (ALP). As indicated above, the MSC Program was assessed at a programmatic level in compliance with CEQA in the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR.

The FAA issued a Record of Decision on the LAX Master Plan EIS that included environmental approval of the construction and operation of the full MSC Program as depicted on the ALP. Because the MSC Program has not substantively changed as documented and assessed in the LAX Master Plan EIS, no additional NEPA analysis of the MSC North Project is required. However, additional project-level CEQA analysis of the MSC North Project is required to assess the specific effects of constructing and operating the MSC North building, which is separate and independent of the later phase or phases of the MSC Program. This first phase of the MSC Program serves a unique and independent function, and it can occur even if there is no future phase(s) of the MSC Program (i.e., it is not dependent upon the later phase(s) of the MSC Program or vice versa). The future phase(s) of the MSC Program will continue to be examined at a programmatic level, focusing on any updates to the MSC Program from that assessed in the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR.

1.3 Purpose of this Draft EIR

Since the Initial Study determined that the proposed MSC North Project and future phase(s) of the MSC Program may have a significant effect on the environment, the State *CEQA Guidelines* require the preparation of this Draft EIR. LAWA has undertaken this Draft EIR for the following purposes:

[2] City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles World Airports Final Environmental Impact Report, Los Angeles International Airport Proposed Master Plan Improvements, April 2004; U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration, Environmental Impact Statement, Los Angeles International Airport Proposed Master Plan Improvements, January 2005.

- To evaluate the potentially significant environmental effects associated with the implementation of the proposed MSC North Project and future phase(s) of the MSC Program, as required by CEQA;
- To indicate the manner in which those significant impacts can be avoided or significantly lessened;
- To identify any significant and unavoidable adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated;
- To identify reasonable and feasible alternatives to the proposed MSC North Project and future phase(s) of the MSC Program that would eliminate any significant adverse environmental impacts or reduce the impacts to less-than-significant levels;
- To inform the general public, the local community, and responsible trustee, State, and federal agencies of the nature of the proposed MSC North Project and future phase(s) of the MSC Program, its potentially significant environmental effects, feasible mitigation measures to mitigate those effects, and reasonable and feasible alternatives;
- To enable LAWA decision-makers to consider the environmental consequences of the proposed MSC North Project and future phase(s) of the MSC Program and make findings regarding each significant effect that is identified;
- To provide a basis for preparation of any future environmental documents; and
- To facilitate responsible agencies in issuing permits and approvals for the proposed MSC North Project.

According to CEQA and the State *CEQA Guidelines*, public agencies must avoid or lessen significant environmental impacts where feasible. Where impacts cannot be mitigated to less-than-significant levels, public agencies have an obligation to balance the project's significant impacts on the environment against other factors, including economic, social, technological, legal, and other benefits.

LAWA must certify the EIR before approving the proposed MSC North Project. Upon certification, the EIR will serve as the base environmental document for LAWA and will be used as a basis for decisions on implementation of the proposed MSC North Project. Other agencies may also use this EIR in their review and approval processes.

This EIR was prepared in accordance with Section 15151 of the State *CEQA Guidelines*, which defines the standards for EIR adequacy as follows:

> An EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision makers with information which enables them to make a decision which intelligently takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of a proposed project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in the light of what is reasonably feasible. Disagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR should summarize the main points of disagreement among the experts. The courts have looked not for perfection; but for adequacy, completeness, and good faith effort at full disclosure.

1.4 Organization of this Draft EIR

This Draft EIR follows the preparation and content guidance provided by CEQA and its Guidelines. Listed below is a summary of the contents of each chapter of this report.

1.0 Introduction and Executive Summary. Chapter 1 describes the background of the MSC North Project and future phase(s) of the MSC Program including refinements; relationship to the LAX Master Plan; CEQA compliance requirements; the environmental review process; Initial Study/NOP; the organization of the Draft EIR; intended uses of the Draft EIR; availability of the Draft EIR; and includes an Executive Summary that presents a brief summary of the proposed MSC North Project and future phase(s) of the MSC Program and alternatives, impacts, mitigation measures and areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency.

2.0 Project Description. Chapter 2 describes the boundaries of the proposed MSC North Project and future phase(s) of the MSC Program, the proposed objectives of the MSC North Project and future phase(s) of the MSC Program, a list of the agencies expected to use this Draft EIR, proposed Project permits and other discretionary actions, and a list of related environmental review and consultation requirements.

3.0 Overview of Project Setting. Chapter 3 provides an overview of the existing environmental setting at and around the MSC site, and describes other projects proposed in the nearby area that may, in conjunction with the proposed MSC North Project and future phase(s) of the MSC Program, need to be considered in order to assess cumulative impacts.

4.0 Environmental Impact Analysis. Chapter 4 describes the existing conditions; methodology used in the impact analysis; thresholds of significance; commitments incorporated into the proposed MSC North Project and future phase(s) of the MSC Program; impacts that would result from the proposed MSC North Project and future phase(s) of the MSC Program; applicable mitigation measures that would eliminate or reduce significant impacts; the residual impacts after mitigation for each environmental issue; and cumulative impacts. The chapter addresses seven main topics:

Chapter 4.1 Air Quality

Chapter 4.2 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Chapter 4.3 Human Health Risk Assessment

Chapter 4.4 Noise

Chapter 4.5 Public Services

Chapter 4.6 On-Airport Transportation

Chapter 4.7 Construction Surface Transportation

5.0 Alternatives. Chapter 5 evaluates the environmental effects of the alternatives to the proposed MSC North Project and future phase(s) of the MSC Program that were considered. As required by CEQA, Chapter 5 evaluates the potential for these alternatives to avoid or substantially lessen any significant effects of the MSC North Project and future phase(s) of the MSC Program while meeting the objectives of the project.

6.0 Other Environmental Considerations. Chapter 6 includes a discussion of issues required by CEQA that are not covered in Chapter 4. This includes growth-inducing impacts, irreversible environmental changes, unavoidable significant impacts, reasons why the proposed MSC North Project and future phase(s) of the MSC Program is being proposed, notwithstanding unavoidable significant impacts, and potential secondary effects. In addition, Chapter 6 includes a summary of the topics evaluated in the Initial Study but not carried forward for further evaluation in this Draft EIR (impacts found not to be significant).

7.0 List of Preparers, Parties to Whom Sent, References, NOP Comments, and List of Acronyms. Chapter 7 provides the following: a list of the individuals from the City of Los Angeles and contractors that performed key roles in the preparation and development of this Draft EIR; a list of the parties to whom copies of this Draft EIR were sent for review or to whom notice of the availability of this Draft EIR was sent; a list containing a bibliography of documents used in the preparation of the Draft EIR; a list of agencies, organizations and individuals who provided comments on the NOP; and a list of acronyms used in the Draft EIR.

Appendices. The Appendices present data supporting the analysis contained in the Draft EIR. The appendices in this Draft EIR include:

Appendix A	Initial Study, NOP, and Scoping Materials
Appendix B	Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Appendix
Appendix C	Human Health Risk Assessment Appendix
Appendix D	Noise Appendix
Appendix E	On-Airport Transportation Appendix
Appendix F	Construction Surface Transportation Appendix
Appendix G	Aircraft Gate Closures at LAX

1.5 Summary of Environmental Impacts

Based on the Initial Study (February 2013), LAWA determined that preparation of an EIR was required because the proposed MSC North Project and future phase(s) of the MSC Program could have potentially significant impacts on Air Quality, Greenhouse Gases, Human Health Risk Assessment, Public Services, and Transportation/Traffic and Mandatory Findings of Significance. During the NOP public comment period, LAWA received a request to analyze the potential impacts of aircraft noise from changes to taxi routes that would occur as a result of the proposed MSC North Project; thus, taxiway noise is also evaluated in this Draft EIR.

Impacts to Aesthetics, Agricultural Resources, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Recreation, Utilities and Service Systems have been found to be less than significant through the analysis in the Initial Study. These environmental topics are not evaluated further in this Draft EIR.

Table 1-1 presents a summary of findings for each of the resources analyzed in this EIR for the MSC North Project. Resources were also analyzed at a programmatic level for the future phase(s) of the MSC Program; these results are shown in **Table 1-2**. Potentially significant impacts to these resources are evaluated further in Chapter 4.

Table 1-1

Summary of Environmental Impacts for the MSC North Project by Resource Topic

Impact by Discipline	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Existing Commitments and/or Mitigation Measures	New Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
AIR QUALITY				
Construction	Significant	LAX-AQ-1. General Air Quality Control Measures (Measure Number 1a through 1g) LAX-AQ-2. Construction-Related Control Measures (2a through 2o)	Modified LAX-AQ-2 that will require: • Use of 2010 model year on-road vehicles for all vehicles over 19,500 pounds (if available) • Use of Tier 4 (final) equipment for off-road equipment greater than 50 horsepower (if available)	Significant and Unavoidable
Operations	Less than significant	LAX-AQ-4. Operations-Related Control Measures (4a, 4b, 4e, 4f)	None required	Less than significant
Cumulative				
Construction	Significant	Same as for Air Quality-Construction above	Same as for Air Quality-Construction above	Significant and Unavoidable
Operations	Less than significant	Same as for Air Quality-Operations above	None required	Less than significant

Table 1-1

Summary of Environmental Impacts for the MSC North Project by Resource Topic

Impact by Discipline	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Existing Commitments and/or Mitigation Measures	New Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
GREENHOUSE GASES				
Construction and Operations	Significant	LAX-AQ-1. General Air Quality Control Measures (1f, 1g) LAX-AQ-2. Construction-Related Control Measures (2d through 2g, 2i through 2k, 2m, 2o) LAX-AQ-4. Operations-Related Control Measures (4a, 4b, 4e, 4f)	No feasible mitigation identified	Significant and Unavoidable
Cumulative Construction and Operations	Significant	Same as for Greenhouse Gases-Construction and Operations above	No feasible mitigation identified	Significant and Unavoidable
HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT				
Construction	Less than significant	LAX-AQ-1. General Air Quality Control Measures (1a through 1g) LAX-AQ-2. Construction-Related Control Measures (2a through 2o)	None required	Less than significant
Operations: Acute non-chronic hazard index for acrolein	Significant	LAX-AQ-4. Operations-Related Control Measures (4a, 4b, 4e, 4f)	No feasible mitigation identified	Significant and Unavoidable
Cumulative				
Construction	Less than significant	Same as for Human Health Risk Assessment-Construction above	None required	Less than significant
Operations	Significant	Same as for Human Health Risk Assessment-Operations above	No feasible mitigation identified	Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1

Summary of Environmental Impacts for the MSC North Project by Resource Topic

Impact by Discipline	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Existing Commitments and/or Mitigation Measures	New Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
NOISE – Aircraft Taxi Noise				
Operations	Less than significant	Not Available	None required	Less than significant
Cumulative	Less than significant	Not Available	None required	Less than significant
PUBLIC SERVICES – Fire Protection Services				
Construction	Less than significant	C-1. Establishment of a Ground Transportation/Construction Coordination Office ST-9. Construction Deliveries ST-12. Designated Truck Delivery Hours ST-14. Construction Employee Shift Hours ST-17. Maintenance of Haul Routes ST-18. Construction Traffic Management Plan ST-19. Closure Restrictions of Existing Roadways ST-21. Construction Employee Parking Locations ST-22. Designated Truck Routes	None required	Less than significant
Operations	Less than significant	FP-1. LAFD Design Recommendations PS-1. Fire and Police Facility Relocation Plan PS-2. Fire and Police Facility Space and Siting Requirements	None required	Less than significant
Cumulative				
Construction	Less than significant	Same as for Public Services-Construction above	None required	Less than significant
Operations	Less than significant	Same as for Public Services-Operations above	None required	Less than significant

Table 1-1

Summary of Environmental Impacts for the MSC North Project by Resource Topic

Impact by Discipline	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Existing Commitments and/or Mitigation Measures	New Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
ON-AIRPORT TRANSPORTATION				
Operations	Less than significant	Not applicable as operational capacity would not be modified.	None required	Less than significant
CONSTRUCTION SURFACE TRANSPORTATION				
Construction	Less than significant	C-1. Establishment of a Ground Transportation/Construction Coordination Office C-2. Construction Personnel Airport Orientation ST-9. Construction Deliveries ST-12. Designated Truck Delivery Hours ST-14. Construction Employee Shift Hours ST-16. Designated Haul Routes ST-17. Maintenance of Haul Routes ST-18. Construction Traffic Management Plan ST-22. Designated Truck Routes	None required	Less than significant
Cumulative	Significant	Same as for Construction Surface Transportation-Construction above	MM-ST (MSC)-1. Widen Manchester Avenue at Sepulveda Boulevard.	Significant and Unavoidable

Source: Ricondo & Associates, Inc., 2013.

Table 1-2

Summary of Environmental Impacts for the Future Phase(s) of the MSC Program by Resource Topic

Impact by Discipline	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Existing Commitments and/or Mitigation Measures	New Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
AIR QUALITY				
Operations	Less than significant	LAX-AQ-3. Traffic-Related Control Measures (3a through 3r) LAX-AQ-4. Operations-Related Control Measures (4a, 4b, 4e, 4f)	None required	Less than significant
Cumulative				
Operations	Less than significant	Same as for Air Quality-Operations above	None required	Less than significant
GREENHOUSE GASES				
Construction and Operations	Significant	LAX-AQ-1. General Air Quality Control Measures (1f, 1g) LAX-AQ-2. Construction-Related Control Measures (2d through 2g, 2i through 2k, 2m, 2o) LAX-AQ-4. Operations-Related Control Measures (4a, 4b, 4e, 4f)	No feasible mitigation identified	Significant and Unavoidable
Cumulative Construction and Operations	Significant	Same as for Greenhouse Gases-Construction and Operations above	No feasible mitigation identified	Significant and Unavoidable
HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT				
Operations: Acute non-chronic hazard index for acrolein	Significant	LAX-AQ-3. Traffic-Related Control Measures (3a through 3r) LAX-AQ-4. Operations-Related Control Measures (4a, 4b, 4e, 4f)	No feasible mitigation identified	Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-2

Summary of Environmental Impacts for the Future Phase(s) of the MSC Program by Resource Topic

Impact by Discipline	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Existing Commitments and/or Mitigation Measures	New Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Cumulative				
Operations	Significant	Same as for Human Health Risk Assessment-Operations above	No feasible mitigation identified	Significant and Unavoidable
NOISE – Aircraft Taxi Noise				
Operations	Less than significant	Not Available	None required	Less than significant
Cumulative	Less than significant	Not Available	None required	Less than significant
PUBLIC SERVICES – Fire Protection Services				
Construction	Less than significant	C-1. Establishment of a Ground Transportation/Construction Coordination Office ST-9. Construction Deliveries ST-12. Designated Truck Delivery Hours ST-14. Construction Employee Shift Hours ST-17. Maintenance of Haul Routes ST-18. Construction Traffic Management Plan ST-19. Closure Restrictions of Existing Roadways ST-21. Construction Employee Parking Locations ST-22. Designated Truck Routes	None required	Less than significant
Operations	Less than significant	FP-1. LAFD Design Recommendations PS-1. Fire and Police Facility Relocation Plan PS-2. Fire and Police Facility Space and Siting Requirements	None required	Less than significant

Table 1-2

Summary of Environmental Impacts for the Future Phase(s) of the MSC Program by Resource Topic

Impact by Discipline	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Existing Commitments and/or Mitigation Measures	New Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Cumulative				
Construction	Less than significant	Same as for Public Services-Construction above	None required	Less than significant
Operations	Less than significant	Same as for Public Services-Operations above	None required	Less than significant
ON-AIRPORT TRANSPORTATION				
Operations	Less than significant	MM-ST(BWP)-2. Improve the Intersection of Center Way and World Way South MM-ST (BWP)-3. Widen World Way Across from the TBIT MM-ST (SPAS)-2. Change Departures and Arrivals Level Commercial Vehicles Curbside Operations Under Future (2025) Conditions	None required	Less than significant

Source: Ricondo & Associates, Inc., 2013.

1.6 Environmentally Superior Alternative

Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the State *CEQA Guidelines* requires an EIR to identify an environmentally superior alternative. If the environmentally superior alternative is the "no project" alternative, the EIR must identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. As further described in Chapter 5, *Alternatives*, the alternatives to the proposed MSC North Project include:

Alternative 1 - No Project: Under the "No Project" alternative, none of the improvements and activities proposed for the MSC North Project would occur. The proposed Project site would continue to be used for aircraft maintenance, Remain Over Night and Remain All-Day (RON/RAD) aircraft parking, the U.S. Coast Guard facility, electrical substations, and the various other existing uses at the site. LAWA would forego the opportunity to develop new gates that would allow them the flexibility to renovate and redevelop the existing terminals, rehabilitate apron and taxiway pavement within the CTA, and reduce reliance on the West Remote Gates/Pads without negatively affecting existing airline passenger operations. LAWA would continue to rely on the West Remote Gates/Pads to provide remote contact gates and/or parking positions when contact gates at the terminals within the CTA are unavailable.

Alternative 2 – Reduced Project (Fewer Gates): A reduced project alternative was identified that would involve the construction of 7-8 gates rather than the 11 gates proposed as part of the MSC North Project. The concourse would stop just north of World Way West and would avoid impacting the FAA navigational aids, one of the electrical industrial stations, 3 RON parking spaces, the natural gas regulator, and the American Airlines Private Post. All other project components would be included.

Alternative 3 – MSC South: Alternative 3 would involve construction of the southern portion of the MSC rather than the northern portion as proposed. This alternative would impact the American Airlines High Bay Hangar, but would stop just south of World Way West. This alternative would avoid impacting the FAA navigational aids, one of the electrical industrial stations, the American Airlines Maintenance (Non-Power) shop, the American Airlines leasehold parking, and the natural gas regulator. This alternative would also result in a reduced project alternative with 2 fewer aircraft gates than the proposed MSC North Project.

Alternative 4 – Alternate Site (Terminal/Concourse 0): Alternative 4 would involve the construction of "Terminal/Concourse 0" north of World Way and east of Terminal 1. Terminal/Concourse 0 could be constructed with up to 7 gates in the western portion of the area currently occupied by Park One. This alternative would require the relocation of Sky Way (upper and lower roadways) eastward to allow development of the terminal and would also provide additional roadway and curbfront in the CTA. This alternative would eliminate the impacts to the existing facilities at the MSC site, which would remain as they exist today, and would also eliminate the need for an Automated People Mover (APM) from MSC to connect to the CTA.

As further described in Chapter 5, the alternatives to the proposed future phase(s) of the MSC Program include:

Alternative 1 – No Future Phase(s) of the MSC Program: As required by CEQA, a "no project" alternative was considered for the future phase(s) of the MSC Program. In this case, the "no project" alternative would mean that after the MSC North Project is constructed, no

additional development of the MSC Program would occur. The MSC would remain an 11-gate facility with the Project components identified as part of the MSC North Project; no other proposed components would be implemented.

Alternative 2 – Reduced Program (Fewer Gates): The future phase(s) of the MSC Program includes up to an additional 18 gates, which when added to the gates proposed for the MSC North Project would provide a concourse with up to 29 gates. An alternative to the future phase(s) of the MSC Program would be a smaller concourse with fewer gates. For purposes of identifying alternatives that may avoid or substantially lessen the significant impacts of the future phase(s) of the MSC Program, a reduced Program alternative of a concourse with a total of 20 gates was considered.

Alternative 3 – No Central Terminal Processor/APM to Existing Terminal: Another alternative considered to the future phase(s) of the MSC Program was an alternative that eliminates the CTP. Instead of the APM going to a CTP, the APM would instead go to one of the existing terminals within the CTA. For purposes of this analysis, it was assumed that the APM would run between Terminal 3 and the MSC.

Alternative 4 – No Central Terminal Processor/No APM: The final alternative considered for the future phase(s) of the MSC Program was an alternative that included no CTP or APM; passengers would check-in, check their luggage, and undergo security screening within one of the existing terminals in the CTA, and then be bused to the MSC, as is assumed to occur for the MSC North Project.

With respect to identifying an environmentally superior alternative among those analyzed in this Draft EIR, the range of feasible alternatives for the MSC North Project includes Alternative 1 - No Project; Alternative 2 - Reduced Project; Alternative 3 - MSC South, and Alternative 4 – Alternative Site (Terminal/Concourse 0). Alternative 1 - No Project is considered to be the overall environmentally superior alternative as it would avoid all construction and operational impacts of the proposed Project and is the only Alternative that would not have a significant unavoidable impact with respect to construction-related regional emissions of CO, PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, VOC, and NO_X, greenhouse gas emissions, construction traffic impacts, and the acute non-cancer hazard index for acrolein. However, this Alternative would not meet any of the objectives established for the proposed Project.

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines requirement to identify an environmentally superior alternative other than the No Project Alternative, a comparative evaluation of the remaining alternatives indicates that Alternative 2 - Reduced Project would be the environmentally superior alternative relative to the other Alternatives. Due to the reduced project size, compared to the proposed Project, the Reduced Project Alternative would result in less construction-related impacts to air quality, health risks, greenhouse gases, and construction surface transportation, and less greenhouse gas emissions related to operations. However, it would most likely have similar impacts related to the acute non-hazard index for acrolein.

It is important to note, while the Reduced Project Alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative, it would not avoid the significant unavoidable impacts that would occur under the proposed Project with respect to construction-related regional emissions of CO and NO_X, construction traffic impacts and the acute non-cancer hazard index for acrolein. However, the environmentally superior Reduced Project Alternative would eliminate the significant and unavoidable impacts of construction-related regional emissions of VOC, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$, as

well as greenhouse gas emissions, and would serve to incrementally reduce significant impacts of the proposed Project related to construction-related emissions of CO and NO_X, construction traffic impacts, and the acute non-cancer hazard index for acrolein.

For the reasons summarized above, in examining the totality of the environmental impacts associated with Alternative 2 – Reduced Project compared to the overall environmental impacts of each of the other alternatives, Alternative 2 – Reduce Project is considered to be the environmentally superior alternative.

1.7 Areas of Known Controversy and Issues to be Resolved

Several letters were received during the public circulation period for the Initial Study/NOP prepared for this EIR; no comments were received at the Public Scoping Meeting held on February 21, 2013. The primary environmental concerns associated with the proposed MSC North Project and future phase(s) of the MSC Program that were raised are summarized below. The NOP comments are included in **Appendix A** of this EIR.

Noise

Concern was raised regarding the potential for noise to have an impact on residential and other sensitive receptors in the vicinity of LAX as a result of operations of the proposed MSC North Project. Specific noise concerns focused on taxiing aircraft to and from the MSC site. A detailed analysis of potential noise impacts is included as part of this EIR in Section 4.4, *Noise*.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Concern was raised regarding potential contaminants and other hazards and hazardous materials located at the MSC site that could pose a risk to the public and the environment with implementation of the proposed MSC North Project. As noted in the Initial Study, a Phase I environmental site assessment[3] was conducted to determine the potential for the presence of hazardous materials contamination of soil and/or groundwater at the MSC site. While the site assessment did not identify any specific hazardous waste sites within the MSC Project site, areas of potential concern during the proposed construction were identified. Mitigation measures contained in the LAX Master Plan Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP) will be employed to mitigate any hazardous waste that may be encountered during construction. Therefore, further analysis of hazards and hazardous materials is not necessary and was not performed.

Transportation

Concern was raised regarding the proposed MSC North Project and the future phase(s) of the MSC Program and its potential to result in individual or cumulative traffic impacts on the existing circulation system and surrounding communities. Potential impacts associated with construction traffic are analyzed in Section 4.7, *Construction Surface Transportation*. The future

[3] Ninyo & Moore, Hazardous Materials Assessment, Midfield Satellite Concourse, Los Angeles International Airport, Los Angeles, California, February 4, 2013.

operation of the MSC North Project would not result in long-term operational changes to traffic activity and traffic flows within the Airport area because it would not change the number of aircraft operations or where aircraft passengers are dropped off or picked up at LAX, therefore it is not studied in this EIR. However, trips associated with operation of the future phase(s) of the MSC Program are analyzed at a program level in this EIR since the LAX Master Plan EIR assumed that no private vehicles would circulate through the CTA. A detailed analysis for transportation related to the future phase(s) of the MSC Program is included as part of this EIR in Section 4.6, *On-Airport Transportation*.

Cumulative Impacts

Comments were provided that emphasized the need for the EIR to study cumulative impacts from the proposed Project. Therefore, cumulative impacts for the MSC North Project and future phase(s) of the MSC Program are discussed relative to each resource topic and are included in each section of Chapter 4.

Relationship to the LAX Master Plan

Concern was raised regarding the relationship of the MSC North Project to components identified in the LAX Master Plan, including the type, location, and size of facilities associated with the proposed MSC North Project compared to the proposed LAX Master Plan improvements. A description of the type, location, and size of facilities associated with the proposed MSC North Project is included in Chapter 2, *Description of the Proposed Project*. An evaluation of the proposed MSC North Project and its consistency with applicable plans, including the LAX Master Plan, is included in Chapter 3, *Overview of Project Setting*.

This page left intentionally blank