

4.12 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

This section of the EA/EIR addresses the cumulative impacts of both Alternative 2 and 3. Alternative 1 is not addressed within this section, as this alternative would not result in any cumulative impacts. This section is provided per the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

4.12.1 LEGAL AUTHORITY

National Environmental Policy Act

An Environmental Assessment must discuss cumulative impacts when they are significant and, when not significant, the document should explain the basis for that conclusion. Cumulative impacts are defined as two or more individual effects that, when considered together, are considerable or that compound or increase other environmental impacts.

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) defines cumulative effects as:

“The impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of an the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (federal or non-federal) or person undertakes such other actions.” (40 Code of Federal Regulation 1508.7)

California Environmental Quality Act

CEQA like NEPA, refers to cumulative impacts as two or more individual effects which, when considered together are considerable, or which compound or increase other environmental impacts (Section 15355 of the CEQA *Guidelines*).

Section 15130(b) of the CEQA *Guidelines* allows the following two methods of prediction: “(A) a list of past, present, and reasonably anticipated future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including those projects outside the control of the agency, or (B) a summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document which is designed to evaluate regional or areawide conditions.” For the purposes of this EA/EIR a list of past, present, and reasonably anticipated future projects is utilized.

4.12.2 LIST OF CUMULATIVE PROJECTS

The past, present, and reasonably anticipated future projects including residential, commercial, industrial and institutional projects used in the cumulative analysis are summarized in **Appendix 4.12 on Table 1, Cumulative Project List**. The general location of the cumulative projects is presented in **Appendix 4.12** and illustrated in **Exhibit 1, Cumulative Projects Locations**.

4.12.3 CUMULATIVE IMPACT ANALYSIS

Geology and Soils

Hazards such as fault rupture, ground shaking, and liquefaction are site specific in nature and do not contribute to cumulative impacts. Alternatives 2 and 3 would be designed in a way that includes mitigation measures to reduce potential earth resource impacts to a level that is less than significant. In addition, each future cumulative project would be required to be designed in accordance with the County, City, and Uniform Building Code (UBC) requirements, as well as any identified mitigation measure proposed within a site-specific geotechnical study. The incorporation of such requirements and measures would reduce impacts to a less than significant level and, therefore, no cumulative impacts would result with the implementation of either Alternative 2 or 3, and cumulative projects.

Traffic and Circulation

Cumulative effects of ambient growth and traffic from cumulative projects have been incorporated into this analysis. **Table 4.12-1, Future Traffic Conditions – With Cumulative Development**, presents the cumulative traffic impacts at key study intersections. As indicated in **Table 4.12-1**, during the PM peak hour period, the intersection of Temple Street and North Broadway, Aliso Street/southbound 101 Freeway off-ramp and North Broadway, and the northbound 101 on-ramp and North Broadway would be significantly impacted due to cumulative projects.

The projected cumulative conditions represent deterioration in operating conditions from year 2005 conditions. Growth in traffic throughout the study area due to regional and cumulative project growth would create significant traffic impacts regardless of the development of the project. In fact, the project's contribution to impacts at these intersections is less than 7 percent. Overall, Alternative 2 and 3 project-specific traffic and circulation impact were considered to less than significant impacts and consequently do not make a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts

**Table 4.12-1
Future Traffic Conditions – With Cumulative Development**

Intersection	Peak Period	Without Project		With Project			With Project + Cumulative Impacts			Project % of Impact
		CMA	LOS	CMA	LOS	Impact	CMA	LOS	Impact	
Temple Street & North Broadway	AM	0.442	A	0.445	A	0.003	0.558	A	0.062	3%
	PM	0.730	C	0.743	C	0.013	0.941	E	0.211	6%
Aliso St./SB 101 Fwy Off-Ramp & North Broadway	AM	0.403	A	0.411	A	0.008	0.451	A	0.048	17%
	PM	0.497	A	0.512	A	0.015	0.701	C	0.204	7%
NB 101 Fwy On-Ramp & North Broadway	AM	0.438	A	0.443	A	0.005	0.542	A	0.104	5%
	PM	0.611	B	0.625	B	0.015	0.829	D	0.218	7%
Temple Street & North Spring Street	AM	0.490	A	0.491	A	0.001	0.524	A	0.034	3%
	PM	0.316	A	0.321	A	0.005	0.351	A	0.035	14%
Aliso Street & North Spring Street	AM	0.339	A	0.366	A	0.027	0.390	A	0.051	53%
	PM	0.251	A	0.257	A	0.006	0.272	A	0.021	29%
NB 101 Fwy Off-Ramp & North Spring Street	AM	0.385	A	0.394	A	0.009	0.407	A	0.022	41%
	PM	0.157	A	0.159	A	0.002	0.173	A	0.016	13%
SB 101 Fwy On-Ramp & Los Angeles Street	AM	0.188	A	0.188	A	0.000	0.312	A	0.124	0%
	PM	0.290	A	0.294	A	0.004	0.465	A	0.175	2%

Source: Crain & Associates, April 2003.

There are a number of viable strategies that the project can utilize to encourage options to single occupancy vehicles to and from the site. The following details plans in which the reoccupied Hall of Justice can achieve vehicle trip reduction goals. The project's Transportation System Management (TSM) plan efforts incorporate ridesharing in all the traditional methods such as vanpooling, carpooling, walking, bicycling and bus ridership. Downtown Los Angeles has the benefit of housing Union Station which provides opportunities to utilize trains, light rail and the current subway system and hence the entire regional network of public transit services. The full TSM program is discussed below in detail.

- The project would encourage employee ridership of the rail, bus and subway services through employee awareness programs and convenient access to schedules and routes.
- The project would implement TSM measures to increase the convenience and attractiveness of the other transportation alternatives among employees and visitors. Services such as carpool and vanpool matching, vanpool formation and leasing assistance, and preferred parking for employees who carpool or vanpool together, would be provided by the project to facilitate ridesharing. These services work well in conjunction with, and benefit those who wish to take advantage of, the high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes on the freeways.
- Bicycle travel would be supported by the project through such on-site amenities as bicycle racks or lockers that are located on site. Bicycle ridership is supported by some other modes of transportation with bicycle racks. The availability of these services would be highlighted.
- The trip-reduction strategies discussed above would be carried out and marketed by a centralized transportation management office (TMO) established within the project. The TMO would provide rideshare matching, public transit schedules and the opportunity to purchase bus and metro rail passes on-site. The services would be coordinated through a centralized rideshare coordinator.

The project volumes can be reduced by 10 to 20% with the implementation of the TSM program. While the TSM program is not required to mitigate a specific project related impact it is offered to participate in the reduction of overall trips into Downtown Los Angeles. The successful implementation of the program would help reduce potential cumulative impacts.

Public Health & Safety/Hazardous Materials

The public health and safety/hazardous materials impacts associated with a proposed project related to asbestos, lead based paint, and polychlorinated biphenyls, occur on a project-by-project basis, rather than in a cumulative nature. Considering the fact that Alternatives 2 and 3 contain mitigation measures to abate the site specific hazards, cumulative impacts associated with either of these alternatives would be expected to be lessened due to the fact that the harmful substances have been removed from the vicinity and replaced with currently approved building materials. Therefore, cumulative impacts associated with either of the alternatives would be less than significant.

Socio-Economic Issues/Environmental Justice

Alternatives 2 or 3, and cumulative development may provide some short-term and long-term employment opportunities for minority and low-income individuals in the area by providing business/personal services to the development project occupants. This in turn would provide for increased business opportunities adjacent to the Hall of Justice site and cumulative project sites, as well as outlying areas. In general, the development of either Alternative 2 or 3, and other cumulative projects are not anticipated to displace any existing on-site or off-site permanent residents in which federal funding is involved. In any instances where this may occur the lead agency on that project would be required to prepare the appropriate NEPA documentation and provide relocation assistance thus reducing impacts to a less than significant level. For the above reasons, the construction of either Alternative 2 or 3, and cumulative projects would not cause environmental injustice to minority or low-income individuals and is consistent with provisions of Executive Order (EO) 12898.

Visual Quality

Increased development associated with buildout of the cumulative projects would alter the visual image of each area surrounding those project sites. As a requirement in the City of Los Angeles and County of Los Angeles, the project design for each project would be reviewed for consistency with applicable City and County codes and regulations prior to final approval. The closest other development project within the area of the Hall of Justice is the Alameda District Plan located near the intersection of Alameda Street and Los Angeles Street. This cumulative project would not be located immediately adjacent to the Hall of Justice site. As a result, there would not be a cumulative alteration to the visual character of the area, as viewed from the surrounding streets and land uses, due to the combined effect of Alternative 2 or 3 and this cumulative project. In addition, the development of the new parking structure would provide for in-fill development and would be designed to be compatible with the existing Hall of Justice building and thus would not considerably contribute to cumulative visual quality impacts.

Impacts associated with light and glare issues are typically limited to the Hall of Justice site and immediate off-site areas and are not considered to be cumulatively significant.

Air Quality

Consistency with 2003 Air Quality Management Plan

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) has not identified thresholds to which the total emissions of all cumulative development can be compared. Instead, the SCAQMD's methods are based on long-term performance standards and emission reduction targets necessary to attain the federal and state air quality standards identified in the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). If a project is not within the emission thresholds, the SCAQMD identifies possible methods to determine the cumulative significance of land use projects.¹ Because the proposed project's operational emissions are within the threshold levels, potential cumulative impacts are considered to be less than significant.

Conformity with Federal Clean Air Act

Section 176 of the 1990 Amendments to the Clean Air Act prohibits the Federal Government from engaging in any activity that does not conform to the applicable implementation plan. A final rule titled "Determining Conformity of General Federal Actions to State or Federal Implementation Plans" was published in the Federal Register on November 30, 1993 and provides guidance in complying with Section 176. This analysis is based upon the requirements contained in the final rule and guidance provided by *General Conformity Guidance: Questions and Answers* published by EPA on July 13, 1994.

40 CFR Section 51.853 of the final rule provides de minimis thresholds that are annual emission rates used to determine if project emissions are of sufficient magnitude that a conformity determination is required. EPA classifies the South Coast Air Basin ("Basin") as an extreme non-attainment area for ozone. The de minimis conformity threshold for extreme non-attainment is 10 tons per year (VOC or NO_x). For CO, the Basin is considered to be in serious non-attainment and for PM₁₀, is considered to be in non-attainment. The de minimis conformity threshold for CO and for PM₁₀ is 100 tons per year.

The project emissions consist of direct and indirect emissions. As defined in the final rule, direct emissions are caused or initiated by the federal action and occur at the same time and place as the action. Direct project emissions include operational emissions, such as natural gas combustion (space and water heating) and electrical demand (power plant emissions). Indirect emissions are caused by the federal action but may occur later in time and/or farther removed in distance from the action and the federal

¹ South Coast Air Quality Management District, *CEQA Air Quality Handbook* (Diamond Bar, California: South Coast Air Quality Management District, April 1993), p. 9-12.

agency can practically control and will maintain control over such emissions due to a continuing program responsibility. Project indirect emissions are limited to exhaust emissions associated with vehicle trips.

Project direct and indirect emissions under worst-case conditions (i.e., Alternative 2) have been estimated using the most recent emission factors available. Section 51.859 of the final rule requires the use of the most recent motor vehicle emissions model. Indirect emissions estimates in the project EA/EIR have been calculated using the most recent versions of URBEMIS 2001. The direct and indirect emissions estimates (assuming operations of 365 day per year, which is not likely) are presented in Table 4.12-2, **Project Direct and Indirect Emissions**.

**Table 4.12-2
Project Direct and Indirect Emissions (Tons/Year)**

Pollutant	Direct	Indirect	Sum
NO _x	0.39	2.33	2.72
VOC	0.04	2.89	2.93
PM ₁₀	0.00	1.38	1.38
CO	0.25	25.65	25.90

The sum of project direct and indirect emissions is less than the de minimis conformity thresholds. Therefore, Alternative 2 and 3 are exempt from the final conformity rule and a conformity determination need not be prepared.

Noise

Alternative 2 and 3, as well as other cumulative projects would introduce mechanical equipment and parking facilities to the downtown area. Given the urban nature of the Hall of Justice site and surrounding area, operation of these cumulative projects together with either Alternative 2 or 3 would not result in cumulative noise impacts from facility operations.

Noise modeling was conducted along study roadways to predict noise levels with existing traffic volumes plus cumulative project generated traffic. Table 4.12-3, **Cumulative Roadway Noise Levels**, presents the anticipated traffic-related noise levels under cumulative conditions.

**Table 4.12-3
Cumulative Roadway Noise Levels**

ROADWAY SEGMENT	Noise Levels in dB(A) ¹		
	Existing	Cumulative	Increase
North Broadway			
Northeast of 101	71.7	72.8	1.0
Between Aliso Street and Temple Street	73.7	74.4	0.7
101 Freeway			
Between Broadway Street and Los Angeles Street	72.6	72.9	0.3
Spring Street			
Northeast of 101	69.2	69.4	0.2
Between Aliso Street and Temple Street	71.0	71.3	0.3
Aliso Street			
Between Broadway Street and Spring Street	68.7	69.7	1.0
Temple Street			
Between Broadway and Spring Street	70.5	71.5	1.0

Source: Impact Sciences, Inc., Model results are contained in Appendix 4.12.

¹ Numbers may not add up due to rounding.

Overall, the cumulative projects would increase ambient noise conditions along existing roadways by 0.3 to 1.0 dB(A) CNEL over existing levels. The greatest increase in noise of 1.0 dB(A) would occur on North Broadway northeast of Highway 101 and Temple Street between Broadway and Spring Street. Noise level increases along existing roadways that would result from the cumulative projects would not be noticeable (i.e., greater than 3.0 dB(A)), and would not result in the threshold criteria being exceeded. Therefore, Alternative 2 or 3 plus cumulative project noise impacts would be less than significant.

Public Services and Utilities

Water

Development of Alternative 2 or 3, along with other cumulative projects within the project area, would increase development intensity and water demand. According to growth projections in the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), the existing supply of water would be adequate to accommodate growth based on projected water demand to the year 2020. The LADWP is equipped to provide water service to meet the cumulative demand for water. Since water demand by either Alternative 2 or 3 would be within the existing remaining capacity of the LADWP, Alternatives 2 and 3, would not result in significant impacts to water supply or make a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts. Consequently, cumulative impacts to water supply would be less than significant.

Wastewater

Development of Alternative 2 or 3, along with other cumulative projects within the project area, would increase development intensity and wastewater generation. Several improvements to the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP) system have recently been completed, that have allowed the system to treat increased wastewater flows. The existing excess dry weather capacity of the HTP is approximately 92 million gallons per day (MGD). Since effluent generated by either Alternative 2 or 3 would be within the existing remaining capacity of the plant, Alternatives 2 and 3 would not result in significant impacts to wastewater or make a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts. Each new development within the City of Los Angeles and County of Los Angeles is required to comply with water conservation ordinances and other regulations pertaining to sewer collection and disposal. Consequently, cumulative impacts are considered to be less than significant.

Energy

Cumulative projects would cause an additional demand for electrical services, which may create the need for additional improvements. The LADWP is capable of providing the needed services from cumulative projects, and each project would be required to incorporate energy conservation features into its design. Consequently, impacts to the LADWP for power services for Alternative 2 or 3, and the cumulative projects would be less than significant.

Solid Waste

Implementation of Alternative 2 or 3 in conjunction with the cumulative projects would further increase demand for solid waste disposal services. It should be noted that the City's and County's source reduction and recycling programs have thus far been successful in reducing the total volume of solid wastes requiring landfill disposal. Further, any cumulative projects would be required to comply with the City's program. This would ensure the continued effort toward source reduction and recycling. Continued implementation of the program and cooperation by cumulative projects in implementing site-specific solid waste management programs are expected to achieve the mandates of AB 939 on a citywide basis. Solid waste generated by either Alternative 2 or 3 would not result in significant impacts, and consequently would not considerably contribute to cumulative impacts. Therefore, cumulative impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

Water Resources/Floodplain Encroachment

Alternatives 2 and 3, with the preparation and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) would not result in significant impacts to surface and groundwater quality, or make a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts. Further, all uses within the City of Los Angeles and County of Los Angeles are subject to the requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for municipal storm water discharge both during construction and operational phases. Implementation of the Best Management Practices (BMPs) pursuant to the NPDES permit requirements for all cumulative projects would minimize the potential for cumulative degradation of water quality. Consequently, no significant cumulative impacts to water quality are expected.

Alternative 2 and 3 would not result in an increase to surface runoff and velocities within the City of Los Angeles or County of Los Angeles storm drain facilities and would not place structures within a 100-year floodplain as identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Neither Alternative 2 nor 3 would result in significant impacts to surface runoff and floodplain encroachment, and would not make a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts. Buildout of other cumulative projects may, however, increase impervious surface runoff and velocities. Each future cumulative project is required to provide adequate capacity to convey drainage to a safe point of discharge and pay fees to connect to the drainage system. In this manner, the existing drainage system would be upgraded as necessary to accommodate runoff created by the development of future uses. Given the above, no significant cumulative impacts with respect to storm drain facilities and flooding are expected.

Biological Resources

Given the existing level of development and historical degree of disturbance, the absence of state or federal candidates for rare, threatened, or endangered species, and the absence of wetlands and wildlife corridors within the proposed development area or immediate vicinity, Alternative 2 or 3 would not contribute significantly to impacts to biological resources on a regional or subregional level. Therefore, cumulative impacts to regional biological resources would be considered less than significant. In addition, with the implementation of the recommended mitigation measure, potential impact on local biological resources would not be cumulatively considerable.

Cultural Resources

Paleontological Resources

Impacts upon paleontological resources tend to be site specific and are assessed on a site-by-site basis. Cumulative impacts to paleontological resources result when geologic units become unavailable for study and observation by scientists. The destruction of unique paleontological resources has a significant cumulative impact as it makes biological records of ancient life unavailable for study by scientists. Where such resources exist, buildout of the project site, together with other development in the City and region would result in an incremental adverse impact to paleontological resources. In this case, the cumulative impact would be to unknown paleontological resources. However, provided that proper mitigation as proposed for Alternative 2 and 3 is implemented in conjunction with cumulative development in the area, no significant cumulative impacts are anticipated.

Archaeological Resources

Impacts upon archaeological resources tend to be site specific and are assessed on a site-by-site basis. Where resources exist, implementation of cumulative development in the region would represent an incremental adverse impact to cultural resources. However, provided that proper mitigation is implemented in conjunction with cumulative project development in the area, no significant cumulative impacts are anticipated. In fact, if mitigation is properly carried out, a positive impact on cumulative cultural resource information would occur; that is, mitigation measures would result in the acquisition of additional scientific information about the prehistory of the region, thereby serving to clarify our reconstruction of prehistoric lifeways. The artifacts obtained from the sites during mitigation procedures would be preserved for future analysis and study.

Historic Architecture

While the implementation of Alternative 2 is considered to result in a significant and unavoidable impact under CEQA, and adverse effect under NEPA, the implementation of this alternative would not result in cumulative impacts. This due to the fact that there are no cumulative projects directly surrounding the site within the area of potential effect that together with Alternative 2 would result in a cumulative impact.

The implementation of Alternative 3 would include rehabilitation of the Hall of Justice building in accordance with Secretary of Interior standards resulting in less than significant impacts under CEQA

and no adverse effect under NEPA. This alternative would not result in cumulative impacts, since there are no cumulative projects directly surrounding the site within the area of potential effect that together with Alternative 3 would result in a cumulative impact.