
1. INTRODUCTION AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document is a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Terminals 2 and 3 (T2/T3) Modernization Project 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. Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) is a proprietary 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 - Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Title 14, Section 15000 et seq.).

A Notice of Preparation and Initial Study, included as Appendix A of this Draft EIR, was circulated for public review from August 11, 2016 to September 9, 2016. During the public review period, LAWA held a public Scoping Meeting on August 24, 2016, at Los Angeles Fire Station #5 at 8900 South Emerson Avenue. The meeting was staffed by LAWA and consultants on the proposed project, and was organized in an open house format, with information on the proposed project and the CEQA process available and on display. The primary purpose of the meeting was to receive public comments regarding the scope and content of the environmental information to be included in the Draft EIR.

The Initial Study identified the resource areas that could be subject to significant impacts from the proposed project. Based on the analysis in the Initial Study, LAWA determined that the proposed project would have the potential to result in potentially significant construction-related air quality and associated human health risk, cultural resources (archaeological resources, paleontological resources, tribal cultural resources, and human remains), greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and surface transportation impacts, as well as operational energy-related air quality and GHG emissions, and potentially having impacts discussed in the Mandatory Findings of Significance (cumulative impacts and substantial adverse impacts on human beings from construction-related air quality, GHG emissions, and surface transportation impacts, and operational energy-related air quality and GHG emissions). As a result, these resources are evaluated further in this Draft EIR.

LAWA determined that impacts related to aesthetics, agriculture and forestry resources, air quality (aircraft and transportation operations and odor), biological resources, cultural resources (historic resources), geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation/traffic (operations), and utilities and service systems would be less than significant through the analysis in the Initial Study; therefore, these topics are not analyzed further in this Draft EIR (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 for this Draft EIR.

1.1 Project Objectives

LAWA proposes improvements to existing T2 and T3 at LAX. The underlying purposes of improvements to the facilities at T2 and T3 are to provide improved security, passenger experience, operations, convenience, and quality of service. The specific objectives of the proposed project are to:

- ◆ Meet Transportation Security Administration (TSA) and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) requirements for security and customs screening and provide flexible space for next generation passenger and baggage security screening functions to improve safety and security;
- ◆ Modernize and revitalize existing T2 and T3 in order to improve passenger level of service and amenities within the terminals and improve building systems, as has been previously done for other terminals within the CTA;
- ◆ Coordinate improvements to the aircraft apron areas (e.g., aircraft parking positions, passenger boarding bridge locations, aircraft fueling system hydrant locations, ground support equipment parking locations) at T2 and T3 to be compatible with proposed changes to the T2 and T3 buildings and anticipated airline fleets and uses;

1. Introduction and Executive Summary

- ◆ Enhance the interior and exterior of the terminals to benefit the overall appearance of the CTA;
- ◆ Provide a secure connector between T2 and T3 to allow passengers to connect from one terminal to the other without having to exit to the non-secure side of the terminal, and only go through security once; and
- ◆ Provide for improvements within each terminal (T2 and T3) that are common to the functions and operations of both terminals and therefore can be shared between terminals, which, in turn, would improve operational efficiency and flexibility, as well as enhance the quality of customer service by reducing redundancies in passenger and baggage processing by providing facilities that support multiple terminals, when feasible.

1.2 Summary of Proposed Project

The proposed project includes:

- ◆ Upgrading the T2 concourse, including construction of additional floor area;
- ◆ Demolition and reconstruction of the T3 concourse building to provide additional concourse area, including a new operation control center; the demolition of the southern appendages of the T3 satellite;
- ◆ Reconfiguring existing passenger gate positions within the existing terminal linear frontage for a total of 27 passenger gate positions at T2/T3;
- ◆ Demolition and reconstruction of the passenger and baggage processing facilities (ticketing buildings – T2.5 and T3.5) associated with T2 and T3, including new facilities for passenger and baggage screening, ticketing, and baggage claim (which will reduce redundancies in passenger and baggage processing by providing facilities that support multiple terminals); and a secure connector (i.e., an enclosed/controlled passenger corridor) between T2 and T3; and
- ◆ Apron improvements, specifically the replacement/resurfacing, restriping, and relocation of fuel pits.

In total, approximately 832,000 square feet of new building space would be added to the two terminals, for a total square footage of approximately 1,620,010 square feet.

The proposed project would be completed in stages and take approximately 76 months (six years and four months) to construct. Construction could commence as early as fourth quarter 2017 and is projected to end in late-2023.

In addition, as discussed in Section III.a-d of the Initial Study (included in Appendix A of this EIR), implementation of the proposed project would not result in a change to air traffic procedures for airspace route and runway assignment or routing of aircraft between the runways and their parking position. Federal Aviation Administration air traffic control would continue to allocate runway assignment in order to balance runway use and maximize the efficiency of the airport. For additional details regarding operations, refer to Section 2.6 in Chapter 2, *Project Description*.

1.3 Purpose of this EIR

Since the Initial Study determined that the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment, CEQA requires the preparation of this Draft EIR. LAWA has undertaken this Draft EIR for the following purposes:

- ◆ To evaluate the potentially significant environmental effects associated with the implementation of the proposed project, 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 project that would attain most of the project objectives or eliminate any significant adverse environmental impacts or substantially lessen any of the significant effects;

1. Introduction and Executive Summary

- ◆ To inform the general public, the local community, and responsible trustee, State, and federal agencies of the nature of the proposed project, 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 project and make findings regarding each significant effect that is identified; and
- ◆ To facilitate any responsible agencies in issuing permits and approvals for the proposed project.

LAWA must certify the EIR before approving the proposed project. Upon certification, LAWA, as well as any responsible agencies, will then use the EIR to decide whether to approve and implement the proposed project. Other agencies may also use this EIR in their review and approval processes.

This Draft 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 EIR

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

Chapter 1 – Introduction and Executive Summary

This chapter provides a summary of the proposed project, CEQA compliance requirements, an overview of the report organization, and a discussion of areas of known controversy and issues to be resolved. Also included is a summary of the environmental analysis and identification of the environmentally superior alternative.

Chapter 2 – Project Description

This chapter presents the location of the proposed project, the objectives of the proposed project, and a description of the components and construction schedule of the proposed project. In addition, Chapter 2 identifies the intended use of the EIR and the approvals required for implementation of the proposed project.

Chapter 3 – Overview of Project Setting

This chapter provides an overview of the existing environmental setting related to the proposed project area, and the topical issues evaluated in Chapter 4, *Environmental Impacts Analysis*, of this EIR. This chapter also describes other projects proposed in the nearby area that may, in conjunction with the proposed project, result in cumulative impacts on that existing setting.

Chapter 4 – Environmental Impact Analysis

The introductory section of Chapter 4 describes the analytical framework for the environmental review of the proposed project. The remaining sections of the chapter provide detailed analysis of the potential construction-related environmental impacts of the proposed project on air quality (including human health risk and energy from operations), cultural resources (archaeological resources, paleontological resources, tribal cultural resources, and human remains), GHG emissions (including energy from operations), and surface transportation.

1. Introduction and Executive Summary

Chapter 5 – Alternatives

This chapter provides a description and evaluation of project alternatives that could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the proposed project while avoiding or substantially reducing any of the significant effects of the proposed project identified in Chapter 4, *Environmental Impact Analysis*, in this EIR. This chapter also identifies alternatives that were considered but rejected from further consideration, and explains why they were rejected.

Chapter 6 – Other Environmental Considerations

This chapter includes a discussion of issues required by CEQA that are not covered in Chapter 4. This includes growth-inducing impacts, irreversible environmental changes, and identification of unavoidable significant impacts (i.e., impacts that cannot be mitigated to a level less than significant) that would be caused by the proposed project, as well as the impacts of the proposed project determined to be less than significant with mitigation, and less than significant. This chapter also includes information about the proposed project's energy consumption and energy efficiency measures. 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).

Chapter 7 – List of Preparers, Parties to Whom Sent, List of References, Notice of Preparation and Scoping Meeting Comments, and List of Acronyms

This chapter provides the following: a list of the individuals from LAWA 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 the bibliography of documents used in the preparation of this EIR; a list of agencies, organizations and individuals who provided comments on the Notice of Preparation/Initial Study and at the public scoping meeting; and a list of acronyms used in this Draft EIR.

All documents listed in the Section 7.3, List of References, of Chapter 7 are available for public inspection at the following location:

Los Angeles World Airports
One World Way, Room 218
Los Angeles, CA 90045

Detailed construction emission calculation spreadsheets and modeling input and output files associated with the LAX T2/T3 Modernization Project Draft EIR construction air quality analysis are voluminous and technical in nature and are therefore not provided in their entirety in hard-copy form in Appendix B of this Draft EIR. These air quality data files are available for review, as electronic files, at the above address.

Appendices

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

- Appendix A** – Notice of Preparation, Initial Study and Distribution List, Scoping Meeting Materials, Notice of Preparation and Scoping Meeting Comments
- Appendix B** – Air Quality, Human Health Risk Assessment, and Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Appendix C** – Archaeological and Paleontological Resources Assessment For The Proposed Landside Transportation Program at Los Angeles International Airport; City of Los Angeles, California
- Appendix D** – Construction Surface Transportation
- Appendix E** – Energy Conservation

1.5 Airport Terminology

Following are definitions for airport terminology used throughout this EIR:

Aircraft Parking Limit Line - A line established by the FAA beyond which no part of a parked aircraft may protrude.

Airside - Areas of the airport that are restricted with access only to authorized personnel and ticketed passengers that have undergone security screening; airside areas include passenger handling facilities, runways, taxiways, apron areas, and airport service roads.

Apron – Areas where aircraft are parked, unloaded or loaded, refueled, or boarded. Also called the “ramp”.

Central Terminal Area (CTA) - The main passenger accessible features of the airport that consists of terminals and parking facilities/structures encircled by a roadway system.

Concessions – Food/beverage, retail, and other passenger service businesses.

Concourse - The portion of the terminal closest to the airfield, which consists of passenger holdrooms, concessions, and operations support.

Federal Inspection Services (FIS) Facility – A station for the processing (i.e., screening/inspection) international air commerce passengers, crew, their baggage and effects arriving from, or departing to, foreign countries.

Holdrooms – Passenger seating/waiting areas within a concourse.

Landside - Areas of the airport that are accessible to the public and include roadway networks, parking lots, rental car operations, and public transportation facilities.

Operation Control Center – A facility at the top of a concourse used by airport staff to coordinate aircraft arrivals at, and push-back from, the individual gates on concourses and coordinate aircraft movements on the alleyways adjacent to the concourses. An operation control center works in conjunction with the FAA's airport traffic control tower (ATCT) in managing the movement of aircraft on the airfield.

Satellite –The oval building at the end of the existing LAX Terminal 3 concourse.

Secure Connector - An enclosed/controlled passenger corridor.

Secured Area - An area within a terminal building to which access is controlled by the inspection of persons and property under federal law.

Terminal - Building at an airport where passengers transfer between ground transportation and the facilities that allow them to board and disembark from aircraft. Terminals at LAX include a ticketing building and a concourse.

Ticketing Building – The portion of the terminal closest to the CTA roadway (World Way), consisting of functions such as ticketing/passenger check-in, passenger security screening, checked-bag screening, baggage claim, and operations support.

1.6 Executive Summary of Environmental Impacts

Table 1-1 summarizes the environmental impacts from construction-related activities of the proposed project to air quality (including human health risks and energy from operations), cultural resources (archaeological resources, paleontological resources, tribal cultural resources, and human remains), GHG emissions (including energy from operations), and surface transportation as identified in Chapter 4, *Environmental Impacts Analysis*, of this EIR. It also summarizes the energy impacts discussed in Chapter 6, *Other Environmental Considerations*. In accordance with the requirements of the State CEQA Guidelines, and as further described in Chapter 6, impacts on all other environmental topics addressed in the Initial Study, including aesthetics, agriculture and forestry resources, air quality (odor), biological resources, cultural resources (historic resources), geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation/traffic (operations), and utilities and

1. Introduction and Executive Summary

service systems, were determined to be less than significant in the Initial Study prepared for the proposed project. The Notice of Preparation/Initial Study is included as Appendix A of this EIR.

1.7 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 project evaluated in detail in the Draft EIR are:

- ◆ **Alternative 1: No Project – No Build:** Under Alternative 1, none of the proposed improvements under the proposed project would occur. The project site would retain the existing physical conditions and the existing terminals would continue to operate as they do today, with future projected passenger growth occurring. The project site is currently developed with approximately 788,018 square feet of existing structures (not including the apron area) which would remain. Further, under Alternative 1, no new infrastructure or other site improvements at T2 and T3 would occur.
- ◆ **Alternative 2: No Project – Limited Interior Improvements Only:** Under Alternative 2, the airline terminal operations would continue and T2 and T3 would undergo improvements reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the proposed project is not approved. Such improvements could include updating the interior infrastructure (i.e., minor amounts of interior and building system renovations) and tenant improvements (i.e., signage, wiring for technology, modifications to layout of holding areas, etc.), all within the existing building footprints. To the extent that remodeling of interior spaces could occur to accommodate changes in security requirements, this would be expected to occur under this alternative. The amount of square footage at the project site would remain at 788,018 square feet (not including the apron area).
- ◆ **Alternative 3: Reduced-Scale Project:** Under Alternative 3, only certain elements of the proposed project would be implemented, resulting in a reduced-scale project. In particular, Alternative 3 would modernize T3, including updates to the interior and exterior of the terminal, the building systems, and some enhancements to amenities and operations within the terminal; however, only very limited improvements would be made at T2. The following elements that are included in the proposed project would be implemented under Alternative 3:
 - ◆ The T3 existing ticketing building would be completely demolished and rebuilt. The new ticketing building would be constructed in the existing area of the T3 ticketing building, and would extend towards the Tom Bradley International Terminal (TBIT) in the paved open area to the southwest of T3. Additionally, the eastern portion of the existing T3 ticketing building would be extended into the western portion of the T2 existing ticketing building.
 - ◆ The T3 existing concourse building would be completely demolished and rebuilt. The southern appendages to the T3 satellite would be demolished. The new T3 concourse would be wider than the existing concourse.
 - ◆ The Security Screening Checkpoint at T3 would be reconfigured in the new space created by reconstructing the ticketing building and concourse.
 - ◆ A Secure T2/T3 Connector would be built to connect the concourses; however, the design of this connector under Alternative 3 would eliminate the office level at the T2 ticketing building.
 - ◆ The T2 FIS would be renovated (interior renovation only).

As the Alternative 3 elements focus primarily on T3 (the oldest of the two terminals), as well as providing security and customs screening to improve safety and security, the elements that are included in the proposed project but would not be implemented under Alternative 3 are as follows:

- ◆ Demolishing and rebuilding the T2 ticketing building (and the associated additional square footage)
- ◆ T2 apron work and passenger boarding bridges

1. Introduction and Executive Summary

- ◆ T3 Control Center
- ◆ Consolidated Checked Baggage Inspection Systems (CBIS) for T2 and T3
- ◆ Consolidated SSCP for T2 and T3

Based on the analysis in Chapter 4, *Environmental Impact Analysis*, and Chapter 5, *Alternatives*, the ‘No Project – No Build Alternative’ (Alternative 1) is considered to be the environmentally superior alternative as it would avoid all construction and operation impacts of the proposed project. However, the No Project – No Build Alternative would not meet any of the objectives of the proposed project, which are identified in Section 1.1, Project Objectives, above, and in Chapter 2, *Project Description*. Additionally, Alternative 2: No Project – Limited Interior Improvements would be environmentally superior to the proposed project through the reduction in construction-related air quality and surface transportation impacts, as further described in Chapter 5, *Alternatives*.

Although Alternative 2: No Project – Limited Interior Improvements Only would result in slightly greater environmental impacts compared to Alternative 1 because it would include some construction activities, it would also avoid significant and unavoidable impacts associated with air quality and avoid making a cumulatively considerable construction-related traffic impact, as well as lessen the impacts to GHG emissions, human health risk, cultural resources, and operational energy (associated with air quality and GHG). However, because Alternative 2 would have limited construction and reduced building space, energy impacts would be less than the proposed project. Because of the limited amount of modernization that could occur under Alternative 2, the terminals would not comply with current state water and energy efficiency standards and regulations; therefore, energy conservation would be less when compared to the proposed project. As only limited interior improvements would occur,

Alternative 2 would not result in improvements to safety and security to meet long-term TSA and CBP security and customs screening (such as space enough to provide next generation passenger and baggage security screening functions), nor the modernization of T2 and T3 and no improvements to the aircraft apron areas (e.g., aircraft parking positions, passenger boarding bridge locations, aircraft fueling system hydrant locations, ground support equipment parking locations). Minimal improvements in level of service, amenities, and building systems would not be sufficient to significantly upgrade the building and building systems. In addition, no exterior improvements would occur, and no benefit to the overall appearance of the CTA would occur. Finally, under Alternative 2 there would be no opportunity to provide a secure connector between T2 and T3 nor would there be the opportunity for shared functions between the two terminals. Therefore, Alternative 2 would not meet the project objectives.

In accordance with the State CEQA Guidelines requirement to identify an environmentally superior alternative other than the No Project alternative, Alternative 3 – Reduced-Scale Project has been identified as the environmentally superior alternative. Due to the reduced project size and shorter construction period, compared to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would result in a reduction in overall duration of construction-related air pollutant emissions, although daily peak NO_x emissions would still be significant and unavoidable, and reduced construction-related impacts to human health risks, GHG emissions, cultural resources, construction surface transportation, and operational energy (associated with air quality and GHG). There would still be a cumulatively considerable construction-related traffic impact. Alternative 3 would involve less construction and less building space than the proposed project; therefore, energy impacts would be less than the proposed project. Alternative 3 would also involve less modernization; therefore, energy conservation would be less when compared to the proposed project.

It is important to note, while Alternative 3 is considered the environmentally superior alternative, it would only lessen the significant impacts of the proposed project, but would not avoid the significant unavoidable impact that would occur under the proposed project with respect to construction-related regional NO_x emissions and with respect to making a cumulatively considerable traffic impact. Thus, the environmentally superior Alternative 3 would not eliminate any significant and unavoidable impacts.

While Alternative 3: Reduced-Scale Project is considered the environmentally superior alternative, it would not fully meet five of the six project objectives. It would meet the objective to provide a secure connector between T2 and T3. It would partially meet the objective to provide for TSA and CBP requirements for security and customs screening and increase the amount of flexible space for next generation passenger and baggage security

1. Introduction and Executive Summary

screening functions, as it would provide 45,000 square feet of SSCP/Office space for security in T3, as is also the case for the proposed project; however, the amount of SSCP/Office area for security in T2 would be over 70 percent less under Alternative 3 than it would be under the proposed project and the amount of FIS area in T2 would be approximately 13 percent less under Alternative 3. Only improvements to the aircraft apron area (e.g., aircraft parking positions, passenger boarding bridge locations, aircraft fueling system hydrant locations, ground support equipment parking locations) at T3 would occur, with no such improvements at T2. Although Alternative 3 would enhance the interior and exterior of T3, it would only partially meet the objective to enhance the interior and exterior of the terminals to the benefit of the overall appearance of the CTA as the exterior of T2 would remain unimproved. It would not meet the objective to provide improvements and functions that can be shared between terminal to improve the operational efficiency and flexibility, as well as enhance customer service.

Therefore, although the Reduced-Scale Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, it would not avoid or substantially lessen the significant cumulative traffic impact. Furthermore, the Reduced-Scale Project Alternative would not fully meet most of the objectives of the proposed project, including fully satisfying TSA and CBP security requirements, modernizing T2 and T3 and associated apron area while improving the level of service and amenities, and improving building systems, as has been previously done for other terminals within the CTA.

1.8 Areas of Known Controversy and Issues to be Resolved

Several letters were received during the public circulation period for the Initial Study/Notice of Preparation prepared for this EIR and comments were also received at the public scoping meeting held on August 24, 2016. The primary environmental concerns associated with the proposed project that were raised are summarized below. The Notice of Preparation comments are included in Appendix A of this EIR.

Air Quality

General issues were raised regarding potential air quality impacts on nearby communities and sensitive receptors related to construction of the proposed project as well as cumulative effects. Potential impacts associated with air quality due to construction of the proposed project are addressed in Section 4.1, *Air Quality and Human Health Risk*.

Transportation/Traffic

Issues were raised regarding the proposed project and its potential to result in individual or cumulative traffic impacts on the off-airport circulation system during construction activities. Potential impacts associated with construction traffic are analyzed in Section 4.4, *Construction Surface Transportation*.

1. Introduction and Executive Summary

**Table 1-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts Related to the Proposed Project**

Resource Category	Impact Before Mitigation	Proposed Mitigation Measures/Standard Control Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Air Quality and Human Health Risk			
Air Quality - Construction	Significant	LAX-AQ-1. Construction-Related Air Quality Control Measures and MM-AQ (T2/T3)-1 – Preferential Use of Renewable Diesel Fuel.	Regional emissions of NO _x - Significant and Unavoidable Local emissions of NO ₂ – Less Than Significant
Air Quality - Cumulative Construction	Significant	LAX-AQ-1 and MM-AQ (T2/T3)-1	Significant and Unavoidable (NO _x)
Human Health Risk Assessment - Construction	Less Than Significant	None Required However, further reduced with implementation of LAX-AQ-1 and MM-AQ (T2/T3)-1	Less Than Significant
Human Health Risk Assessment - Cumulative Construction	Less Than Significant	None Required However, further reduced with implementation of LAX-AQ-1 and MM-AQ (T2/T3)-1	Less Than Significant
Air Quality – Operations (energy usage)	Less Than Significant	None Required	Less Than Significant
Cultural Resources			
Archaeological Resources	Potentially Significant	LAX-AR-1. Conformance with LAWA’s Archaeological Treatment Plan and LAX-AR-2. Archaeological Resources Construction Personnel Briefing	Less Than Significant
Paleontological Resources	Potentially Significant	LAX-PR-1. Conformance with LAWA’s Paleontological Management Treatment Plan and LAX-PR-2. Paleontological Resources Construction Personnel Briefing	Less Than Significant
Tribal Cultural Resources	Less Than Significant	None Required However, further reduced with implementation of LAX-AR-1 and LAX-AR-2	Less Than Significant
Human Remains	Less Than Significant	None Required	Less Than Significant

1. Introduction and Executive Summary

**Table 1-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts Related to the Proposed Project**

Resource Category	Impact Before Mitigation	Proposed Mitigation Measures/Standard Control Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
Construction	Less Than Significant	None Required However, further reduced with implementation of Air Quality measures LAX-AQ-1 and MM-AQ (T2/T3)-1	Less Than Significant
Operation (energy usage)	Less Than Significant	None Required	Less Than Significant
Construction Surface Transportation			
Construction	Less Than Significant	None Required However, further reduced with implementation of LAX-ST-1. Construction Traffic Management Plan	Less Than Significant
Cumulative Construction	Significant (Intersections #5 and #14)	LAX-ST-1; No additional feasible mitigation is available	Significant and Unavoidable (Intersections #5 and #14)
Energy Impacts And Conservation (Construction and Operation)			
Wasteful, Inefficient or Unnecessary Consumption	Less Than Significant	None Required However, further reduced during construction with implementation of LAX-AQ-1 and MM-AQ (T2/T3)-1	Less Than Significant
Reliance on Fossil Fuels	Less Than Significant	None Required However, further reduced during construction with implementation of LAX-AQ-1 and MM-AQ (T2/T3)-1	Less Than Significant
Source: CDM Smith, 2016			