
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

FOR THE DEMOLITION ASSOCIATED WITH AND THE

CONSTRUCTION OF THE

LOGISTICS OPERATIONS RESOURCE CENTER

LOS ANGELES AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA

Project Number ACJP492021

FEBRUARY 13, 2006

**Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence
3300 Sidney Brooks
Brooks City-Base, Texas 78235-5112**

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE 13 FEB 2006		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2006 to 00-00-2006	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Environmental Assessment for the Demolition Associated with and the Construction of the Logistics Operations Resource Center Los Angeles Air Force Base, California				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Shaw Environmental Inc,1401 Enclave Parkway #250,Houston,TX,77077				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Same as Report (SAR)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 48	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
ACJP492021 DEMOLITION ASSOCIATED WITH AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE
LOGISTICS OPERATIONS RESOURCE CENTER

Agency: Los Angeles Air Force Base, U.S. Department of the Air Force

Background: This document has been prepared to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended (42 U.S. Code [U.S.C.] 4321, et seq.), the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Parts 1500 - 1508), and Air Force policy and procedures (32 CFR Part 989). The United States Air Force (USAF) has prepared this Environmental Assessment (EA) to examine the potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed demolition of three buildings (Buildings 212, 219, and 220) and construction within that location (approximately 2.3 acres) of a new, steel-frame, 65,792 square foot (sf) Logistics Operations Resource Center (LORC) with parking. The project site is located within Area B of the Los Angeles Air Force Base (LAAFB) in El Segundo, California. This EA, in addition to this proposed action, reviewed the environmental impacts of an alternative action and a "no action" alternative. This Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) summarizes the results of the evaluations of the Proposed Action and the alternatives. The discussion focuses on activities that have the potential to change both the natural and human environments.

Proposed Action and No Action Alternative: The EA, hereby incorporated by reference, assesses the environmental impacts associated with the demolition of three buildings on the 2.3-acre site, and the construction of a new 65,792 sf building with parking on the same site. An alternative analyzed was the "no action" alternative. The Air Force determined that implementing the "no action" alternative would mean that the critical need for a LORC would not be filled and that the three buildings currently on the site would be demolished (in any event) because they are obsolete and do not meet standards.

Demolition, construction, and operational activities associated with the Proposed Action will affect the existing environment. However, because the existing environment is already urbanized and part of the existing Los Angeles Air Force Base, the impacts would not be significant. Demolition and construction will create temporary impacts, primarily traffic, dust, and noise. These impacts were evaluated and found to be minor, and subject to standard dust and noise controls, such as wetting down the disturbed area, and working within normal work day hours. Construction traffic would also be subject to traffic controls that the contractor would put into place if needed. When the LORC is in operation, the facility will provide a location that will be consistent with other activities around the site and within the Los Angeles Air Force Base. The primary beneficial effects from the operation of the Proposed Action is that the LORC will be housed in one building, the building will be energy efficient, provide for better safety and occupation health conditions, have greater security, meet present-day building standards, will have hazardous materials and waste storage and management, and will have acoustical qualities appropriate for a working environment.

The potential environmental impacts evaluated are: aesthetics and views, air quality, airspace, biological resources, cultural resources, geological and soil conditions, hazardous materials/waste, hydrology/water quality, land use, noise, public services/utilities, socio economic considerations, and transportation/traffic.

The majority of the environmental impacts of the Proposed Action would occur within the boundary of the Los Angeles Air Force Base and would neither have an impact on low-income or minority populations, nor constitute a disproportionate impact to low income or minority populations in Los Angeles County. Therefore, there would be no environmental justice impacts associated with the Proposed Action.

There are no direct, or cumulative impacts associated with the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action, along with other projects planned for the Los Angeles Air Force Base (identified in their General Plan), will not create any cumulatively significant impacts on the environment.

There are no adverse, unavoidable impacts associated with the implementation of the Proposed Action.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Based on my review of the facts and analyses contained in the attached Environmental Assessment, I conclude that implementation of the Proposed Action will not have a significant environmental impact, either by itself or cumulatively with other projects at the Los Angeles Air Force Base. Accordingly, the requirements of NEPA, the regulations promulgated by the Council on Environmental Quality and 32 CFR Part 989 are fulfilled and an Environmental Impact Statement is not required. A Notice of Availability for public review was published in the local newspaper. The signing of this Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) completes the Air Force's environmental impact analysis process.



JOSEPH M. CODISPOTI, Col, USAF
Commander

9 Mar 06

Date

Attachment: Environmental Assessment

PUBLIC NOTICE

In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, the Los Angeles Air Force Base announces the availability of the Environmental Assessment and draft Finding of No Significant Impact for the "Demolition Associated with and the Construction of the Logistics Operations Resource Center at the Los Angeles Air Force Base, California," for public review.

The Proposed Action of the Construction of the Logistics Operations Resource Center and the associated demolition is to replace the existing Center's operations in one location within a larger, modern, and energy efficient building. The United States Air Force has prepared this Environmental Assessment to examine the potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed demolition of three buildings and construction within that location (about 2.3 acres) a new, steel-frame, 65,792 square foot Logistics Operations Resource Center with parking. The project site is located within Area B of the Los Angeles Air Force Base in El Segundo, California.

Copies of the Environmental Assessment and draft Finding of No Significant Impact can be reviewed at the El Segundo Public Library at 111 West Mariposa Avenue, El Segundo, California, telephone (310) 524-2722.

Copies will be available for review from December 22, 2005 through January 23, 2006. Agencies and the public are invited to provide written comments on issues or concerns they might have with these proposed actions. Comments must be received by (date) to be considered.

For more information or to comment on this proposed action, contact: Claude Youssafzadeh, Environmental Operations Manager at (310) 363-1382.

Note:

No letters, comments, and/or inquiries were made on the EA during the public review period.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

COVER SHEET
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
ACJP492021 DEMOLITION ASSOCIATED WITH AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE
LOGISTICS OPERATIONS RESOURCE CENTER

- a. Responsible Agency: Department of the Air Force
- b. Proposed Action: Project Number ACJP492021 Demolition Associated with and Construction of the Logistics Operations Resource Center
- c. Written comments and inquiries regarding this document should be directed to:

Claude Youssafzadeh,
Job Title - Environmental Operations Manager
2420 Vela Way Ste 1467
El Segundo, Ca 90245
Ph 310 653-5496

- d. Report Designation: Environmental Assessment (EA).
- e. Abstract: The purpose of the Proposed Action is to construct the Logistics Operations Resource Center at the Los Angeles Air Force Base, in El Segundo, California. This EA analyzes the potential environmental effects that could be generated from: demolition of three existing buildings (212, 219, & 220) and the subsequent construction and operation within that location (approximately 2.3 acres) of a new, steel-frame, 65,792 square foot (sf) Logistics Operations Resource Center (LORC) with parking within Area B of the Base.

The scope of this EA focuses on the examination of impacts to environmental resources that may result from demolition, construction and operational activities associated with the Proposed Action or Alternatives. The potential environmental impacts evaluated are: aesthetics and views, air quality, airspace, biological resources, cultural resources, geological and soil conditions, hazardous materials/waste, hydrology/water quality, land use, noise, public services/utilities, socio economic considerations, and transportation/traffic. After each environmental category of impact was reviewed, the Air Force determined that the proposed action would not have a significant impact on the

environment. A summary table of impacts is provided below. Therefore, a Finding of No Significant Impact is appropriate.

SUMMARY TABLE OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS			
	Summary Analysis	Detailed Analysis	Determination
Aesthetics and Views	X		Aesthetics and views would be minimally affected because of the existing flat terrain and because no scenic view or views would be affected.
Air Quality		X	Temporary (short term) construction impacts that will be controlled by using water and/or wetting agents to control dust.
Airspace	X		No aircrafts operate at LAAFB, thus no impacts foreseen.
Biological Resources	X		Area is highly urbanized and does not provide suitable natural habitat for endangered/special species.
Cultural Resources	X		Based on existing cultural resources information, cultural resources will not be affected.
Geological and Soil Conditions		X	Natural methane gas would not create significant impacts.
Hazardous Materials/Waste	X		No impacts foreseen because little hazardous materials/wastes be will on the site, and if they are, they will be properly stored and disposed of.
Hydrology/Water Quality	X		No impacts are anticipated to occur to the hydrology and water quality. Drainage and sewage disposal will utilize existing collection and treatment systems.
Land Use	X		Land use will be similar to the existing land use and consistent with the LAAFB's General Plan.
Noise		X	Temporary (short term) construction impacts are not significant because noise will be limited to normal daytime work hours.
Public Service/Utilities	X		Existing public service/utilities will be available and utilized.
Socio Economic Considerations	X		Some temporary jobs will occur; however, given the large population of the area and the number of temporary jobs and monies entering the area, this would result in a very small impact.
Environmental Justice	X		No environmental justice issues were found.
Transportation/Traffic	X		The short-term impact will result in increasing vehicles to a very small percentage and permanent employment within LAAFB should remain the same.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	
Section 1: Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action.....	1
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 PURPOSE AND NEED	1
1.2 LOCATION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION	2
1.3 SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW	2
1.3.1 Aesthetics and Views	3
1.3.2 Air Quality	3
1.3.3 Airspace.....	3
1.3.4 Biological Resources	4
1.3.5 Cultural Resources.....	4
1.3.6 Geological And Soil Conditions	4
1.3.7 Hazardous Materials/Waste.....	4
1.3.7.1 Storage Tanks.....	5
1.3.7.2 Asbestos	5
1.3.7.3 Lead-Based Paint.....	5
1.3.7.4 Pestic ide Usage.....	6
1.3.7.5 Polyvinyl Chlorinate Biphenol (PCB)	6
1.3.7.6 Radon.....	6
1.3.7.7 Medical/Biohazardous Waste.....	6
1.3.7.8 Ordanance.....	6
1.3.7.9 Installation Restoration Program.....	6
1.3.8 Hydrology/Water Quality.....	7
1.3.9 Land Use	7
1.3.10 Noise.....	7
1.3.11 Public Service/Utilities	7
1.3.12 Socioeconomic Considerations.....	8
1.3.13 Environmental Justice.....	8
1.3.14 Transportation/Traffic	8
Section 2: Description of Proposed Actions and Alternatives (DOPAA).....	10
2.0 INTRODUCTION	10
2.1 BACKGROUND	10
2.2 LOCATION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION	11
2.3 KEY ENVIRONMENTAL AREA S OF CONCERN	14
2.3 1 Air Quality	14
2.3 2 Geological and Soil Conditions	14
2.3.3 Hazardous Materials and Waste	15
2.3.4 Water Resources	15
2.3.5 Noise	15
2.4 ENVIRONMENTAL AREA MINIMALLY AFFECTED.....	15
2.5 NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE.....	15
Section 3: Affected Environment.....	17
3.0 INTRODUCTION	17
3.1 AIR QUALITY	17
3.2 GEOLOGICAL AND SOIL CONDITIONS	19
3.3 NOISE	20
Section 4: Environmental Consequences.....	23
4.0 INTRODUCTION	23
4.1 AIR QUALITY	24
4.1.1 Significant Criteria	24
4.1.2 Estimated Proposed Action Air Quality Impacts	24

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)**PAGE**

4.1.3 Cumulative Impacts	25
4.1.4 Long Term Impacts	25
4.1.5 Estimated Impacts Under the "No Action" Alternative	25
4.2 GEOLOGICAL AND SOIL CONDITIONS METHANE	26
4.2.1 Significant Criteria	26
4.2.2 Estimated Proposed Action Methane Impacts	26
4.2.3 Relevant Control Measure.....	26
4.2.4 Estimate Impacts Under the "No Action" Alternative.....	27
4.2.5 Cumulative Impacts	27
4.2.6 Long Term Impacts	27
4.3 NOISE.....	27
4.3.1 Significant Criteria	27
4.3.1.1 U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Requirements	28
4.3.2 Estimated Impact of Proposed Action.....	28
4.3.3 Relevant Control Measures	30
4.3.4 Estimate Impacts Under the "No Action" Alternative.....	30
4.3.5 Cumulative Impacts	30
4.3.6 Long Term Impacts	31
4.4 IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES	31
4.5 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SHORT TERM USES OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND LONGTERM PRODUCTIVITY	31
Section 5: Preparers and Contributors	32
Section 6: Distribution List.....	33
Section 7: References.....	34

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1.2.1 REGIONAL MAP

FIGURE 1.2.2 LOGISTICS OPERATIONS RESOURCE CENTER (LORC) LOCATION MAP

FIGURE 1.2.3 EXISTING SITE USES PROPOSED LORC SITE, LAAFB

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 3.1.1 NATIONAL AND CALIFORNIA AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS

TABLE 3.1.2 SOUTH COAST AIR BASIN DE MINIMIS THRESHOLDS

TABLE 3.1.3 SOUTH COAST AIR BASIN 2003 ESTIMATED ANNUAL EMISSIONS FOR
CRITERIA POLLUTANTS (TONS PER YEAR)

TABLE 3.3.1 EXISTING ESTIMATED COMMUNITY NOISE EQUIVALENT LEVEL

TABLE 3.3.2 EXISTING NOISE LEVELS AT SENSITIVE RECEPTORS

TABLE 4.1.1. SOUTH COAST AIR BASIN THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

TABLE 4.1.2. CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS

TABLE 4.1.3. LOCALIZED SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS (LST) EMISSIONS

TABLE 4.1.4. CONSTRUCTION EMISSION ESTIMATES CUMULATIVE

TABLE 4.3.1. HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPEMENT (HUD) ENVIRONMENTAL
NOISESTANDARDS

TABLE 4.3.2 MAXIMUM NOISE LEVELS OF COMMON CONSTRUCTION MACHINES

TABLE 4.3.3 OUTDOOR CONSTRUCTION NOISE LEVELS

TABLE 4.3.4 CONSTRUCTION NOISE IMPACT

LIST OF APPENDICES

- Appendix A: Logistics Operations Resource Center (LORC) Air Quality Data
- Appendix B: Logistics Operations Resource Center (LORC) Cumulative Air Quality Data
- Appendix C: Site Photos
- Appendix D: Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) Noise Distribution Map

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ACM	asbestos-containing material
AFCEE	Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence
AAFES	Army and Air Force Exchange Services
AQMP	Air Quality Management Plan
ASHRAE	American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air Conditioning Engineers
AT-FP	Anti-terrorism-Force Protection
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CBSC	Consolidated Base Support Complex
CDC	Child Development Center
CDRL	Contract Data Requirements List
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
CO	Carbon Monoxide
CPSMR	Contractor's Progress, Status, and Management Report
dB	decibel
dBA	Decibel – a weighted measurement for sound
DoD	Department of Defense
DOPAA	Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives
EA	Environmental Assessment
EIAP	Environmental Impact Analysis Process
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
HUD	Housing and Urban Development
HVAC	Heating Ventilation and Air Conditioning
LAAFB	Los Angeles Air Force Base
LAX	Los Angeles International Airport
LBP	Lead-based paint
lbs	Pounds
LEED	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
LEL	Lower Explosive Limit
Leq	equivalent noise level
LFL	Lower Flammable Limit
LORC	Logistics Operations Resource Center
LST	localized significance threshold
MSL	mean sea level
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NO _x	nitrogen oxide compounds
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
PCB	polyvinyl chlorinate biphenol
PM _{2.5}	particulate matter of 2.5 microns
PM ₁₀	particulate matter of 10 microns
PPM	Parts per million
NO ₂	Nitrogen Dioxide
ROG	reactive organic gases
ROI	Region of Influence
SAMS	Systems Acquisition and Management Support Complex
SCAB	South Coast Air Basin
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SMC	Space and Missile Systems Center
SO ₂	Sulfur Dioxide
SO _x	Sulfur Oxide Compounds
URBEMIS	Urban Emissions Model
U.S.	United States
U.S.C.	United States Code
VOCs	volatile organic compounds

Section 1: Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The United States Air Force (USAF) has prepared this Environmental Assessment (EA) to examine the potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed demolition of three buildings (Buildings 212, 219, and 220) and construction within that location (approximately 2.3 acres) of a new, steel-frame, 65,792 square foot (sf) Logistics Operations Resource Center (LORC) with parking. The project site is located within Area B of the Los Angeles Air Force Base (LAAFB) in El Segundo, California (see Figure 1-1).

This document has been prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended (42 United States Code [U.S.C.] 4321, et seq.), the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Parts 1500 - 1508), and Air Force policy and procedures (32 CFR Part 989).

1.1 PURPOSE AND NEED

The new LORC facility is needed to support troop readiness by increasing capacity to store supplies and equipment and providing administrative support and operations, and other functions. The current Logistics and Operations missions are housed primarily in Building 229, a 60-year-old building that does not meet current fire, seismic, or building energy requirements. This building is considered dilapidated. The buildings that would be demolished require extensive renovations or complete replacement for their structural and mechanical systems. These conditions drive both maintenance costs and heating and cooling loads to grossly excessive levels when compared to modern construction methods. Other missions are located in three other areas of the LAAFB installation and this proposed project would consolidate these activities.

The new LORC will provide a quality facility that will ensure end users have adequate space to meet their mission requirements, in a safe and timely manner. Construction of this project will provide enhanced and modernized mobility processing, including equipping and training personnel along with receiving, storing, and issuing material to meet current-day deployment mission requirements. The proposed project will also permit the effective and efficient receiving, processing, accounting, distributing and storage of information technology/system hardware and software components for LAAFB personnel. Additionally, the proposed LORC will provide civil engineering maintenance shops and storage areas. This proposed project will meet the critical LAAFB Space Launch Operations Support mission goals.

Section 1: Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed facility is intended to provide full operational support that will be consistent with standards set by the LAAFB General Plan and the latest Department of Defense (DoD) Antiterrorism/Force Protection (AT/FP) construction standards. The LAAFB General Plan has recommended that all temporary structures (pre-engineered buildings) in Area B be demolished and the cleared area used either for parking or sites for additional permanent structures.

The LORC facility, as a military facility supporting the LAAFB, must be located with the air base property.

1.2 LOCATION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

LAAFB is within Los Angeles County, and lies inside the corporate limits of the City of El Segundo. Figure 1-1, Regional Map, shows the location of the LAAFB. The LAAFB occupies about 111 acres and is situated approximately 2 miles south of Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). LAAFB consists of two, noncontiguous parcels of land, known as Area A and Area B. The new LORC will be located in Area B.

The site of the proposed LORC is where Buildings 219 and 220 are currently located. This site is bordered by the Consolidated Base Support Center to the south, the Fitness Center to the west, the Child Development Center to the east, and an access road to the north (Figure 1.2.2). Entrance into the facility will be accommodated from Aviation Boulevard through Gate 4 or off Douglas Boulevard through Gate 5. Figure 1.2.3 identifies existing site uses.

1.3 SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The scope of this EA focuses on the examination of environmental resources that may be adversely affected by demolition, construction and operational activities associated with the Proposed Action. The potential environmental impacts evaluated are: aesthetics and views, air quality, airspace, biological resources, cultural resources, geological and soil conditions, hazardous materials/waste, hydrology/water quality, land use, noise, public services/utilities, socioeconomic considerations, and transportation/traffic.

The analysis conducted in this EA is in accordance with the President's Council of Environmental Quality (CEQ) Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) subsections 1500-1508, as they implement the requirement of NEPA, 42 U.S.C. subsection 4321, et seq., and Air Force

Section 1: Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action

Instruction (AFI) 32-7061, "The Environmental Impact Analysis Process", as promulgated in 32 CFR Part 989 (that addresses the implementation of NEPA and directs Air Force officials to consider environmental consequences as part of the planning and decision-making process). These regulations require federal agencies to analyze the potential environmental impacts of the proposed action and alternatives and to use these analyses in making decisions on a proposed action and/or alternative. The extent of the analysis examines the potential environmental impacts associated with the design, development, and demolition for and construction of the Logistics Operations Resource Center. The EA also examines potential impacts related to a Proposed "No Action" Alternative.

In the EA, environmental impacts must be considered and evaluated; however, if environmental concerns are not anticipated and/or are minimal, detailed discussion is not deemed appropriate. Below, various impact areas are discussed to determine the need for further evaluation.

1.3.1 Aesthetics and Views

The LORC will be in compliance with the Los Angeles Air Force Base General Plan, and as such will blend with the other buildings currently on base, currently being constructed or to be constructed in the future. The LORC is in the middle of an industrial/commercial environment that has no vista or view that it can cause obstruction to or impact on. With the building to be constructed in a manner so that its exterior matches or is compatible to all of the other buildings on Base and does not cause a negative impact on any vista or views there is a minimal to no potential for impact. Therefore, no further analysis of aesthetics and views considerations is required in this EA.

1.3.2 Air Quality

There will be short-term and cumulative impacts to air quality associated with demolition of older buildings and new construction. This will be further analyzed for significance in this environmental assessment.

1.3.3 Airspace

Since there are no aircraft operations associated with the LAAFB, there will be no anticipated impacts to airspace. No further analysis of airspace considerations is required in this EA.

Section 1: Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action

1.3.4 Biological Resources

According to the LAAFB Natural Resource Management Plan, surveys of the site concluded that LAAFB is situated within a highly urbanized area and contains no open or undeveloped space that could serve as a potential habitat for species considered to be rare, threatened, endangered or special status species. Therefore, no further analysis of biological resources is required in this EA.

1.3.5 Cultural Resources

According to the LAAFB Integrated Cultural Resource Management Plan, surveys of the site for cultural resources concluded that Buildings 212, 219, and 220 proposed for demolition are not considered to be of historical or culturally significance. Furthermore, no prehistoric or tribal resources have been identified within the LAAFB boundaries. Thus, there are no anticipated impacts to cultural resources and no further analysis of cultural resources is required in this EA.

1.3.6 Geological and Soil Conditions

During demolition and construction of the new LORC facility, there is the potential of the release of methane gas trapped underground as indicated by prior soil studies. These studies indicated the presence of methane at and around the new facility at levels at or above the Lower Explosive Limit (LEL) of methane. This document will analyze the impact of methane gas releases during construction and operation phases and determine if such impacts are significant.

1.3.7 Hazardous Materials/Waste

Transportation, use or disposal of known hazardous materials during this phase will be subject to existing regulations and procedures outlined in the following:

Air Force Instruction 32-7042 Solid and Hazardous Waste Compliance,

Air Force Pamphlet 32-7043 Hazardous Waste Management Guide,

Los Angeles AFB Hazardous Waste Management Plan/Waste Analysis Plan,

LAAFB Emergency Response Plan.

In addition, all State, federal, and local regulations must be followed.

The development of necessary infrastructure may involve use of hazardous materials that may cross several drainages during the construction phase and could accidentally be released into local waterways. To prevent accidental drainage or leakage into local waterways, construction activities are required to be in accordance with the existing Hazardous Materials Management

Section 1: Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action

Plan and will require that the demolition and construction companies have Spill Prevention Plans that prevent these events from occurring.

After the construction phase, household/industrial cleaning supplies, paints and toners are expected to be used and stored at the proposed facility. These materials are currently being stored in Building 229 and are subject to the Base's Hazardous Material Management Plan, a plan for determining quantities of reportable waste and any spills for the year. No increase in hazardous materials stored is expected and as such no changes to the current plans are anticipated. Therefore no further analysis of Hazardous Materials/Waste is required in this EA.

Other hazardous storage, materials and waste concerns are identified below.

1.3.7.1 Storage Tanks. No storage tanks are present at project site associated with the site development and/or construction of the LORC and there will be no requirement to construct storage tanks to support the activities and programs linked to the new facilities.

1.3.7.2 Asbestos. Buildings 212, 219, and 220 at the project site have been partially surveyed for asbestos, with these surveys showing that asbestos-containing material (ACM) will be encountered during the demolition of these buildings. Buildings 212, 219, and 220 are required by the South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1403 to be completely surveyed prior to demolition to inform the contractor of the type, condition, and amount of ACM present within the facilities or assume those materials not surveyed are ACM. ACM will be removed and disposed of and in accordance with all local state and federal applicable regulations as cited in the Base's Asbestos Management and Operation Plans.

1.3.7.3 Lead-Based Paint. Buildings 212, 219, and 220 at the project site have been partially surveyed for lead-based paint (LBP), with these surveys showing that LBP will be encountered during the demolition of these buildings. Buildings 212, 219, and 220 must have a survey completed prior to demolition to inform the contractor of the presence and condition of any lead-based paint within the facilities. Any LBP to be disturbed in a manner that would create dust or deteriorate the painted surface will be removed and disposed of would be handled in accordance with all applicable local, state and federal regulations as cited in the Base's Lead Based Paint Management Plan.

Section 1: Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action

1.3.7.4 Pesticide Usage. The Proposed Action and alternatives might result in the handling of pesticides that are stored in the buildings. During demolition, these pesticides would have to be handled and disposed of properly. Pesticides and their containers are considered hazardous waste and would have to be handled as such for removal and disposal purposes.

1.3.7.5 Polyvinyl Chlorinate Biphenol (PCB). The LAAFB does not utilize any equipment containing PCBs nor does the LAAFB store any PCB's. Likewise, the LORC will not utilize, store or handle PCBs. All abandoned PCB ballasts found during the demolition of Buildings 212, 219 and 220 shall be handled and disposed of in accordance with all local, state and federal regulations as cited in the Base's PCB Management Plan. Building 220 might have some potential PCB's stored inside of power equipment which can be found in a currently unused equipment room. This equipment should be checked for PCB containing materials before demolition.

1.3.7.6 Radon. The proposed project is for administrative and security related activities; therefore, they would not be permanently occupied or used for lodging. Radon levels and where necessary any mitigation associated with these levels are only required in permanently occupied facilities or those used for lodging. The proposed facility and alternatives will contain adequate ventilation to prevent any accumulation of radon.

1.3.7.7 Medical/Biohazardous Waste. Buildings 212, 219, and 220 do not currently use or store medical/biohazards. The activities under the Proposed Action or alternatives will not handle or store medical/biohazardous waste, and as such there is no potential for impacts from medical/biohazardous waste.

1.3.7.8 Ordnance. Ordnance has not been stored, used, or disposed of within Buildings 212, 219, and 220 to be demolished. The new LORC and its activities will not include the use of, storage, and handling of ordnance.

1.3.7.9 Installation Restoration Program. Installation restoration sites are areas of soil or water contamination caused by action committed prior to 1 January 1984 that require environmental clean up. There are no active Installation Restoration Program sites on or near the proposed building demolition sites nor the new construction site.

Section 1: Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action

1.3.8 Hydrology/Water Quality

Buildings 212, 219, and 220 are not on or near any surface water resources, floodplains, or wetlands. Construction activities are required to comply with the Construction Site Storm Water National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for storm water runoff since the amount of ground disturbance anticipated would be equal to or greater than 1 acre, that will minimize potential impacts to less than significant. Therefore, no further analysis of Water Resources is required in this EA.

1.3.9 Land Use

In the Los Angeles Air Force Base General Plan, the site for the LORC is currently designated as an area for parking and administrative use. In future site plans the site is shown as being designated strictly for administrative use. The placement of the LORC on the proposed site would comply with future use designations for the area. The areas occupied by the buildings being demolished, are all currently designated as administrative use. The site currently occupied by Building 212 is in future site plans designated as parking.

Under the Proposed Action and alternatives the proposed construction of LORC is in accordance with LAAFB General Plan and the Los Angeles Air Force Base Excellence Plan. Since the new LORC will be designed to be compatible with surrounding facilities there is no anticipated impacts to land use and aesthetics. No further analysis of land use is required in this EA. Local land use plans are not applicable to this area because of its past and existing use as a military facility.

1.3.10 Noise

There will be noise generated during demolition and construction activities and as such the Child Development Center (CDC) (a sensitive noise receptor) next to the construction area could experience potential noise impacts during the project. This document will analyze the impact for significance.

1.3.11 Public Service/Utilities

The LORC will not require substantial increases in utilities nor will it require any changes to the existing utility system or public services serving LAAFB (e.g. water, electricity, fire).

Section 1: Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action

1.3.12 Socioeconomic Considerations

Since the Proposed Action has operational (long-term) impacts on population or employment within the region, there will be no anticipated impacts associated with job loss or adverse effects to payroll. The demolition and construction employment will be minimally affected, as the proposed project is estimated to cost \$12.8 million. In contrast, in 2003 the City of El Segundo issued building permits for construction projects valued at \$108.7 million. This project would represent less than 10 percent of the construction in El Segundo. In addition, the City of El Segundo has a working population of over 70,000 people.

1.3.13 Environmental Justice

The environmental justice analysis has considered those areas immediately adjacent to the LAAFB where the likelihood of experiencing impacts from proposed project activities could be anticipated. No environmental justice issues would occur because the region of influence for Area B does not have a impacted minority population in comparison to the County of Los Angeles (31.65% versus 68.91%). Median family income in 2000 was \$74,007 for the City of El Segundo, while the median family income for the County of Los Angeles was \$39,035. Finally, the Proposed Action would not change the exiting population or employment within the region, so no environmental justice issues will occur.

1.3.14 Transportation/Traffic

The LORC will change the distribution of traffic within the LAAFB because the employees will be placed in a single area. Parking will be increased in this project by approximately 140 spaces accommodate the LORC personnel, fleet vehicles and visitors. Additionally the Base General Plan and the Master Plan for Area B allow for additional parking areas around Area B. Since no operational personnel will be changed, the number of cars entering and leaving the Base onto public streets will remain the same. Demolition and construction activities will temporarily increase traffic during this period and should not involve significant vehicular trips (less than 50 round-trips per day).

This EA indicates that the Proposed Action do not have the potential to result in either significant short- or long-term impacts that would necessitate the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Environmental resources that may be affected by the Proposed Action were considered in more detail to provide the Air Force decision makers with sufficient information for determining whether or not additional analysis is required pursuant to 40 CFR Part 1508.9.

Section 1: Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action

Section 3.0 Affected Environment, and Section 4.0 Environmental Consequences, of this EA contain the full and complete evaluation of the potential impacts that could result from the Proposed Action for Air Quality, Noise and Geology and Soils.

Section 2: Description of Proposed Actions and Alternatives (DOPAA)

2.0 INTRODUCTION

This document identifies the Proposed Action and the No Action Alternative, of the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Los Angeles Air Force Base (LAAFB) involving the construction of the Logistics Operations Resource Center (LORC) and to highlight those environmental areas set forth in National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) that may have potential to affect the surrounding environment in either a positive or negative manner.

A No Action Alternative will not meet the objectives of the proposed action. It would also still require the demolition of the three buildings because of their present dilapidated condition, inefficiencies, and disuse. Subsequently a No Action Alternative is not acceptable.

The demolition of these three buildings and the construction of the LORC was found to be a situation that produced the most effective action.

2.1 BACKGROUND

As part of the United States Air Force (USAF), the mission of the LAAFB is to provide integrated affordable systems for the control and exploitation of air and space. The LAAFB installation is home to the Space and Missile Systems Center (SMC), 61st Air Base Group, and numerous Operating Locations and Detachments. SMC is the center of technical excellence for researching, developing and purchasing military space systems, sustaining and maintaining military satellite constellations and other Department of Defense space systems.

Los Angeles Air Force Base, California, currently consists of five (5) separate areas that are located within industrial, commercial, and residential portions of the greater Los Angeles metropolitan area. These five (5) areas include one (1) within the City of El Segundo (Area B), one (1) within the City of Hawthorne (Area A) and three within the San Pedro area (Fort MacArthur Middle Reservation, Pacific Crest Housing Area, and Pacific Heights Housing Area). Area A will be transferred to a private developer in 2006. The proposed LORC project will be located at Area B of the base facility in El Segundo, immediately south of and adjacent to Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) as shown on Figure 1-1. Area B also houses the base Commissary, Medical & Dental Clinic, Fitness Center, Child Care Center and various other personnel, office and administration-related activities.

Section 2: Description of Proposed Actions and Alternatives (DOPAA)

With a primary focus on research and development, LAAFB employs approximately 4,420 government workers on about 111 acres in El Segundo and Hawthorne. There is no airfield and no requirement for flight operations at the El Segundo facility.

Due to the war on terrorism, LAAFB has an increased requirement for its troop readiness to deploy on minimal notice. Construction of the LORC will meet this need for Logistics, Operations, and Readiness by increasing capacity to store supplies and equipment, providing administrative support and operations needed to deploy troops quickly and efficiently, providing a more functionally adequate facility for Civil Engineering maintenance shops, and providing adequate training area and secure holding/communications briefing rooms.

Currently, Operations is located in building 229, which was constructed in the 1940's. This building does not provide sufficient space and lacks adequate modern resources for Operations to effectively accomplish its present (and future) functions. The existing building does not have seismic retrofitting, and would need extensive renovations to be brought up to current local, state and federal building codes. The building is highly inefficient in utilizing energy (in comparison to new buildings). In contrast, the proposed LORC will meet the existing building and seismic codes. The need to replace Building 229 and at the same time have the space available for a new LORC building, provided an obvious reason for the selection of this location of the new LORC.

2.2 LOCATION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

A new LORC is proposed to be located in Area B of the LAAFB in El Segundo to provide the Air Force Base a suitable facility to support the Space Launch Operation Support function. The LORC will consolidate functions from four existing facilities.

To accommodate the construction of the new LORC, the Proposed Action involves the demolition of buildings as follows:

- Building 219, currently used as office space (26 feet in height, 52,000 square feet in area),
- Building 220, currently used as a Thrift Shop (16 feet in height, 3,375 square feet in area), and
- Building 212, currently used as office space (32 feet in height, 15,000 square feet in area). After demolition this area will be utilized for additional parking.

Section 2: Description of Proposed Actions and Alternatives (DOPAA)

In the proposed action the LORC would be constructed in the vicinity of the footprint of the demolished buildings 219 and 220 (Figure 1-2). As noted above, the area of demolished building 212 will be used for additional parking area.

Following demolition, a 65,972 square-foot, two-story low rise building (steel frame) will be constructed that will meet the needs identified by all groups that plan to use the LORC. The project area including the building demolitions and new construction involves an area of approximately 2.3 acres.

The LORC will consolidate functions from four existing facilities located elsewhere in Area B. The LORC will be a state of the art warehouse facility with administrative office space, consolidating the functions and missions of Logistics, Readiness and Operations. The building will have a high bay warehouse area, administrative office space, conference rooms, deployment control center, mobility processing and bag storage centers, hazardous material storage facility, maintenance shop and computer sanitizing area. The maintenance shop will require dust collection ports and compressed air. The building dimensions will be approximately 256 feet east-west by 172 feet north-south. The roof height will be approximately 42 feet.

The facility will be staffed by approximately 57 individuals. During deployment exercises, there may be more than 100 people in the building at one time.

The building will contain all necessary equipment for the housed organizations to fulfill their mission requirements now and in the foreseeable future. This will include vertical hydraulic shelving/stacking systems, an assortment of woodworking and metalworking equipment, modern HVAC, electrical, communication and plumbing systems, as well as all the equipment of a modern office space.

The LORC will be designed to meet all local, state and federal building codes appropriate to a building of its function as well as using green building design elements that would allow the building to have a rating of 26 or greater in the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design, (LEED) Green Building Rating System.

The LORC will also meet all the structural and security requirements of the Anti-Terrorism-Force Protection Act (AT-FP).

Section 2: Description of Proposed Actions and Alternatives (DOPAA)

The LORC building will include a loading/unloading dock for trucks, and appropriate circulation, maneuvering and parking/staging areas for delivery/transport vehicles and for Logistics' fleet of vehicles in close proximity to the LORC. As noted above, additional parking will be provided to the northwest, in the area of demolished Building 212 approximately 82 feet away.

Primary and secondary entrances will be provided as well as a deployment exit which will be closest to the parking areas.

LAAFB currently provides underground utilities including natural gas, electric, telecommunications, domestic water, fire water, reclaimed water, and sanitary sewer lines. A storm water drainage system captures storm water sheet flow across the proposed site. Overhead power lines existing above the parking lot between the proposed site and the existing Thrift Shop (Building 220) are unacceptable and will be modified. All new tie-ins to existing utility systems will be required.

The LORC may require a new fire hydrant to the northeast and a new fire hydrant to the southwest of the proposed location if such hydrants are excluded from other facility projects in the vicinity of the proposed LORC. The hydrants must meet location requirements of the AFB Fire Standards. Access roads and entrances will need to accommodate the size and turning radius of Fire Dept. Services and 18-wheel vehicles. Key areas of the LORC facility including the warehouse storage shelving will have complete sprinkler (wet-type) coverage for fire protection. All areas of the facility shall be covered by smoke detectors and connected to the main fire detection panel, which will also communicate with the LAAFB Central Alarms facility.

All building construction design for the new LORC, including all electrical, lighting, communications, plumbing and mechanical systems for heating ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) will be based upon proven design techniques utilizing state-of-the-art design with readily available materials and hardware; architectural, structural and system designs will focus on safety, convenience, reliability, maintainability, and comfort of the end users, customers and visitors. Energy conservation shall be of prime importance in the design of all building systems and system components, and will meet all Air Force Base, local, state, and federal energy conservation codes, including applicable American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) standards. To further promote conservation means, water

Section 2: Description of Proposed Actions and Alternatives (DOPAA)

used for urinals, toilets, and outdoor landscaping will be reclaimed, recycled water. The LORC will have a single exterior utility area where facility equipment such as transformers and chiller are located, and which will be fenced and out of sight of main facility entrances and courtyards, but accessible to service roads and equipment maintenance vehicles.

Since the primary concern of an air force base operations is security and, more recently terrorist protection, access to the LORC facility will be strictly controlled; vehicle inspection will take place at the northeast gate. Vehicle travel once through the gate will be carefully directed via the most direct route to the LORC. The building site for the LORC has been selected to maximize setback from Base perimeter and to allow appropriate setback from other buildings.

The demolition of the above mentioned buildings is proposed to begin in the late 2005 and continue through to the end of 2006. Demolition would involve the removal/demolition of all internal and external structures, as well as all underground structures, such as pipes, that would be in the footprint of the new LORC building.

The construction of the new LORC building is proposed to start at the end of 2006 and beginning of 2007 and would take approximately 9 months to complete. The new LORC building would be of steel frame construction and be of similar appearance to the newly constructed Systems Acquisition and Management Support Complex (SAMS) and the Consolidated Base Support Complex (CBSC) buildings, as well as meet or exceed the standards identified in the Los Angeles Base General Plan.

2.3 KEY ENVIRONMENTAL AREAS OF CONCERN

Below are the key environmental areas of concern

2.3.1 Air Quality

Due to the short term and cumulative impacts of demolition of the old buildings and construction of the new facility.

2.3.2 Geological and Soil Conditions

Due to the surveys of the area indicating the presence of methane near the new facility.

Section 2: Description of Proposed Actions and Alternatives (DOPAA)

2.3.3 Hazardous Materials and Waste

The demolition of Buildings 212, 219 and 220 will involve the removal of hazardous waste such as asbestos, lead and PCBs. The LORC will handle and store certain hazardous materials that are currently stored and handled in other existing facilities at the base.

2.3.4 Water Resources

Because the amount of ground disturbance anticipated to occur during the project would be equal to or greater than 1 acre, construction activities would need to be conducted in accordance with a Construction Site Storm Water National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for storm water runoff.

2.3.5 Noise

Due to the construction and the majority of the demolition occurring near a sensitive receptor (Child Care Facility).

2.4 ENVIRONMENTAL AREA MINIMALLY AFFECTED

Other environmental areas analyzed and determined to be minimally affect are:

- Aesthetics and Views
- Airspace
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Land Use
- Public Services/Utilities
- Socio Economic Considerations
- Transportation/Traffic

2.5 NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The no action alternative would involve no changes to the current condition or use of Buildings 212, 219 and 229, and would specifically preclude the construction of a new facility to house the Logistics Operations Resource Center. All of the commands (Logistics, Readiness and Operations) would remain in their current locations until a new location is found. Because of the

Section 2: Description of Proposed Actions and Alternatives (DOPAA)

nature of the existing buildings, demolition of these buildings would eventually occur. A no action alternative would not meet the objective of the proposed project.

Section 3: Affected Environment

3.0 INTRODUCTION

To identify the potential impacts of the proposed action on the environment, a discussion on the existing conditions is required. Below, the existing conditions for air quality, geological and soil conditions (including methane), and noise are discussed.

3.1 AIR QUALITY

The Region of Influence (ROI) for air quality related to the LAAFB is the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB).

The federal Clean Air Act (CAA) (42 U.S.C. 7401-7671(q), amended in November 1990) states that emissions sources must comply with the air quality standards and regulations that have been established by federal, state, and local regulatory agencies. These standards and regulations focus on the maximum allowable ambient pollutant concentrations and the maximum allowable emissions from individual sources.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) established the federal standards for the permissible levels of certain pollutants in the atmosphere. A criteria pollutant is a pollutant for which a National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) has been established. The NAAQS have been established for seven criteria pollutants:

- ozone
- nitrogen dioxide (NO₂)
- particulate matter equal to or less than 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀)
- particulate matter equal to or less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM_{2.5})
- carbon monoxide (CO)
- sulfur dioxide (SO₂)
- lead.

Ozone is a secondary pollutant formed in the atmosphere by photochemical reactions of previously emitted pollutants, or precursors. The ozone precursors are nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and volatile organic compounds (VOCs). The California Air Resources Board (CARB) has established the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) for these air pollutants, and

Section 3: Affected Environment

also for visibility reducing particles, sulfates, hydrogen sulfide, and vinyl chloride. Both the NAAQS (National Ambient Air Quality Standards) and the CAAQS are shown in Table 3.1.1.

The U.S. EPA designates all areas of the United States as having air quality in non-attainment, attainment, unclassified, or maintenance. Pollutants in an area may be designated as unclassified when there is insufficient ambient air quality data for the U.S. EPA to form a basis for an attainment status. Under the CAA, the non-attainment classifications for CO and PM₁₀ were further divided into moderate and serious categories. Ozone non-attainment was divided into marginal, moderate, serious, severe, and extreme categories. The CARB also designates areas that exceed the CAAQS as non-attainment for the specific pollutant.

The SCAB is in non-attainment for ozone, CO, and PM₁₀ according to the CAAQS. With regard to the NAAQS, the SCAB is in extreme non-attainment for ozone, and serious non-attainment for PM₁₀ and CO. The SCAB is in attainment or unclassifiable for all other NAAQS and CAAQS (California Air Resources Board, 2004; U.S. EPA, 2004). In February 2004, the CARB submitted their recommendations to the U.S. EPA for area designations under the federal air quality standards for PM_{2.5}. The CARB recommendation identifies the SCAB as an area of non-attainment. The U.S. EPA is required to promulgate designations within 1 year after state recommendations are submitted and no later than December 31, 2005.

In areas where the NAAQS are exceeded, preparation of a State Implementation Plan (SIP) detailing how the state would attain the standard within mandated time frames is required. Section 176c of the CAA provides that a federal agency cannot support an activity in any way unless the federal agency determines that the activity will conform to the SIP's purpose of attaining and maintaining the NAAQS. In accordance with this part of the CAA, U.S. EPA announced promulgation of its final conformity rule for general federal actions for non-attainment and maintenance areas in the November 30, 1993, (40 CFR Part 51). The final rule applies to LAAFB because the installation is situated within the non-attainment area of the NAAQS for ozone, CO, and PM₁₀.

Air emissions from a proposed activity are considered to have a significant impact on air quality if they would:

Section 3: Affected Environment

- 1) Increase ambient air pollutant levels such that they exceed the CAAQS, or
- 2) Exceed the SCAQMD significance emission thresholds for construction and/or operational activities.

The SCAQMD has established specific criteria for determining whether the potential air quality impacts of a project are significant. These criteria are presented in the SCAQMD's California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Air Quality Handbook, April 1993 (Table 3.1.2). They include significant emissions thresholds, compliance with state and national air quality standards, and consistency with the current air quality management plan (AQMP)

The significance thresholds for construction emissions established by the SCAQMD for criteria pollutants are presented in tons per quarter or pounds per day of criteria pollutants. Projects in the SCAB with construction-related emissions that exceed these emission thresholds are considered significant by the SCAQMD.

The daily operational significance emissions thresholds are presented in pounds per day of criteria pollutants. Projects in the SCAB with operation-related emissions that exceed these emission thresholds are considered significant by the SCAQMD.

Table 3.1.3 shows the 2003 estimated annual emissions of these pollutants in the SCAB.

3.2 GEOLOGICAL AND SOIL CONDITIONS

LAAFB lies within the Los Angeles Basin. The basin's basic geology consists of unconsolidated and indurated sediments ranging in age from the Jurassic to Recent epochs. The youngest deposits are a veneer of late Pleistocene quartz dune sand. Metamorphic rocks of the Franciscan and Catalina Schist Formation and an overlay of Miocene units form the bedrock under LAAFB.

The Los Angeles Basin is characterized by an approximately 2 percent gradient with an east to west aspect the topography at LAAFB slopes very gradually and nearly imperceptibly from 92 feet above mean sea level (MSL) at the southern edge of the property to 98 feet above MSL at the northern edge.

Section 3: Affected Environment

The Base is situated in Seismic Zone IV and the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program Map Zone 7, which represents a high potential risk for large seismic events. LAAFB is in the vicinity of several active faults, including the San Andreas, Newport-Inglewood, San Fernando, Sierra Madre, and Verdugo (Los Angeles Air Force Base, 2003).

Soils at the proposed construction sites consist of several feet of fill. This fill material overlies the Oceano Association, which lies on a deposit of Pleistocene quartz dune sand known as the Older Dune Sand deposit. This deposit is approximately 200 feet thick and consists of fine-to medium-grained sands with minor amounts of gravel, sandy silt, and clay that were deposited as sediment.

The fill soil on top of the Oceano Association has a moderate potential for water erosion and a high potential for wind erosion if exposed. The only exposed soils at LAAFB are in areas where construction of new facilities is occurring. Other areas of the Base contain structures or are paved and landscaped.

LAAFB Area B is situated within a methane hazard zone based on historic data showing elevated levels of naturally occurring methane in soil. These deposits of methane are associated with the natural deposits of oil that have historically been found and mined in the area of the City of El Segundo. Areas where methane is found in the soil at concentrations exceeding 40,000 parts per million (ppm) are considered to be within a methane hazard zone. Sampling conducted in 2004 in support of ongoing construction projects at the base identified methane concentrations between 22,000 ppm and 640,000 ppm (Earth Tech, 2004).

The ROI for soils and geology is localized and limited to the areas of construction where the demolition and construction activities are proposed.

3.3 NOISE

Noise analysis in this document will be based on sound levels in terms of Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) and Equivalent Noise Level (Leq).

The Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) is an average sound level during a 24-hour day. CNEL is a noise measurement scale, which accounts for noise source, distance, single event

Section 3: Affected Environment

duration, single event occurrence, frequency, and time of day. Because CNEL accounts for human sensitivity to sound, the CNEL 24-hour figure is always a higher number than the actual 24-hour average. This is due to lower background noise, causing human reaction to sound between 7:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. as if the sound were actually five decibels higher, than if it occurred from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., and reaction to noise between 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. as if it were 10 dBA higher.

The Equivalent Noise Level (Leq) is the average noise level on an energy basis for any specific time period. The Leq for one hour is the energy average noise level during the hour. The average noise level is based on the energy content (acoustic energy) of the sound. Leq can be thought of as the level of a continuous noise which has the same energy content as the fluctuating noise level. The equivalent noise level is expressed in units of dBA.

Sound is described in terms of the loudness (amplitude) and frequency (pitch) of the sound. The standard unit of measurement for sound is the decibel (dB). The human ear is not equally sensitive to sound at all frequencies. The “A-weighted measurement for sound,” abbreviated dBA, reflects the normal hearing sensitivity range of the human ear. On this scale, the range of human hearing extends from approximately 3 to 140 dBA. Noise is measured at sites deemed as “sensitive receptors.” Land uses that are considered sensitive to noise impacts are referred to as “sensitive receptors.” Noise sensitive receptors consist of, but are not limited to, schools, residences, libraries, hospitals, and other care facilities.

Noise levels decrease as the distance from the noise source to the receiver increases. Noise generated by a stationary noise source, or “point source,” will decrease by approximately 6 decibels over hard surfaces and 9 decibels over soft surfaces for each doubling of the distance. For example, if a noise source produces a noise level of 80 dBA at a reference distance of 50 feet, then the noise level would be 74 dBA at a distance of 100 feet from the noise source, 68 dBA at a distance of 200 feet, and so on.

It has been shown an increase in sound level of 3 dBA can be perceived by the general populous and that a 10 dBA is perceived as a doubling in loudness. This later level of sound increase would more than likely cause a community response and as such an increase of 10 dBA or greater

Section 3: Affected Environment

in sound above the baseline levels below will be used as our threshold of significance (Handbook of Environmental Acoustics, 1994).

Baseline levels of noise are based on the data collected for the SAMS Environmental Impact Report/EIS between August 1, 2002 and January 22, 2003, and are noted below in Table 3.3.1.

Section 4: Environmental Consequences

4.0 INTRODUCTION

This section forms the scientific and analytic basis for determining whether there is an adverse or positive affect on the natural or human environment, direct or indirect that will result from the Proposed Action or the 'No Action Alternative'. This section will also identify potential cumulative effects on the environment that could result from the Proposed Action together with other known pending or planned projects in the vicinity of the Proposed Action.

A project can have an adverse effect on the environment that is not significant. "*Significant*" as defined in NEPA is based upon both context and intensity of the effect with both context and intensity defined in 1508.27 of the CEQ regulations. Where it is determined that significant impacts will occur, this section will identify any reasonable or feasible mitigation to reduce the impact to less than significant, as well as those impacts which may constitute an irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources. "*Mitigation*" as defined in 1508.20 of the CEQ regulation can involve:

1. Avoidance of the impact by not taking an action or part of an action,
2. Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action,
3. Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating or restoring the affected environment,
4. Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation or maintenance operations,
or
5. Compensating for the impact by replacing or substituting resources or environments.

If even a single resource is determined by this EA to have a significant or irreversible or irretrievable impact that cannot be mitigated to less than significant, then an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) must be prepared.

This section will analyze each of the effected environments identified in Section 1 as requiring further evaluation. Each affected environments' analysis will first evaluate the Proposed Action, followed by the 'No Action' Alternative. Each of the affected environments will conclude with an evaluation of any potential cumulative effects on each environment resulting from the Proposed Action.

Section 4: Environmental Consequences

4.1 AIR QUALITY

4.1.1 Significant Criteria

Criteria for determining the significance of impacts under NEPA were derived from standards established by SCAQMD. Based on the requirements set forth by these agencies, the criteria listed below were used to determine whether potential air quality impacts associated with the proposed project are considered significant. Criteria were established for the construction activities of the project.

Five pollutants are currently assessed in the SCAB. They are:

- Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)/Reactive Organic Gases (ROGs) – ozone precursor
- Nitrogen Oxide Compounds (NOx) – ozone precursor
- Suspended Particulate Matter, 10 Microns or smaller (PM₁₀)
- Sulfur Oxide Compounds (SOx)
- Carbon Monoxide (CO).

Table 4.1.1 lists the quarterly and daily thresholds of significance established by the SCAQMD for the five assessed pollutants.

4.1.2 Estimated Proposed Action Air Quality Impacts

Both regional and local air quality impacts were evaluated for the Project. Table 4.1.2 shows the quantity, in tons per year, tons per quarter, and pounds per day, of (VOC) ROG, NOx, CO, and PM₁₀ for the various emissions projected to occur in 2005, 2006 and 2007 with Project implementation on a regional scale and no control measures. As stated previously regional emissions were calculated using Urban Emissions Model (URBEMIS) 8.7. The actual Urban Emissions Model, URBEMIS 8.7 printouts are provided in Appendix A.

As can be seen in Table 4.1.2, VOC/ROG is projected to exceed the daily threshold of significance in 2007 due to the architectural coatings and solvents that potentially would be used in the Project. URBEMIS 8.7 uses a worst case assumption of 250 g/liter in the VOC/ROG calculations. No other exceedances, either in tons per quarter or pounds per day, are projected to occur during the Project.

Section 4: Environmental Consequences

Local impacts were evaluated using the localized significance thresholds (LST) construction spreadsheets as developed by the SCAQMD. Since the site is 2.3 acres, the 2 acre spreadsheet was utilized. Table 4.1.3 shows the results of this analysis.

As shown in Table 4.1.3 with an estimated 25 meter distance to a sensitive receptor from the Project site, none of the analyzed pollutants are projected to exceed the thresholds.

Please note that construction activities will be in compliance with all applicable construction permit requirements.

4.1.3 Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts include the construction and demolition associated with the Army Air Force Exchange Serves (AAFES) Base Exchange building and the construction and demolition associated with the LORC. AAFES construction was assumed to be approximately the same square footage as the LORC with an expected completion date of December 2006. Table 4.1.4 shows the worst year (2006) of the cumulative impacts.

As with the non cumulative impacts for the LORC, ROG is the only air pollutant above the threshold. Similar control measures are being implemented on the AAFES Base Exchange project as on the LORC per the AAFES Base Exchange EA. With implementation of all these standard control methods, some effects on air quality will occur but will be reduced to a level less than significant.

4.1.4 Long Term Impacts

No long term air quality impacts are anticipated. Once construction activities cease, the general operations of the LORC (administrative and warehouse) do not have any expected air quality impacts.

4.1.5 Estimated Impacts Under the 'No Action' Alternative

As no construction or demolition is associated with the 'No Action' Alternative, there is no possibility of changes to the current air quality. As such there are no adverse effects from the 'No Action' Alternative and no requirement for mitigation.

Section 4: Environmental Consequences

4.2 GEOLOGICAL AND SOIL CONDITIONS METHANE

4.2.1 Significant Criteria

Criteria for determining the significance of impacts under NEPA were derived from standards contained in the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety Methane Mitigation Standard. Based on the requirements set forth by County of Los Angeles, the criteria listed below were used to determine whether potential methane impacts associated with the proposed project are considered significant. Criteria were established for the construction activities of the project. A site specific geo technical survey is required and should include methane sampling to identify site specific results and can recommend specific design requirements to comply with the most current Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety Methane Mitigation Standards.

The Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety Methane Mitigation Standard section 91.7109.1 defines a significant health and safety hazard for naturally occurring methane requiring control methods to be implemented at any building that has naturally occurring methane levels greater than 25 percent of the Lower Explosive/Flammable Limit (LEL) for methane.

4.2.2 Estimated Proposed Action Methane Impacts

The Proposed Action does not create methane but rather in the removal of the current asphalt and concrete parking area during the demolition phase, releases trapped methane. Methane is then trapped by constructing an enclosed building over the area. This allows the build up of methane in an occupied area. The Site Investigation Report Los Angeles Air Force Base Area B by Earth Tech completed on April 16, 2004 documents that significant levels of methane (22,000 ppmv to 640,000 ppmv) were observed at Area B of LAAFB, in the vicinity of the proposed action. These levels of methane are greater than 25 percent of the LEL as defined by the Los Department of Building and Safety Methane Mitigation Standards and would place the design level at Level V. This is a potentially significant impact that will be reduced to less than significant levels via the implementation of the control measures set forth by the Los Department of Building and Safety Methane Mitigation Standards.

4.2.3 Relevant Control Measure

To offset the projected methane levels at the LORC and to aid in minimizing Project related impacts, the following policies and standards will be implemented for the Project:

- De-watering system would be installed.
- Sub-slab vent system with perforated horizontal pipes would be installed.

Section 4: Environmental Consequences

- A 4" gravel blanket would be installed under the impervious membrane and around the perforated horizontal pipes.
- An impervious membrane would be installed under the slab.
- Pressure sensors would be installed below the slab.
- A mechanical extraction system would be designed and installed.
- The lowest occupied space would have a gas detection system.
- These same space will have mechanical ventilation and an alarm system.
- All these systems shall be linked to a central control panel
- In addition trench dams, conduit and/or cable seal fitting would be installed.
- Additional vent risers would be added as need to reduce the levels of methane to that of safe levels.

The Contractor will implement all of these control methods. With all these control methods in place methane will still exist but the hazard will be reduced to a level of less than significant. As such no mitigation is required.

4.2.4 Estimate Impacts Under the 'No Action' Alternative

As no construction or demolition is associated with the 'No Action' Alternative no possibility exists that changes to air quality related to escape of trapped methane will occur. As such, there are no adverse effects from this alternative and no requirement for mitigation.

4.2.5 Cumulative Impacts

No cumulative impact for soil and geology are expected. No other known activities that occur during the construction and/or operations of the LORC will increase the methane reservoirs of the areas nor increase the rate at which the methane is released in the project area.

4.2.6 Long Term Impacts

No long term impact for soil and geology are expected. The construction and/or operations of the LORC do not increase the natural methane deposits and so will not have any long term effects on the natural or human environment.

4.3 NOISE

4.3.1 Significant Criteria

Criteria for determining the significance of impacts under CEQA were derived from standards contained in the City of El Segundo Noise Ordinances. Based on the requirements set forth by El Segundo, the criteria listed below were used to determine whether potential noise impacts

Section 4: Environmental Consequences

associated with the proposed project are considered significant. Criteria were established for the construction phase of the project.

A significant construction noise impact would occur if:

The proposed project would result in temporary construction noise levels that exceed 65 dBA at a sensitive receptor. If the existing ambient sound level at the sensitive receptor location is 65 dBA or more, than an incremental increase of 5 dBA over the existing ambient sound level would be considered significant.

4.3.1.1 U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Requirements

The proposed project could include a federal funding component. In order for HUD to approve the project, it must meet specified environmental requirements set forth in Title 24, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 51 (24 CFR 51). Noise Abatement and Control Standards are set forth in 24 CFR Section 51.100. A "Site Acceptability Standard" for exterior noise is defined in 24 CFR Section 51.103. This standard states that the "degree of acceptability of the noise environment at a site is determined by the sound levels external to buildings or other facilities containing noise sensitive uses."

The noise environment inside a building is considered acceptable if:

- i) The noise environment external to the building complies with these standards, and
- ii) The building is constructed in a manner common to the area or, if of uncommon construction, has at least the equivalent noise attenuation characteristics.

The Site Acceptability Standards set forth in 24 CFR Section 51.103 are shown in Table 4.3.1.

4.3.2 Estimated Impact of Proposed Action

Construction of the Proposed Action would result in temporary increases in ambient noise levels in the project area on an intermittent basis. The increase in noise would likely result in a temporary annoyance to nearby sensitive receptors. Noise levels would fluctuate depending on construction phase, equipment type and duration of use, distance between the noise source and receptor, and presence or absence of noise attenuation barriers.

Construction activities require the use of numerous noise-generating equipment, such as jack hammers, pneumatic impact equipment, saws, and tractors. Typical noise levels from various

Section 4: Environmental Consequences

types of equipment that may be used during construction are listed in Table 4.3.2. The table shows noise levels at distances of 50 and 100 feet from the construction noise source.

Table 4.3.3 shows the typical noise level associated with each construction phase. The noise levels shown in Table 4.3.3 take into account the likelihood that more than one piece of construction equipment would be in operation at the same time and lists the typical overall noise levels that would be expected for each phase of construction. These noise levels are based on surveys conducted by the USEPA in the early 1970's. Since 1970, regulations have been enforced to reduce noise generated by certain types of construction equipment to meet worker noise exposure standards. However, many older pieces of equipment are still in use. Thus, the construction phase noise levels indicated in Table 4.3.3 represent a conservative assessment. As the table shows, the highest noise levels are expected to occur during the grading/excavation and finishing phases of construction.

To ascertain worst-case noise impacts at sensitive receptor locations, construction noise has been modeled by introducing the noise level associated with the grading phase of a typical development. The noise source is assumed to be active for 40 percent of the eight-hour work day (consistent with the EPA studies of construction noise), generating a noise level of 89 dBA (Leq) at a reference distance of 50 feet.

The noise level during the construction period at each receptor location was calculated by (1) making a distance adjustment to the construction source sound level and (2) logarithmically adding the adjusted construction noise source level to the ambient noise level. The estimated construction noise levels at sensitive receptors are shown in Table 4.3.4.

Below is a table showing noise levels at sensitive receptors and the impact, if any, that the demolition and construction activities associated with the Proposed Action would have with no control methods implemented.

Although construction activities in Area B are not subject to the limitations set forth in the City of El Segundo ordinance, these activities would likely take place during time frames that the on-Base LAAFB Child Development Center (CDC) is occupied. As such, construction activities in Area B would result in a temporary, but significant, construction noise impacts at one receptor location, the CDC, as shown in Table 4.3.4.

Section 4: Environmental Consequences

4.3.3 Relevant Control Measures

To offset the projected degradation of noise levels at the sensitive receptor (CDC) and to aid in minimizing Project related impacts, the following policies and standards will be implemented for the Project:

- Construction contracts shall specify that all construction equipment shall be equipped with mufflers and other suitable noise attenuation devices.
- A “noise disturbance coordinator” position shall be established for the project. The disturbance coordinator shall be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator would determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad mufflers) and would be required to implement reasonable measures such that the complaint is resolved.
- Noise levels will be monitored and recorded by the prime contractor.
- A noise attenuation or deadening system (large sand bank, baffles, etc.) will be implemented if monitoring shows a consistently high level of noise and the activities that are causing the noise will continue for a time greater than a week.

With implementation of all these control methods, the effects of noise will still be negative but will be reduced to a level of less than significant. As such no mitigation is required.

4.3.4 Estimate Impacts Under the No Action Alternative

Under the ‘No Action’ Alternative, no construction activities generating substantial noise (grading, demolition, etc.) would occur. Construction activities under this Alternative would include small scale renovation projects primarily involving interior construction. Impacts related to construction noise under this alternative would be less than significant.

4.3.5 Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative noise impacts associated with the construction of the LORC are minimal due to the lack of construction or other continuous noise creating activities occurring at the same time, within 800 feet of any of the sensitive receptor in which the LORC Proposed Action or any of the alternatives have a negative effect. 800 feet was used as the determining criteria as it would reduce basic construction noise to levels (Table 4.3.3) to levels of minimal impact when compared to the pre construction noise levels (Table 3.3.1). The largest source of noise in the area

Section 4: Environmental Consequences

is Los Angeles Airport. LAAFB is not within the area of concern for noise as shown by Appendix D. Based on this information impacts related to cumulative noise would be less than significant.

4.3.6 Long Term Impacts

No long term noise impacts are anticipated with this project. Demolition and construction activities are the only activities associated with the LORC in which continues discernable noise levels are expected. General administrative and warehouse activities will not produce discernable noise levels at any of the “sensitive receptors”. Based on this information impacts related to long term noise would be less than significant.

4.4 IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES

Implementation of the Proposed Action or alternatives would result in an irreversible or irretrievable commitment of small quantities of resources such as fuel, metallic and nonmetallic construction materials, and labor.

4.5 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SHORT-TERM USES OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY

The Proposed Action and alternatives would not affect the long-term productivity of the environment since no significant environmental impacts are anticipated and natural resources would not be depleted.

Section 5: Preparers and Contributors

TPG Consulting, Inc.

Mary Beatie, Sr. Planner

BS in City and Regional Planning – California Poly State University, San Luis Obispo

25 years of experience

Jason Taylor, Sr. Planner

BS in Environmental Science – Curtin University, Australia

8 years of experience

Jeff Obana, Associate Planner

MA in Planning – University of Southern California

MA in Public Administration – University of Southern California

6 years of experience

Ruth Davis, Sr. Civil Engineer

BS in Civil Engineering – Texas A&M University

BS in Physics/Earth Sciences, East Texas State University

18 years of experience

Shaw Environmental

Caroleen Toyama, Senior Environmental Planner

BA in Geography and Sociology – University of Hawaii, Manoa

32 years of experience

Los Angeles Air Force Base

Claude Youssafzadeh, Environmental Operations Manager

Randy Muir, Community Planner

Section 6: Distribution List

Department of Defense

Claude Youssafzadeh
Environmental Operations Manager
2420 Vela Way Ste 1467
El Segundo, Ca 90245
Ph 310.653.5496

Mr. Ed McCown
AFCEE/GEITA
27068 La Paz Road
Aliso Viejo, CA 92656

State Agencies

State of California Clearinghouse
Governors Office
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121
Sacramento, CA 95814

South Coast Air Quality Management District
21865 Copley Drive
Diamond Bar, CA 91765

Local Agencies

City of El Segundo
Planning and Building Safety Department
350 Main Street
El Segundo, California 90245-3895

Libraries

El Segundo Public Library
111 West Mariposa Avenue
El Segundo, CA 90245

San Pedro Regional Branch Library
931 South Gaffey Street
San Pedro, CA 90731

Section 7: References

1. Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act, Council on Environmental Quality, 1978.
2. Air Quality Thresholds of Significance, First Edition, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality District, 1994.
3. CEQA Air Quality Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, April 1993.
4. Uniform Building Code, International Conference of Building Officials, 1991.
5. City of El Segundo Economic Development Annual Status Report 2003, City of El Segundo, 2004.
6. Los Angeles Building Code Chapter 71, Document No. P/BC 2001-77, Draft, Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety, March 2004.
7. Ordinance No. 175790 of Section 91.106.4.1 and Division 71 of Article I, Chapter IX of the Los Angeles Municipal Code, March, 2004.
8. Noise from Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment and Home Appliances, PB 206717, Environmental Protection Agency, 1971.
9. Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust, Table 3, South Coast Air Quality Management District, 2003.
10. Los Angeles Air Force Base Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report for Land Conveyance/Seismic Upgrade, Christopher A. Joseph and Associates, July 2003.
11. Site Investigation Report, Los Angeles Air Force Base Area B, Earth Tech, April 2004.
12. Environmental Assessment for Gate Complex Improvements at Los Angeles Air Force Base, California, Earth Tech, September 2004.
13. Report Geophysical Investigation Los Angeles Air Force Base El Segundo, CA GEOVision Geophysical Services, February 6, 2004.
14. Los Angeles Air Force Base Facility Excellence Plan 2005.
15. Los Angeles Air Force Base General Plan, 2005.
16. Los Angeles Air Force Base Intergrated Cultural Resource Management Plan, Updated 2004.
17. Los Angeles Air Force Base Natural Resource Management Plan, Updated 2004.
18. Los Angeles Air Force Base Asbestos Management Plan, Updated 2004.
19. Los Angeles Air Force Base Asbestos Operations Plan, Updated 2004.
20. Los Angeles Air Force Base Lead Based Paint Management Plan, Updated 2004.
21. Los Angeles Air Force Base PCB Management Plan, Updated 2004.
22. Los Angeles Air Force Base Radon Management Plan.

Section 7: References

23. Los Angeles Air Force Base FY2006 Logistics Operation Resource Center, URS Group.
24. Los Angeles Air Force Base, Final Environmental Impact Statement/Final Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR), Los Angeles Air Force Base Land Conveyance, Construction and Development Project, California State Clearinghouse No. 2002071106, July 2003.
25. Handbook of Environmental Acoustics, Cowan, James P., 1994.
26. U.S. Census, information from 2000 census and projections, websites:
<http://www.census.gov/> and <http://www.census.gov/>

