

---

---

## V. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT

---

---

### 1. INTRODUCTION/METHODOLOGY

This chapter evaluates the alternatives and compares the impacts of the alternatives to those of the proposed Project. The *State CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15126.6, require that an EIR present a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed Project, or to the location of the project, that could feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives, but would avoid or substantially lessen any significant effects of the project. The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a “rule of reason” that requires an EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather, the alternatives must be limited to ones that meet the project objectives, are ostensibly feasible, and would avoid or substantially lessen at least one of the significant environmental effects of the proposed project (*State CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15126.6[f]). The EIR must also identify the environmentally superior alternative other than the No Project Alternative. Alternatives may be eliminated from detailed consideration in the EIR if they fail to meet most of the project objectives, are infeasible, or do not avoid or substantially lessen any significant environmental effects (*State CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15126.6[c]).

The *State CEQA Guidelines* do not require the same level of detail in the alternative analysis as in the analysis of the proposed project. *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(d) reads as follows:

*The EIR shall include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project. A matrix displaying the major characteristics and significant environmental effects of each alternative may be used to summarize the comparison. If an alternative would cause one or more significant effects in addition to those that would be caused by the project as proposed, the significant effects of the alternative shall be discussed, but in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed.*

#### **(a) Assumptions and Methodology**

The alternatives analysis is presented as a comparative analysis to the proposed Project. Pursuant to the *State CEQA Guidelines*, alternatives are to be selected for the purpose of avoiding or substantially lessening the significant environmental effects of the proposed Project. As documented in Chapter IV, Environmental Impact Analysis, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any impacts that are significant or could not be mitigated to a level that is less than significant. Given the absence of unavoidable significant impacts associated with the proposed Project, the need to identify and evaluate alternatives that could avoid or substantially reduce significant impacts is diminished. Notwithstanding, alternatives are considered in this chapter to provide a general comparison of how impacts related to key issue areas such as land use and planning, visual resources, artificial light and glare, and transportation safety, would differ from those of the proposed Project under different options to the LAX Sign District Project.

Impacts associated with the alternatives are compared to Project-related impacts and are classified as greater, less, or essentially similar to (or comparable to) the level of impacts associated with the Project.

**(b) Project Objectives**

As discussed under Section 5 (Project Objectives) in Chapter II (Project Description) of this Draft EIR, the objectives for the Project are as follows:

- 1) Promote and enhance LAX as an international gateway to the Pacific Rim, an important public amenity, and maintain an image as one of the nation's premier airports by encouraging creative, well-designed signs that contribute in a positive way to LAX's visual environment.
- 2) Recognize the uniqueness of LAX as a regional economic engine.
- 3) Ensure that new off-site signs are responsive to and integrated with the aesthetic character of the structures on which they are located, and are positioned in a manner that is compatible both architecturally and relative to the other signage at the airport, thereby minimizing potential safety issues.
- 4) Protect adjacent communities from potential adverse impacts of new off-site signs by avoiding visual clutter, including visual impacts of excessive number of signs, excessive sign size, sign illumination, and sign motion/animation.
- 5) Support and enhance limited new off-site signage to the interior of LAX and the urban design, land use, economic development, and modernization objectives of the LAX Master Plan and LAX Specific Plan.

**2. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED AS INFEASIBLE**

*State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(c) requires EIRs to identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process, and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. In addition to the alternatives listed later in this chapter, other alternatives were considered and rejected by the Lead Agency.

*Alternative Sites*

Alternative sites were not analyzed because the proposed Project is designed specifically with respect to the unique characteristics of the Project site, namely the opportunity to promote local businesses and attractions to millions of visitors and travelers at a regional, national, and international gateway to Los Angeles and improve the visual environment of LAX by encouraging creative, well-designed signs throughout the airport. There is no other property within the City of Los Angeles that presents the same level of opportunity while at the same time minimizing visibility of signage from surrounding roadways and communities. For this reason, alternative sites for the proposed Project were not considered as feasible alternatives.

**3. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT**

Two alternatives, which meet all or most of the Project objectives, and the No Project Alternative required by CEQA have been carried forward for detailed analysis in this Draft EIR. The alternatives analyzed in this Draft EIR are as follows:

Alternative 1: No Project

Alternative 2: Reduced Signage

Alternative 3: No Digital Signage

The alternatives analysis compares the potential environmental impacts of the three alternatives with those of the proposed Project for each of the environmental topics analyzed in detail in Chapter IV (Environmental Impact Analysis) of this Draft EIR, although to a lesser level of detail than in Chapter IV (pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[d]).

Impacts associated with each alternative are compared to Project-related impacts and are classified as greater, less, or essentially similar (or comparable to) the level of impacts associated with the Project. An impact summary for the proposed Project and alternatives is shown in Table V-1.

**Table V-1**

**Comparison of Impacts of the Alternatives to Impacts of the Proposed Project**

Impact Category	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 No Project	Alternative 2 Reduced Signage	Alternative 3 No Digital Signage
Land Use and Planning	LTS	LTS (0)	LTS (0)	LTS (0)
Visual Resources	LTS	LTS (-)	LTS (-)	LTS (0)
Artificial Light and Glare	LTS	LTS (-)	LTS (0)	LTS (-)
Transportation Safety	LTS	LTS (-)	LTS (0)	LTS (0)

Notes:

LTS = Less Than Significant

LTS (-): Impact considered to be somewhat less when compared with the proposed Project.

LTS (0): Impact considered to be similar or equal to the proposed Project.

LTS (+): Impact considered to be somewhat greater when compared with the proposed Project.

**4. ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS**

**a. Alternative 1 - No Project**

*Description*

CEQA requires the alternatives analysis to include a No Project Alternative. The purpose of analyzing a No Project Alternative is to allow decision-makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed Project with the impacts of not approving the proposed Project (*State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6[e][1]). Pursuant to *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(e)(2):

*The “no project” analysis shall discuss the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation is published, or if no notice of preparation is published, at the time the environmental analysis is commenced, as well as what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the proposed project were not approved, based on current plans, and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.*

Alternative 1, the No Project Alternative, would evaluate what would be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the proposed Project were not approved. As is currently the case, under Alternative 1, no new off-site signage would be placed in the Project site. On-site, wayfinding, and tenant signage would continue, as well as the existing off-site signage at the Park One Property (subject to their current leases), and no billboard take downs or compliance with other applicable requirements from the Department of City Planning associated with the

proposed Project would occur. In summary, Alternative 1 would not preclude future improvements or signage already permitted within the Project site.

Alternative 1 would meet the objective of the proposed Project of protecting adjacent communities from visual clutter. Maintaining the signage currently allowed at LAX would partially meet the objectives of providing well-designed signs that support economic development; however, there would be substantially less flexibility to provide modern creative signage to enhance the visual environmental and less opportunity to support economic development and the uniqueness of LAX. The No Project Alternative would not provide a revenue stream that would be used to support infrastructure projects at LAX.

### ***Land Use and Planning***

Under Alternative 1, although no sign district would be established and no new off-site signage would be placed in the Project site (with the exception of existing off-site signage at the Park One Property, subject to their current leases), on-site signage would continue to be installed at the airport consistent with existing requirements and policies governing signage, such as the citywide Sign Ordinance (a part of the Los Angeles Municipal Code [LAMC]), LAX Specific Plan, and the LAX Airport Tenant Signage Standards. Under existing requirements, no supergraphics or digital signage are permitted. The proposed Project would conform to the applicable goals and policies and programs identified in the LAX Plan. An LAX sign ordinance would be established that regulates aspects of signage such as sign type, size, overall amount, illumination standards, and sign placement. As with Alternative 1, if the LAX sign ordinance is approved for the proposed Project, the signage would be consistent with the LAMC. No significant changes to the land use or zoning would occur under Alternative 1 or the proposed Project that would make the site or the site uses incompatible with surrounding uses. Therefore, the land use and planning impacts would be less than significant. However, without a sign district allowing promotion of business and activities outside LAX and encouraging creative well-designed signs that enhance the gateway aspect of LAX, goals and policies related to the modernization of the airport and enhancement of the local/regional economy and businesses would not be supported under Alternative 1 as compared to the proposed Project.

### ***Visual Resources***

Under Alternative 1, no sign district would be established at LAX. Signage at LAX would continue to be installed in compliance with the LAMC citywide Sign Ordinance and other requirements such as the LAX Specific Plan and LAX Airport Tenant Signage Standards, which generally prohibits off-site signage, supergraphics, and digital signage. Thus, new signage would continue to be placed at the airport as currently occurs but off-site signage, supergraphics or digital signage would be installed. Both on-site and off-site signage are similar in appearance. The difference is the content of the signage; on-site signage is airport-related signage, while off-site signage is non-airport related signage. Under Alternative 1 no digital signage would be installed; therefore, as a result, it is anticipated that this alternative would result in less change to the visual character and aesthetics than under the proposed Project. As a result, the visual impacts under this alternative would be similar, although reduced, as compared to the proposed Project and, therefore, less than significant.

### ***Artificial Light and Glare***

Under Alternative 1, no sign district would be established at LAX. Signage at LAX would continue to be installed in compliance with the LAMC citywide Sign Ordinance and other requirements such as the LAX Specific Plan LAX Airport Tenant Signage Standards, which generally prohibits off-site signage, supergraphics, and digital signage. No externally lit supergraphics or digital signage would be installed at LAX. Therefore, no sign types that could potentially serve as new sources of artificial light and glare would be installed. There would

be no artificial light and glare impacts associated with Alternative 1. As a result, the artificial light and glare impacts under this alternative would be less as compared to the proposed Project.

### *Transportation Safety*

Under Alternative 1, no sign district would be established at LAX. Signage at LAX would continue to be installed in compliance with the LAMC citywide Sign Ordinance and other requirements such as the LAX Specific Plan and LAX Airport Tenant Signage Standards, which generally prohibits off-site signage, supergraphics, and digital signage. Under Alternative 1, while on-site, tenant, and wayfinding signage, as well as off-site signage at the Park One Property (subject to their current leases) would still be allowed, no off-site signage types prohibited under the LAMC Sign Ordinance, such as supergraphics and digital displays, would be permitted. Therefore, under Alternative 1, there would be less potential for traffic distractions than would occur under the proposed Project. Although no new off-site signage would be installed under Alternative 1, existing on-site signage would continue to occur, and so would short-term lane closures, although fewer compared to the proposed Project. Therefore, transportation safety impacts would be less than significant.

## **b. Alternative 2 – Reduced Signage**

### *Description*

Alternative 2 would establish a new sign district that would allow 20 percent less signage throughout the Project site than under the proposed Project. Alternative 2 includes a maximum of approximately 65,218 square feet (sq ft) of proposed new off-site signage within the Landside Sub-Area and a maximum of approximately 231,680 sq ft of proposed new off-site signage within the Airside Sub-Area. Alternative 2 would also create a sign ordinance that would govern the type and size of allowable off-site signs and their placement throughout the Project site. The proposed signage types and allowable locations under this alternative would be the same as under the proposed Project and would include supergraphics, wall signs, digital display signs, and other signs such as signs on passenger boarding bridges, hanging signs, and column wraps. As with the proposed Project, Alternative 2 is designed to limit visibility from off-airport locations (i.e., surrounding communities) and to not visually or negatively affect airport operations or affect or alter historical buildings within LAX. No digital displays or externally lit signs would be allowed in the Airside Sub-Area. As with the proposed Project, the estimated implementation date for the construction and operation of the new off-site signage under Alternative 2 is 2013.

As with the proposed Project, Alternative 2 would also include a plan to remove a number of billboards in LAWA's control and compliance with other applicable requirements from the Department of City Planning.

Alternative 2 would support the objectives of the proposed Project, however to a lesser degree, as the decreased amount of signage would provide less flexibility to enhance the visual environment through modern creative signs, and would provide a decreased opportunity to support LAX as a regional engine. In addition, compared to the proposed Project, the decreased amount of signage under Alternative 2 would provide a decreased revenue stream that would be used to support infrastructure projects at LAX.

### *Land Use and Planning*

Under Alternative 2, a sign district would be established that includes provisions superseding the citywide Sign Ordinance, including the installation of off-site signage, supergraphics, and digital signage. An LAX sign ordinance would be established that regulates aspects of signage such as sign type, size, overall amount, illumination standards, and sign placement. As with the proposed Project, with approval of the sign district, Alternative 2 would be consistent with the LAMC and would also support regional and local plans and policies. Therefore, no inconsistencies with local land use plans and policies would occur, and thus Alternative 2 would not

result in significant land use and planning impacts, comparable to the proposed Project. However, the reduced amount of allowable signage proposed under Alternative 2 would decrease the flexibility of the sign district, thus limiting creativity and providing less space for promoting local/regional businesses and activities.

#### *Visual Resources*

Under Alternative 2, a sign district would be established that allows installation of new off-site signage, such as supergraphics, wall signs, column wraps, signage on passenger boarding bridges, hanging signs, and digital signage at a reduced amount as compared to the proposed Project. As with the proposed Project, the amount, size, and placement of the signs would be subject to a sign ordinance that would serve to ensure that visual clutter would not occur. Under Alternative 2, as with the proposed Project, no signage would be allowed on buildings with notable architecture. As with the proposed Project, the sign district would allow for creative well-designed signage that would not substantially change the visual character of the site. Potential locations for signs would not change, and thus visibility from off-airport locations would be similar to that as described for the proposed Project. As with the proposed Project, the first sky bridge and the digital sign at Terminal 1 would have some limited visibility to motorists and pedestrians along the eastern boundary. Although visibility and visual character would be similar to the proposed Project, there would be fewer signs throughout the Project site. As with the proposed Project, potential impacts to visual resources under Alternative 2 would be less than significant.

#### *Artificial Light and Glare*

Under Alternative 2, a sign district would be established that allows installation of new off-site signage, including supergraphics, wall signs, column wraps, signage on passenger boarding bridges, hanging signs, and digital signage at a reduced amount as compared to the proposed Project. Signage would continue to be subject to limitations on sign illumination, sign motion/animation and control refresh rates as specified for the proposed Project. As with the proposed Project, digital and lighted signs would be allowed in the Landside Sub-Area only and would not be visible to surrounding communities. Along the eastern boundary, limited views of digital signs would be available. The Project area is characterized by high ambient light levels and the diodes associated with the digital displays would be pointed downward. As with the proposed Project, lighting associated with proposed signage under Alternative 2 would not add to the ambient glow of the area that would represent a substantial change in brightness levels as seen from adjacent sensitive uses and a change in brightness and light trespass would not occur; thus, impacts would be less than significant. Although Alternative 2 includes less signage overall, the signage proposed under this alternative would include digital signage throughout the Landside Sub-Area similar to the proposed Project, which would constitute a majority of the artificial light and glare associated with this alternative, and therefore, the artificial light and glare impacts would be similar as under the proposed Project.

#### *Transportation Safety*

Under Alternative 2, a sign district would be established that allows installation of new off-site signage, including supergraphics, wall signs, column wraps, signage on passenger boarding bridges, hanging signs, and digital signage at a reduced amount as compared to the proposed Project. As with the proposed Project, the amount, size, and placement of the signs would be subject to a sign ordinance that would serve to ensure that visual clutter and transportation safety impacts (i.e., driver distraction that leads to crashes) would not occur. As with the proposed Project, digital signage could be located within the CTA and this would be subject to the same regulations and Project Design Features as the proposed Project including limits on the control refresh feature (CR-I and CR-III), limits on brightness, provision of dimming technology for digital displays, and restrictions on sign placement, size, and type. Implementation of the Project Design Features and compliance with regulations would reduce the potential for driver distraction to occur. As with the proposed Project, no lighted signage/digital displays would be allowed within the Airside Sub-Area and lighted signage/digital displays within the Landside Sub-Area would

not be a distraction to pilots that could pose a safety risk. As such, similar to the proposed Project, impacts related to transportation safety under Alternative 2 would be less than significant. Although Alternative 2 includes less signage overall, the signage proposed under this alternative would include digital signage throughout the Landside Sub-Area similar to the proposed Project. Therefore, transportation safety impacts under Alternative 2 would be similar to the proposed Project.

### **c. Alternative 3 – No Digital Signage**

#### *Description*

Under this alternative, no digital off-site signage would be allowed within the Project site. As with the proposed Project, Alternative 3 would establish a new sign district that would allow a maximum of approximately 81,522 sq ft of proposed off-site signage within the Landside Sub-Area and a maximum of approximately 289,600 sq ft of proposed off-site signage within the Airside Sub-Area. The proposed location of digital displays within the Landside Sub-Area would be replaced with supergraphics.

Proposed new off-site signage within the Airside Sub-Area would remain the same as under the proposed Project. Alternative 3 would also create a sign ordinance which would govern the type and size of allowable off-site signs and their placement throughout the Project site. The proposed signage under this alternative would include supergraphics, wall signs, and other signs such as signs on passenger boarding bridges, hanging signs, and column wraps. Alternative 3 is also designed to limit visibility from off-airport locations (i.e., surrounding communities) and to not visually or negatively affect airport operations or affect or alter historical buildings within LAX. No lighted signs would be allowed in the Airside Sub-Area.

Under Alternative 3, there would be no digital display signs available as use for emergency communication as necessary. As with the proposed Project, Alternative 3 would include a plan to remove a number of billboards in LAWA's control and compliance with other applicable requirements from the Department of City Planning.

As with the proposed Project, the estimated implementation date for the construction and operation of the new off-site signage under Alternative 3 is 2013.

Alternative 3 would support the objectives of the proposed Project; however, to a lesser degree, as without digital displays, the Sign District would have less flexibility to enhance the visual environment through modern creative signs. In addition, compared to the proposed Project, the likely decreased amount of advertising that could be sold with the elimination of digital displays under Alternative 3 would provide a decreased revenue stream that would be used to support infrastructure projects at LAX.

#### *Land Use and Planning*

Under Alternative 3, a sign district would be established that includes provisions superseding the citywide Sign Ordinance, including allowing the installation of off-site signage and use of supergraphics. Digital signage would not be permitted. Areas identified as allowing digital signage under the proposed Project would be locations for supergraphics. The amount of signage allowed in both the Landside and Airside Sub-Areas would be the same as the proposed Project.

An LAX sign ordinance would be established that regulates aspects of signage such as sign type, size, overall amount, lamination standards, and sign placement. As with the proposed Project, with approval of the sign district, Alternative 3 would be consistent with the LAMC and would also support regional and local plans and policies as described for the proposed Project. As such, similar to the proposed Project, no inconsistencies with

local land use plans and policies would occur under Alternative 3; therefore, land use and planning impacts would be less than significant impact.

### *Visual Resources*

Under Alternative 3, a sign district would be established that allows installation of new off-site signage, including supergraphics, wall signs, column wraps, hanging signs, and signage on passenger boarding bridges. No digital signage would be permitted. Areas identified as allowing digital signage under the proposed Project would be locations for supergraphics. The amount of signage allowed in both the Landside and Airside Sub-Areas would be the same as the proposed Project.

Under Alternative 3, construction activities to replace the signage would occur more frequently than under the proposed Project as all the signage allowed under Alternative 3 would require manual installation and replacement, as opposed to digital signs, which could be updated electronically from off-airport locations. Construction would occur infrequently, be short in duration, and require a small construction crew and equipment. It would not result in a substantial change in the visual character. Therefore, as with the proposed Project, the impact on visual resources associated with construction would be less than significant under Alternative 3.

As with the proposed Project, the amount, size, and placement of the signs would be subject to a sign ordinance that would serve to ensure that visual clutter would not occur. Additionally, no signage would be allowed on buildings with notable architecture. As with the proposed Project, the sign district under Alternative 3 would allow for creative well-designed signage that would not substantially change the visual character of the site. Potential locations for signs would not change, and thus visibility from off-airport locations would be similar to that as described for the proposed Project. As with the proposed Project, supergraphics on the first sky bridge and Terminal 1 would have some limited visibility to motorists and pedestrians along the eastern boundary. Therefore, the visibility and visual character under Alternative 3 would be similar to the proposed Project. As with the proposed Project, potential impacts to visual resources under Alternative 3 would be less than significant.

### *Artificial Light and Glare*

Under Alternative 3, a sign district would be established that allows installation of new off-site signage, including supergraphics, wall signs, column wraps, signage on passenger boarding bridges, and hanging signs. The amount of signage allowed would be the same as the proposed Project; however, digital signage would not be allowed. Externally lit supergraphics would be allowed at the locations identified for digital signage under the proposed Project.

Under Alternative 3, construction activities to replace the signage would occur more frequently than under the proposed Project as all the signage allowed Alternative 3 would require manual installation and replacement, as opposed to digital signs, which could be updated electronically from off-site. Construction would continue to occur infrequently, be short in duration, and require a small construction crew and equipment. If nighttime construction occurs, additional lighting such as floodlights could be required. If floodlights are required for nighttime construction, the lights would be directed on the work area to limit spill-over. Additionally, the Project site is in an area with a high ambient lighting level associated with lighted airport facilities, street lighting, traffic, and the surrounding urban development. The use of floodlights would be similar to existing lighting and would not create a substantial increase in the intensity of light that could affect light-sensitive uses.

Signage would continue to be subject to limitations such as placement, size, and type. As with the proposed Project, lighted signs would be allowed in the Landside Sub-Area only and would not be visible to surrounding communities. Along the eastern boundary, limited views of the proposed lighted supergraphics would be available. The Project area is characterized by high ambient light levels and sign lighting would be pointed

downward towards the roadway. As with the proposed Project, lighting associated with proposed signage under Alternative 3 would not add to the ambient glow of the area that would represent a substantial change in brightness levels as seen from adjacent sensitive uses and a change in brightness and light trespass would not occur. Therefore, impacts under Alternative 3 would be less than significant. Because Alternative 3 would not include digital signage, artificial light and glare impacts (i.e., LED-based illumination) associated with Alternative 3 would be less than under the proposed Project.

### ***Transportation Safety***

Under Alternative 3, a new sign district would be established that allows installation of new off-site signage, including supergraphics, column wraps, signage on passenger boarding bridges, and hanging signs. No digital signage would be permitted. Areas identified as allowing digital signage under the proposed Project would be locations for supergraphics. The amount of signage allowed in both the Landside and Airside Sub-Areas, would be the same as the proposed Project.

Under Alternative 3, operational activities to replace the signage would occur more frequently as all the signage allowed would require manual installation and replacement, as opposed to digital signs under the proposed Project, which would be updated electronically from an off-airport location. Updates of signage along the sky bridges would require temporary lane closures while sign/removal installation is occurring. As with the proposed Project, lane closures would be of short duration and occur only at limited points at any one time, without closing the entire roadway. Other areas of the CTA would be kept clear and unobstructed at all times during sign installation in accordance with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), State Fire Marshal, and Los Angeles Fire Code regulations. Given the short duration of construction for each sign and the limited amount of time that lane closures could be required, impacts to the transportation safety of the site during construction would be less than significant under Alternative 3, although slightly greater than the proposed Project given the increased frequency.

As with the proposed Project, the amount, size, and placement of the signs would be subject to a sign ordinance that would serve to ensure that visual clutter and transportation safety impacts (i.e., driver distraction that leads to crashes) would not occur. Transportation safety impacts would be less than significant under the proposed Project, and this potential would be similar under Alternative 3 as signage would still be installed at locations proposed under the Project; however, no digital signage would be installed. As with the proposed Project, no lighted signage/digital displays would be allowed within the Airside Sub-Area and lighted signage/digital displays within the Landside Sub-Area would not be a distraction to pilots or Air Traffic Control personnel that could pose a safety risk. Therefore, no transportation safety impacts would occur under Alternative 3. Under Alternative 3, there would be no digital display signs available to use for emergency communication as necessary. Therefore, the potential safety benefits associated with digital displays would not occur.

## **5. ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE**

Section 15126.6(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires the identification of an environmentally superior alternative to the proposed Project. If the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, then the EIR must identify an environmentally superior alternative among the remaining alternatives. As indicated at the beginning of this chapter, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any impacts that are significant or could not be mitigated to a level that is less than significant; hence, the need to identify and evaluate alternatives that can avoid or substantially lessen any significant impacts of the proposed Project is diminished. Similarly, the need for, and utility of, identifying the environmentally superior alternative is, at this point, largely for general information than for decision-making purposes. Notwithstanding, the following describes how the alternatives would rank overall relative to having the least environmental effects.

Alternative 1 (the No Project Alternative) would be the environmentally superior alternative primarily because no new off-site signage, including supergraphics or digital signage, would be placed in the Project site. Under this alternative, on-site, wayfinding and tenant signage would still be allowed within the Project site. This alternative would be similar to the proposed Project in that it would be consistent with land use and planning requirements. Alternative 1 would introduce fewer new sources of artificial light and glare, fewer elements that have the potential to create traffic distractions associated with new off-site signage than the proposed Project. Alternative 1 would meet the objective of the proposed Project of protecting adjacent communities from visual clutter. Maintaining the signage currently allowed at LAX would partially meet the objectives of providing well-designed signs that support economic development; however, there would be substantially less flexibility to provide modern creative signage to enhance the visual environmental and less opportunity to support economic development and the uniqueness of LAX. The No Project Alternative would not provide a revenue stream that would be used to support infrastructure projects at LAX.

Table V-1 provides a matrix that compares the impacts of each alternative relative to the level of impact anticipated with the proposed Project, understanding that there are no unavoidable significant impacts associated with the proposed Project. Based on the above analysis, among the remaining alternatives, Alternative 2 – Reduced Signage, and Alternative 3 – No Digital Signage, would tie as the environmentally superior alternative because either alternative would result in fewer environmental impacts compared to the proposed Project. Both Alternatives 2 and 3 would, to a limited extent: 1) promote and enhance LAX as an international gateway, 2) recognize the uniqueness of LAX as a regional economic engine, 3) ensure that new off-site signs are responsive to and integrated with the aesthetic character of the Project site and are positioned in a manner that is compatible both architecturally and relative to the other signage at the airport, thereby minimizing potential safety issues, 4) place in a manner that protects adjacent communities from potential adverse impacts of new off-site signs by avoiding visual clutter, including visual impacts of excessive number of signs, excessive sign size, sign illumination, and sign motion/animation, and 5) support and enhance limited new off-site signage to the interior of LAX and the urban design, land use, economic development, and modernization objectives of the LAX Master Plan and LAX Specific Plan.

As described in Chapter VI, Summary of Significant Unavoidable Impacts, based on the analysis contained in Chapter IV (Environmental Impact Analysis) of this Draft EIR, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any significant unavoidable impacts for land use and planning, visual resources, artificial light and glare, or transportation safety. The proposed Project would provide a revenue stream that would be used to support infrastructure projects at LAX, allow digital displays signs to be used for emergency communication as necessary, and implement signage in a manner consistent and considered in the LAX Specific Plan, which establishes procedures for approval of a Sign District. The proposed Project would implement the project objectives and result in the least environmental impacts with regard to land use and planning, visual resources, artificial light and glare, and transportation safety; therefore, this Draft EIR also identifies the proposed Project as the environmentally superior alternative.