

PC00121 Rodine, Robert The Polaris Group 6/4/2001

PC00121-1

Comment:

A copy of my personal letter for both the record of the proceedings and availability at the forums follows.

A letter from VICA will be sent under separate cover from the VICA office.

I ran my letter up the flagpole at the FAA and Transportation to help it get the attention of Messrs Kessler and Withycombe.

I hope that our colleagues at LA Chamber, LABA, CCI and LAHQ are working aggressively to support modernization.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00121-2

Comment:

The entire thrust of my consulting practice is in the realm of objective analyses of economic and business issues. In that context I have examined the Preferred Alternative of the Master Plan for Los Angeles International Airport ("LAX,") and if it is flawed in any way it is a lack of aggressiveness in providing infrastructure to satisfy the projected air travel demand for this Region.

In face of demand in the range of 98 to 104 Million Annual Passengers ("MAP,") and freight at approximately 4.2 million tons annually, in my mind it borders on criminal for elected officials to fail to insure that LAX is prepared to absorb that load.

The State has been advised by Cal-Trans in their latest Vision Statement that if we have a trade vulnerability it is in the inadequacy of our commerce gateways, the capacity of airports and ports with particular emphasis on LAX and San Francisco.

Our region's most widely recognized economist, Jack Kyser of the LAEDC, has emphasized the importance of attaining adequate capacity at LAX to sustain the region's economic base.

The non-political, analytic staff at the Southern California Association of Governments ("SCAG") have demonstrated the potential for loss that will result from inaction in bringing LAX up to the capacity levels needed to service forecasted demand.

Secretary Mineta has declared that inaction in upgrading airport infrastructure will only result in worsening air travel conditions in coming years, particularly in face of the historic unwillingness of communities to meet known demand.

Response:

Comment noted. The initial purpose of concept development in the master planning process was to develop ideas that would provide the facilities needed to accommodate the forecast demand through 2015. The unconstrained options, upon completion in the 2nd iteration, underwent extensive feedback from local residents, business owners, and oversight agencies. As a result of this input, LAWA staff reexamined the goals and objectives of the LAX Master Plan and placed a higher priority on environmental and community objectives over economic and air service objectives. The Master Plan alternatives, thus, were designed to maximize the amount of traffic that could be served in the limited space available.

3. Comments and Responses

LAX faces growth constraints and limited physical size. LAWA is not pursuing the maximum development needed to serve the unconstrained 2015 market demand, in response to feedback from the community and oversight agencies on the growth constraints. As a result, the three build alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIS/EIR either would not be able to accommodate the 2015 market demand for approximately 98 million annual passengers (MAP) as forecast in the Master Plan (Alternative C), or could only accommodate approximately 98 MAP if the airlines make adjustments in air service (by serving commuter demand with air carrier jets as forecast for Alternatives A and B). Also, the No Action/No Project Alternative examined the capacity of all of the airport components and defined the maximum level of activity (approximately 78.7 MAP) that could be accommodated at LAX without improvements. The activity levels forecast for each alternative reflect the growth constraints at LAX. See Chapter V, Section 3.3.2 of the Draft LAX Master Plan for more information on the activity associated with each alternative. The analysis in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR followed the guidelines outlined in Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Order 5050.4A, Airport Environmental Handbook.

The amount of land necessary to serve a given number of passengers can vary widely at different airports depending on a variety of factors such as local wind and weather conditions, runway layout, the instrumentation available on the runways, the proximity of other airports (and corresponding airspace), the fleet mix, and hourly demand patterns. Many airports are not able to operate with all runways at all times due to wind conditions. Chicago O'Hare is a good example of this. O'Hare has seven runways but not all of the runways can be used at the same time because many of the runways intersect. At LAX, there are four parallel runways with sufficient instrumentation available that the runways are usually not closed due to wind and weather conditions. This allows LAX to serve more passengers per acre than other airports. In addition, the Master Plan projected that delays would increase to 10 to 15 minutes per operation by 2015. These delays would be higher than those experienced at most airports, which would allow LAX to serve more passengers than other airports. The forecast passenger demand not met by Alternative C would need to be accommodated by service outside the region.

PC00121-3

Comment:

Those elected officials who point to El Toro and Palmdale as the solutions are not visionaries as they paint themselves. They are naive dreamers, who are gambling against very bad odds with our economic destiny. The people of Orange County have made it clear that they will do all in their power to prevent the utilization of El Toro as a commercial airport. The airlines, if anyone was listening during briefings at SCAG, showed that the free market conditions at Palmdale simply won't support commercial service of the sort that will relieve LAX for many years to

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00121-4

Comment:

The claim of freezing growth at LAX in pursuit of a regional approach is not supported by any of the data. If the capacity of LAX is corrected to accommodate 98 MAP, that will still leave 59 MAP to be serviced by the region's other airports, Burbank, Long Beach, Ontario and John Wayne, and they will be unable to do so unless they too improve their facilities and change their community postures relative to the value of their airports.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00121-5

Comment:

Mr. Kessler, I see no alternative for the FAA but to heed Secretary Mineta's warning and demand that LAX be modernized such that it can handle efficiently, in comfort and with safety, every one of those 98 million passengers that will pass through its gates in 2020. It is my sincere hope that the FAA will not only keep with this philosophy, but that you use all the resources at your access, as the guardians of our airways, to insure that we will no longer be allowed to strangle ourselves in the sea of underserved travelers that we are already struggling to accommodate.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00122 Peach, Lisa None Provided 6/10/2001

PC00122-1

Comment:

No expansion!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00123 Patton, Ruth None Provided 6/12/2001

PC00123-1

Comment:

I am against the over expansion of LAX Airport.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

PC00123-2

Comment:

I believe the cargo facility should be shifted to Palmdale Airport.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00123-3

Comment:

There has been no consideration for the Maintenance Hangers as far as I can see.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The subject of airline maintenance hangars was included as part of the ancillary facilities component of each alternative. Chapter 3, Alternatives, in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR described the ancillary facilities program for each alternative.

PC00123-4

Comment:

I believe that the Centinela Adobe should not be demolished or moved.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding impacts to the Centinela Adobe.

PC00124

Lada, Dennis

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00124-1

Comment:

Westchester has always been a family community. By expanding the airport you will be taking homes away from our community.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00040-46. Please also see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation issues.

PC00124-2

Comment:

Why should we as a community have the burden of expanding our airport when all the growth is east. Doesn't it make sense to have the airports in the east since that is where the population is growing the most.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR dealt only with the development of LAX. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. LAWA is currently updating the master plan for Ontario in order to develop adequate facilities to meet the projected demand that is based upon population growth in the Inland Empire.

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00125

Chan, Jerry

None Provided

6/12/2001

PC00125-1

Comment:

LEAVE THE LAX THE WAY IT IS. WE DO NOT WANT ANY MORE NOISE, AIR POLLUTION, TRAFFIC TO SPOIL OUR PEACEFUL COMMUNITY.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

Also, Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00126 Chin, Helen None Provided 6/12/2001

PC00126-1

Comment:

NO LAX EXPANSION PLEASE.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00127 Leighton, Andrew None Provided

PC00127-1

Comment:

Please count my voice among the many Southbay residents in opposition to the expansion of LAX. We here in the Southbay feel that we are already absorbing more than our fair share of the burden for economic expansion in the L.A. area. A more than 50% increase in air, noise and ground traffic is more than we should be expected to bear especially in light of the reluctance of our Orange County neighbors to help. Why can't El Torro and John Wayne airports be expanded to help take the burden off our already overtaxed roadways and airways?

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendices D and G and Technical Reports 2, 3 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendices S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-2 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00127-2

Comment:

The E.I.R. submitted on behalf of Los Angeles World Airports is deeply flawed in using 1996 for its base year and as a result does not take into account the worst case scenario that it is designed to account for.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-1 regarding baseline issues.

PC00127-3

Comment:

Help us out down here and spread the responsibility to all who benefit. Thank you for your time and attention.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00128

Holt, Patricia

None Provided

6/13/2001

PC00128-1

Comment:

I strongly object to further expansion of the LAX airport for all of the reasons expressed at the hearing on June 9, 2001 at the Marriott in Manhattan Beach. My husband and I attended part of the hearing but were unable to stay for comments. We waited 2 1/2 hours. My major reasons are:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below. In addition, it should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00128-2

Comment:

1. The health hazards from the airplanes is already at and beyond critical. We are overloaded with black dirt everywhere.

Response:

Human health impacts were addressed in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC00128-3

Comment:

2. The traffic on Sepulveda is already at gridlock.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00128-4

Comment:

3. Closing Pershing Dr. would adversely affect El Segundo's route around the airport.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment AL00018-30. Please see Response to Comment AL00018-30.

PC00128-5

Comment:

I believe economically and morally the money should be spent to develop regional airports (Palmdale & Ontario) instead.

In the Master Plan EIS/EIR) - the answer in response to Q. 3 - the statement that this plan can accommodate its appropriate share of aviation demand is absolutely false. We are carrying the major burden for all regions and counties and this is unjust.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00128-6

Comment:

Also, I want to add my anger to others about the way these public (ha!) hearings were scheduled - 3 on 1 day to divide and conquer.

Response:

Comment noted. As stated in Response to Comment PC00109-1, the strategy of the three referenced meetings was to allow for more people to be able to provide oral comments in a hearing setting and to distribute locations to permit easier access to a greater population. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process.

PC00128-7

Comment:

Please listen to what we have to say. We are not with you on this.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00129

Ebsen, Buddy

None Provided

6/12/2001

PC00129-1

Comment:

My wife and I are residents of Palos Verdes Estates for the last 12 years. All but the last 4 years have been a delightful place to live. However, during the last four years the increase in air traffic from LA has become intolerable. We have joined Civic protests and corresponded with our National political representatives requesting relief from this ongoing noise abuse without results.

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PC00129-2

Comment:

Now comes the LAX Master Plan which has turned a deaf ear to ours and thousands of concerned citizens' protests and is seeking authority to expand LAX in an attempt to handle airplane traffic at the rate of a landing and departure every 25 seconds. That United States Air Traffic Official would support such a suicide plan is mind boggling and calls for investigation by the nation's higher authority.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

PC00129-3

Comment:

In seeking an alternative program to the LAX Master Plan I strongly recommend Jane Harman's solution of utilizing the full availability of other airports in this region.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00130 Tsai, Kim Photo King 6/8/2001

PC00130-1

Comment:

I am a small business owner and a resident of Redondo Beach, I travel frequently through LAX and I do support the LAX Master Plan.

An efficient airport will allow the Los Angeles area to be more competitive in the air cargo, international trade and air travel industries. Our local economy should benefit as a result.

The mass transit connection should alleviate local traffic congestion for the South Bay residents.

I look forward to a new, world class LAX soon.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00131 Kwong, Peter Best Western Dragon Gate Inn

PC00131-1

Comment:

As a Hotel business owner located in Downtown Los Angeles, I would like to express my support for the Los Angeles Airport Master Plan. Los Angeles is a World Class City and the Los Angeles International Airport is a World Class Airport. It needs to maintain that profile to continue to provide the kind of service and facilities necessary to serve the people of Los Angeles and the world.

Its ability to perform not only for its traveling customers, but for the good of its neighbors and for the whole city, is critical. To do this requires the commitment to update and improve all aspects of this facility and the surrounding area. The LAX Master Plan is a decisive step in this direction. Not only will it benefit the productivity and functionality of the airport, it will create an economic uplift for the whole region.

I look forward to being both a supporter and benefactor of this enterprise. The Lax Master Plan will create a facility I can be proud of.

Response:

Comment noted.

**PC00132 Benjamin, Kim Los Angeles Chinatown
Business Council 6/8/2001**

PC00132-1

Comment:

On behalf of the Los Angeles Chinatown Business Improvement District, I would like to express our support for the Los Angeles Airport Master Plan. Los Angeles is a world class city and the Los Angeles International Airport is a world class airport. In order to maintain that profile and continue to provide quality service and facilities to the people of Los Angeles and, indeed, the world, upgrading the Los Angeles Airport is a must!

Its ability to perform not only for the traveling customers but for the good of the community is critical. To achieve this goal requires commitment to update and improve all aspects of this facility and the

3. Comments and Responses

surrounding areas. The Los Angeles Airport Master Plan is a decisive step in this direction. It will benefit the productivity and functionality of the Airport as well as create an economic uplift for the whole region.

The Chinatown BID looks forward to supporting the implementation of the LAX Master Plan.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00133 Pyon, Chang Korean-American Garment Industry Association 6/7/2001

PC00133-1

Comment:

On behalf of the Korean American Garment Industry Association, I would like to communicate our support of the Los Angeles International Airport Recommended Master Plan. The LAX Recommended Master Plan will bring unprecedented economic opportunities to communities neighboring the airport such as Inglewood and South Central Los Angeles, ultimately benefiting the entire Southern California region.

Perhaps the most exciting benefit for our communities will be the creation of hundreds of new jobs and small business opportunities unlike anything many of our local communities have seen before. It will be wonderful to see familiar faces among the myriad of airport employees and to know that many of our business will have a chance to participate in an arena previously reserved for large corporations.

We appreciate Los Angeles World Airports' willingness to work closely with the Korean American community in order to make decisions that are informed by our neighborhood's specific needs. When the Master Plan is finally complete. I am confident that LAX will be an airport all of us can be proud of.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00134 Franklin, Theodore None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00134-1

Comment:

As one of those attending the public LAX expansion meeting at the Furma Hotel today, I want to add my voice to the unanimous opposition there against LAX expansion.

I'm sure, Mr. Ritchie, that by now you're already aware of the many specific objections to expansion of LAX so they won't be reiterated here.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00134-2

Comment:

I do, however, want to comment about LAWA promotional literature such as the "Environmental Justice" pamphlet handed at the meeting. This last-mentioned reads like something developed at a 'Mad Hatters' tea party.

3. Comments and Responses

That is, promoting further expansion of LAX by more despoilation of lovely surrounding residential areas and their quality of living under the rubric of "Environmental Justice". This to be accomplished by "Mitigation (read limiting increase) of traffic noise, air pollution, and other social and environmental consequences that must be shared with low-income communnities," Such as? Westchester? Loyola University? Marina del Rey? Playa del Rey? Palos Verdes? El Segundo? Manhattan Beach?

It sounds sort of like the LAWA bureaucracy 'went around the bend' in striving to support the immensely wealthy promoters of LAX "modernization".

These same 'handlers' incidentally will not require protection of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Why? Simply because they won't be living amongst the further despoilation brought about by LAX expansion.

Come on, get real! Get a life---elsewhere!

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed disproportionate impacts on minority or low-income populations for a variety of technical topics, including noise, air quality, and health risk, in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits.

PC00135

O'Neal, Virginia

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00135-1

Comment:

I, vehemently, reject your Masterplan Expansion and flawed Environmental Impact Report. And, urge, along with 100 other cities and many other entities, to base plans for the future on regional airports in So. California rather than growth concentrated at LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00135-2

Comment:

Growth concentrated at LAX would intensify intensifies pollution, increase traffic, create devastating noise, and air and surface safety would be in jeopardy.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, and human health and safety in 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00135-3

Comment:

I urge you to rethink your priorities. We are not owls or blue butterflies - we are people. Can't we have the same consideration. Preserve our "HABITAT."

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00135-4

Comment:

I attach herewith as exhibits (which may give you information to rethink your priorities) from the

Daily Breeze

June 8, 2001, p. 5, "Regional airports offer opportunity" by Jane Harman and Don Knabe

June 6, 2001, p., "Supervisors to fight LAX" by Troy Anderson

Los Angeles Times

June 6, 2001, p 4, "LAX Study Called 'Fatally Flawed'" by Aviation: Consultants hired by expansion foes - - - - -

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00136

**Jusko, Andrew &
Florence**

None Provided

6/12/2001

PC00136-1

Comment:

RECOMMENDATION:

We recommend the "No Action/No Project Alternative" for the LAX Master Plan which is in accordance with the President's Council on Environmental Quality Regulations as stated in your Public Hearing for the following reasons:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below. In addition, it should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00136-2

Comment:

PROTECT OUR CHILDREN & SCHOOLS FROM AIR POLLUTION:

There are a lot of children and schools in the area surrounding LAX. There are 6 grade schools, 3 high schools and one university in the vicinity of LAX. We are doing a disservice to the children by exposing them to the high concentrations of aircraft and vehicular pollution. Jet engines pollute heavily during take-off and landing.

Response:

This analysis specifically assessed possible impacts to children attending grade schools at locations where predicted impacts to air quality are predicted to be highest. Further, the analyses specifically addressed jet aircraft emissions during take-off and landing, as well as other operational modes (taxi

idle, climb out). The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC00136-3

Comment:

405 FREEWAY JAMMED:

Presently the 405 freeway is overcrowded; bringing more car and truck traffic to LAX is unacceptable.

STATE HIGHWAY 1 (Lincoln Boulevard):

This highway is so crowded that traffic is spilling into adjacent residential neighborhoods. The residents are fighting back by blocking their streets or restricting turns and traffic! Expansion of LAX would further aggravate this crowded condition and therefore is unacceptable.

Response:

Please see Topical Responses TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology and results and the Congestion Management Program.

PC00136-4

Comment:

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE:

This term should include the meaning of "sharing pollutants equally among all regional airports" and "sharing automobile congestion equally with other regional airports".

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-EJ-3 regarding environmental justice and regional context. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed environmental justice in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00136-5

Comment:

JET FUEL FUMES:

My wife and I have smelled jet fuel fumes on several occasions driving near LAX, and in the "Sepulveda Tunnel" and sometimes at our home when the wind is from the south.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00045 - 4 regarding the topic of odor and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC00136-6

Comment:

GROUND NOISE:

3. Comments and Responses

On busy days at LAX and when the wind is from the south we get a lot of noise from simultaneous landing and takeoff of aircraft on multiple runways. With forthcoming jumbo, 600 passenger jets, this will get undoubtedly get worse.

Response:

The commentor lives to the north of the airport approximately 2.5 miles where, during certain weather conditions (like winds from the south), residents will experience an increased perception of aircraft noise. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PC00136-7

Comment:

REGIONAL AIRPORTS:

The regional airports must be expanded to take up additional air cargo and passenger demand. More jobs would become available under regional airport expansion.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00136-8

Comment:

EL TORO AIRPORT & ORANGE COUNTY RESIDENTS:

To encourage development of El Toro Airport Orange County residents should pay a fee for using an LA county airport.

Response:

LAX is a public facility and is supported by grants from the FAA. It is illegal to charge different fees to users of the same facility and thus discriminate among users. Also, please refer to Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC00136-9

Comment:

SEPULVEDA TUNNEL UNDER LAX:

You need to hire a safety engineer to study this long and narrow tunnel. Cars change lanes frequently; often the traffic is crowded. In case of fire there is no safety tunnel for people to escape into.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00137 **Ruppert, Rory** **Del Rey Manor Homeowners Association** **6/12/2001**

PC00137-1

Comment:

I am writing in opposition to the Airport Expansion plan for several Homeowners living at the above address who are opposed to this plan.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00137-2

Comment:

Several seniors live in this building and the change in air quality will drastically affect their life style.

Response:

Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In general, the predicted air pollution impacts of any of the LAX Master Plan build alternatives will be lower than the predicted impacts of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution.

PC00137-3

Comment:

Many of them work in the area and will experience a great deal more traffic having to be rerouted around the newly expanded airport.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Regarding existing traffic concerns surrounding LAX, percent contribution of airport traffic in the adjacent communities, and how traffic conditions around the airport would change with implementation of the Master Plan Alternatives, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. Regarding traffic measures to minimize neighborhood impacts, please see Topical Response TR-ST-6.

PC00137-4

Comment:

Between the noise, air quality and added congestion in the area we see nothing about this project benefiting the neighborhood. We sincerely wish you to reconsider this expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, air quality impacts in Section 4.3, Air Quality, and surface transportation impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation,

3. Comments and Responses

with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendices D and G, and Technical Reports 2, 3 and 4. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00138 **Woods, Fe** **None Provided** **6/10/2001**

PC00138-1

Comment:

I am writing to your organization to voice opposition to the proposed plan to expand the Los Angeles Airport. I have been a long time resident of the community of Westchester. My children have been brought up here. When I established residency here, the community was small and very pleasing. Over the years, I have noted a gradual increase in traffic congestion and pollution of various sorts, especially noise.

I have read portions of the voluminous EIR report and I am very concerned that the planned changes for LAX will further erode the pleasure of living in my community. There is no doubt in my mind that there will be added traffic congestion as well as an increase in the noise factor as many more airplanes take off and land at LAX. Picturing as many as 20 million more passengers coming through LAX in the next few years is something I cannot accept. I find the estimates of the increases in noise and air pollution in the EIR to be very conservative.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00138-2

Comment:

I would ask that you work on implementing a regional approach to the issue of more air activity in this area. The words FAIR SHARE have been mentioned many times. Let us let those outlying communities accept their share of whatever the downside is of increased air activity. You are, of course, aware of the possibilities available at Palmdale, El Toro, San Bernardino, and other sites that could be built or expanded to help alleviate the crowded conditions at LAX. Why should the people of Westchester be asked to carry the brunt of increased air activity in this area?

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00138-3

Comment:

I understand that LAX has already purchased and is ready to move a number of homes and businesses in this area. Even without going on with the expansion, our community is already being impacted.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

As was described in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, voluntary acquisition of properties at Belford Avenue and Manchester Square was initiated several years ago by LAWA under the existing Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program as an action separate from the LAX Master Plan. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

PC00138-4

Comment:

I would ask that you not negatively impact this area further. I am not one who does not favor progress, but this expansion plan is so laden with unknowns, that I would not consider it progress. Thank you for your consideration of my position.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00139 Krekeler, Katherine None Provided 6/11/2001

PC00139-1

Comment:

My husband and I have lived in Westchester for 20 yrs. and 14 yrs., respectively. We have two children who attend local elementary schools here and who play soccer and little league at Neilson Park. To expand LAX would bring noise, pollution, traffic and congestion that would adversely affect our lives. We cherish our home, our neighborhood, our neighbors and our community. Please do not expand LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00140 Halpern, Sam None Provided 6/12/2001

PC00140-1

Comment:

1. As a Playa del Rey resident, for the past 3 years, I am gridlocked now in the morning. I live only a few miles away from work and do not have the luxury of "sleeping in" because of the current traffic on Pershing/Culver blvd. Between 7:45a.m. and 9:45a.m.

I leave for work @7:00a.m. to avoid this. There were times when I was totally trapped in PDR as I normally drive west on Manchester to go north on Pershing and then east on Culver. Traffic is so bad, sometimes, that I have turned around to go East on Manchester back to Lincoln so I could go North, however Lincoln is then gridlocked so I have to continue to Sepulveda and when that's gridlocked, I'm literally trapped. I don't think you considered the Playa Vista project in your reports. We don't need anymore traffic.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. The second bullet on page 4-277 of the Draft EIS/EIR discussed how the future traffic generated by Playa Vista was considered in the traffic analyses. For details on how the future traffic demand from the Playa Vista development was incorporated in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR or traffic forecast years or technical details on the traffic analysis methodology, please see Topical Response TR-ST-2.

PC00140-2

Comment:

Go the regional airport route!!!

2. In 1963, I bought land in Palmdale because I was shown a "master plan" of a regional airport there, which I think LAWA, owns. I'm not interested in my land value as I sold it for a loss 12 years ago. However, it was the "greed" and "shortsightedness" of politicians and business people, that an airport was not put in Palmdale.

The time has come to expand/develop Palmdale airport.

After 40 years don't you think we should start?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00141 No Author Identified, Orange County, Go Fly Yourself! 6/6/2001

PC00141-1

Comment:

Los Angeles does not NEED more air traffic capacity -- we have more than enough to serve all of Los Angeles.

But we DO need to recapture the full capacity of LAX for Los Angeles.

And we DO need to eliminate the 15 million Orange County freeloaders --who are using our airport services, yet who contribute nothing to our City or our County.

And we DO need to reestablish efficient flight priorities which work for Los Angeles.

- Every week, LAX wastes 208 take-off and landing slots on tiny propeller planes into and out of Orange County Airport!
- We want flights to Taiwan, not Tustin!
- We want flights to Costa Rica, not Costa Mesa!
- We want flights to New York, not Newport Beach!

It is right and just that Los Angeles withhold approval of any expansion plan for LAX which makes it easier for Orange County to use our resource.

It is right and just that Los Angeles work to delay and penalize Orange County fliers who seek to use LAX as a substitute for providing their own airport services.

Before these reports are submitted to the Commission and City Council, please isolate the number of current LAX passengers who are residents or visitors to Los Angeles County, and then tell us the number of LAX passengers who are residents or visitors to Orange County.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, that discusses the El Toro conversion, constraints at John Wayne Airport, and the Ontario Master Plan. LAX is a public facility and is supported by grants from the FAA. It is illegal to charge different fees to users of the same facility and thus discriminate among users.

PC00141-2

Comment:

Next, please quantify in specific dollar amounts, the benefits that accrue to the City of Los Angeles from these Orange County free-loading fliers.

Response:

The economic effects of Master Plan alternatives were provided in Section 4.4.1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR with supporting technical data in Technical Report 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00141-3

Comment:

We do not need to expand our airport -- we need to use it more efficiently.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00142

Hartman, Randall

None Provided

6/12/2001

PC00142-1

Comment:

I have worked at LAX airport for the last 17 years, as both an aircraft mechanic, and inspector for American Airlines. I have seen first hand the effects of growth and increased air traffic at the airport. I believe that currently the airport is way, way overburdened with air and ground traffic, and despite any reconfiguration or expansion of the airport, it would not be prudent to anyone, including the airlines, to expand the number of passengers flying in and out of LAX.

I invite you to spend some time in the cockpit of a aircraft just trying to just get onto the taxiway at LAX during the peak times of the day. Or even just listen to the ATC on the radios. It is nearly utter chaos, and I do give much credit and admiration to the ATC controllers who have to deal with this mess, and stress everyday. Especially the Ground Traffic Controllers who monitor the aircraft as they taxi here and there on the ground at LAX. But they are talking with so many aircraft, and talking so fast, that for anyone trying to ask for clearance to taxi, it can take a very long time just to key in on the microphone and ask for clearance, let alone get the clearance which can take up to an hour more.

Response:

Each of the proposed build alternatives (Alternatives A, B, C, and D) propose substantial airfield improvements to enhance the safety and operational efficiency of aircraft arriving, taxiing, and departing at LAX. The proposed improvements are designed to address current and anticipated levels of aircraft activity at LAX. Included in these improvements are runway and taxiway improvements specifically intended to reduce the potential for incursions, as must be managed by air traffic controllers. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00142-2

Comment:

Over the years of working here, one thing that I've noticed that has changed is the way aircraft are moved to and from maintenance facilities here on the airport. We used to tow them with tractors. Although this was a bit slower than moving (taxiing) the aircraft under their own power, it was a lot more efficient, safer, and less polluting. But now since the airport is so crowded with airplane traffic, things have changed. It now can take sometimes over an hour of waiting next to the taxiway, before we are given clearance to move the aircraft between our gates, and our maintenance facility. And the whole time all engines will be running. Aircraft taxiing under their own power are given priority over aircraft being towed by tractors, so our airline, and most others opt to waste the fuel, and taxi the aircraft under their own power, rather than tow them.

Response:

As indicated in the Response to Comment PC00142-1 above, airfield improvements proposed under each of the build alternatives are proposed to enhance the safety and operational efficiency of aircraft movements at LAX. The improvements, in conjunction with terminal improvements designed to accommodate current and planned larger-size aircraft, will reduce the overall time, distance, and inefficiencies of today's taxiing requirements. As was demonstrated in the air quality analyses found within the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, these improvements will result in reduced aircraft engine emissions. Additionally, Master Plan improvements include the conversion of ground service equipment to alternative fuels for further reductions in air pollutant emissions.

PC00142-3

Comment:

One of my points here is this has led to a large increase in the amount of air pollution experienced by people on and around the airport. I would say about half of the pollution generated is from just aircraft taxiing on the ground, or aircraft running engines at idle just waiting to get clearance.

Response:

Comment noted. Please note that all the build alternatives result in a reduction of the taxi/idle times. Please see Response to Comment PC00142-2.

PC00142-4

Comment:

Anyway I have noticed over the years the pollution getting really bad. It is hard to breathe sometimes working here, and I get headaches frequently.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC00070-1 and PC00088-2.

PC00142-5

Comment:

Jet fuel when burned has a nasty smelly oily residue that doesn't completely burn, and it sticks to your skin and clothes.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding jet fuel and Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding the odor of jet fuel.

PC00142-6

Comment:

Jet fuel is also laced with a cancer causing fungicide which is also present in jet exhaust. Over the years I am also watching workers around me dying of cancer and a alarming rate. I don't have any scientific data to show any correlation, but I wish someone would do a study, because I think that the toxic environment around here at LAX has something to do with it.

Response:

Please see Topical Responses TR-HRA-2 and TR-HRA-3 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects and human health impacts. LAWA is aware of no studies conducted or being conducted on health impacts of aircraft emissions on airport workers.

In Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, the Draft EIS/EIR evaluated health risks and hazards associated with occupational exposure at LAX. The onsite worker was assumed to be exposed to toxic air pollutants (TAPs) associated with LAX operations over the course of an 8-hour day. Occupational exposures were assessed by comparing maximum 8-hour concentrations of TAPs near gates and aprons, estimated through air dispersion modeling, with Permissible Exposure Limits - Time Weighted Average (PEL-TWAs) developed by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). Estimated maximum 8-hour concentrations for the build alternatives and the No Action/No Project Alternative are well below PEL-TWAs for all TAPs. Under OSHA and American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists guidelines, if TAP concentrations are below PEL-TWAs, health impacts are unlikely.

PC00142-7

Comment:

And expanding the number of flights into LAX will just make matters worse.

Response:

Please see Topical Responses TR-HRA-2 and TR-HRA-3 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects and human health impacts.

This comment was made in the context of impacts to people working at LAX, and the following response reflects that context. Worker risks and hazards were evaluated in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, based on modeled emissions associated with the proposed alternatives and comparisons of these concentrations with occupational standards. Emission estimates for aircraft is discussed in Technical Report 14a of the Draft EIS/EIR [Section 3.3, Emissions Estimates for TAPs (Step 4)]. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. As stated in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment (subsection 4.24.1.7.3), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAX emissions under Alternative D would reduce cumulative cancer risks for all areas near the airport relative to the other future year alternatives, including the No Action/No Project Alternative.

An evaluation of occupational exposures for horizon years 2005 and 2015 is provided in Technical Report 14a (subsections 6.3.1 and 6.4.1, Comparison of On-Airport Air Concentrations with OSHA Standards for Workers) of the Draft EIS/EIR. Occupational exposures were assessed through the comparison of maximum average air concentrations of TAPs to thresholds of significance determined for workers by relevant governing bodies. Permissible Exposure Limits - Time Weighted average (PEL-TWA) are air concentrations for chemicals developed by Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), adopted by California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal-OSHA) to represent maximum concentrations (8-hour time-weighted average) to which workers may be repeatedly exposed during business hours without developing adverse health effects. These occupational limits are deemed adequate to protect healthy workers during repeated 8-hour exposures to toxic compounds.

Maximum 8-hour concentrations of TAPs near gates and aprons were estimated through air dispersion modeling. Estimated 8-hour on- airport concentrations for the different alternatives were compared to PEL-TWAs for TAPs of concern for LAX. Estimated maximum 8-hour concentrations for build

3. Comments and Responses

alternatives and the No/Action/No Project Alternative are below PEL-TWAs for TAPs of concern. This suggests that air concentrations from air emissions will not exceed those considered acceptable by Cal-OSHA. Under American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists (ACGIH) guidelines, if TAP concentrations are below PEL-TWAs, health impacts from exposures to air emissions are unlikely for LAX workers.

PC00142-8

Comment:

I feel that instead of expanding LAX, we should take a more regional approach and spread more of the flights to outlying airports. Not only do people who want to fly live out there in great numbers, so do the workers who now commute many miles every day to work at LAX. The majority of the people I work with anyway do, and they would love nothing more than for more airline work to open up in airports like Ontario. It would greatly shorten their commute, plus when they want to fly, they wouldn't have to drive all the way to LAX.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00142-9

Comment:

I also think it would make a lot of sense to make Palmdale into an international airport, and then have high speed rail links to LAX and other airports, and then to the L.A. metro system.

Response:

Please see Topical Responses TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail connection and TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00142-10

Comment:

In addition to ease the congestion and burden of already overcrowded air traffic, we should build and promote the use of high speed rail in prime transportation corridors like: Los Angeles -San Jose-San Francisco; Los Angeles - Las Vegas; and Los Angeles - San Diego. I think if we truly had a good high speed rail system that people would use it. The current rail is too slow, and too many stops.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand.

PC00142-11

Comment:

It just makes common sense to do these things. Most every major city in the world doesn't put their biggest international airport in the middle of the city, but rather at the edge of the city, where there is plenty of room.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00142-12

Comment:

They also use rail as a significant part of their transportation system. Let us do what's right for the people, and the environment of Los Angeles. Let us truly make Los Angeles a world class city.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand.

PC00143

Stockwell, M.

None Provided

6/19/2001

PC00143-1

Comment:

For the citizens of El Segundo to fight this awful proposal is like a flea going to combat a giant. Think of the many thousands of hours of paid personnel you have used to project your proposal, while we must find scarce time among jobs and family needs to make our pitifully weak voices heard.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process.

PC00143-2

Comment:

Do not put our community at further risk for lung pollution by expanding this airport one fraction more. Do not put our ears at risk by one more decibel. Do not fray our nerves by one more traffic jam. Do not grieve us by one more film of black grease over our homes, patios, windowsills. Do not commit the dishonorable act of imposing further on a neighbor who has been patient and forbearing over many decades.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00143-3

Comment:

PLEASE DO distribute the burden and the advantages to other airports in the region, many of whom are welcoming the business.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00144 Crescione, Frank None Provided 6/19/2001

PC00144-1

Comment:

"NO ACTION/NO PROJECT"

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00145 Greenfield, Julie None Provided 6/17/2001

PC00145-1

Comment:

VERY CONCERNED ABOUT ADDED POLLUTION & NOISE - ESPECIALLY NOISE AT NIGHT FROM CARGO PLANES.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase, Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC00146 Gleason, Jennette None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00146-1

Comment:

Do not expand LAX. Expansion will cause more toxic and non-toxic carcinogens by 80%.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft

3. Comments and Responses

EIS/EIR. Please refer to Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a discussion of air modeling. In addition, please refer to Technical Report 14a, Attachment D, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-9a of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a presentation of maximum exposure point concentrations for each of the alternatives modeled in the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC00146-2

Comment:

Will increase noise level in area due to the addition of yearly flights extended from 69 million to 87 million.

Response:

Comment noted. The average number of flights per day is forecast to increase from environmental baseline conditions of 2,075 to as many as 2,535 for future conditions, dependent upon the alternative actually constructed. The noise level patterns associated with the increased traffic were discussed in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information regarding increased noise levels see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PC00146-3

Comment:

More carbon dioxide by pollution from cars will increase due to more flights and larger passengers aircraft.

Response:

Although emissions of carbon dioxide may increase as a result of implementing any build alternative considered in the Draft LAX Master Plan, carbon dioxide is neither a criteria pollutant nor a toxic air contaminant. Consequently, neither EPA, CARB, nor SCAQMD have established acceptable ambient air quality concentrations nor allowable increases in emissions for carbon dioxide. Please see Response to Comment PC00258-1 regarding the topic of greenhouse gases.

PC00146-4

Comment:

More nitrogen oxide from increase of jet fuel (landing & taking off) due to increase number of flights from 69 million to 87 million: by 3 times the amount.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00014-4 regarding NOX emissions.

PC00146-5

Comment:

The EIR Does not have a measure to mitigate the Traffic on the 405 Fwy.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00146-6

Comment:

The amount of nitrogen oxide will increase by three times the current amount.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00014-4 regarding NOX emissions.

PC00147 **Ikemura, Bonnie** **Los Angeles Sheet Metal** **6/18/2001**
Workers' Local 108

PC00147-1

Comment:

Los Angeles Sheet Metal Workers' Local 108 supports the Master Plan alternative "C" for Los Angeles International Airport.

LAX has long needed modernization. We direct access from the Green Line and 405 freeway. Everyone who uses the airport will appreciate and benefit from a ring road to ease gridlock. Adding a western terminal and new customs facilities will help to carry the passenger demand that is estimated to double over the next twenty years.

Our economy will be limited unless we improve the cargo facility to handle increased trade.

The Master Plan will create jobs at LAX. The Master Plan will put 86,000 construction men and women to work. Improving and modernizing LAX will indirectly create many more jobs that will translate into active economic growth in the region across all sectors.

We need Alternative C to remain an economically viable city. We need it to keep commerce alive in California. We need it for a safer LAX.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00148 **Medina, Linda** **None Provided** **6/19/2001**

PC00148-1

Comment:

I am writing this letter to let you know that I do not support the expansion or modernization of the Los Angeles International Airport ("LAX"), in any form. I believe it is harmful to the quality of life in the El Segundo, Inglewood, Playa del Rey, Santa Monica and Westchester area for the following reasons:

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts to quality of life.

PC00148-2

Comment:

1. The EIR/EIS Master Plan is grossly inadequate since it does not mitigate the increase of traffic that will be contributed by the Playa Vista Project. There is in need of further mitigation and analysis regarding the impact of traffic from this project.

Response:

The transportation impacts of the Playa Vista project are identified, and mitigation measures recommended, in a separate Environmental Impact Report prepared for that project. The same is true for other proposed development projects in the area. The methodology used to incorporate Playa Vista and other proposed development projects into the analysis follows the LADOT Traffic Study Policies and Procedures. This issue is discussed in Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology and results. Playa Vista was reduced in size subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, which means that the future conditions will not be as bad as were assumed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns for more information.

PC00148-3

Comment:

2. Auto emission, emissions from planes idling and jet fuel emissions will have a drastic impact on air pollution. LAX is already one of the region's single largest source of NOx emissions - the primary precursor to ozone.

Response:

Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In general, the predicted air pollution impacts of any of the LAX Master Plan build alternatives will be lower than the predicted impacts of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution.

PC00148-4

Comment:

AQMD already notes that this area is out of compliance for many pollutants including particular materials (PM10) known to affect respiratory systems and can lead to cancer.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00070-1 regarding existing air quality. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition, Topical Response TR-AQ-2 regarding toxic air pollutants, and Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health impacts.

PC00148-5

Comment:

The EIR/EIS predicts that the increased ground and air traffic will result in creased emissions of all five 'criteria pollutants' (the five EPA-classified major air pollutants).

Response:

Comment noted. Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G

3. Comments and Responses

and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00148-6

Comment:

3. Increase in cargo volume will lead to thousands of more diesel trucks and 18-wheelers to congest the area. Larger cargo aircraft will mean more flights from noisier heavy-cargo aircraft. Construction will bring more traffic, though it may be temporary. Expansion would add numerous cars to our already impacted surface streets and freeways. Local traffic will gridlock. Even if airport generated traffic is diverted directly onto the freeways there is no mitigation proposed or available to handle it on the freeways. Freeway delays will promulgate throughout the north side.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic, Topical Response TR-ST-3 regarding construction traffic issues such as haul routes, staging areas, and mitigation commitments, and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding traffic improvements on off-airport roadways.

PC00148-7

Comment:

4. The FAA requires LAX to use a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) to measure noise impacts. The CNEL is a weighted daily average, thereby discounting the loud single event noises.

Response:

Comment noted. CNEL is used because it is the metric approved and used by the State of California, therefore, the FAA has accepted this metric. All other states use the DNL metric. The commentor is correct in identifying that CNEL does average noise levels (using logarithmic addition), but does not acknowledge that it is based on single noise events. For more information regarding single event noise and CNEL differences, please see Topical Response TR-N-2. Single event noise was extensively analyzed for nighttime awakenings and classroom disruption in sections 4.1, Noise and 4.2, Land Use of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report and Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report. Additionally, please Response to Comment PC02605-29 regarding single event levels.

Aircraft noise mitigation was described in Section 4.2.8 of the Draft EIS/EIR beginning on page 4-216. Mitigation measures for road traffic, construction equipment, and automated people mover noise were provided in Section 4.1.8 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR beginning on page 4-78. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR also provided mitigation measures for aircraft noise in Sections 4.1.8 and 4.2.8.

PC00148-8

Comment:

Homes in the 65 CNEL are eligible for soundproofing - making home owners prisoners in their own homes. More noise and soundproofing may mean that people will have to remain indoors with their doors and windows closed or it may force people to move.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program. To achieve the full benefits of this program, windows need to be closed. See also Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels. Note that areas within the 65 CNEL under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions are heavily populated, indicating the existing high noise levels have not forced people to move.

PC00148-9

Comment:

5. The EIR/EIS Master Plan is abhorrently flawed because it does not look at a regional master plan alternative/solution for Southern California. LAX owns two other airports that it can develop. Those are Ontario Airport and Palmdale Airport. The high desert and inland empire are regions that are rapidly growing. It would make sense to have these two airports developed to handle the increase of air travel from these areas instead of having people driving to LAX - contributing to more air pollution over a wider area.

The Master Plan is a short-term, quick fix approach. Southern California needs a long term solution. It would be more efficient to develop Ontario and Palmdale airports as opposed to LAX. The State of California has plans to build a high speed rail which would provide a direct link between Palmdale and Los Angeles. El Toro (Orange County) should be developed. Why should the communities around LAX bear the burden of Orange County's need for air commerce?

Response:

The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Please also see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00148-10

Comment:

In conclusion, LAX expansion/modernization destroys the quality of life for the residents in the general vicinity of LAX and should not be constructed.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. Also, Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00149

No Author Identified, The Ladies' Group

6/12/2001

PC00149-1

Comment:

ZERO EXPANSION

We wonder if you can have any idea how desperate we feel trying to make our voices heard when we see so many tons of paper YOU have used to promote your plan. We see the enormous expense you have gone to to make life a misery for us, and wonder how in the world we can make you see our side of things. Sometimes it makes our little group despair of democracy. Nobody is listening. The huge bureaucracy that is supposed to help to serve the people, is marshalled against us to pollute our lives and depreciate our property.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The FAA and LAWA are committed to receiving public input. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 for a listing of all public hearings.

PC00149-2

Comment:

We wish you would realize that so many of us are suffering from asthma now, and shortness of breath, strictly from airport pollution and traffic to the airport. How much greater ills will we suffer if the airport is expanded. Many more planes to increase the deafness already caused by previous expansions, and to lead our children toward early hearing loss. Many more layers of oily black dirt over everything. Many more cars to deprive us of easy movement in and out our own town, and to slow police and fire and paramedic response when quickly needed.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in 4.24, Human Health and Safety, traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and public service impacts in Section 4.26, Public Services. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding soot and air pollutant deposition, and Response to Comment AL00017-246 regarding hearing loss.

PC00149-3

Comment:

There is a kind of laziness about starting an enterprise in one place and letting it grow and grow until it is too large for the original place, like a plant that is allowed to grow up the walls and over the roof because we are too lazy to keep it in trim. We have cooperated in the past, but the ivy has now reached the chimney and we have had enough. You must stop this for everybody's sake.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00149-4

Comment:

There are other airports waiting for the business. Because a few wealthy voices do not want regional expansion is not a good reason for making this area suffer. Listen to the regional communities who do want the convenience of closer airports to service their travelling needs, and would enjoy the extra jobs.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please

3. Comments and Responses

see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00149-5

Comment:

We do not understand why you cannot see that expansion of LAX will increase the pollution in the basin far inland, so this is a matter for Beverly Hills and San Marino as well as us. The unfortunate thing is that they will only catch on to it too late.

Response:

Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In general, the predicted air pollution impacts of any of the LAX Master Plan build alternatives will be lower than the predicted impacts of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution.

PC00149-6

Comment:

We understand you will be replying to this. Can you assure us that there will be not one gram of further assault upon our senses and bodies? Will you make such a promise? We are already at peak

Response:

LAWA is committed to reducing project-related impacts to the maximum extent feasible.

PC00150

Streets, Bob

None Provided

6/6/2001

PC00150-1

Comment:

I have been to the LAX web site to review the recommended plan for airport expansion and have the following comments:

1. The LA Airport has not been a good neighbor to El Segundo.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC00150-2 through PC00150-4 below.

PC00150-2

Comment:

- Approval for the Imperial Cargo terminal was slipped in several years ago under questionable circumstances. It has been a continuing source of unwanted noise ever since.
- The vast majority of after-hours flights have always been scheduled for the south runways.

Response:

The commentor's concern is noted. The Imperial Cargo terminal was not slipped in several years ago. The cargo structure did sit dormant for a period of time since it was not being used. However, it was refurbished thus giving the impression of a new structure and it is being used once again. Restrictions are in place which control ground run-ups and ground operations in the Imperial Terminal. Additionally, Master Plan commitments will continue the use of tug and tow procedures in the Imperial Terminal Area. The use of engine off procedures is expected to be continued under all future alternatives where applicable. Violations of these restrictions occasionally do occur and are dealt with proactively by

3. Comments and Responses

airport management. Cargo aircraft have been able to operate from both the north and south runway complexes for many years. During over-ocean procedures (between midnight and 6:30 a.m.) aircraft typically arrive from the west to the inboard runway in the north airfield and depart to the west from the inboard runway in the south airfield. FedEx is proactive in requesting that departures leave on Runway 25R to reduce aircraft noise. The development proposed by the alternatives would not change this capability. For additional information on nighttime activity, please see Topical Response TR-N-5 and Topical Response TR-N-7.

PC00150-3

Comment:

- Maintenance and landscaping along Imperial Highway have been lacking for more than the last decade.

Response:

Comment noted. The maintenance of off-airport streets and street lighting is not within the jurisdiction or responsibility of Los Angeles World Airports.

PC00150-4

Comment:

- The provision of funding for noise mitigation was initially delayed and then tied to onerous conditions of acceptance.

Response:

The "conditions of acceptance" the commentor is referring to is the aviation easement requested by LAWA in exchange for soundproofing. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program and aviation easement requirement.

PC00150-5

Comment:

2. There will be significant construction impact on the local area.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC00150-6 through PC00150-8 below.

PC00150-6

Comment:

- The construction will result in major dust and dirt problems, and thus air pollution problems.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air pollution from fugitive dust and dirt in Section 4.6, Air Quality, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in the Technical Report 4 and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00150-7

Comment:

- There will be an incredible noise impact on the community, not only from the direct airport construction, but particularly from the construction of the extension of the 105 freeway into what appears to be an elevated 'ring road' around the airport. And, I imagine that this construction will be scheduled for more than just regular business hours.

Response:

Please refer to Response to Comment SPC00275-44 for additional information regarding construction noise impacts and measures that would be implemented to mitigate such impacts, to extent possible. Please note however that Alternative D, which was addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, would not include the LAX Expressway or the ring road. Furthermore, and in accordance with Mitigation Measure MM-N-10 of the Final EIS/EIR, regarding construction scheduling, the timing and/or sequence of the noisiest on-site construction activities shall avoid sensitive times of the day as feasible (9 p.m. to 7 a.m. Monday - Friday; 8 p.m. to 6 a.m. Saturday; and any time on Sunday or holidays).

PC00150-8

Comment:

- All of the construction will certainly result in substantial disruption to local traffic.

Response:

Please see subsections 4.3.1.6.2 and 4.3.2.6.2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 7 of the Technical Reports S-2a, On-Airport Surface Transportation Technical Report, and S-2b, Off-Airport Surface Transportation Technical Report, and Topical Response TR-ST-3 regarding addressing disruptions due to construction.

PC00150-9

Comment:

3. Once operational, the expanded airport will negatively impact the area in the following ways:

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC00150-10 through PC00150-13 below.

PC00150-10

Comment:

- Increased traffic.
- There will be more traffic in general. In particular, this traffic will now be on an elevated roadway, flowing directly past the north side of El Segundo.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PC00150-11

Comment:

I imagine that there will be as much mitigation of this noise as there is just east of us in the Del Aire area (none).

Response:

Please see Section 4.1, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for the roadway noise methodology; and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology. Specifically, please see subsection 4.1.8, Mitigation Measures, for a listing of all roadway traffic noise mitigation measures.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00150-12

Comment:

- Not only will this increased traffic generate additional noise, it will generate additional air pollution.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00150-13

Comment:

- Increased cargo and passenger jet flights.
- The LAX plan professes to not significantly increase the number of daily flights (current = 2235 (1996 base year), proposed = 2320). Who are you kidding? You expect to increase the annual passenger capacity by around 33%, and more than double (1.9 million tons annually to 4.2) the amount of cargo processed. This means more major aircraft takeoffs and landings.
- This will result in more aircraft noise.
- This will result in more early turns.
- This will result in more air pollution from the aircraft.
- There will be more engine run-ups.
- Airport noise will extend further through the day and night.
- On top of all this, the plan calls for moving the south runway fifty feet farther south, moving all this future noise even closer to El Segundo.

Response:

The fleet mix forecast associated with future operations (which includes air cargo) is based on the best estimates of the Master Planners and is subject to differences of professional judgment. While total operations are forecasted to grow throughout the day and night, they are only expected to grow anywhere from a low of 2.4 percent to a high of 18.3 percent depending on which alternative is implemented. A forecasted doubling of air cargo volume does not correlate to a doubling of flight operations. The volume increase would be due predominantly to the increase in aircraft size and efficiency of cargo space on newer larger aircraft and not as a result of a larger increase in total operations. Even though it is anticipated that there would be a greater frequency of operations, this does not mean a significant increase in CNEL levels. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 for additional information. Early turns over El Segundo have been a focus of public complaint for years. The airport has attempted to deal with the issue for years through the posting of signs at the end of each runway calling for flight to the coastline prior to turns, but occasional deviations from the procedure continue to occur. A part of the reason is the alignment of the runways relative to the community. The west end of the runways nearest El Segundo are closer to the community than the east ends (the runways are aimed more toward the community's west end). Early turns over El Segundo are addressed in Topical Response TR-N-3. They were also addressed in Section 4.1.5, Master Plan Commitments, of Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 7, Noise Mitigation of Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR, as well as, subsection 4.1.8, Master Plan Commitments, of Section 4.1, Noise, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Topical Response TR-AQ-3 addresses air pollution increase. Air Quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR as well as Appendix G, Air Quality Impact Analysis, and Appendix SE-1, Supplemental Air Quality Impact Analysis. Ground run-ups are forecast to increase in direct proportion to the increase in aircraft operations. For more information on ground run-ups please see Section 3, Future Aircraft Operating Conditions, in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, as well as Topical Response TR-N-7. Alternative A shows that Runway 7R/25L would be reconstructed on an alignment 156 feet south of the existing runway centerline with a length of 12,000 feet. Its east end would be approximately 950 feet east of the relocated threshold of existing Runway 25L and the west end would be even with the existing 7R runway end. The year 2015

development plan for Alternative B assumes the construction of a new 6,700-foot Runway 7R/25L, in the south airfield, south of the existing outboard runway. This new runway would be located along a three-degree converging alignment to Runway 7R/25L, which would be re-designated Runway 7C/25C. A third simultaneous approach from the east would be provided to new Runway end 25L along a parallel course to the other south airfield approach courses. New Runway end 7R would not be used for arrivals. In the south airfield, Runway 7L/25R would be relocated approximately 370 feet north of its current location. It would be constructed at a length of 12,000 feet, with its east end approximately 950 feet east of the existing Runway 25R displaced threshold; the west end would be even with the existing end of Runway 7L. Existing Runway 7R/25L would be reconstructed along an alignment 500 feet north of the existing alignment at a length of 12,000 feet and would be re-designated Runway 7C/25C. The east end would be approximately 950 feet east of the relocated threshold of existing Runway 25L and the west end would be even with the existing Runway 7R end. Alternative C and D shows that Runway 7R/25L would be widened by 50 feet to the south and remain its present length, while Runway 7L/25R would be reconstructed in place. By 2015, each alternative would show a reduction in acreage exposed to noise levels of 65 CNEL or greater in El Segundo. This information was provided in greater detail in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and the related Land Use Technical Report and Supplemental Land Use Technical Report.

PC00150-14

Comment:

4. Current maintenance around the airport is lacking; how much worse will it be with an expansion?
- I've already mentioned the lack of maintenance along Imperial Highway.
 - Maintenance on Pershing has been at least as bad.
 - It is often months between the time that a streetlight goes out and the time it gets replaced.
 - Street sweeping rarely takes place.
 - What little landscaping exists (by the World Way West overpass) is often neglected for years.
 - Street maintenance on Sepulveda is non-existent.
 - Just north of the Century Blvd overpass the road has been in a state of disrepair for years.
 - Some of the potholes are celebrating birthdays.

Response:

Comment noted. The maintenance of off-airport streets and street lighting is not within the jurisdiction or responsibility of Los Angeles World Airports.

PC00150-15

Comment:

In conclusion, the airport expansion should be cancelled. It has been clearly demonstrated that LAWA and the city of Los Angeles are not able to properly maintain the airport in its current configuration. How much worse would it be with an expanded airport? It has been shown that they have no regard for neighboring cities. And, with the misrepresentation of the annual flight information mentioned above, it is clear that they are trying to deceive the public as to the true impact of the proposed expansion of LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00151 Polzin, Allan None Provided 6/13/2001

PC00151-1

Comment:

Increase use of the Ontario Airport. This would reduce traffic at LAX. ONT also has much more room, a new terminal and also welcomes the revenue. Ontario has excellent freeway access and has long runways. U.P.S. already knows this.

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00152 Bennett, Guy None Provided 6/19/2001

PC00152-1

Comment:

I am very much against the proposed LAX expansion, primarily because of the dramatic loss of quality of life that it represents for those of us living in the area. Particularly troubling to me are the increases in traffic, air pollution and noise that will result from the expansion, making the local communities unsafe and potentially unpleasant places to live.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also, Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00152-2

Comment:

My wife and I moved to Westchester in 1999 to start a family. Like many of our neighbors, we now have a small child that we hope to raise in a safe and quiet environment. The proposed expansion threatens to dash our hopes since it would break up our community and radically change the area for the worse, forcing young families like ours to either stand by and watch as our beautiful neighborhood is ruined, or move away to a more family-friendly area, something we would prefer not to do.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. Also, Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00152-3

Comment:

Please don't do this to us. Rather, consider a regional solution, developing the airports in Ontario and Palmdale and thus easing the burden of airport growth on the LAX area.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00152-4

Comment:

We already have congested streets and freeways, as well as airplane noise that lasts well into the night. Don't make it any worse! Leave our community whole.

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC00153

Hyra, J.

None Provided

6/14/2001

PC00153-1

Comment:

As a volunteer at the historic and beautiful Centinela Adobe, I am writing to voice our family's opposition to the proposed elevated access expressway. Not an inch of this complex should be touched for any reason. It is landmark and a quiet and green place in this increasingly congested and crowded area. People from all over, school children, and history buffs visit the Adobe. This is one place that should be protected and cared for both for today and tomorrow. It is a legacy we leave those who follow us.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding impacts to the Centinela Adobe.

PC00154

Lurvey, Lawrence

None Provided

6/17/2001

PC00154-1

Comment:

I approve of ground improvements including the ring road and western terminal and feel these improvements should begin now. This includes the greenline extension and energy conservation measures.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan (see Subtopical Response TR-ST-5.3 on transit) for more information. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or ring road, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00154-2

Comment:

I oppose any increase in the number of flights, for several reasons:

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC00154-3 through PC00154-6 below.

PC00154-3

Comment:

(1) There is no mention of regionalization of airports. Using all airports in the region would expand growth and conserve energy as passengers could travel less to the airport closer to their home. (i.e. El Toro)

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00154-4

Comment:

(2) Pollution and noise disproportionately impact low income Inglewood, which is not environmentally just. Larger planes do create more noise. There is no effort to make the airport any quieter than it is now.

Response:

Please see Section 4.4.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding environmental justice, with supporting data and analyses provided in Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding land use/noise mitigation, Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding larger aircraft and more noise, and Topical Response TR-EJ-1 regarding potential air quality and health risk impacts on low-income and minority communities.

PC00154-5

Comment:

Airport expansion should be done as in all cities, in areas of low population density (i.e. Palmdale).

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and Topical Response TR-EJ-3 regarding environmental justice and regional context, and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00154-6

Comment:

(3) Commuter and short hop traffic could be better handled by a better rail system as recommended by the RAND Institute study. This is a large percentage of LAX flights.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan. Alternative D would connect a people mover to an Intermodal Transportation Center near the Aviation station of the Green Line, with no extension of the Green Line necessary for terminal access. The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Sections 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, and 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00155

Paek, Paul

GS America

6/11/2001

PC00155-1

Comment:

I read in the Korea Times of June 11, 2001 that the LA Airport would plan to expand by investing a total of \$12 billion by 2015. The article says there are pros and cons as regards the project. I also agree that the program will contribute to the rejuvenation of regional economies along with contingent problems.

My opinion on the project is that basically I am in favor of the investment to scale up the LA Airport. But I am against the redevelopment of the LAX on the current site, for during reconstruction more traffic hassle is expected and you can find another site to replace some of the functions that the LA Airport performs.

In this regard, I suggest that redevelopment can take place in the Edward Airport in the Palmdale Area without aggravating environmental problems in the area surrounding the present LA Airport. I expect that the project will be of service to upgrading the quality of the airport.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00156 Warne, Rose None Provided 6/18/2001

PC00156-1

Comment:

I am very much opposed to LAX expansion - why ruin a lovely community? I have lived here 50 years and I know that neighborhoods such as Westchester's, as well as the businesses needed by them, should be preserved.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. Also, Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00156-2

Comment:

I worked for CAA (ATC) during the 1940's and FAA (airports) during the 70's and even then there was an EIR for Palmdale.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00156-3

Comment:

Also, with airport expansion how will the controllers handle increased traffic - will the present tower accommodate more personnel, etc. The controllers have too much traffic as it is!

Response:

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is responsible for the seamless operation of the National Airspace System (NAS) and ensuring the safety and efficiency of the air transportation system. In accomplishing its mission, the FAA invests millions of dollars in physical plants such as Air Traffic Control Towers (ATCT). These physical plants are designed for expansion of capability with a life-cycle formula that will ensure the facility can serve the airport for many years into the future. This life-cycle formula considers forecast traffic growth and new and emerging technologies and requirements for equipment installation associated with the new technologies. The LAX ATCT is among the most technologically advanced in the world. It was commissioned on March 26, 1996 and is equipped with the most sophisticated air traffic control technology available. Among these technologies is the Airport Movement Area Safety System discussed in Topical Response TR-SAF-1. The proposed improvements under each of the alternatives described in the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR may require additional controller staffing, or perhaps a redistribution of controller workload. The FAA will likely formulate a staffing plan to accommodate any controller workload or revised air traffic control procedures when an alternative has been selected. Development of an appropriate staffing plan is a customary activity for FAA as few airports or air traffic control procedures remain static, but continually evolve.

PC00157 **Black, Deborah & Gregory** **None Provided** **6/11/2001**

PC00157-1

Comment:

We are residents of Westchester, and therefore very concerned and very much opposed to the plan to expand the Los Angeles Airport. Not only will the expansion be detrimental to our neighborhood but to the surrounding areas as well. The expansion will increase noise pollution and air pollution, reduce safety, and aggravate the already bad traffic situation.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00157-2

Comment:

In addition, your claims that it will "create new jobs" is criminally misleading.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00157-8 below.

PC00157-3

Comment:

Those of us living in Westchester have learned to live with the level of noise generated by the airport. However, an increase in air traffic will make the noise levels intolerable. Not only will the noise affect those of us living in the area, but it will also affect our children. Concentrating on one's studies or listening to instruction with jets streaming overhead is extremely difficult if not impossible.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to nighttime awakenings and school disruption associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative and all four build alternatives in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1.

PC00157-4

Comment:

Air pollution is a second major concern. Living in Los Angeles and breathing the air each day is bad enough without adding to the problem with more air traffic.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR

3. Comments and Responses

and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC00157-5

Comment:

The pollutants from jet fuel emissions will create more health hazards for us all. It is our children who suffer the most.

Response:

Please refer to Topical Responses TR-HRA-2 and TR-HRA-3 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects and human health impacts.

PC00157-6

Comment:

Safety is a major issue affecting the residents of Westchester. The skies are already too crowded above Los Angeles. There have been too many close calls as it is. Adding more planes to an already overcrowded area is just asking for disaster.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00157-7

Comment:

Finally, the expansion will create extreme traffic congestion in and around LAX. Just getting in and around the area, especially during peak hours is already very difficult. Los Angeles does not need more traffic in the already crowded streets near the airport.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00157-8

Comment:

Your claim that expanding the airport will create new jobs is criminally misleading. In order to expand the airport, you plan to destroy many existing businesses. Expanding LAX will destroy existing jobs for "new" low-wage, civil servant jobs, and will likely result in no net job increase.

Response:

Employment and business acquisition were addressed in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, and Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As further described in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics (subsection 4.4.2.6), of the Draft EIS/EIR, employment growth under Alternatives A, B, and C would overwhelm the potential loss of jobs due to business acquisition and relocation. However, it should be noted that the estimates of job loss are very conservative and assume that businesses that could not be relocated on the airport would lose all of their employees. In reality these businesses would be relocated in conformance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of

3. Comments and Responses

1970, its implementing regulations, state and local regulations, and FAA Circular 150/5100-17, and it is expected that most or many of the businesses would continue to function in a new location while retaining many, if not all, of their employees. Therefore, while acquisition and relocation would place a temporary hardship and inconvenience on affected businesses, it would not result in wholesale destruction of existing businesses and jobs. Provisions for relocation assistance to businesses are set forth in Master Plan Commitment RBR-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

As noted in Sections 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, and 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative A would result in a potential loss of 9,568 jobs vs. a potential increase of 40,413 direct jobs, Alternative B would result in a potential loss of 11,272 jobs vs. a potential increase of 40,413 direct jobs, and Alternative C would result in a potential loss of 3,681 jobs vs. a potential increase of 6,421 direct jobs. As presented in Sections 4.4.1 and 4.4.2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, and in contrast to the other build alternatives, Alternative D would result in a net decrease of 9,261 direct jobs and a potential for 597 jobs to be affected due to acquisition and business relocation. The majority of the decline in jobs is not related to business acquisition and relocation under Alternative D, but to productivity increases over time that would outweigh the net additional jobs associated with the limited growth in annual passenger and cargo levels. It is important to note that all of the build alternatives would create a substantial number of construction jobs, with an estimated 48,788 jobs projected under Alternative D during the construction phase.

As for the types of new jobs and associated wages that will be generated with Master Plan implementation, each of the alternatives would be directly associated with a wide range of long-term employment opportunities within 17 different manufacturing sectors related to air cargo (none of which are minimum wage) and a variety of airline industry, government, and tourism-related sectors related to air passengers (only some of which may involve minimum wage jobs). Additionally, it should be noted that airport security operations came under federal control following the events of September 11, 2001, resulting in changes to training requirements, working conditions, wages, and consequently turnover rates.

PC00157-9

Comment:

The proposed LAX expansion plan is flawed. While it is necessary to manage the growth of air travel, it is clear that expansion at LAX is not the answer.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00158

Sexton, L.

None Provided

6/7/2001

PC00158-1

Comment:

I am a resident of the City of Los Angeles and have been for close to 2 1/2 years. I live in an apartment complex that is in the vicinity of Airport Boulevard and 98th Street, directly under the LAX flight path. Since moving into this area to be closer to my job, I have discovered that it is not the ideal place to reside, especially for families.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00158-2

Comment:

The noise level is high and the whining and rumbling of the aircrafts flying overhead is, I must say, quite acute. I have found much difficulty in resting peacefully at night due to the jets flying in at all hours of the night and to hear television, radio or even people talking in the same room as me. And it is almost impossible to have a phone conversation, as the LAX background noise blocks out the person on the other end of the phone line.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. However, please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding areas exposed to high noise levels under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions and current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. Regarding high noise levels at the commentor's property (located in the vicinity of Airport Boulevard and 98th Street), to qualify for soundproofing, properties must be exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels.

As shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S1 in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the area located in the vicinity of Airport Boulevard and 98th Street is located within the 1992 fourth quarter, 1996 baseline, and Year 2000 65 CNEL and greater noise contour. Therefore these properties within the 65 CNEL are eligible for sound insulation under the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP), as described in Topical Response TR-LU-3. Also relative to single event noise levels that result in nighttime awakening (as established by the 94 dBA SEL noise contour), property in the vicinity of Airport Boulevard and 98th Street are located within the 94 dBA SEL noise contour under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions, as shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As presented in Section 4.2.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the Airport/Belford Area (in the vicinity of Airport Boulevard and 98th Street) is part of a voluntary residential acquisition/relocation program administered by LAWA. This program was established based on the interest of property owners who requested that LAWA purchase their properties in lieu of soundproofing. See also Topical Response TR-MP-3 for further discussion of the existing program for Manchester Square and Belford. See Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels and Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 regarding existing high noise levels.

PC00158-3

Comment:

On the days that the jets depart eastbound from LAX, the noise level is intensified even more.

Response:

Due to the prevailing winds, aircraft at LAX normally approach and depart to the west (westerly operations). When weather conditions require, operations are reversed, with aircraft arriving and departing to the east (easterly operations). Because departure operations use more power than arrivals, the easterly operations are louder for those residing east of the airport. Also, please see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement and Mitigation Measure MM-N-5 recommending initiation of a 14 CFR 161 study to seek Federal approval of a locally-imposed restriction on departures to and approaches from the east when over-ocean procedures are in effect.

PC00158-4

Comment:

Apart from the noise pollution, the air quality is horrid. I find that I have to wipe down surfaces in my home frequently, due to the black, grainy "soot-like" dust that settles on everything.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC00158-5

Comment:

If this jet exhaust residue is that heavy and always constant, imagine what it must do to the lungs and one's overall health.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition

PC00158-6

Comment:

The LAX area also gives way to heavy traffic flow. It is a major hub and thus creates a lot of street traffic, with people rushing to make their flights, taxi drivers driving erratically looking for potential customers and going as far as to even break a few of the driving laws to do so. In turn causing the possibility of accidents to rise significantly.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00158-7

Comment:

I am fully aware that it is impossible to eliminate all of the LAX negatives, but to allow an expansion would be injurious to the entire area and it's residents. I am a concerned resident from the South Bay region and I hope that my input will, even in the smallest way, help to aid in making the right decision concerning this matter.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 14a and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00159

Salzman, Phoebe

None Provided

6/15/2001

PC00159-1

Comment:

I want to take this opportunity to express my opinion relative to the LAX Master Plan. I am not in favor of any of the plans. It is unjust and unfair for LAX and the surrounding communities to bear the burden of

3. Comments and Responses

all future air traffic and it's associated elements. The noise level here is high enough! The air quality here is bad enough. Enough is Enough!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00159-2

Comment:

It is time other airports; other communities assumed a share of the responsibilities for providing air service in and out of the LA area.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00159-3

Comment:

Of course traffic in Westchester has increased over the past decade. Where hasn't traffic increased? All the major cities in California have experienced population growth and are ill prepared to accommodate it. What is and has been lacking is a Master Plan to improve and upgrade our infrastructure. We have no mass transit system from outlying areas directly into the airport as other cities do. Efforts to provide mass transit from and to anywhere effectively and efficiently have been watered down in politics and special interest groups.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan for more information. The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Sections 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, and 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester.

PC00159-4

Comment:

Westchester traffic to and from the airport is mainly restricted to Lincoln Blvd., Sepulveda Blvd., La Tijera, Manchester and the 105 Freeway. This does not represent the majority of the traffic on those streets. All around us new industrial areas/business parks have been added. I travel these major streets every day as I go back and forth to work, run errands, attend meetings. Most of the traffic is doing

3. Comments and Responses

exactly that. There is a major difference in our traffic volume on holidays when people are not working and school is out. I have lived here and driven here for 30 years. To the south of us office buildings are being build/reconditioned at an all time high in the El Segundo area. The Hughes Center to the southeast of us continues to grow. New homes are being added to the bluff areas every year and now Playa Vista is beginning construction and will be a reality in the near future!

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. For details on how the future traffic demand from the Playa Vista development was incorporated in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR or traffic forecast years or technical details on the traffic analysis methodology, please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology and results. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-7 regarding a brief history of LAX Northside/Westchester Southside, its role in the Master Plan, and the impact/benefits of the proposed airport alternatives.

PC00159-5

Comment:

We remember the last time LAX expanded and promised that they would never "encroach on Westchester again".

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-121 and Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding the mitigation of impacts to the community from activities at LAX. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00159-6

Comment:

Take your Master Plan to some other area, some other airport. We do not want it today or tomorrow.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00160

Evans, Lynne

None Provided

6/14/2001

PC00160-1

Comment:

Recently I flew on a United Airlines 777 from LAX to Dulles, VA. The captain allowed the passengers to listen to our communication with the tower - what a hair-raising experience! Try that for an hour or two, then tell me how much we can increase capacity while maintaining safety!

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Aviation safety was addressed in Section 4.24.3, Safety (CEQA), of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also please refer to Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00160-2

Comment:

We cannot put more planes in the air here - they must go to Ontario, Palmdale & El Toro!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00161 Thompson, Marlene None Provided 5/31/2001

PC00161-1

Comment:

I think it is ridiculous that you will not listen to the cities around Los Angeles when they say to you that WE DO NOT WANT THE EXPANSION OF LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00161-2

Comment:

You have already gone way over your capacity to handle the passengers and air traffic that you now have. By the time you complete the expansion, it will already be obsolete. Our traffic off the 405 is almost in gridlock. Our air and noise pollution is intolerable.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00161-3

Comment:

I understand that it has been proven to you that there will be little growth in the So. Bay and surrounding areas because there is no place to grow. The reports say the growth will be in Riverside, San Bernardino and Orange County. Please stop you're selfish thinking and let the growth be in the area that want to expand their airports and can handle the additional flights. I understand that Oxnard, Palmdale and March Air Force base would love to have the expansion of their facilities.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00161-4

Comment:

Please listen to people and stop forcing this expansion that is not wanted.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00162

Gonzalez, Sergio

None Provided

6/14/2001

PC00162-1

Comment:

There is enough pollution, airplane noise and traffic congestion. I am against LAX expansion because of the pollution, airplane noise and traffic on the freeways and streets are bad enough.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00162-2

Comment:

We need to help this situation by building a new airport in a new location. This is the short and long term solution because we cannot just expand expand & expand LAX every time LAX runs out of room.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00162-3

Comment:

Opening a new airport will reduce traffic, noise pollution ect. in the LAX area. I know this means less money for the city & businesses but, this is about the people not money. If you are for the expansion of LAX. You are only interested in \$\$\$\$. Power to the PEOPLE

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socioeconomics. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2, and S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00163 Ma, Johnny None Provided 6/14/2001

PC00163-1

Comment:

(1) Underground plan is a good plan but it will created more traffic jam for around airport area.

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00163-2

Comment:

(2) No matter how much money will spend for Master plan in LAX, the best way to do, is move out all of the commercial or even residential area around airport (has to be move all out), just like "Disneyland extension plan."

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00164 Gebhardt, Zenith None Provided 6/15/2001

PC00164-1

Comment:

We have lived with 2 other LAX expansions that were suppose to be the "last expansion". Why should we believe you now.

Response:

Comment noted. The Master Plan offers five alternatives with varying degrees of airport development. The No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative D are considered to be "no expansion" alternatives.

PC00164-2

Comment:

Other LAWA propterties must be expanded first. Palmdale and Ontario, especially Ontario are closer to the growth area of Southern California I am opposed to any expansion of LAX

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project

3. Comments and Responses

Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00165 **Levine, Bonnie** **None Provided** **6/14/2001**

PC00165-1

Comment:

After coming away from the meeting of June 9, 2001 I am still unclear of what is being really proposed. Signs, grafts & spokespersons all were unclear as to whats going to really happen.

Response:

Chapter 3, Alternatives (Including Proposed Action), of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included descriptions of the alternatives considered, including the preferred alternative. Also, please see the LAX Master Plan web site www.laxmasterplan.org

PC00165-2

Comment:

I believe a regional plan is the only way it can work for the future of our city and area we live in -

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00165-3

Comment:

Please, please, please save our coastline - it's the only one we have --

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed coastal zone impacts in Section 4.14, Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers.

PC00166 **Gebhardt, Becky** **None Provided** **6/13/2001**

PC00166-1

Comment:

The Master LAX Plan seems flawed to me. LAWA wants to expand an already over burdened airport with a 50%+ expansion. Almost everywhere else in the county a Regional Airport Policy is utilized. Why are you not proposing real expansion at Ontario and Palmdale?

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00167 Green, Muriel None Provided 6/14/2001

PC00167-1

Comment:

I oppose the LAX Expansion for the following reasons:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below. In addition, it should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00167-2

Comment:

1. Increase noise & pollution
2. Traffic congestion (already intolerable)
3. Increased possibility of air mishaps. More air-traffic, more chances for disasters.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00167-3

Comment:

4. Regional airports servicing commercial cargo traffic, could alleviate ground transport of trucks, thereby leaving fwys with less congestion & surface wear & tear.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00167-4

Comment:

5. "No LAX Expansion" would help outlying communities develop & grow by using their existing airports.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00168 Gillig, Lottie & James None Provided 6/11/2001

PC00168-1

Comment:

We live in El Segundo and I can't believe any one believing that expanding LAX would be a good thing. It would be disasteriois for our community and the surrounding cities.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00168-2

Comment:

Take the plan where it is needed and has the space for it. You know we don't have it here. It would cause all kind of discomfort for all.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00168-3

Comment:

The proposed expansion of LAX will generate more noise, traffic congestion, air pollution, etc etc and believe me we have too much as it is now. Please take the plan elsewhere.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00169 Grow, Sheila None Provided 6/12/2001

PC00169-1

Comment:

I am against any further expansion @ LAX. I have lived here my whole life (48 yrs). The traffic is unbearable in Westchester, and locally on the San Diego Fwy.

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-

3. Comments and Responses

2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00169-2

Comment:

Its time for the surrounding areas to expand their own airports, its only fair.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00169-3

Comment:

I will be watching closely how our elected officials handle this situation, and will vote accordingly in future elections!

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00170

Bernstein, Ken

Los Angeles Conservancy

6/14/2001

PC00170-1

Comment:

1. Hangar One: The Conservancy is very concerned about the potential relocation of this original Airport structure under Alternative B. As the first permanent structure at the airport, Hangar One has tremendous significance in its original setting and context. Relocation of this structure, which is already listed in the National Register of Historic Places, would significantly erode its historic integrity. The Los Angeles Conservancy would therefore oppose relocating Hangar One from its current site.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed historic/architectural resources, including Hangar One, in Section 4.9.1, Historic/Architectural and Archaeological/Cultural Resources, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix I of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-G of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please note that Alternative C, LAWA Staff's preferred alternative in the Draft EIS/EIR, and Alternative D, LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative analyzed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, do not involve relocation or other impacts on Hangar One.

PC00170-2

Comment:

2. Centinela Adobe: Under Alternative "A", it is stated that "The Centinela Adobe would be directly and indirectly impacted by the encroachment of the roadway onto the property." Further explanation and detailed maps and renderings should be included so that the public may better understand these potential impacts, including any visual impacts and vibration impacts that could damage the fragile adobe. The public's access and enjoyment of this important historic resource should be addressed with regard to the need for noise mitigation or access protection.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding impacts to the Centinela Adobe.

PC00170-3

Comment:

3. Randy's Donuts: Under Alternative "A" it is stated that, "Randy's Donuts would be indirectly impacted by elevated portions of the LAX Expressway, due to visual and possible vibration impacts on the resource." However, as in the case of the Centinela Adobe, the document's maps do not provide an accurate representation of the proposed roadway's proximity to Randy's Donuts. Randy's Donuts is a well-known example of a special Los Angeles style of architecture, Programmatic/Mimetic Architecture, that reflects the energy and creativity of the era in which it was built (1953). Randy's is also one of Los Angeles' most filmed and photographed landmarks. The LAX Expressway could block the public's ability to view or photograph this resource, or possibly cause long-term deterioration of the structure due to vibrations or other expressway-related problems. If so, one of Southern California's defining structures, embodying "California Crazy" architecture, could be imperiled.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HA-1.

PC00170-4

Comment:

4. International Airport Industrial Complex: The 48 original buildings in this area will all reach fifty years of age in 2005, an age that has traditionally been used as a cutoff by the National Park Service for consideration for the National Register of Historic Places. The Final EIR should more carefully examine whether this complex represents a district that will be eligible at that time for the National Register or the California Register of Historical Resources.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR addressed historic resources in Section 4.9.1, Historic/Architectural and Archaeological/Cultural Resources. As discussed on page 4-591 of the Draft EIS/EIR and on page 37 of Technical Report I - Section 106 Report, this property is ineligible for the National Register of Historic Places, not because of age, but because of lack of sufficient integrity necessary at that level of significance. However, the analysis goes on to state that this district is eligible for the California Register and as a City of Los Angeles Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ).

PC00170-5

Comment:

5. The "Single Viaduct Alternative" needs to be explained in more detail regarding its potential impact on historic resources in the plan, particularly the Centinela Adobe and Randy's Donuts. The document's explanation ("If the Single Viaduct alternative is selected, impacts on these properties would be avoided, however, they would still be impacted") is very unclear.

Response:

Historic resources impacts were addressed in Section 4.9.1, Historic/Architectural and Archaeological/Cultural Resources, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data, analyses, and illustrations with full presentation of information on the Centinela Adobe and Randy's Donuts was provided in the Supplemental Section 106 Report for LAX Expressway Improvements dated January 2001. As described in the Draft EIS/EIR on pages 4-596 and 4-598, construction of improvements along the west side of I-405 under the Split Viaduct alternative for the LAX Expressway would have direct (demolition or partial demolition) and indirect (visual and/or vibration) impacts on the Centinela Adobe due to encroachment of the roadway onto the property. Additionally, under this alternative potential indirect impacts on Randy's Donuts may occur due to elevated portions of the LAX Expressway causing visual and possible vibration impacts. However, it is fundamentally important to note, as stated in the Draft EIS/EIR on page 4-604 that "...LAWA's Preferred Alternative, Alternative C, with selection of the Single Viaduct LAX Expressway proposal, will have no effect on the historic properties identified within the APE or Supplemental APE, with the implementation

3. Comments and Responses

of the Mitigation Measures given." The single viaduct alternative places the LAX Expressway on the east side of I-405, completely avoiding the Centinela Adobe and Randy's Donuts. Furthermore, as described in Section 4.9.1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D, which is now LAWA Staff's Preferred Alternative, does not involve the LAX Expressway and avoids impacts on the Centinela Adobe and Randy's Donuts. Also see Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding impacts on the Centinela Adobe and Randy's Donuts.

PC00170-6

Comment:

The Conservancy looks forward to working with LAWA to resolve future issues concerning historic resources at and around LAX. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at (213) 430-4203. Thank you for your consideration.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00171 Brands, Thomas None Provided 6/11/2001

PC00171-1

Comment:

In response to the draft EIS/EIR fo LAX expansion, and as a resident of Los Angeles, I oppose any further expansion of LAX and recommend the development of the Palmdale property for these reasons:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below. In addition, it should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00171-2

Comment:

1. SAFETY

The air space around LAX is already over saturated. Witness the Cerritos accident of a few years ago and various recent near misses of midair collisions over the Los Angeles area. Expansion of LAX would exacerbate, and development of the Palmdale facility would alleviate the currently existing safety hazard. The safety problem is not just an LAX problem, it is a Los Angeles and vicinity problem. Airplane crashes are equal opportunity killers, both for passengers and those on the ground, regardless of which part of town gets devastated.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00171-3

Comment:

2. NOISE

There appears to be a discrepancy in the location of the Eastern end of the 65 dB noise contour line. The multi-volume draft in the public library shows the 1996 line about a mile short of the Harbor Freeway, while the General Plan revision dated September 1998 Exhibit B shows the 65 dB noise contour extending East of the Harbor Freeway. Perhaps that was the noise level increase in two years?

Response:

Exhibit B of the 1998 City of Los Angeles General Plan was prepared by the City of Los Angeles Planning Department Graphics Section. The discrepancy is acknowledged with a note on the diagram indicating that the exhibit is illustrative and not to scale. For further information contact Los Angeles World Airports. For more information on noise please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR as well as the related appendices: Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, Appendix D, S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, 1. Land Use Technical Report and S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report. Additionally, please see Topical Response TR-N-1 regarding the noise modeling approach.

PC00171-4

Comment:

As traffic increases at LAX, air traffic, and therefore noise, increases all over town. Already noise complaints are coming in from as far away as Monterey Park. Soon noise abatement programs similar to those in the immediate vicinity of LAX will be necessary in many parts of town that are many miles from LAX. LAX noise is a problem for the entire city and environs.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-6, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 regarding present and future noise levels and Subtopical Response TR-N-6.2 regarding the relationship between air traffic and noise. Please see Section 4.1 Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for more information on 1996 baseline and Year 2000 noise levels and noise impacts projected to occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternatives A, B, C, and Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative). It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00171-5

Comment:

3. GROUND TRANSPORTATION

The existing ground transportation congestion will turn into gridlock. I have recently been driving to Claremont from Westchester about once per week in the early morning and each time that I see the traffic crawling West on the I105 and the I210 I am thankful that I am headed East. Expansion of LAX can only make these traffic jams worse, all over town, not just in the vicinity of LAX, and not just on those particular freeways. The proposed traffic mitigation plans do not address these situations.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00171-6

Comment:

4. BUSINESS

The idea that expansion of LAX will be good for business is a myth, because the ensuing gridlock will send business elsewhere, probably resulting in a net loss of jobs for the area. Also, how many businesses will get displaced by LAX acquiring additional real estate for the planned expansion? That's more job loss. However, at Palmdale, jobs are just as important as they are around LAX, and the potential for growth is much greater.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Traffic impacts were addressed in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As discussed therein, the Master Plan includes a traffic congestion relief package, in addition to specific mitigation measures, that would mitigate nearly all project-related traffic impacts. In many cases, project-related traffic impacts on off-airport streets and freeways would be reduced compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative in 2015. Please see Response to Comment PC00157-8 regarding the number of businesses to be acquired under the Master Plan, the associated level of employment that may be displaced, and the overall net change in employment expected under each of the alternatives. Relative to suggested growth at Palmdale Regional Airport, please see Response to Comment PC02664-11 as well as Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for further discussion. Please also see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00171-7

Comment:

5. AIRPORT ACCESS

A significant percentage of the population, and business, in Los Angeles is North of the Santa Monica mountains, and recent projections show that the fastest growth in the near future will be North of that, in the Santa Clarita valley. People in these areas can get to Palmdale just as easily, if not easier than to LAX. This will get even more true as traffic congestion increases and Palmdale access improves.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00171-8

Comment:

6. AIR QUALITY

Los Angeles already can not meet federal air quality standards. Expansion of LAX will exacerbate this problem too, especially since gridlock would be inevitable. Increased air pollution is a problem for the entire city of Los Angeles since the prevailing wind tends to send Westside pollution to other parts of town.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC00070-1 regarding existing air pollution in the South Coast Air Basin. Both the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the impacts of air pollution in and around the airport in Section 4.6. In general, the predicted air pollution impacts of any of the LAX Master Plan build alternatives would be lower than the predicted impacts of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC00171-9

Comment:

7. COST

According to the Master Plan the proposed LAX expansion is supposed to take care of increased traffic until 2015. Then what? Palmdale? Why not do it right the first time? Why do an expensive and shortsighted plan first? Besides, when we hear an estimate as high as 12 billion dollars, based on virtually all previous experience, that number is just for starters. It will inevitably go up from there. How much more money will then be required to alleviate the problems caused by additional traffic jams and pollution? Twelve billion dollars should be more than adequate to develop Palmdale and improve its ground access with money left over.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00171-10

Comment:

8. CONSTRUCTION

During the construction phase, even the current LAX capacity will be reduced as existing runways and terminals are razed. What kind of safety and other problems will that situation engender? Development of Palmdale obviates this concern.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00297-11. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00171-11

Comment:

9. ALTERNATIVES

The alternatives in the Master plan and the EIR are really just variations of the same plan. A true alternative would be to accommodate increased air traffic at other airports.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding the range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR, and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and shifts the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region.

PC00171-12

Comment:

SUMMARY

To summarize, the idea of further expansion of LAX is expensive, dangerous, and temporary. It makes more sense to develop the Palmdale property instead.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC00171-1 through PC00171-11 above.

PC00172

Landau, Aileen

None Provided

6/14/2001

PC00172-1

Comment:

Please stop the Master Plan of LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00172-2

Comment:

Life is unberable with flights in the middle of the night. How come there is no curfue after 11:00 PM at LAX are we second class citizens?

Response:

Please see Topical Responses TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding night-time aircraft operations.

PC00173	Rodriguez, Gabriel and Gillian	None Provided	6/15/2001
----------------	-------------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC00173-1

Comment:

We disagree with the LAX expansion plan because:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below. In addition, it should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00173-2

Comment:

1. The burdens, and advantages, of airports should be felt regionally. As the Inland Empire is the fastest-growing part of L.A. County, there should be a nearby airport(s) to service this area, as well as El Toro for Orange County.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00173-3

Comment:

2. The present pollution from LAX is such that it would be unacceptable to have increased flights with even more pollution.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In general, the predicted air pollution impacts of any of the LAX Master Plan build alternatives will be lower than the predicted impacts of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution.

PC00173-4

Comment:

Also, the town of Westchester has only recently recovered from a prior purchase of houses and business by and for the airport; to remove more houses and businesses would be a death knell.

Response:

Comment noted. The Master Plan is considered separate from growth and expansion that has occurred at LAX in the past. Please see Response to Comment PC00035-2 regarding residential acquisition; Response to Comment PC00013-5 regarding business acquisition and relocation impacts, proposed collateral development at LAX Northside/Westchester Southside, and the proposed Preliminary Property Acquisition and Relocation Plan; and Response to Comment AL00018-1 regarding commercial property acquisition within the Westchester Business District. Please also refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding the potential effects of the Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester.

PC00173-5

Comment:

3. On a personal level, three seniors live in this house and are able to walk to the shops, bank, etc. It would be very difficult, if not impossible, to find a similar house and lot close to the shopping area in Westchester.

Response:

Comment noted. As was described in Section 4.4.2, Relocation, of the Draft EIS/EIR under Alternatives A, B, and C, 84 dwelling units (including the commentator's property) are proposed for acquisition. In the event one of these alternatives is selected and approved, residents of acquired properties would be relocated through a LAWA-sponsored acquisition and relocation program developed and implemented in compliance with the Uniform Act, as further described under Master Plan Commitment RBR-1, Residential and Business Relocation Program. Although the needs of each resident would be considered in preparing the Residential and Business Relocation Plan, it is acknowledged that relocation may potentially present an inconvenience and hardship for some residents, including the possible loss of proximity to the shopping area in Westchester. It is important to note, however, that under LAWA staff's new preferred Alternative D, no acquisition is proposed in residential areas or the Westchester Business District.

In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00174

Callinan, Joseph

None Provided

6/15/2001

PC00174-1

Comment:

General Comments: 1. LAX has too little space to safely handle the movement of aircraft on the ground. Improvements must be made at the airport without increasing the number of planes landing and taking off.

Response:

Comment noted. Please refer to Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00174-2

Comment:

2. A regional approach makes sense for such a huge geographic area as Southern California. The San Francisco area has three major airports. Washington, D.C. has three major airports. The airlines would be happy to have to maintain facilities only at LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00174-3

Comment:

However, LAX's neighbors (of which I am one) is adamantly opposed. The L.A.W.A. is making enough money with the present volume of air traffic. Let's make LAX safer!!!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. Safety impacts were addressed in Section 4.24.3, Safety, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00175

Mason, Janet

None Provided

6/12/2001

PC00175-1

Comment:

We have lived in Westchester for 31 years and the Airport has been eating away at us for most of that time. Westchester has always been a wonderful community with schools, churches, Little League fields (NO parks to speak of) such as other local communities.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-121 and Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding the mitigation of impacts to the community from activities at LAX. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00175-2

Comment:

The traffic in our area now is almost unspeakable - what more do they want us to do except move away - to where? How about Palmdale? Do you like the heat? We happen to like the weather in Westchester. We do not want more air pollution, more noise, more traffic and less safety. We do not need airport expansion in this area. NO on Airport Expansion

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting

3. Comments and Responses

technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00176 Edmonds, Chris None Provided 6/8/2001

PC00176-1

Comment:

I am strongly opposing LAX Expansion & the Arbor Vitae Expressway. I understand this would include making Airport Blvd. an expressway. We want to keep our neighborhood a neighborhood and not live right next to an expressway!

Response:

Airport Boulevard would not become an expressway under any of the Master Plan alternatives. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed surface transportation issues impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road.

PC00177 Gare, Helen None Provided 6/14/2001

PC00177-1

Comment:

I am in favor of airport expansion to regional airports instead of placing the burden on those of us who live in LAX's vicinity, for example, Denver and Kansas City have airports out of town taking pressures off city dwellers.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00178 Verduzco, Maria Lennox Coordinating Council 6/8/2001

PC00178-1

Comment:

I am here on behalf of the Lennox Coordinating Council (LCC), the informal governing board of the unincorporated area of Lennox. The LAX expansion will have a significant impact on the communities, like Lennox, surrounding the airport. Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) in an effort to address the concerns of the communities on the periphery of the airport has hired a consulting group (URS) to convene public forums to inform residents about the impact of the airport expansion plans.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00178-2

Comment:

Our concern is that these public forums, which are being billed as Environmental Justice meetings, will not present information to the community in an unbiased and objective manner. As you know the proposed expansion has significant implications for the public health and safety for the surrounding communities such as Lennox. As a result there is a great deal of community concern and interest in this proposal. It is therefore vital that every effort be made to inform and provide local residents with accurate and objective information so that they in turn may fully participate in the decision making process.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR addressed Environmental Justice in Section 4.4.3, with supporting data and analysis provided in Appendix F. As stated on page 4-433 of Section 4.4.3, the environmental justice community outreach process was developed to assure an effective dialogue with minority and low-income communities affected by LAX in order to best respond to the needs of the various communities as Environmental Justice benefits and mitigation measures are developed and implemented. As committed to in the Draft EIS/EIR, a series of community workshops focused on Environmental Justice (EJ) were held subsequent to the release of the Draft EIS/EIR beginning in May 2001. A total of four workshops were held in the communities of Inglewood, Lennox, and South Los Angeles. The workshops were widely noticed to residents within a 10-mile radius of each meeting site through newspapers, posted notices, and door-to-door delivery of notices. Approximately 1,500 letters of invitation to the workshops were also mailed to organizations and leaders in the affected communities. The combined attendance at these meetings totaled approximately 275 persons. The format of the workshops included a number of tables staffed by LAWA and/or technical consultants where graphic illustrations and materials were provided to inform attendees about potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed LAX Master Plan alternatives. Information was also provided regarding on-going LAWA programs, such as the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program. Those staffing the tables spent considerable time engaged with the public in explaining information, answering questions, and documenting suggestions relative to possible EJ mitigation measures and benefits. At the last two workshops the format was revised per request to include a group briefing and question and answer period. Comments were received verbally and by comment form to gain input regarding community concerns and needs as they might apply to EJ benefit and mitigation programs. During the workshop phase described above, the format was focused on hearing from the community. This input along with more recent community outreach, has been used and has directly influenced development of the Environmental Justice Program set forth in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. With circulation of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, additional EJ workshops were held and other important input was received during public hearings and other outreach meetings representatives of adjacent communities. The overall outreach program is described in Topical Response TR-EJ-2. Every effort has been made by LAWA and the FAA throughout the environmental review process to provide accurate and objective information. To the extent specific issues have been raised regarding the accuracy or objectivity of information presented by LAWA and the FAA at the workshops or in the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA and the FAA, as required by CEQA and NEPA, have responded to these comments.

PC00178-3

Comment:

We believe that the manner in which the Environmental Justice group is doing their community outreach is inconsistent with the requirements for community outreach spelled out in the LAWA Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The EIR states that "the environmental justice community outreach process will involve an interactive and ongoing program to assure an effective dialogue with minority and low-income communities affected by LAX. To initiate this process, members of LAWA's Environmental Justice Task Force and other LAWA representatives will meet with elected officials and other

3. Comments and Responses

community representatives, and community workshops will be held." The Environmental Justice Meeting on May 19 at Inglewood High School did not allow residents to share their concerns and questions publicly. Instead, the format of the meeting only allowed residents to voice their concerns or ask questions individually to the various consultants staffing a booth. We believe this format is not conducive to creating an effective dialogue with the community (instead it fosters individual dialogue without allowing other residents a chance to hear comments or questions that might be of importance to them). We have met with the Environmental Justice group convened by LAWA in a good faith effort to request that certain conditions be met in order to present the workshops in an unbiased manner. Some of these requests were met, while others were refused. LAWA's refusal to engage the community in an interactive manner, makes the EIR goal of "forming advisory and other types of working groups" implausible.

Response:

As noted above in Response to Comment PC00178-2, LAWA has engaged the community in an interactive manner and the format of the workshops was changed to include group orientation and question and answer sessions. From the beginning, every effort was made to design and conduct the workshops in a manner that would foster the fullest possible input from the community.

PC00178-4

Comment:

We believe that the process being proposed for community outreach by the Environmental Justice Task Force is not in the best interest of the community. Ultimately, we want to ensure that the public receives unbiased, objective information about the impact of the expansion on their communities and that they are clear on the distinction between the workshops being offered by the Environmental Justice Task Force and the formal public hearings on the LAX masterplan, EIR.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC00178-2 and PC00178-3. Noticing for the EJ Workshops as well as workshop presentations and materials were clear regarding the objectives of the workshops. Comment forms for both the Draft EIS/EIR and more specific EJ comments were made available at the workshops. While the Draft EIS/EIR public hearings were more broadly focused, all comments received through both public input processes have been considered and addressed by LAWA and the FAA. Also see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding the outreach process and Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Final EIS/EIR with supporting information in Appendix F-A, of this Final EIS/EIR.

PC00179

Cheng, Suellen

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00179-1

Comment:

I am oppose to the expansion of LAX & the master plan for the following reasons:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00179-2

Comment:

1. LAX's congestion problems will not be improved by the current proposed plan.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns

3. Comments and Responses

PC00179-3

Comment:

2. Los Angeles' air quality will be significantly worsen. It will impact the greater L.A. area, not only the airport area.

Response:

Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In general, the predicted air pollution impacts of any of the LAX Master Plan build alternatives will be lower than the predicted impacts of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution.

PC00179-4

Comment:

3. The quick fix so-called modernization would hurt L.A. business in the long run.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00179-5

Comment:

4. The quick fix approach can only hurt and damage the health of Los Angeles residence & children in particular.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, and Topical Response TR-HRA-4 regarding human health mitigation strategies.

PC00179-6

Comment:

5. The workshop is totally inadequate. More community meetings to explain the findings and to solicit ideas are definitely needed.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process.

PC00179-7

Comment:

Thank you for listening and for your help in making L.A. a better and more livable city.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00180 Jarvis, Jean None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00180-1

Comment:

This Plan is on shaky ground! In fact, the LAX Master Plan is a Master Disaster waiting to happen. These reports do not adequately address the danger and vulnerability of a super-size airport at LAX.

In other words, "Yo, FAA, are you jiggly with it?" And I DO mean jiggly!

How can the FAA justify a plan to build what will become the busiest airport in the United States in earthquake country?

Has the FAA's Airport Safety Office considered the hazards of this site? Whose fault will it be if the big one hits? Or should I say, which fault will it be if the big one hits?

If a catastrophic earthquake were to level the airport towers and split the runways, where will the FAA divert 90 million passengers? The answer, of course, is the FAA will not be able to handle a loss of this magnitude, nor should it even try.

The FAA should be working vigorously to avoid concentrating air traffic at a single airport in Southern California - the most geologically unstable region in the country. Putting all your eggs in one basket only works for the Easter Bunny!

The FAA's Airport Safety Office is supposed to approve projects which reduce vulnerability of a disaster at civil airports, not approve plans which increase it!

I would like to ask for the Safety Office's written opinion on the risks of this plan in a catastrophic earthquake.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed geologic hazards, including earthquake-induced hazards, in Section 4.22, Earth/Geology, with supporting technical data and analysis provided in Technical Report 12 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00180-2

Comment:

And I would like the FAA to include a plan for damage control and for short-term and long-term restoration of air traffic services to Los Angeles, in the event of a major earthquake.

Response:

Section 4.22, Earth Geology (subsection 4.22.6), of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed potential earthquake-related impacts and concluded that impacts related to each of the build alternatives would be less than significant. As such, no mitigation measures are required. The request that the FAA include a plan for major damage control and restoration of traffic services to Los Angeles in the event of a major earthquake is so noted.

PC00181 Sirls, Bobby None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00181-1

Comment:

I disagree with the expansion of LAX.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00181-2

Comment:

My home is directly under the flight path and a increase in planes flying over is not desired; I and my neighbors already can not talk on phones or hold conversations without being interrupted every minute to every 2 minutes apart due to noisy planes.

Response:

The commentor resides just north of the centerline of the approach to Runway 24R, approximately one mile east of the runway threshold. The residence is within the existing boundaries of LAWA's Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program and Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures under way to address existing noise levels. Given the location, noise events will continue at present or increased frequencies. The commentor's annoyance with the overflights by aircraft is acknowledged.

PC00181-3

Comment:

Traffic is also a big concern: the congestion is already bad and with the passing of time alone traffic will get worse; and with the expansion traffic would probably almost double.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Regarding existing traffic concerns surrounding LAX, percent contribution of airport traffic in the adjacent communities, and how traffic conditions around the airport would change with implementation of the Master Plan Alternatives, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4. Regarding traffic measures to minimize neighborhood impacts, please see Topical Response TR-ST-6.

PC00181-4

Comment:

Alternative Solution: Expand John Wayne Airport, or Long Beach Airport, Burbank Airport. Please leave LAX as is!

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00182 Elam, Donna None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00182-1

Comment:

1) How LAX going to help the school districts within the 10 miles?

Response:

Schools impacted by the LAX Master Plan would be helped through commitments and mitigation measures. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed commitments and mitigation for impacts on schools in Section 4.27, Schools, and Section 4.2, Land Use.

Enrollment impacts on schools would be addressed through payment of an estimated three to four million dollars in school impacts fees to the Los Angeles Unified School District under Alternatives A, B, and C, and through payment of an estimated 1.8 to 2 million dollars in fees under Alternative D. In accordance with Senate Bill 50 (SB 50), the maximum fees allowed by the bill are deemed to provide full and complete school facilities mitigation for purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act. In addition, new residential and commercial/industrial development associated with indirect growth resulting from the LAX Master Plan would generate school impact fees pursuant to SB 50 in those jurisdictions where the development would occur.

Where the project would have direct impacts on public schools, rather than impacts through changes in enrollment, these effects are analyzed in other sections of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR which pertain to those impacts (e.g., 4.1, Noise; 4.2, Land Use; 4.3, Surface Transportation; 4.6, Air Quality; and 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment) and are summarized in Section 4.27. Technical Report 17, of the Draft EIS/EIR contains an existing conditions information and analysis of impacts to schools outside of the Los Angeles Unified School District focusing on Alternatives A, B, and C.

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding mitigation measures for noise impacts on schools.

PC00182-2

Comment:

2) Where is the housing for these new residents coming from? How (1 & 2) will impact the rent within the area?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding housing issues, including affordable housing.

PC00183 Zamora, Salomon None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00183-1

Comment:

YO ESTOY EN FAVOR 100% DE EL PROYECTO DE EXPANCIÓN DEL AEROPUERTO

I am in favor 100% for the expansion project of the airport.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00184

Range, Vonda

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00184-1

Comment:

1. Some planes are so low that we can see the people on them.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00184-2

Comment:

2. If sitting in back yard we have stop conversations as each plane goes overhead.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00184-3

Comment:

3. At night their lights shine thur bedroom windows.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00184-4

Comment:

4. They should have large identification numbers on underneath wings.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00184-5

Comment:

5. Our windows are doublepaned at our expense.

Response:

See Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding LAWA's Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program as relates to sound insulation.

PC00184-6

Comment:

6. The planes come in so low that there are cracks in walls and items fall off shelves.

3. Comments and Responses

Response: Please see Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration.

PC00184-7

Comment: 7. Planes have dumped fuel that has gas-like odor

Response: Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition. In addition, please see Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding odors.

PC00184-8

Comment: and leaves black soot-like partials on roof, patio tables, chairs & vehicles.

Response: Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC00184-9

Comment: We have even called Fire Dept. out, it has caused medical problems.

Response: The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, and Topical Response TR-HRA-4 regarding human health mitigation strategies.

PC00185 Jacquet, Joyce None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00185-1

Comment: How can they consider 9600 block on Denker and I live a few block from Denker for noise reduction.

Response: Please see Subtopical Response TR-LU-3 regarding how eligibility is determined for sound insulation under the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

PC00185-2

Comment: I would like them reduct the noise in 3:00, 4:00 & 5:00 a.m. in the morning.

Response: Nighttime single event noise impacts and mitigation for LAX Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting information in Appendix SC and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding

3. Comments and Responses

nighttime aircraft operations and Topical Response TR-N-4.1 regarding additional mitigation actions suggested for flight activity, including the recommended mitigation measure to restrict east takeoffs in the late night hours.

PC00185-3

Comment:

Also when the weather is bad, they take off the same way they land. It shakes the house.

Response:

See Response to Comment PC00158-3. Also, please see Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding vibration impacts.

PC00186

Miller, Carrie

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00186-1

Comment:

I have not seen an equitable plan for LAX.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00186-2

Comment:

My house is right under a flight path. At time I have landing lights shine in my bedroom windows.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00186-3

Comment:

We have spent \$10,000.00 for new windows. We still cannot hear a T.V. in our house. It is impossible to have window or doors open. The noise is unbearable. I like one person on the committee to spend an evening in my home.

Response:

Regarding LAWA's Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program and how it would be affected by the LAX Master Plan see Topical Response TR-LU-3. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00186-4

Comment:

The planes empty fuel

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC00186-5

Comment:

leave soot over my home.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC00186-6

Comment:

I have applied for soundproofing yet I am not eligible. Yet homes not under flight plan are. Go figure.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the existing ANMP, including how soundproofing is prioritized and how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP.

PC00186-7

Comment:

Plane arrive twent four hours a day. Making rest impossible. I really would like to be able to hold a conversation in my own home. Whezte on the phone or person to person

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels and Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing noise levels.

PC00186-8

Comment:

The planes come in so low that there are cracks in walls and item fall of shelves

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise based vibration.

PC00187

Anderson, Odessa

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00187-1

Comment:

I lived here since 1974. And it has affected my hearing.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-246 regarding the fact that existing and future noise levels at and around LAX are projected to be well below the OSHA and CalOSHA standards that serve to protect against hearing loss.

PC00187-2

Comment:

It distrubs my reception of my television & radio. Its extremely loud all day all night.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. However, please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. See also Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding residential sound insulation and monitoring provisions under the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP) and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC00188 No Author Identified, None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00188-1

Comment:

On your "mailer" - why didn't you put the events & itenory (times) of speakers & so on - we were at Hally Park at 1130 & the meeting doesn't start until 2:30 - what a waste of our time & money for parking you don't seem to care about the little people just big shots

Response:

All of the public meetings and hearings carried the same format, one hour of presentation and review of material followed by public input. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process.

PC00189 Hetrick, Effie

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00189-1

Comment:

LAX EXPANSION NO

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00189-2

Comment:

#1 Polution extreem in State of Cal.

Response:

Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00189-3

Comment:

#2 NOISE EXTREEM IN STATE OF CAL.

Response:

Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also, please see Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 regarding existing and future noise levels.

PC00189-4

Comment:

#3 NOISE, POLLUTION, DANGER OVER ALL HOMES AND SCHOOLS.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and schools in Section 4.27, Schools. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 4, 14a, 14c, and 17 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00190

Ross, Oadie

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00190-1

Comment:

At one time the planes did not come over my house late night and early morning but now they come by all day night and morning.

Response:

The commentator resides two blocks south of the centerline of the approach to Runway 25L, approximately four miles east of the runway threshold. Given the location, noise events will continue at present or increased frequencies throughout the foreseeable future. The commentator's annoyance with the overflights by aircraft is acknowledged. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program and Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing noise levels.

PC00190-2

Comment:

If I'm looking at T.V. in the day I have to close my windows to hear my television.

Response:

Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also, please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC00190-3

Comment:

They also wake me up some morning as early as 5:30 am.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment PC00190-1 above. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime noise operations.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00191 Campbell, Daniel None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00191-1

Comment:

The environmental impact to my home is the airplanes shifts my door jams and sets off my home alarm system.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration.

PC00191-2

Comment:

I have considerable silt accumulates on my house and windows causing me to have my house waterblasted once a year.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC00192 Conerly, Dontre None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00192-1

Comment:

If the goal of LAX is to improve the emissions into the air - which are contributed to by commuters to LAX - why not expand the Metro Green Line and increase shuttle service first. By doing this after improvements, when traffic to LAX is proposed to increase by 40%, the effect is the same. You are merely offsetting the emissions of additional traffic, what about what's already there?

Response:

The goal of any mitigation program is to mitigate the project-related impacts to the environment. The additional traffic generated as a result of the project creates an adverse environmental impact. The traffic that is already at the facility is the environmental baseline, or current condition. Therefore, mitigation measures are not aimed at existing conditions, but at the Master Plan itself. Effective mitigation should, however, alleviate overall traffic impacts both in and around the airport, including those trips that are currently occurring.

PC00193 Allen, Dorothy None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00193-1

Comment:

I am concerned by the noise & the number of planes that pass over my house & back yard, at certain hours of the day & night.

Response:

Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00193-2

Comment:

I have to raise the volume on TV and ask callers to hold until the plane passes over my house.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIS. However, please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels and Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing noise levels.

PC00193-3

Comment:

I am also concerned about fall out over my fish pond

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC00194 No Author Identified, None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00194-1

Comment:

Why schedule a meeting at noon when you know it won't start 'til 230 - or later!! = usual screwup

Response:

The first part of each meeting was for information purposes with staff and project planners available to describe the alternatives and project in detail prior to the public input portion of the meeting.

PC00195 Lopez, Rocio None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00195-1

Comment:

Safety - Plan does not address midair collisions; not addressing fuel spill from plans & does not affect.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed aviation safety in Section 4.24.3, Safety. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 for clarification regarding aviation safety. The risk of a potential fuel spill and associated impacts were addressed in Section 4.23, Hazardous Materials, and Section 4.24.3, Safety, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00195-2

Comment:

I live in southeast L.A. and am concerned that residents there were not notified via workshops, mailers, etc. Please do more outreach in low-income minority communities of color - contact cities like, Bell, Huntington Park, Southgate

Response:

While noticing of the workshops was widely published, and included areas within a 10-mile radius, notification to date has focused deliberately on those communities in proximity to LAX where

3. Comments and Responses

disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority and low-income populations have been identified as a possible consequence of the proposed LAX Master Plan. These areas are identified in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR with supporting data and analysis provided in Appendix F. Also see Topical Response TR-EJ-2.

PC00195-3

Comment:

tell me how your addressing safety & noise - did not find in EIR.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, and safety in Section 4.24.3, Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00196

Kwok, Munson

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00196-1

Comment:

While favoring some necessary growth, I oppose the current Master Plan taking growth well beyond 98 MAP and 4 MAT. It is essential that aviation growth assume a regional viewpoint, much as SCAG is now supporting. Yet most of the Master Plan focuses on LAX without defining and exploring the balance of assets and resources to achieve a successful regional solution. Only lip service is paid to the idea of a regional solution. It is hard to accept any Master Plan for LAX without developing a Master Plan for the region in today's environment that allows for development of Ontario, El Toro, and even Palmdale.

Response:

The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00196-2

Comment:

I do favor aspects of the plan that improve ground transportation and access to LAX

1. Automated people movers
2. Completion of Green Line into Terminal System. Earlier the better.
3. Better & more satellite parking linked by automated transportation.
4. Arbor Vitae & Ring Road Alternative C

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00196-3

Comment:

Development plans must preserve historical & natural resources. The prime historical asset is the Centinela Valley Adobe.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding impacts to the Centinela Adobe.

PC00197

Lanphere, Ralph

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00197-1

Comment:

I have been a resident in El Segundo for 46 years. The home I have lived in for the past 41 years is located a quarter of a mile from the south runway. I have learned to live with the pollution; bought myself a black car so the kerosene dropped from the airplanes doesn't show. I have managed to live with the noise, my hearing is still fair for my age. I have mitigated the traffic, by leaving at 4 in the morning if I am traveling by car. The problem I am most concerned with is the amount of planes landing at LAX. With the amount of traffic landing and taking off, the FAA's ability to handle air traffic has to be overtaxed. I only fly half a dozen times a year, but is disturbing to me that the airlines are adding times to their trips, because they know there will be delays at LAX. I recently returned by air from Oakland. We were 30 minutes late leaving the gate, not because of traffic at Oakland, but because of over crowding at LAX. We spent 15 minutes doing figure eights on a foggy night before we could land because of the traffic conditions at the LAX airport.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding concerns about deposition and soot associated with aircraft activity. The proposed Master Plan is intended to address the current and projected activity levels at LAX in order to improve the operational efficiency of the airport and reduce delays. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00197-2

Comment:

There is an additional problem with wave-offs, that are happening more frequently. When I look up through my skylight and see the bottom of a 747 at 500 feet, it makes me a little nervous.

Response:

Please see Topical Responses TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety and TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

PC00197-3

Comment:

I would hope that you will consider the expansion of LAX to be not reasonable, and consider the regional expansion of airports to be the best solution.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00198

Low, Carol

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00198-1

Comment:

I'm adamantly opposed to LAX expansion when there are other viable options.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00198-2

Comment:

Its a danger as well as health & welfare hazard to expand LAX beyond it's current over crowded capacity.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health impacts in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. The Draft EIS/EIR provides supporting technical data and analyses in Technical Report 14, Human Health and Safety Technical Report, in the Draft EIS/EIR, and in Technical Report S-9, Supplemental Human Health and Safety Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00199

Palmer, Stacey

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00199-1

Comment:

You have been non-responsive and non-accountable with current operations:
- W/ form letter responses to specific overflight incidents

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety and Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

PC00199-2

Comment:

- W/ current passengers served being 67 million as opposed to the 40 million that was identified originally
- Your proposed 98 million would then by projection seem to estimate perhaps 170 million

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding projected versus actual capacity levels at LAX.

PC00199-3**Comment:**

Your EIR is likewise in serious respects non-accountable. It seems acceptable to you apparently to triple NOx emissions while then proposing to mitigate only 30% of a triple amount. Perhaps a little math work then indicate the net result would be more than double existing nitreous oxide emissions.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00014-4 regarding NOX emissions.

PC00199-4**Comment:**

The plan needs to be rejected for many reasons
- Inappropriate to tax this city and area and population to take care of travel needs for multiple other regions [Orange/Riverside/San Bernadino/...]

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC00199-5**Comment:**

- This plan is an outrage and is a fraud and your attempt to perpetuate it borders on forced aggression.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00200**Wills, Yvonne****None Provided****6/9/2001****PC00200-1****Comment:**

From a taxpayer who has been a resident of El Segundo for 73 years (before LAX) any expansion will adversely effect me as the LAX encroachment on El Segundo has already placed my life, health and property in jeopardy by overflights, noise and air pollution. There are pilots flying over our home instead of directly to the shoreline - old, noisy, fully loaded cargo planes (at approximately 1 am - 4 am) are making sleeping conditions intolerable. During daylight hours FEDX is one of the most blatant offenders - I cannot identify the other airplanes logos.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 4, and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-4, and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 for additional information regarding aviation safety, Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding

3. Comments and Responses

nighttime aircraft operations. Please also note that Alternative D, added subsequent to the publication and public review of the Draft EIS/EIR is designed for a future (2015) level of activity at LAX comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and would have the fewest total annual aircraft operations of all the Master Plan alternatives, even slightly less than the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00200-2

Comment:

I fear for the safety of my family and community. El Segundo was founded before LAX. The droppings from the airplanes cover our plants cars and window sills, and sift through the window screens. I will not live in a closed window environment. My property value has also been adversely affected. Traffic is now intolerable on Sepulveda.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-2, S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition and Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding residential property values.

PC00200-3

Comment:

LAX and FAA - stop violating the living conditions of my family and community! Other airport locations can be developed to carry the airline needs!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00201

Puleo, Joanne

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00201-1

Comment:

The traffic is a disaster around LAX, Westchester, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Marina del Rey, Hermosa Beach. It is continual grid lock. Besides #405 Sepulveda, Vista del Mar, Lincoln Blvd, Hawthorne Blvd., Imperial Blvd., Rosecrans, El Segundo Blvd., Century Blvd., Manchester Blvd. - all are heavily trafficed roads at all hours. To bring new workers into the Lax area, more air passengers, more ground personnel could only be more of a problem. The area cannot handle more traffic. A ring road along 105, Pershing is not the answer.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Regarding existing traffic concerns surrounding LAX, percent contribution of airport traffic in the adjacent communities, and how traffic conditions around the airport would change with implementation of the Master Plan Alternatives, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4. Regarding traffic measures to minimize neighborhood impacts, please see Topical Response TR-ST-6. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-7 regarding a brief history of LAX

3. Comments and Responses

Northside/Westchester Southside, its role in the Master Plan, and the impact/benefits of the proposed airport alternatives.

PC00201-2

Comment:

We need to take some air traffic and move it to other regional airports - Long Beach, John Wayne, Ontario, Burbank, Palmdale, El Toro, March AF.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00202 Meyers, Linda None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00202-1

Comment:

The noise is unbearable - structural damage is evident -

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration.

PC00202-2

Comment:

BUT worse is the pollution - the black jet fuel that covers my outside area is POISENOUS and I breath it every day -

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC00203 Wislocky, Joseph None Provided 6/8/2001

PC00203-1

Comment:

Have studies of earthquake impacts been made?

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed geologic hazards, including earthquake-induced hazards, in Section 4.22, Earth/Geology, with supporting technical data and analysis provided in Technical Report 12 of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00204

King, Karen

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00204-1

Comment:

Traffic near the airport is already impossible all day not just during rush hour. The airport cannot handle any more traffic on the surrounding freeways & streets.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Regarding existing traffic concerns surrounding LAX, percent contribution of airport traffic in the adjacent communities, and how traffic conditions around the airport would change with implementation of the Master Plan Alternatives, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4. Regarding traffic measures to minimize neighborhood impacts, please see Topical Response TR-ST-6.

PC00204-2

Comment:

The area doesn't need any more pollution or noise. Spread the wealth and expand airports in rapidly growing adjacent counties.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00205

Frick, Cheryl

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00205-1

Comment:

I am against the expansion of LAX. My concerns lie with:

1. Public Safety & Health: increased air traffic (trying to fit 2 gallons of water into a one gallon bucket!)
2. Increased auto traffic - auto traffic already at capacity.
3. Increased pollution: both air & noise. High levels of noise have been know to cause learning disabilities in children.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Regarding noise effects on learning, please see Response to Comment AL00017-257. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00205-2

Comment:

2. EIR - down plays all of these concerns. The EIR does not adequately reflect current conditions, rather down plays these hazards to lessen what I believe are impossible mitigation measures.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-1 regarding baseline conditions used in the EIS/EIR analysis.

PC00205-3

Comment:

A regional plan makes sense. I do not wish to see our communities destroyed. I look forward to your response.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. .

PC00205-4

Comment:

Also: 3) Ring Road - unacceptable proposition which will lead to further traffic hazards.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the Ring Road. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00206

**Newcomb, Alan &
Gaylia**

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00206-1

Comment:

WE AGREE WITH THE PLAN PROPOSED BY CONGRESSWOMAN JANE HARMON.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00207 Su, Rayshya None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00207-1

Comment:

I was very concerned about the extremely crowded situation in the LAX Airport. On Apr. 17, 2001, when I ended my vocation expecting immediately going back my sweet home. I spent more than 2 hours when I was standing in the line and waiting for inspection to exit. That's totally different from the situation three years ago I experienced.

I strongly feel that LAX Airport need to expend immediately.

LAX airport is one of the most important entrance in the United States. And if it is not safe enough or no good quality, making American Gate becoming a narrow old & not safe place, it may seriously impact the developing of the Los Angeles areas or even the whole South California.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00208 Tsai, Fu-Min None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00208-1

Comment:

I hope LAX to have a immediately expansion to meet comming requirement of rapid growing of LA.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00208-2

Comment:

I also hope there will be satisfactory environmental protection facilities to be parrellel to the expansion of LAX's.

Response:

Many measures have been incorporated into the design of the Master Plan alternatives that would reduce the adverse impacts of their implementation. Furthermore, over 130 Master Plan commitments and mitigation measures have been recommended to further reduce the impacts of the project. A complete listing of these design features, Master Plan commitments, and mitigation measures was provided in Chapter 5, Environmental Action Plan, of this Final EIS/EIR.

PC00209 Iwasaki, Joni None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00209-1

Comment:

I am in favor of the proposed plan Alternative C. I am currently an employee of Northwest Airline. I understand that there is a need for some kind of expansion and change if LAX is to remain the gateway/hub it is.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00210

Wislocky, Nicky

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00210-1

Comment:

I would like to support the no project alternative, but I can't even do that. The Environmental Impacts of the present configuration have not been implemented. All LAX has done is confiscate public and private property to be used for their own advantage.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-121 and Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding opportunities to alleviate impacts associated with past or present airport activities at LAX. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00210-2

Comment:

The effects of the airport are visible in my own home. Oil drops visible on a front north facing screen door. Patio furniture covers that last less than a year.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC00210-3

Comment:

Other private property owners are prevented from full use of their own land due to noise. While homes may be sound insulated (without LAX funding) that covers only 40% of the property. The remaining 60% has been confiscated by LAX noise.

Response:

It appears that the commentor's statement regarding "full use of their own land" and "remaining 60% confiscated by LAX noise" is referring to existing outdoor noise levels (i.e., 60 percent of lot coverage) versus interior noise levels (i.e., 40 percent of lot coverage) that can be reduced through sound insulation. The noise impact area which determines residential uses eligible for sound insulation is described in Topical Response TR-LU-3 and is based on the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL noise contour. Noise-sensitive uses exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour under the 1996 baseline were described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3), and were shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Noise-sensitive uses exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour under Year 2000 conditions were described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3), and were shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As was shown on these respective figures, under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions, the area within the 65 CNEL noise contour has decreased compared to the ANMP contour. Although this is a comment on existing noise levels and conditions the general focus of the document, pursuant to NEPA and CEQA, is to evaluate the potential future environmental effects of the project and to provide feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts. The Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6), acknowledged that noise levels between 65 and 75 CNEL affect outdoor speech and the quality of outdoor activities, and outdoor noise levels greater than 75 CNEL were considered significant for certain outdoor habitable areas and parks. As was stated in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.9.1), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts remained significant even with implementation of residential sound insulation. Please see Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4 for a description of who is eligible for sound insulation. As stated in Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.9 sound insulation is not funded by the homeowner. Furthermore, the airport has and continues to provide considerable funding toward sound insulation, as described under the current ANMP.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00210-4

Comment:

While LAX claims that their traffic is not responsible for traffic jams on Sepulveda, they have confiscated one lane of the Sepulveda Tunnel for their own use. They now propose to confiscate Pershing which is the only other way to escape the Sepulveda traffic jams.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00018-30.

PC00210-5

Comment:

Look at Imperial going towards Vista Del Mar. On the south side of the street you see trees and landscaping in the area belonging to El Segundo. In the median, a trash dump. On the north side, weeds but not even a sidewalk. All of this indicates a total lack of social responsibility on the part of LAX management. LAX funding is put into illuminated towers which serve as an insult to all of us who face a scarcity of resources to generate electric power.

If the present management of LAX chooses to fund illuminated towers over sound-proofing homes, if they have not mitigated the effects of their present operation, why should we believe them, or anyone who promises mitigation for operations on a larger scale.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00210-6

Comment:

This pipe dream of a lame duck Mayor should be put to rest. Until LAX demonstrates some degree of social responsibility no consideration should be given to any expansion of the current operations. The regional airport proposal is the only acceptable mitigation measure.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00211

Wilde, James

None Provided

6/8/2001

PC00211-1

Comment:

Plan B is Unsafe. Plan B adds a new, shorter, runway on the southern edge of the airport. Pilot confusion between the Hawthorne Airport runway will lead to unsafe operations. Pilots have already confused the short Hawthorne runway with the long 25 Left LAX runway several times. Additionally Plan B would seem to require demolition of some of the newest & most expensive cargo facilities along Imperial Highway.

Response:

Comment noted. In urbanized areas it is not uncommon to have airports in close proximity, often with runways aligned in the same direction due to the prevailing wind patterns. Awareness and vigilance on the part of flight crews and air traffic controllers minimizes the potential for a flight crew to mistake the

3. Comments and Responses

assigned runway. Additionally, the geometry of the runways, e.g., length and width, aids in determining the differences between general aviation and commercial use runways.

The most significant factor, however, is the instrumentation for the runway. The concept of operation for the southern most runway in Alternative B (Runway 25L) is to provide the capability of an additional arrival stream to LAX to reduce arrival delays. In this concept Runway 25L would be equipped with an Instrument Landing System (ILS) to provide all-weather capability. The ILS would provide electronic guidance to the runway in both the horizontal and vertical planes, thus an aircraft assigned Runway 25L would be operated on the glide path assuring flight crews could not confuse the LAX and Hawthorne runways.

Prudent planning necessitates minimizing the impact on existing facilities in order to reduce costs and maximize the return on historical investments in facility development. However, in developing a long-term plan for a major commercial airport, the desire to preserve existing facilities in the short term is often outweighed by the long-term benefit of re-development. The master plan development has been sensitive to the desire to maintain and re-use existing facilities whenever possible, within the objective of developing the best possible long range-plan for the airport.

PC00212 Puleo, Richard None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00212-1

Comment:

1. TO CONCENTRATE ALL AIR TRAFFIC IN ONE AREA DOES NOT MAKE ANY SENSE - PEOPLE FROM RIVERSIDE, ORANGE COUNTY, S.D., G.V., ETC. TO COME TO OUR AREA DOES NOT MAKE SENSE.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC00212-2

Comment:

2. INCREASED ROAD TRAFFIC
3. INCREASED NOISE
4. INCREASED AIR POLLUTION

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00213 Babbitt, Tom & Erika None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00213-1

Comment:

We are opposed to the expansion of LAX Airport. We feel any expansion would negatively impact the quality of living for ourselves and our neighbors. Specific reasons for opposition include:

3. Comments and Responses

1. Increased noise
2. Increased pollution
3. Increased traffic on Sepulveda Blvd. and Imperial Highway

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts to quality of life. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00213-2

Comment:

We currently believe the noise, pollution and traffic are excessive for any community. Increasing air traffic (be it passenger or cargo) would push these factors to the point of harm on the community and the people. Any LAX expansion is a constructive nuisance.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00213-3

Comment:

We support a regional plan. With expansion moving to other locations.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00214

**Jones, Donald &
Lynn**

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00214-1

Comment:

Questions concerning LAX EIS/EIR 2001 Since LAX is currently operating approximately 23 MAP over it's current capacity (approx. 68 MAP) will the new proposed "Master Plan" for expansion to 89 MAP do the following?

Response:

Comment noted. Please refer to Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels.

PC00214-2

Comment:

1. Increase substantially freeway traffic on the 105 and 405 and surface streets?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PC00214-3

Comment:

2. Increase truck and auto congestion within the airport itself?

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed surface transportation impacts in Section 4.3, Surface, Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 3a, 3b, S-2a and S-2b. Specifically, page 4-9 of the January 2001 Draft EIS/EIR Summary Report states, "Effect of Master Plan Improvements: Traffic modeling projects that peak hour trips would drop anywhere from 21 percent to 34 percent in the CTA if any one of the Master Plan alternatives is implemented. By contrast, under the No Action/No Project Alternative, the number of peak hour trips in the CTA is estimated to increase by 22 percent."

PC00214-4

Comment:

3. Lessen available parking for those using the airport?

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-290 regarding parking demand. Table 4.3.1-7 and 4.3.1-8 on pages 4-260 and 4-261 of the Draft EIS/EIR indicated that Alternative C has more planned capacity than either the environmental baseline or the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00214-5

Comment:

4. Create more noise for all cities South of LAX bordering the airport and down the coast including the Palos Verdes Peninsula?

Response:

Table S3-1, Summary of Activity Alternative-2015, located in Chapter 3, Alternatives, (Including Proposed Action) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided forecasts for passenger activity, cargo activity and aircraft operations for the environmental baseline, Unconstrained Forecast and all alternatives. In the South Bay communities and Palos Verdes, aircraft noise levels associated with the project actions would be much lower than those considered to be significant by all regulatory agencies. The area may be effected by noise from other airports, as well as ongoing modifications in air traffic routes out of LAX that have nothing to do with the proposed Master Plan actions. For further information on this topic, please see Topical Response TR-N-3, particularly Subtopical Responses TR-N-3.1, TR-N-3.2, and TR-N-3.3.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00214-6

Comment:

5. Cause more burned jet fuel pollution in the coastal atmosphere?

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality impacts, including emissions from aircraft, in Section 4.6, Air Quality.

PC00214-7

Comment:

6. Be less safe to communities directly under the flight paths because of the increase in air traffic?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00214-8

Comment:

7. Cause a loss of homes and businesses because of expansion construction at LAX adjacent the airport?

Response:

Residential and business acquisition and relocation impacts were addressed in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment PC00035-2 regarding residential acquisition; Response to Comment PC00013-5 regarding business acquisition and relocation impacts, proposed collateral development at LAX Northside/Westchester Southside, and the proposed Preliminary Property Acquisition and Relocation Plan; and Response to Comment PC00018-1 regarding commercial property acquisition within the Westchester Business District.

PC00214-9

Comment:

8. Why expand LAX, a major American airport which is already the smallest major airport (from a land standpoint) in the nation as opposed to expansion on a regional basis which makes far more sense since more of the future growth is projected to be in the regional areas?

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00214-10**Comment:**

9. In addition to the 89 MAP what will the additional freight brought into LAX by expansion do to the overall operation of the airport in terms of congestion and pollution?

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic and TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC00214-11**Comment:**

10. Will there be more night flights out of LAX because of the additional freight load and if so will it cause more night time noise in surrounding cities?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding cargo operations, Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increases.

PC00214-12**Comment:**

11. Will there be more dumping of fuel over the ocean for any reason?

Response:

Fuel dumping is an exercise practiced only during emergency situations or when an aircraft is forced to land before reaching its intended destination.

When an aircraft's designed maximum takeoff weight is higher than the maximum landing weight, it is required to be lighter when landing than during take-off. An aircraft achieves this lighter weight by burning fuel during flight. This is common in long-range flights by larger aircraft. Only when an airplane experiences an emergency, forcing them to land before initially planned, do they dump fuel in order to fall below the maximum landing weight. None of the alternatives would increase the necessity to dump fuel since the procedure is practiced only in emergency situations.

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC00214-13**Comment:**

12. Since the FAA says there is no current room off shore to put more airplanes leaving LAX. How and where will the additional planes be routed? Over the beach cities and the Palos Verdes Peninsula like they currently are?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00214-14

Comment:

13. Won't there be more health problems from the increased burning of jet fuel that will have a negative effect on older residents and school children under the flight paths and around the airport not to mention others?

Response:

Please refer to Topical Responses TR-HRA-2 and TR-HRA-3 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects and human health impacts.

PC00214-15

Comment:

14. Won't there be more health problems for those daily workers at the airport? IE: firemen, ground support personnel and others because of increased toxicity from burning of jet fuel?

Response:

Please see Topical Responses TR-HRA-2 and TR-HRA-3 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects and human health impacts. Also, please refer to Responses to Comments PC02221-2 and PC02224-71 for additional information regarding the evaluation of human health impacts associated with jet fuel.

Exposures to toxic air pollutants (TAPs) associated with airport operations may be greatest for LAX workers. LAX workers, especially baggage handlers at the gates and on the aprons, spend large amounts of their time at work in areas where exhaust from jet engines, GSE and other sources may reach their highest concentrations.

An evaluation of occupational exposures for horizon years 2005 and 2015 is provided in Technical Report 14a (subsections 6.3.1 and 6.4.1, Comparison of On-Airport Air Concentrations with OSHA Standards for Workers) of the Draft EIS/EIR. Occupational exposures were assessed through the comparison of maximum average air concentrations of TAPs to thresholds of significance determined for workers by relevant governing bodies. Permissible Exposure Limits - Time Weighted average (PEL-TWA) are air concentrations for chemicals developed by Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), adopted by California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal-OSHA) to represent maximum concentrations (8-hour time-weighted average) to which workers may be repeatedly exposed during business hours without developing adverse health effects. These occupational limits are deemed adequate to protect healthy workers during repeated 8-hour exposures to toxic compounds.

Maximum 8-hour concentrations of TAPs near gates and aprons were estimated through air dispersion modeling. Estimated 8-hour on-airport concentrations for the different alternatives were compared to PEL-TWAs for TAPs of concern for LAX. Estimated maximum 8-hour concentrations for build alternatives and the No/Action/No Project Alternative are below PEL-TWAs for TAPs of concern. This suggests that air concentrations from air emissions will not exceed those considered acceptable by Cal-OSHA. Under American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists (ACGIH) guidelines, if TAP concentrations are below PEL-TWAs, health impacts from exposures to air emissions are unlikely for LAX workers.

As discussed in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment (subsection 4.24.1.6, Environmental Consequences), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, results of the human health risk assessment performed for the Draft EIS/EIR indicated that airport emissions with or without implementation of the LAX Master Plan would not exceed acceptable threshold levels for worker exposure. Therefore, on-site workers were not reevaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00214-16

Comment:

15. With no additional runways in the master plan, will there be more congestion with all of the additional planes taking off and landing on the four current runways?

Response:

Under Alternative C, which would include four runways, daily operations are not projected to increase significantly from current levels. There is a slight increase in aircraft operations projected for Alternative C, but this is due to air cargo operations, which would occur during non-peak operation hours. Therefore, these additional cargo operations would not add congestion on the runway system during peak hours. Please see Chapter V of the Draft Master Plan, Table V-3.32 for detailed information on aircraft operations.

The build alternatives propose various airfield improvements including construction of a center taxiway between the parallel runways. These improvements would reduce the congestion on the runway system. The proposed center taxiway between the runways would allow arrival aircraft be held between the runways for runway crossing without interfering with the operations on both runways. Without the proposed center taxiway, arrival aircraft could not be held between the runways for runway crossing due to insufficient separation. Wide body aircraft, such as the Boeing 747-400, would be required to land on the inboard runway, which is the departure runway; therefore departure capacity would decrease and congestion on the runway system would increase.

Alternative D proposes to modify the existing airfield while maintaining the exiting four-runway system. Alternative D would provide insufficiently gate capacity to allow the four-runway airfield to operate at peak capacity. Therefore, the LAX runway system proposed in Alternative D would not add to congestion in future years.

PC00214-17

Comment:

16. Since the ATC says it is difficult to keep separation of aircraft now, won't it be more difficult with additional aircraft to maintain safety and separation of LAX operations?

Response:

The statement made by Mr. Mark Benner representing the National Air Traffic Controller Association, found in comment letter PHF00009, acknowledges several short-comings of the current airport configuration. Mr. Benner does not endorse a specific alternative; however, he states "Not modernizing this airport, is not an option."

FAA sets standards for aircraft separations in the air to ensure operation safety. Please see Table II.2-10 in Chapter II of the Master Plan for a summary of these standards. The FAA manages air traffic in such a manner that assures that safe separation between aircraft is always maintained.

The Master Plan build alternatives propose improvements on the airfield to increase operational efficiency and enhance safety. The improvements include runway extension, construction of a center taxiway between closely spaced parallel runways, and an upgrade of existing facilities and proposed construction of new facilities to provide sufficient taxiway clearness for all aircraft types. For a more detailed discussion on the airfield and safety improvements proposed under Master Plan Alternatives A, B, and C, please see the Master Plan Chapter V, Section 3.3.1. For a discussion of the airfield and safety improvements proposed under Alternative D, please see the Draft Master Plan Addendum.

Also, please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 for a discussion of aviation safety. Please note that Alternative D, the Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, is specifically designed to protect airport users and crucial airport infrastructure, and to incorporate federal security recommendations as they are developed to the greatest extent possible.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00214-18

Comment:

17. Due to increases in freight loaded planes out of LAX will we experience more noise and pollution from these additional flights in addition to regular passenger flights?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-5, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-5.4 regarding relationship of air cargo flights and night noise impacts. Please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for more information on and comparisons of noise and noise-related land use impacts under the baseline and Year 2000 conditions and the various Master Plan alternatives including new Alternative D. Please see Section 4.6 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for air quality analyses results.

PC00214-19

Comment:

Opposing the LAX "Master Plan" expansion:

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00215

Wilde, James

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00215-1

Comment:

Small 30 seat airplanes contribute to a lot of congestion and at least one fatal accident @ LAX.

What are the landing fees for a 30 seat Brasilia and @ 150 seat Boeing 737-500 etc.? Are they the same? Is it in the same ratio as the passenger capacity? Please advise, phone or e-mail.

Response:

Comment noted. The landing fees for commercial passenger aircraft are based upon the certificated landing weight of the aircraft. The certificated landing weight is approximately proportional to the seating capacity. Thus, the landing fee for a 150-seat aircraft is about 5 times the landing fee for a 30-seat aircraft. The actual landing fee rate per 1000 pounds also depends upon whether the operating carrier is a signatory to the airport-airline use agreement. Carriers that are not signatories to the use agreement pay a premium.

Please see Response to Comment PC00222-1 for more information on commuter aircraft operations and safety.

PC00216

Carrara, Jessie

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00216-1

Comment:

I support LAWA doing a Part 161 Study to control large jets taking off to the east late at night.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. For additional information on the use of a Part 161 Study as a mitigation measure, please see Subtopical Response TR-N-4.1 regarding additional mitigation actions suggested for flight activity.

PC00216-2

Comment:

I am a 30 year resident of Gardena. I purchased my home knowing that the flight path to the LAX did not affect my community. That was and is very important to me. However since the last week of May I have seen a grave change. Airplanes are flying closer to my community and the noise pollution is very disturbing to me and my neighbors. I am losing sleep and I am very upset that this is occurring. We were not notified of the change in flight pattern. I feel my rights as a homeowner has been infringed upon. I enjoyed the peaceful, restful evenings on my deck. Now I hear jets!! What can we do? This not only affects my health and peace of mind, it also affects my property value.

This is not fair to the people in the City of Gardena. Our City Council will hear about our displeasure with this situation.

Response:

Comment noted. LAX has not implemented any new flight patterns over the Gardena area. However, because Gardena is located approximately seven miles southeast of LAX it is possible that the commentor may be hearing LAX operations as well as operations from a variety of other airports. In particular, Hawthorne Airport does have arrival and departure patterns where general aviation jets and propeller aircraft may cross the Gardena area. Please see Section 4.1, Noise, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for nighttime awakenings, and Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

PC00217

Paneitz, Vicki

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00217-1

Comment:

I use the Falmouth and Westchester parkway intersection to get to my job. According to the master plan, you will be taking away this intersection. I don't want to spend an extra 15 - 30 plus minutes getting to work. I also visit friends, shop, etc. in the South Bay. Again, without this intersection the drive will be much longer.

Response:

The existing Falmouth/Westchester Parkway intersection is not altered in Alternative D. Closure of the Falmouth Avenue/Westchester Parkway intersection is necessary in Alternatives A, B, and C, which include the Ring Road, due to the proximity of the Falmouth intersection to direct ramps that will be built between Westchester Parkway and Pershing Drive. To mitigate the loss of this intersection, improved roadways within the Westchester Southside development will provide better access and circulation between Lincoln Boulevard and Pershing Drive in Westchester and Playa Del Rey.

PC00217-2

Comment:

Please don't change our community. There are several other airports you can use for "growth".

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No

3. Comments and Responses

Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00217-3

Comment:

*Please send me the map(s) that shows the ring road and intersections.

Response:

A schematic diagram of the ring road and intersections was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Draft EIS/EIR. The Draft EIS/EIR was made available for public review at numerous local libraries as well as on the LAWA website.

PC00218

Papaccio, Philip

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00218-1

Comment:

THE PLAN NEEDS TO CONSIDER ALL OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AS DESCRIBED BY CONGRESSWOMAN HARMAN.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00219

Wollner, Jr., Joseph

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00219-1

Comment:

I support the proposed expansion of LAX, as described by "Alternative C".

We must be prepared to accommodate the increase in passengers/airline traffic that will undoubtedly occur in the decades ahead.

Let's go for it!!!

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00220 Hester, Colette None Provided 6/8/2001

PC00220-1

Comment:

1. Who made up printed displays proverting to be "facts"? In lobby?
2. As respects pollution (vehicles & aircraft) who, and how many "so called experts (also their education background & experience)" were used for the displays in lobby?
3. As respects quality of life - same questions as 2. above.
4. Traffic - local streets & freeways - same questions as 2. above.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included a full list of project and document preparers in Chapter 7, List of Preparers, Persons/Agencies Consulted, Parties to Whom Sent, References, Glossary, Abbreviations/Acronyms, and Index, of each document. For more information, please see the project web site www.laxmasterplan.org.

PC00221 Martin, Aileen None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00221-1

Comment:

I am AGAINST LAX expansion. I'm going to do everything in my power to stop you.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00222 Wilde, James None Provided 6/8/2001

PC00222-1

Comment:

Restrict Turboprops/Small Aircraft

One fatal accident has already resulted from the large number of 30-seat turboprops sharing the facilities with larger turbojets. These small turboprops take up a disproportionately large amount of taxiway, runway and airspace for the passenger-miles that they provide. Plans A & B which add facilities for turboprops should be set aside and only Plan C considered. Small aircraft should either be banned or else made uneconomic by adjusting the airport use fee tariff. La Guardia seems to be moving in that direction.

Response:

Comment noted.

The FAA's first responsibility (over and above the operation of the air traffic control system) is to establish safety standards for aircraft flight operations that all airlines and pilots must adhere to. These standards anticipate that air traffic controllers (and pilots) are human and may make mistakes, in which case air traffic control procedures include escape paths for aircraft to fly. The specific margins of safety specified by FAA standards vary with the size of aircraft, the type of aircraft, whether the aircraft is commercial, non-commercial or military and the type of flight the aircraft is conducting. It is the FAA's

3. Comments and Responses

responsibility to enforce air traffic control procedures that ensure the continued safety of flight operations at LAX.

There is no federal law or regulation that would permit the FAA or a local airport sponsor to prohibit the use of a public use airport. It is airlines' responsibility to provide suitable facilities to serve the airlines' needs. On the other hand, demand would regulate itself when airside capacity is constrained. The Draft LAX Master Plan has predicted that the airlines would adjust air service patterns in several ways in response to the capacity constraints. The implication of the predicted air service changes is a larger aircraft. See Chapter V, Section 3.3.2, page V-3.181 of the Draft LAX Master Plan for more information on the predicted air service adjustments. See Chapter 3, Section 3.3.3, page 3-6 of the Draft Master Plan Addendum for more information on air service changes with regard to Alternative D.

PC00223 Wilde, James None Provided 6/8/2001

PC00223-1

Comment:

Improved Mass Transit is a Must. Extension of the MTA 'Green Line' is referred to in the plan, but work should start now so that its benefits can be enjoyed while any other construction is in progress. Extending the Green Line to several terminals will not only ease traffic but also reduce the heavy demand for employee parking which is provided for under any of the three plans.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

PC00224 Skinner, Kay None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00224-1

Comment:

In looking at the video, I am excited about the prospects of the expansion as it was described in the video. All of my concerns seemed to be addressed. I also realize that it won't happen overnight.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00224-2

Comment:

As a local resident, I would like to get involved as a way of insuring that the plan stays true to the promise. Tell me how I can get involved.

Response:

There are several avenues for citizen involvement. LAWA has established an Airport Advisory Committee made up of residents from local communities. City Councilwoman Cindy Miscikowski works closely with the Westchester Neighborhood Council that meets regularly on airport and other matters.

PC00225 Wilde, James None Provided 6/8/2001

PC00225-1

Comment:

I am also enclosing a copy of a previous analysis that I wrote in rebuttal of MITRE Report MTR 00W/0000053. The MITRE study was commissioned by the FAA and, not surprisingly, says exactly

what their masters, the airlines, wanted to hear-that it is absolutely impossible to route the turboprop traffic offshore as we had requested. This is based on a supposed 'wide range of flight characteristics' of the many (claimed) different types of aircraft in the turboprop traffic. This is a complete load of garbage as there are only two types of aircraft involved, - the Brasilia and the SAAB 340-and these are so similar that they can be, and often are, flown along exactly along the same flight path and with exactly the same climb profile.

Response:

The referenced MITRE Report is not part of the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment PC00225-5 for more information regarding turboprop service.

PC00225-2

Comment:

Independently, let me note that while I generally agree with P.A.N.I.C's arguments, I differ strongly on their support for the development of alternate airports in the region, such as Palmdale and El Toro. I feel that this will not only 'spread the grief', but it will also lead to a multitude of inter-airport flights for passengers who finish up at the 'wrong' airport. Frequent low-flying shuttles between airports will be a terrible nuisance. On the East Coast, however, there are two airports which serve a very useful purpose in keeping unnecessary flights out of large metropolitan areas. These are Bangor, Maine and Sanford, Florida. Bangor provides a refueling stop and Sanford handles hundreds of vacation charter flights from Europe. Neither of these airports generates any low-altitude shuttle flights to the nearby metropolitan areas of Boston and Orlando. Los Angeles should not be a refueling stop between Europe and Australasia/Polynesia, but there are no facilities on the West Coast comparable to Bangor and Sanford.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00225-3

Comment:

In conclusion, let me raise one more point on the situation at LAX. Tokyo (Narita) and many European capitals have night-time air traffic curfews. Los Angeles does not. This means that flights leave Los Angeles in the middle of the night so that they can arrive shortly after the curfew lifts at their destination. The schedule at the non-curfew city is distorted to comply with the mandates of the curfew city. This means that we suffer an unnaturally high number of night-time departures so that the Japanese farmers, and their animals, can sleep better.

Response:

Narita Airport (11 p.m. to 6 a.m. curfew) and others in European cities have nighttime curfews and LAX does not. Airlines will schedule their flights where there is a demand by passengers and/or for cargo. Since LAX does not have a curfew, airlines and cargo operators routinely schedule flights during the nighttime hours. Since Narita opens at 6:00 a.m. departures could be initiated as early as 1:00 a.m. at LAX to arrive at 6:00 a.m. in Narita. However, flights scheduled for Asia and Europe are not only scheduled during nighttime hours, they are scheduled throughout the day as well. For further information on nighttime operations, please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.1, Noise, and Appendix SC of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC00225-4

Comment:

Three different plans are proposed as follows:

Plan A: This adds a 6,700 ft. runway on the northern edge of the airport and extends both of the existing northern long runways, now designated 24Left and 24 Right, 'back' over Sepulveda Boulevard.

3. Comments and Responses

Plan B: This adds a 6,700 ft. runway on the southern edge of the airport and extends only one of the existing northern long runways 'back' over Sepulveda Boulevard.

Plan C: This does not add any runways but extends both of the existing northern runways 'back' over Sepulveda.

In each case the separation between the pairs of long runways is increased to accommodate the extended wingspans of the new, bigger inter-continental jets planned for service around 2005.

Response:

Comment noted. The decision to relocate Runway 6L/24R (the northern most runway) 350 feet north in Alternative C is to enhance safe aircraft operations by providing a taxiway between the parallel runways. The purpose of this safety enhancement is to reduce the potential for runway incursions. At the same time, the proposed center taxiway would be designed to accommodate New Large Aircraft (NLA) based on the forecast which anticipates NLA operations in the future. Please see Response to Comment PC00015-1 for a discussion on the need of a center taxiway. Also, it should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00225-5

Comment:

Quick comparison of the three plans:

Plan A: This will hopefully take some traffic away from the southern part of the airport, that which is most troublesome to us. However, the new shorter runway is obviously an accommodation for the continued use of turboprops which are very troublesome to us. FAA claims that they are being 'phased out' in favor of 'Regional Jets' are spurious. The CEO of 'Skywest' is still buying 'Brasilia' Turboprops and says that RJs would only be considered for flights over 300 miles and most Brasilias are used to San Diego and Palm Springs, each less than half that distance.

Response:

Not all turboprop service will be replaced by regional jets. This is consistent with the Master Plan forecasts. The new 6,700-foot runway in Alternative A is proposed to accommodate arrival operations (not departures). Departing flights will use the existing runways. Arriving aircraft require less runway length than departures and many narrowbody jets can land on 6,700 feet of runway, in addition to turboprops and regional jets. Aircraft such as the Airbus A310, Boeing 737-200, 737-300, 737-500, and the Boeing 757-200 can be accommodated on this length. See Chapter IV, Figure IV-3.9, page IV-3.35 of the Master Plan document for a summary of the runway length requirements. See Master Plan Appendix J, Figure V-J.60 for a summary of the aircraft that were assumed to land on the new runway in the airside simulation analysis. There has been a trend in recent years for the airlines to use regional jets to serve markets historically served by props, as well as markets historically served by air carrier jets. This trend is expected to continue and has been incorporated into the master plan forecast. The decision to use a regional jet on a particular route is an individual airline decision based on a variety of economic and operational factors. Regional jets are not projected to replace all turboprop aircraft. Historically small props (with 19 seats) made up the majority of the commuter fleet at LAX. The forecast predicts that 36.5 percent of the commuter fleet will be made up of regional jets and larger props with 50 or more seats by 2015 (see Chapter IV, Table IV-2.3 of the Master Plan document).

PC00225-6

Comment:

Plan B: This has absolutely no redeeming features from our point of view. It accommodates the continued and even expanded use of turboprops on the part of the airport closest to us and will encourage even more left-turns on climb-out (over the South Bay) even when the ultimate desired course is north-easterly. Additionally, it will cause even more pilot confusion on the approach to the shorter runway due to the proximity of the Hawthorne Airport runway. This is a considerable danger. Plan B will be ridiculously wasteful due to the necessary demolition of the newly-built cargo facilities on the north side of Imperial Highway.

Response:

Comment noted. LAWA has provided features in the Master Plan to prevent the occurrences that are suggested by the commentor. The FAA will also design features into the air traffic control system and instrument approach system to prevent such occurrences, as described below. The new south runway in Alternative B is proposed to accommodate arrival operations only when LAX operates in a westerly flow. Thus, the new runway will not generate any additional departures in west flow. All departures will be conducted from the existing runways (24R and 24L on the north airfield; 25R and 25L on the south airfield). In Alternative B, the south airfield runways are relocated north (Runway 25R by 555 feet, and Runway 25L by 500 feet), so takeoffs from these runways will be conducted from a further distance to the area of concern, not closer. The number of overflights over the South Bay will be a function of demand for air service to various geographic destinations and the need to balance operations between the north and south airfields to reduce delay. In general, northbound departures depart from the north complex and southbound departures depart from the south complex. Departures are conducted in this manner in order to avoid coordinated crossings in the air, which reduce the departure capacity of the airfield and can increase delays. In Alternative B (as well as Alternative A) some northeasterly jet departures (to the Dagget outer fix) are conducted from both, the north and south complex, to balance departure demand and minimize delay, as needed. The Draft EIS/EIR specifies mitigation for each alternative includes the institution of instrument departure procedures that, under standard operating procedures, will ensure that aircraft follow runway heading to the coast before turning in the desired direction. See also Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding overflights. See also Response to Comment PC00211-1.

PC00225-7

Comment:

Plan C: This is the best plan from our point of view since it does not facilitate or perpetuate the continued use of turboprops, and permits the take-off of the heaviest jets from the northern 24Left and 24 Right runways. It would seem to restore the airfield operations to the scenario that prevailed before the 25 Left and 25 Right runway crossings of Sepulveda were strengthened to take Boeing 747s. Unfortunately the 25 runways will still be longer than the extended 24s, so we will still, presumably, suffer the 'wrong way' midnight take-offs of maximum load 747-400s to China and Australasia on the southern-most pair of runways (the 25s).

Response:

Currently, fully loaded Boeing 747-400s and like aircraft departing for Asian/Pacific long haul markets sometimes take off from Runway 25R at night instead of the desired Runway 24L because Runway 24L (10,285 feet long) does not provide the needed length. Runway length requirements at LAX were assessed in part to determine what length would be required to correct this operational deficiency. Several design aircraft were selected including Boeing 747-400 because they either generate the longest runway length requirements or because they represent a large portion of the 2015 forecast fleet mix. The runway length requirements were determined based on takeoff and landing F.A.R. aircraft performance data provided by the manufactures. A minimum runway length of 12,000 feet is required to accommodate all aircraft in the projected fleet in 2015 at 100 percent of maximum takeoff weight. This requirement is dictated primarily by the Boeing 747-400 and the anticipated requirements for the New Large Aircraft. See Figures IV-3.8 and IV-3.9 of Chapter IV in the Master Plan for a summary of the runway length analysis.

In Alternative C, Runway 24L would be extended to the required length of 12,000 feet. With the additional length on Runway 24L, all aircraft would have the capability to depart on Runway 24L when it is the preferred departure runway based on the noise abatement procedures. Although Runway 25L is slightly longer, the difference is insignificant (91 feet, or less than one percent) and it is anticipated that the pilots will depart Runway 24L when the over-ocean procedures are in effect. (It should be noted that deviations from the preferred procedures are permitted in cases of adverse weather, emergencies and field construction or maintenance work.)

Runway 24L would have a pavement length of 11,700 feet in Alternative D. However, a 300 foot clearway may be provided at the west end of the runway allowing for a Take-Off Distance Allowed (TODA) of 300 feet thus providing the preferred 12,000 foot length.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00225-8

Comment:

General Comments.

Note that the plan's photograph with the caption referring to 'airfield inefficiencies' shows a line-up of aircraft in which one half are thirty-seat Brasilia turboprops. The average 'passengers per departure' is planned to rise from 130 to 150 during the period under study. San Francisco has recognized the limitations imposed on total service by the mixture of large and small aircraft and has been trying to reduce the number of smaller aircraft in the mix and having the turboprops done away with.

Response:

Comment noted. The unconstrained design day enplanements per departure is forecast to increase from 90.76 in 1996 baseline to 122.98 in 2015. Due to the capacity constraints, the forecast enplanements per departure would be further increased to 145.09 by 2015 in Alternative C with the predicted air service changes. Please see Chapter V, Section 3.3.2 of the Master Plan for a more detailed explanation of the predicted air service changes. There is no federal law or regulation that would permit the FAA or a local airport sponsor to prohibit the use of a public use airport. Please see Response to Comment PC00222-1 for more information about commuter aircraft safety.

Following the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA developed a new alternative that, consistent with public comments calling for a regional approach alternative, is designed to accommodate passenger and cargo activity at LAX that would approximate those of the No Action/No Project Alternative, has fewer environmental impacts, and improves airport safety and security. Assumptions about air service changes associated with Alternative D are described in the Draft Master Plan Addendum, Section 3.3.3, page 3-6. 2015 design day enplanements per departure are forecast to be 127.68 with implementation of Alternative D.

PC00225-9

Comment:

Note that the plan laments the lack of direct freeway access to the airport. I propose that of much greater concern is the lack of any frequent rail, light-rail, or subway public transit access to the complex. The rumors of heavy contributions to mayoral campaigns by the taxi and shuttle-bus lobbies take on more credence the longer this situation is allowed to continue. The Green Line extension is planned in the distant future, but I believe it should receive the highest priority if only so that its benefits can mollify the chaos that will ensue when any plan starts to be implemented.

Reasonable public rail access to LAX would significantly reduce the demand for employee parking and the space to be provided for it. It is shown to double under the plans from 7,000 spaces to 14,000 spaces. The need for this should be properly substantiated by comparison with, say, Boston / Logan and the effect on parking demands of the recent improvement of rail (London Underground) service to London / Heathrow.

The coloring of the maps shows a people-mover in a shade of green that was indistinguishable from other features in the printed copy that I studied. If the plan is reprinted, the extent, and features, of the people-mover should be clarified.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan. A small benefit was assumed for employees in the analysis should the Green Line be extended. However, that benefit was intentionally held to a conservative (i.e. low) amount, to ensure that the roadway system was adequately analyzed. If the employee parking benefits more than assumed, an overall benefit would result from the project. It would be inappropriate to compare the impacts of light rail between cities, particularly between domestic and foreign cities, since the transit use characteristics vary widely between different cities. Ridership is uniquely determined by such issues as transit system design, cost of use, station locations, alternative modes available, local transit acceptance, and others.

PC00225-10

Comment:

Ironically, there are comments about the low-income people of Inglewood. In conclusion, I hope the airport-planners appreciate that they live there still because they could not afford to move away to avoid the noise and pollution of generated by the airport itself.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed environmental justice in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice. Supporting technical reports and analyses are provided in Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00226

Ballesteros, Eleanor None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00226-1

Comment:

Re: The LAX expansion Master Plan

The current LAX should not be expanded to accomodate more planes & more passengers. it is too close to people's homes & the traffic is already too conjested.

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Furthermore, please see Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00226-2

Comment:

The sound insulation that has been done in Inglewood homes is substandard work & shoddy.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that after completion of residential sound insulation under the City of Inglewood's Residential Sound Insulation Program, the contractor's work is inspected by the City to ensure that insulation and finish work meets City standards. All work performed by the contractor is under warranty for one year after completion of construction. As described in Topical Response TR-LU-3 the effectiveness of residential sound insulation to reduce interior noise levels is continually evaluated through on-going noise measurements taken by the City. Questions or concerns regarding sound insulation can be directed towards the City of Inglewood, Residential Sound Insulation Program (310/412-5289).

PC00226-3

Comment:

& the Loud Roaring noise of the jets overhead has decreased property values, and has a detrimental effect on one's health & hearing.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding residential property values, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, and Response to Comment AL00017-246 regarding impact on hearing.

PC00226-4

Comment:

LAX should only be expanded by Building at the 17,000 acres Palmdale land that has already been purchased & other So. CA locations & A fast rail system should Be Built.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Finally, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00227

Kenton, Jack

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00227-1

Comment:

Could not find info as to plans for I-105/Imperial Ave west of Sepulveda. What about access to El Segundo's Main St?
Is the 4 R/W plan really to eliminate Pershing Ave as a connection between El Segundo & Westchester/Marina del Rey? I think this is wrong!

Response:

This comment is similar to comment AL00018-30. Please see Response to Comment AL00018-30.

PC00227-2

Comment:

Plans to expand LAX capacity mean more people are coming via surface transport. The area can't handle more surface transportation/vehicles.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Regarding existing traffic concerns surrounding LAX, percent contribution of airport traffic in the adjacent communities, and how traffic conditions around the airport would change with implementation of the Master Plan Alternatives, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4. Regarding traffic measures to minimize neighborhood impacts, please see Topical Response TR-ST-6.

PC00227-3

Comment:

Increased A/C ops may not increase noise level, but annoyance from the never-ending noise is becoming too much.

Response:

Although the number of operations will increase, the CNEL levels may not necessarily increase. Please see Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PC00227-4

Comment:

I recommend expansion at ONT & El Toro - not at LAX. (Or Palmdale, etc.)

Response:

Please note that the City of Los Angeles and LAWA only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00228

Broussinos, Peter

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00228-1

Comment:

The LAX expansion Master plan is flawed & should not be implemented. A regional solution, which makes more sense, has not been considered.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00228-2

Comment:

Impacts to surrounding communities - noise, air pollution, and traffic primarily - will be severe and will significantly harm the quality of life for residents of these communities.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts to quality of life.

PC00228-3

Comment:

Imposing the entire burden of all of So. California's air transport growth on the people living near LAX is very unfair and, in some cases, quite racist.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed potential disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and low-income populations in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, with supporting technical data and analysis provided in Appendix F and Appendix S-D.

PC00228-4

Comment:

I urge you to not implement the LAX Expansion Master plan. It is a disaster.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00229

Huang, Andrew

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00229-1

Comment:

I am in favor of LAX Master Plan. Expansion will benefit the regional economy. Environmental impacts are minimal and can be mitigated.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00230

Cassidy, Michael

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00230-1

Comment:

1. There is no EIR/EIS from the 40 MAPS to the present 68 MAPS. The scoping needs to reflect the increase from 40 MAPS not 68 MAPS.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding projected versus actual capacity levels at LAX.

PC00230-2

Comment:

2. The noise measurements USED ARE not in compliance with N.E.P.A. They are arbitrary and capricious.

Response:

NEPA does not require noise monitoring. FAA's policy of basing noise evaluations on modeling has been used for many environmental reviews of airports and has been upheld in past legal challenges. The use of CNEL is an acceptable metric for the evaluation of airport noise impacts as described in FAA Order 5050.4A, Airport Environmental Handbook. See Topical Response TR-N-1 regarding the noise modeling approach. Also see Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences.

PC00230-3

Comment:

3. The runways need a westerly slope of 4o to aid westerly take offs.

Response:

LAWA complies with all applicable FAA standards. Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Advisory Circular 150-5300-13 Chapter 5 recommends that "it is desirable to keep longitudinal grades to a minimum" and the maximum longitudinal grade is plus/minus 1.5 percent. For example, the south complex runways at LAX currently slope up from east to west at a 0.3 percent grade which is acceptable and within the maximum longitudinal grade of plus/minus 1.5 percent. A 4 percent downward slope to the west as suggested would exceed the FAA standards. The suggested slope would help the take offs to the west but would make it difficult to operate the runways in the opposite direction (to the east). The east flow is dictated by wind direction and operates 5.71 percent of time on average annually.

PC00231

Golden, Terry

None Provided

6/8/2001

PC00231-1

Comment:

1. The present handling of traffic at the airport is and will not handle traffic increases.
2. An outright Ban on passenger traffic or expensive fee should be effected as the LARGE number of cars create gridlock, so an expansion of the number of flights is not an option.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00231-2

Comment:

3. Rent A Car need to be moved into where the airport parking is now like it is at very other airport on the west coast.

Response:

A consolidated rental car facility is included in each alternative. There are many benefits to consolidating the rental car functions and connecting them via an automated people mover to the terminal buildings, including less traffic next to the terminal buildings. Note that Alternative D, which is detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, includes an expanded consolidated rental car facility on the east side of the airport.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00231-3

Comment:

4. The airport needs to Build a monorail to move people to Hotels & Terminals.

Response:

A monorail system is typically considered a subclass of the automated people mover (APM) class of transit technologies. Monorail technologies could be considered for application to the people mover systems. Selection of the exact type of technology for the LAX people mover is beyond the scope of the Draft EIS/EIR, but the potential environmental impacts of any of these technologies is accounted for.

Supplemental information on the transit technologies accessing the airport and their associated alignments is provided in Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan. The APM system will run alongside the hotels in Alternative D, connecting the Ground Transportation Center and Intermodal Transportation Center to the CTA. In Alternatives A, B, and C, an extension of the APM from the CTA to the hotels along Century Boulevard is cost-prohibitive.

PC00231-4

Comment:

5. Need to use the west side of the terminals to create a multi lane multi curbs dropoff point for passengers that gets cars out Quickly.
6. Need to use LBA via a light rail link.

Response:

Curbfronts at the West Terminal are both multi-lane and multi-curb. Efficient flow of traffic in and surrounding the curbs is an objective of the LAX Master Plan. Please refer to Technical Report 3a, On-Airport Ground Transportation Technical Report, in the Draft EIS/EIR for more detailed information on the curbs layouts and operations. It is unknown what the "LBA" is that the commentor is referring to in comment 6.

PC00232

Moore, Irma

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00232-1

Comment:

LAX already exceeds the previously planned number of passengers. I propose NO Further growth of the Airport at LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00232-2

Comment:

Any growth should be at Ontario, Palmdale, El Toro, or March AF Base area.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range

of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00232-3

Comment:

Cargo arrives at LAX and is transported across the city and out to San Bernardino via a truck. Thus our freeways are further clogged.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic. Alternative D, which was addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, would not increase cargo handling facilities at LAX. As was indicated in Table S3-2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, cargo operations are projected to increase to about 3,120,000 tons/year at LAX by 2015 under the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative D. The traffic impacts of this level of cargo activity were described in subsection 4.3.2.6.1, Operations Impacts, of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00232-4

Comment:

I agree with the SCAG idea, that other airports should be expanded.

NO GROWTH AT LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00233

Olsen, Kathleen

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00233-1

Comment:

WAY TOO CONGESTED NOW! NOISE IS UNBELIEVABLE ALL HOURS.

L.A.X. WILL BE AN ACCIDENT WAITING TO HAPPEN!!

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and safety impacts in Section 4.24.3, Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations

PC00234 Alsbaugh, Ron None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00234-1

Comment:

INCREASE AREA OF AIDE FOR SOUND PROOFING & AIR CONDITIONG TO RESIDENCES NORTH STRIP OF IMPERIAL

NOTE INGLEWOOD MAILING ADDRESS BUT IN HAWTHORNE.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding how eligibility is determined for sound insulation under the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program and for a description of how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP.

PC00235 Alsbaugh, Ronald None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00235-1

Comment:

MY OPTION IF ONE HAS TO BE IS INCREASE NORTH RUNWAY.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00235-2

Comment:

I AM CURRENTLY IMPACTED BY THE AIRPORT NOISE & POLLUTION BUT AM TOLD I DO LIVE IN LINED AREA TO QUALIFY FOR SOUND AIDE OR FOR AIR CONDITIONING. PLANNING SHOULD INCREASE AREA SINCE MY AREA IS AFFECTED OF QUALITY OF LIFE IS JUST AS BAD. JUST BECAUSE THE STUDY SHOWS OK MAP DOES NOT MEAN THOSE LIVING THERE ARE NOT BEING HARMED BY THE NOISE & AIR POLLUTION.

Response:

The commentor's property appears to be located outside the boundary of residential properties eligible for sound insulation. The noise impact area which determines residential uses eligible for noise insulation is described in Topical Response TR-LU-3 and is based on the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL noise contour. Noise-sensitive uses exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour under the 1996 baseline were described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3), and shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Noise-sensitive uses exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour under Year 2000 conditions were described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3), and were shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As was shown on these respective figures, under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions the area within the 65 CNEL noise contour has decreased compared to the ANMP contour, which continues to define the area of eligibility for sound insulation. Although this is a comment on existing noise levels and conditions, the general focus of the document, pursuant to NEPA and CEQA, is to evaluate the potential future environmental effects of the project and to provide feasible

3. Comments and Responses

mitigation measures to address significant impacts. See Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4 regarding how eligibility for soundproofing is determined and Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.14, for a description of how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP. See Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding quality of life. See Section 4.6.3, Air Quality (subsection 4.6.3), of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, for a discussion of 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions for air quality and air pollutant levels. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

PC00235-3

Comment:

WE NEED HELP TOO. WITH THE INCREASE USE OF THE AIRPORT WILL ONLY MAKE MATTERS WORSE. WE ALREADY CAN NOT KEEP OUR WINDOWS OPEN BECAUSE OF THE NOISE & POLLUTION.

Response:

Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also, please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels, including thresholds used to identify significant noise levels that would result from development of the build alternatives and mitigation measures that would reduce exposure of noise-sensitive uses to high noise levels.

PC00235-4

Comment:

I AM NOT TALKING DUST IF WE HAVE OUR WINDOWS OPEN WE GET FILM OF ALMOST OILY SUBSTANCE. I HATE TO THINK WHAT THAT IS DOING TO OUR LUNGS.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC00235-5

Comment:

FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR THOSE LIVING IN LARGER AREA SHOULD BE ADDRESSED.

NOT JUST THE LINE THAT HAS BE DRAWN. ESPECIALL WHEN WIND CHANGES & PLANES TAKE OFF TO THE EAST. JUST STOP BY SOMEDAY & CHECK.

Response:

Comment noted. The limitations on and criteria for inclusion within the areas of the mitigation program for noise were addressed in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information regarding evaluation of impacts should extend beyond the 65 CNEL contour to all sensitive areas under flight tracks please see Topical Response TR-N-2.

PC00236

Deutsch, James

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00236-1

Comment:

I am opposed to the LAX Master Plan because:

3. Comments and Responses

1. The LAX Master Plan fails to address the future traffic congestion caused when the airport expands - this traffic will create a severe bottle neck at the Sepulveda Tunnel both north & south bound because the transportation plan fails to widen the tunnel.

Response:

Alternatives A, B, and C would result in improved conditions in the tunnel because they would off-load over half of the CTA traffic to the west terminal. Therefore, the tunnel would experience less traffic and consequently, operate better. However, studies have shown that the capacity constraints are not in the tunnel itself, but are at the intersections on either end of the tunnel. The projects would improve the intersections on both ends, resulting in further improved operations. Alternative D would result in a "shift" of CTA traffic out of the tunnel to the east-side Ground Transportation Center and Intermodal Transportation Center. While much of that freed up capacity would be filled by non-airport trips shifting from I-405 or Aviation Boulevard, the tunnel would still operate better with Alternative D as well. This was presented in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and in Technical Report S-2b.

PC00236-2

Comment:

2. I am opposed to the EIR/EIS in that no analysis was done dealing with air traffic safety over adjacent communities of Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach or the remainder of South Bay cities were the MAPS to increase 4 times current existing MAPS - the EIR/EIS fails to address the safety of air traffic over these communities - were there to be a crash-

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00237

Puleo, Joanne

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00237-1

Comment:

The number of "wave offs" have increased substantially the last 2 years. Even recently it has escalated. When I hear a plane taking off directly over my house which is south of the airport only 1 1/2 blocks west of Main Street, it sounds like it is right on top of me. I call the phone # 64 NOISE and always get the reply that it was a wave off. Why are there so many wave offs and why don't they just go out directly over the ocean instead of cutting over El Segundo? With more planes landing and taking off with the proposed expansion it seems the wave offs will also increase.

Response:

The FAA maintains logs of missed approaches, however, it does not keep an annual total. It's criteria for defining a missed approach was changed in 1999. Missed approaches are now attributed to weather, where as, a go around is operationally related. Early turns over El Segundo have been a focus of public complaint for years. The airport has attempted to deal with the issue for years through the posting of signs at the end of each runway calling for flight to the coastline prior to turns, but occasional deviations from the procedure continue to occur. A part of the reason is the alignment of the runways relative to the community. The west ends of the runways nearest El Segundo are closer to the community than the east ends (the runways are aimed more toward the community's west end). The fly around (missed approach) pattern in the area will remain unchanged to assure safety of flight. For those alternatives with projected numbers of daily operations equivalent to baseline conditions (No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternatives C and D) the numbers of missed approaches should not increase, and improved separation criteria and sequencing of operations may reduce the number. For those alternatives with substantially increased operations (Alternatives A and B) the average number of arrivals on the runway will be reduced because a third approach runway is added in each alternative. Consequently, the number of missed approaches should be reduced. For further information about turns over El Segundo, please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

PC00237-2

Comment:

I believe other airports should be developed more fully eg. Long Beach, March AF, El Toro. People live around those airports and why should they have to travel to LAX to fly anywhere. The inland Empire and Orange County have people that travel.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00238

Bainbridge, Steven

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00238-1

Comment:

NOISE ABATMENT

REF. LAWA DOC. G-0013, M-0005, M-0004 NOISE EFFECTS ON HEALTH 30% more deaths in high noise foot print. 30% more admissions to mental health facilities.

MASTER Plan should include extra funding in noise footprint area. Not just insulation, windows. Mental health and hospital support to equal the statistics of increased harm.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments AL00017-52 and PHM00029-2.

PC00238-2

Comment:

Also even more zoning and home removal in high noise footprint area.

Response:

As was indicated on page 4-93 in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA prepared a composite Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP) in compliance with the variance under which LAWA operates. The purpose of the ANMP is to resolve land use incompatibilities that exist with regard to airport noise. Jurisdictions included in the composite ANMP are the unincorporated Los Angeles County, City of Los Angeles, City of Inglewood, and City of El Segundo. Incompatible uses under Title 21 and FAR Part 150 are defined as residential, schools, hospitals, and churches exposed to noise levels of 65 CNEL or more. Two noise mitigation strategies under the ANMP are currently being implemented: 1) the installation of sound insulation in structures and 2) the acquisition of property followed by the conversion of the incompatible land use to a compatible land use (i.e., land recycling). All incompatible residential, school, church, and hospital parcels within the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL contour are eligible for mitigation under the ANMP.

Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR provided a discussion regarding the approach that each of the impacted jurisdictions has taken with regard to the ANMP. Residential sound insulation, rather than

3. Comments and Responses

acquisition of dwelling units, is the preferred method by LAWA to achieve land use compatibility under the ANMP. Acquisition of residential units proposed under Alternatives A, B, and C is for the development of airport-related uses and not to remove dwelling units from exposure to high noise levels. Under Alternative D, no acquisition of dwelling units is proposed. In addition, Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, provided an analysis of the potential land use incompatibilities that would result from each of the LAX Master Plan Alternatives. As was indicated in these documents, all of the alternatives would result in some residents and noise-sensitive uses being newly exposed to high noise levels (defined by the 65 CNEL noise contour) with some residents and noise-sensitive uses experiencing an increase of 1.5 dB or greater within the 65 CNEL contour compared to 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions. However, due to shifts in the noise contours, under Alternatives A, C, and D, there would be a reduction in the number of residents and noise-sensitive uses exposed to high noise levels compared to 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions.

Also, please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding LAWA's Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program and changes that would take place with implementation of the LAX Master Plan.

PC00239 Bainbridge, Steven None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00239-1

Comment:

HANGER #1 NATIONAL HISTORIC STATUS.

The hanger should be left in its' historic location. Surrounding structures should continue to harmonize with it. Money should be allocated as part of master plan to upgrade it from stabilized to fully function as a aircraft/historic facility or museum of airport & L.A. aviation.

National Historic Trust Act requires this and it would benefit the city and surrounding area. It would make a great focal point for airport related public relations.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed historic/architectural resources, including Hangar One, in Section 4.9.1, Historic/Architectural and Archaeological/Cultural Resources, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix I of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-G of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please note that Alternative C, LAWA Staff's preferred alternative in the Draft EIS/EIR, and Alternative D, LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative analyzed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, do not involve relocation or other impacts on Hangar One.

PC00240 Hamilton, Janet None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00240-1

Comment:

1) I am far from persuaded that any current option will reduce airport-generated air pollution.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00240-2

Comment:

2) I am opposed to the plan for a West Entrance as I believe it will flood the neighboring beach communities with cars fleeing the 405 (which is almost gridlocked now!).

Response:

Beach access is not expected to be negatively impacted by the project. In fact, because airport traffic would not be allowed to access the west terminal complex directly from Vista Del Mar in Alternatives A, B, and C, the analysis showed that there would be little airport traffic using Vista Del Mar to get to LAX with the project. Alternative D would not change the existing access routes to Dockweiler Beach. Also, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding I-405.

PC00240-3

Comment:

3) I don't buy the helpless stance the airport claims re: regulating numbers of flights. If you don't think you have the power, GET IT! Get out in front like La Guardia.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC00222-1 regarding the airport's ability to regulate aircraft operations.

PC00240-4

Comment:

4) Noise pollution is a serious health issue and I see no evidence that it has been given any real attention in your studies.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise.

PC00240-5

Comment:

5) LAX ought to contract, not expand.

Response:

Comment noted. Also, please note that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

PC00240-6

Comment:

6) I sure wish someone was dealing with helicopter problems.

Response:

Helicopter operations are not discussed in the Draft EIS/EIR, however to assist the commentor in understanding helicopter operations an overview of the rules for helicopter operations, which differ from fixed-wing operations and a general discussion of helicopters in the vicinity of LAX is provided. Federal air Regulations, Part 91.119 provides for the minimum safe altitude for operation of aircraft. Except for landing and takeoff, the minimum safe altitude for an aircraft over congested areas such as towns and cities is 1,000 feet above the highest obstacle within a radius of 2,000 feet of the aircraft. In other than congested areas, (open areas such as rural areas, or over water) the minimum safe altitude is 500 feet Above Ground Level (AGL), person, vessel, or vehicle. Helicopters may be operated at less than the prescribed minimum altitudes if the operation is conducted without hazard to persons or property on the surface. Additionally, helicopters must comply with any routes or altitudes prescribed for helicopters by the FAA Administrator.

Within the Los Angeles basin there are several published helicopter routes that are generally aligned along freeways or major thoroughfares. Within the immediate vicinity of LAX several routes are used

3. Comments and Responses

for ingress/egress to/from the airport or to transit the Los Angeles Class B airspace. These routes are assigned by Air Traffic Control (ATC) to preclude interactions between helicopters and fixed-wing operations arriving and departing LAX. Except where noted, the altitude assigned by ATC along the route is normally is at or above 1,500 feet Mean Sea Level (MSL). The assigned altitude may be lower when clouds preclude flight at the normally assigned altitude. The following routes are used in the vicinity of LAX:

Sepulveda Route - North and South along Sepulveda Boulevard between Imperial Highway and Lincoln Boulevard;

Industrial Route - South along Sepulveda Boulevard to Imperial Highway, then east along Imperial Highway to Nash Street. South along Nash Street to the Artesia Freeway (91 Freeway);

Imperial Route - East or West along Imperial Highway between the Harbor Freeway (110 Freeway) and Sepulveda Boulevard;

Marina Route - North along Sepulveda Boulevard to the Marina Freeway (90 Freeway), then west along the Marina Freeway to Ballona Creek;

Harbor Route - North and South along the Harbor Freeway (110 Freeway). The altitude on this route is at or below 900 feet MSL.

Shoreline Route - North and South along the shoreline west of LAX between Imperial Highway and Marina del Rey. The altitude on this route is at or below 150 feet MSL.

On weekends, and particularly holidays, there are a significant number of helicopters engaged in towing advertising banners along the beaches of southern California. These operations must conform to the minimum safe altitudes provided in the FARs. Except for those operations along the Shoreline Route between Ballona Creek and Imperial Highway, the banner tow operations are not under the control of air traffic control.

PC00241 Jones, William None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00241-1

Comment:

When I moved to my present house in 1974, there was no airplane noise. Since then, noise has waxed and waned, varying from constantly extremely annoying to occasionally extremely annoying, as it is today.

I believe that if the number of flights at LAX is expanded, increased noise is inevitable, and if there is a substantial expansion, there will be a substantial increase, resulting in lower property values and lower quality of life. I oppose such expansion

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding residential property values, and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. Also, because the commentor resides in Hermosa Beach, the discussion provided in Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay.

PC00242 Haster, Madelyn None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00242-1

Comment:

Has there been any thought to an "earthquake" impact on an underground train and a fuel pipeline extension line into the airport, etc.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The construction of new facilities, including any improvements or additions to the fuel distribution system at LAX or construction of an underground People Mover, occurring in conjunction with the Master Plan would be designed, engineered, and constructed in accordance with applicable safety requirements, including seismic safety requirements. This would include consideration of local geologic and soil conditions such as the suitability of existing fill material. Compliance with current safety requirements provides an acceptable level of safety for potential hazards such as earthquakes. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-219 regarding the potential impacts of earthquakes on fuel pipelines.

PC00243

Lee, Lillie

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00243-1

Comment:

NOISE AND FLY-OVERS

LAX'S CURRENT OPERATIONS ARE ALREADY INUNDATING OUR COMMUNITY WITH UNACCEPTABLE LEVELS OF VARIOUS TAKE-OFFS, FLY-OVER NOISE.

Response:

Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PC00243-2

Comment:

LAX HAS NOT REMEDIED THE NOISE AND POLLUTION PROBLEM DUMPED ON US 01-01-00.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00243-3

Comment:

I WOULD NOT SUPPORT ANY TYPE OF EXPANSION AT LAX. I WOULD SUPPORT ROLLING LAX BACK TO 40 MILLION. NO FURTHER EXPANSION GIVE US BACK... OUR BEAUTIFUL QUIET, CLEAN NEIGHBORHOOD.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. It should be noted that under Alternative D, air pollution and noise pollution are expected to be less than under the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00244 Sullivan, Anne None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00244-1

Comment:

THE PREVIOUS AIRPORT EXPANSION'S EIR STATED THAT 40,000,000 MAP'S WAS THE MOST THAT COULD BE HANDLED SAFELY AT THE SMALLEST ACRE AIRPORT FOR INTERNATIONAL TRAFFIC IN THE COUNTRY.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding projected versus actual capacity levels at LAX.

PC00244-2

Comment:

DON'T SELL OUT THE CITIZENS OF THE SOUTH BAY FOR THE PROFIT OF L.A. AND THE AIRLINES. LAWA AND THE FAA HAVE BEEN BOUGHT OFF AND DO NOT PROTECT US. NO WONDER THE CITIZENS HAVE NO CONFIDENCE IN GOVERNMENT APPOINTED OFFICIALS.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00245 Sullivan, Anne None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00245-1

Comment:

Traffic - I live 4 miles from the Artesia #405 freeway on-ramp and 4 miles from the Inglewood #405 freeway and it takes me 20 minutes to get there. It takes 25 minutes to get to LAX. The #405 north at La Cienega is stopped day and night going North from the airport. Moving in more passengers and moving toward the ocean will create gridlock.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology and results, regarding the Congestion Management Program.

PC00245-2

Comment:

All so airlines and the City of LA get more money.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00245-3

Comment:

Noise -There is a constant noise at my house from planes on the ground (screaming) and fly overs. I cannot hear the ocean at the end on my street anymore.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 regarding current and future noise levels.

PC00245-4

Comment:

The pollution from fly overs ruins the paint on my house.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC00245-5

Comment:

I have lived here for 28 years and the plane pollution has increased in the past 4 years.

Response:

Air quality emissions from aircraft at LAX in 1996 and 2000 are provided in Table S4.6-6, LAX Environmental Baseline (1996) Emissions Inventory for On-Airport Sources, and Table S4.6-7, LAX Year 2000 Emissions Inventory for On-Airport Sources, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As indicated in the tables, aircraft-related emissions have increased for some pollutants (NOx and SO2), have decreased for other pollutants (CO and VOC), and generally stayed the same for PM10. Please see Response to Comment PC00045-3.

PC00245-6

Comment:

The airport is too small for any more planes.

Response:

Please refer to Responses to Comments PC00260-1 regarding the level of activity that could be served at LAX given its size constraints.

PC00246

Olsen, Robert

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00246-1

Comment:

Our whole family We do not any L.A.X. expansion go to Palmdale with all freight operations

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00246-2

Comment:

noise way too much already!!! It's inhuman!!!

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00246-3

Comment:

We are 35 yr. residents of Manhattan & I ran for City Council in 1999. Anti-L.A.X.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00247

Poyourow, Joanne

None Provided

6/1/2001

PC00247-1

Comment:

EIR Subsection 2.1
A plan for the region

The LAX Master plan is not a plan for the region. It is a plan for a LAWA "empire". Their approach is not service, but domination and annihilation.

The Master Plan would have us concentrate the predominance of our air travel resources at one major Southern California location. The Plan is an attempt to stay centralized in approach, when population concentrations at that center are at capacity.

LAWA is seeking to overbuild an airport that local passengers and freight trucks won't be able to get to, rather than working with other areas to dissolve hurdles to their expansion.

Under the LAX Master Plan the region as a whole will be caught short of accessible (thus useable) air transportation by 2015.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC02287-44; please refer to Response to Comment PC02287-44.

PC00247-2

Comment:

If we are to approach the problem of air transport in Southern California with a regional viewpoint, we will consider the situation not just through 2015 but even further into the future. Population demographics are shifting. The center is too impacted, and new outlying "centers" are beginning to emerge. We should plan now to cultivate accessible air transport where population development is taking place.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided

3. Comments and Responses

in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00247-3

Comment:

If we are to look at the entire regional transport picture, not just the air portion, we will acknowledge that mass transit systems such as subways and light rail are conspicuously lacking in Southern California. They have not been made part of the fiber of LA culture. Light rail represents a significant savings and conservation of our common-wealth: energy and fuel resources, pollution including greenhouse issues, land use for space gobbling freeway interchanges. Connection of light rail systems to major airports would be a major step toward this transition.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

PC00247-4

Comment:

A Master Plan that was truly regional in its thinking would incorporate these issues as an integral part of its design. The 12,000 pages before us don't even approach the mark of a regional solution.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00248

Poyourow, Joanne

None Provided

6/1/2001

PC00248-1

Comment:

Subsection 4.3.1.6.1
Evidence of statistical tampering

The EIR's preparer was obviously instructed to distort statistics in order to derive LAWA's desired results. Section 4.3.1.6.1 is clear evidence of this manipulation.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC00248-2

Comment:

In many areas of the EIR the point is made that No Action/No Project Alternative is the true "baseline", since 1996 is now outdated.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Although the No Action/No Project Alternative provides a benchmark for comparison of the four build alternatives, in accordance with the State CEQA Guidelines, conclusions regarding the significance of impacts for all the build alternatives are based on the 1996 baseline or, for certain environmental disciplines, the adjusted environmental baseline. Please also see Topical Response TR-GEN-1 regarding baseline issues.

PC00248-3

Comment:

Yet in Section 4.3.1.6.1 the EIR admits that the P-6 parking garage (which already exists) is included only in the 2005 and 2015 scenarios¹. It is not included in the No Action/No Project Alternative!

By consciously deleting P-6 from the No Action/No Project Alternative scenario, Alternatives A, B & C falsely appear to offer additional parking spaces. In fact, for 2005, Alternatives A, B & C each offer LESS parking spaces than if I drove to LAX today to park my car!²

Add to this, LAWA's assertion that parking demand will remain the same under Alternatives A, B & C as it will under No Action/No Project Alternative³. The statistics given for forecasted vehicle trips indicate 5,668 to 7,621 additional vehicle trips per hour⁴. The EIR plans that none of these cars will be stopping!

¹ First paragraph of EIR Section 4.3.1.6.1 Page 4-253

² Table 4.3.1-7 at EIR page 4-260 "Planned Capacity" under the No Action/No Project Alternative should be 686 spaces higher for the P-6 garage. Therefore NA/NPA capacity would be 36,298 (=35,612 + 686). This is higher than planned capacity shown for any of the Alts A, B, C for 2005. Alt A is essentially the same as the present day for 2015. Parking today is higher than Alt B for 2015.

³ Table 4.3.1-7 "Daily Demand (Spaces)" is essentially the same for Alternatives A, B & C as it is for No Action/No Project Alternative.

⁴ EIR Table 4.3.1-4 "1996" columns, inbound plus outbound, compared to each of Tables 4.3.1-10, 4.3.1-11, and 4.3.1-12 "2015" columns, inbound plus outbound

Response:

The impacts of the Master Plan alternatives are presented in Chapter 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR (for Alternatives A, B, and C) and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR (for Alternative D). As stated on page 4-253 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the analysis does account for the P-6 garage in the No Action/No Project (year 2005 and 2015) scenarios. Therefore, the 35,612 space count already includes the 686 additional close-in parking stalls of the P-6 garage. The P-6 garage is not included in the 1996 Environmental Baseline scenario since it was not opened until 2000.

The No Action/No Project parking demand shown in Table 4.3.1-7 was calculated early in the master planning process. These demand estimates were included in the Draft EIS/EIR, even though the methodology was later refined when calculating parking demand for the project alternatives. The refinements that were made for the project alternatives but not for the No Action/No Project alternative are: Year 2005 estimates accounted for a future private vehicle occupancy increase from 1.45 to 1.50 people per car (as mandated by Reg. IV) and a future change in private vehicle mode split from 51.8 percent to 51.2 percent; Year 2015 refinements included a further increase in vehicle occupancy to 1.55 people per car and a further decrease in private vehicle mode split to 50.5 percent. This recalculation using the same vehicle occupancy rates as used in the build alternatives would reduce the daily demand in the No Action/No Project alternative from 36,600 daily parking spaces to 34,470 daily parking spaces. Also, a typographical error occurred within the Year 2015 Planned Capacity of Alternative C. The actual capacity is 39,491, not 39,441. If the changes were accounted for in the No Action/No Project parking demand, the parking demand comparison would be as shown in the following table:

3. Comments and Responses

Public Parking Requirements

Alternative	2005				2015			
	Originating Daily Passengers	Daily Demand (Spaces)	Planned Capacity (Spaces) ¹	Demand/ Capacity	Originating Daily Passengers	Daily Demand (Spaces)	Planned Capacity (Spaces) ¹	Demand/ Capacity
Environmental Baseline	N/A	17,330	20,279	85.5%	N/A	17,330	20,279	85.5%
No Action/No Project ²	84,847	28,745	35,612	80.7%	87,280	34,470	35,612	96.8%
Alternative A	84,847	29,288	33,257	88.1%	108,355	35,636	36,621	97.3%
Alternative B	84,847	29,288	31,037	94.4%	108,355	35,636	34,401	103.6%
Alternative C	84,847	29,288	36,127	81.1%	108,113	35,636	39,491	90.2%
Alternative D					95,026	35,636	35,002	101.8%

Note: For comparative purposes, the table above also provides the parking demand estimates for Alternative D 2015.

¹ Includes close-in parking (short and long-term), remote public parking and private parking.

² Includes similar refinements to demand as accounted for in Alternatives A, B, and C.

Source Landrum & Brown, Inc., 2003

Use of these No Action/No Project parking demand estimates would have no bearing on the analysis of the project alternatives, since the impact thresholds of significance for parking (as shown in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.3.1.4) are independent of the No Action/No Project parking demand estimates.

One would expect the parking demand to be similar for the Build Alternatives since the forecasted air passengers for the Build Alternatives are similar. As stated on page 4-238 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the demand for most airport surface transportation facilities is not based on total airport passengers. Rather, it is based on originating air travel and terminating air passengers only, which are the passengers who begin or end their air travel in the Los Angeles region. It excludes connecting passengers, which are those passengers who connect from flight to flight, since they do not use the airport's surface transportation system. Connecting passengers are, however, included in many passenger demand figures such as million annual passengers (MAP).

PC00248-4

Comment:

The credibility of this EIR is seriously shaken. All statistics in this EIR should be reviewed by independent auditors prior to being taken as fact! Findings such as the tampering of parking statistics cast doubt and question upon ALL statistics contained in the EIR.

Response:

Comment noted. The EIS/EIR was prepared by a large number of independent consultants and experts. While there is no reason to question the overall accuracy of the statistics in the report, the public review period required under NEPA and CEQA affords agencies, interested parties, and the general public the opportunity to review, and question if desired, the assumptions, calculations, and conclusions of the analyses. In the case of the LAX Master Plan, a 295-day review period was provided for the Draft EIS/EIR and a 120-day review period was provided for the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00248-5

Comment:

No Action/No Project Alternative
 planned parking capacity 35,612 per EIR Table 4.3.1-7
 P-6 garage 686 per EIR section 4.3.1.6.1
 Corrected capacity 36,298

3. Comments and Responses

Table 4.3.1-7 at EIR page 4-260
restated to include garage P-6 in NA/NPA

	demand yr 2005	year 2005		demand yr 2005	year 2015	
		planned capacity	ratio as corrected		planned capacity	ratio as corrected
Environmental Baseline	17,330	20,279	85.5%	17,330	20,279	85.5%
No Action/No Project	29,600	36,298	81.5%	36,600	36,298	100.8%
Alt A	29,288	33,257	88.1%	35,636	36,621	97.3%
Alt B	29,288	31,037	94.4%	35,636	34,401	103.6%
Alt C	29,288	36,127	81.1%	35,636	39,441	90.4%

No Action/No Project provides more spaces than Alt A, B or C

No Action/No Project provides more spaces than Alt A. Alt B does not represent any significant addition.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00248-3.

PC00249 Poyourow, Joanne None Provided 6/1/2001

PC00249-1

Comment:

EIR Tables 4.3.1-4, and 4.3.1-10 through -12
Freeways at LOS-F

Additional vehicles PER HOUR

Over the traffic we are currently experiencing

	Alt. A	Alt. B	Alt. C
Airport Peak	7,621	7,150	5,668
P.M. Peak	6,451	6,403	6,095

This is in addition to other massive increases looming in the area!5

The greater Los Angeles infrastructure cannot support this influx of traffic.

The EIR admits that the I-405 and the I-105 were already at LOS E-F in 1996 6. The LAX Master Plan would add 5,668 to 7,621 ADDITIONAL VEHICLES PER HOUR to these already overburdened roadways.

The EIR conspicuously fails to reveal how many of these 5,668 to 7,621 ADDITIONAL VEHICLES PER HOUR will be driving on the I-405 between I-101 and SR-90. This stretch of freeway never seems to flow well, at any hour of day, any day of the week. The EIR fails to give breakdowns, to reveal how many of these additional vehicles will be using the I-105 east of Hawthorne Blvd, or using the I-405 south of Imperial Hwy. The EIR simply marks these LOS E-F freeway stretches "more airport with project"7

The EIR takes the approach that because LAWA proposes the LAX Expressway, Alts A, B & C will "improve" the current traffic issues.

In saying this, they are only looking at the immediate geographical vicinity of the airport8. They avoid considering the burden this Plan will place on the total freeway system.

The LAX Master Plan will "significantly impact" transportation corridors up the I-405 beyond the I-10 through the Sepulveda Pass. It will "significantly impact" I-405 flow (or lack thereof) through the South Bay curve, and I-105 through Hawthorne and beyond. In short, the LAX Master Plan will create massive gridlock throughout the greater LA basin.

No thanks!

3. Comments and Responses

	(all figures for 2015)		total	
	inbound	outbound		
Airport Peak Hour				
1996 Baseline				
per EIR Table 4.3.1.-12	6,043	5,396	11,439	
	1,804	1,588	3,392	
			14,831	14,831
Alternative A				
Per EIR Table 4.3.1-10	3,935	3,621	7,556	
	1,149	1,089	2,238	
	6,080	6,335	12,415	
	161	81	242	
			22,451	22,451
Difference				7,620
P.M. Peak Hour				
1996 Baseline				
per EIR Table 4.3.1.-12	3,225	4,530	7,755	
	1,010	1,237	2,247	
			10,002	10,002
Alternative A				
Per EIR Table 4.3.1-10	2,785	3,282	6,067	
	647	930	1,577	
	3,964	4,545	8,509	
	110	190	300	
			16,453	16,453
Difference				6,451

5 Developments like Playa Vista, etc. are mentioned in other sections of the EIR (Sec 4.17.1.7.1 on Natural Resources for example) but are suspiciously absent from the discussions of surface transportation!

6 EIR Figure 4.3.2-2

7 EIR Figure 4.3.2-4

8 EIR Section 4.3.2 page 4-299, paragraph 1, even goes so far as to say that increased traffic congestion on the I-405 north of the LAX Expressway "should not be construed as adverse impacts created by the project" ! They slickly try to avoid taking responsibility for the fact that their proposal is way out of line with the area's overall resources!

Response:

The numbers quoted in this response reflect total trip generation of the airport, excluding cargo and ancillary trips. Graphic illustrations of airport trips on specific roadways are provided in Technical Report 3b, Attachment B. Estimated traffic volumes on individual freeway segments, freeway ramps and arterial streets are provided in Technical Report 3b, Attachment C. Quantitative comparisons of intersection volumes, as well as comparisons of levels of service for intersections, arterial streets, freeway segments and freeway ramps are provided in Technical Report 3b, Attachment D. Regional transportation system impacts, including all freeways and regional arterials in Los Angeles County are addressed in Technical Report 3b, Section 6, following procedures established by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding traffic in the vicinity of LAX.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00250

Poyourow, Joanne

None Provided

6/1/2001

PC00250-1

Comment:

EIR Subsection: Figure 1-3
Exaggerated 60-Min.Accessibility

The 60-minute accessibility statistics used in the EIR are grossly exaggerated. The Airport Travel Time Zones shown on Figure 1-3 are laughable. LAWA has overstated its 60-minute geographic territory, and thus has overstated its projected passenger load, in order to distort the reader's impression of demand for LAX air services.

LAWA simply wants to monopolize Los Angeles air transportation, and they have produced misleading figures to get us to approve their facilities expansion, to "sustain and advance"⁹ their market share.

Section 1.2.1.2 makes a big point of "market accessibility," the idea that a passenger has to be able to get to an airport to use it.

LAWA claims that 44 MAP¹⁰ are within the 60-minute access zone of LAX.¹¹ These 44 MAP won't get to LAX in 60 minutes; some won't even get there in 2 hours!

⁹ The Purpose and Objectives of the Proposed Project, EIR section 2.1, third bullet point

¹⁰ EIR section 1.2.2.1, page 1-17 paragraph 2

¹¹ LAWA is careful not to reveal the exact boundaries of this supposed 60-minute access zone, giving us only a fuzzy map without street name identifications (Figure 1-3). So I compared their Fig 1-3 to my Thomas Guide and then applied the results to Yahoo on Maps/Mapquest.com

Response:

The 60-minute accessibility diagram, Figure 1-3, was based upon average travel times. During peak travel times, actual driving times are higher. During off-peak hours, actual driving times are lower.

A total of five freeway mainline locations on I-405 and I-105 were included in the analysis of daily peaking characteristics of traffic in the LAX area. The morning peak occurs during a three-hour period, from 6:00 - 9:00 am, with the highest hourly volume of the day occurring at about 7:00. The afternoon peak occurs at about 5:00 pm, but spreads over a longer period of time, from about 2:00 - 7:00 pm. Traffic volumes stay relatively high throughout the midday, with hourly volumes remaining at or greater than 5 percent of daily volumes throughout the afternoon. Chapter II, Section 7, Off-Airport Transportation, of the Draft LAX Master Plan document contained a detailed discussion of the freeways, ramps, roadways and intersections that were studied and modeled.

PC00250-2

Comment:

In Section 4.3.2.6.1 the EIR makes a dramatic issue about future traffic: "In 2020 . . . a 12-mile trip will take 60 minutes." Given LAWA's own assertion about future traffic speeds, and the LOS-F freeways that already exist¹², those 44 MAP will quickly find other travel options and will avoid LAX. They will choose other airports.

Analysing 4 geographic points from what Fig 1-3 claims is LAX's 60-minute accessibility zone:

Northernmost - 405 fwy near Roscoe Blvd, Van Nuys. From here a passenger would travel approximately 23 miles to LAX¹³. At 12 miles per 60 minutes¹⁴, this would mean just under 2 hours to get to LAX.

3. Comments and Responses

Northeast - near the intersection of the 605 and the 10 fwys, El Monte. From here a passenger would travel approximately 30.2 miles to LAX¹⁵. At 12 miles per 60 minutes, this would mean about 2 and a half hours to get to LAX.

East - intersection of 5 fwy and 91 fwy, Fullerton. From here a passenger would travel approximately 29.3 miles to LAX¹⁶. At 12 miles per 60 minutes, this would mean about 2 and a half hours to get to LAX.

Southeast - intersection of 405 fwy and 605 fwy, Long Beach. From here a passenger would travel approximately 22.2 miles to LAX¹⁷. At 12 miles per 60 minutes, this would mean about 2 hours to get to LAX.

LAWA derives its incredible demand statistics by usurping the geographic territory already served by other local airports. For some geographic pockets, consumers already have a choice between two or even three other local airports, yet LAWA still includes these people in the count for LAX.¹⁸

As a result, any analysis attempting to use these figures is hopeless. LAX's stated 55% of regional demand¹⁹ merges with Long Beach's 43% of regional demand²⁰ which includes some Orange County noses in its count. From figures such as these, it appears that Long Beach needs the expansion plan, not LAX!

Additionally, LAWA has downwardly distorted the 60-minute accessibility volume portrayed for other airports. From personal experience: I used to live at the intersection of 405 fwy, 55 fwy and 73 fwy in Orange County. We regularly used Ontario for certain air routes. It took us less than an hour to get there. Yet the location of my former residence is far outside the odd zone shown for Ontario.

Thus LAX will not draw passengers from nearly the geographic territory they claim they will. Traffic congestion will send these people to other airports. The demand figures for future LAX air travel services are grossly exaggerated in the LAX Master Plan, in order to support this project to preserve LAWA's stranglehold on Southern California air transport.

LAX does not require facilities expansion of the magnitude that LAWA would have us believe.

12 by their own acknowledgement at Figure 4.3.2-2

13 On Yahoo Maps, starting point 15800 Roscoe Blvd, Van Nuys. Arriving point 5300 century blvd, LA. I did not use Arbor Vitae because Mapquest.com does not acknowledge random points on the fwy and this is not yet an offramp.

14 EIR Section 4.3.2.6.1

15 On Yahoo Maps, starting point 12200 Garvey, El Monte. Arriving point 5300 century blvd, LA.

16 On Yahoo Maps, starting point 1200 Magnolia, Fullerton. Arriving point 5300 century blvd, LA.

17 On Yahoo Maps, starting point 1900 Studebaker Rd, Long Beach. Arriving point 5300 century blvd, LA.

18 Reference Figure 1-3, in particular, Long Beach

19 EIR section 1.2.2.1, page 1-17

20 EIR section 1.2.2.6, page 1-18

Response:

The travel statistics the commentator refers to are SCAG statistics. Also, history has shown that people from the areas to the north, northeast, east, and southeast areas that the commentator refers to will use LAX. In fact, if someone wants to fly to a destination that only LAX serves, they would have no choice. Unfortunately, many airlines want to serve many destinations from a single airport to minimize the costs of redundant airport staff, and they want to consolidate aircraft passengers destined from Los Angeles

3. Comments and Responses

region to the same location. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding regional air passenger demand.

The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development at LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Long Beach Airport is operated by the City of Long Beach.

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00251 Poyourow, Joanne None Provided 6/1/2001

PC00251-1

Comment:

EIR Subsection 4.1.7.2
Conflicting opinions!

The EIR states, regarding Level of Significance After Mitigation:

"Although Master Plan Commitment N-1 and Mitigation Measures MM-N1 through MM-N3 would reduce aircraft noise impacts, the residual impact would not be less than significant. As such, a significant and unavoidable impact from aircraft noise is expected. 21"

The EIR states, regarding Cumulative Impacts:

"The cumulative effects of noise from aircraft, construction and roadway noise are not expected to be significant. 22"

The EIR authors have so completely scrambled the facts that they cannot themselves derive a consistent opinion on this Plan!
This EIR is not to be trusted!!

21 EIR section 4.1.9.1 Level of Significance After Mitigation: Aircraft Noise. Emphasis added.

22 EIR section 4.1.7.2 Cumulative Impacts: Alternatives A, B, C. Emphasis added.

Response:

Construction noise does not occur in areas where aircraft noise increases, and to a large degree the existing aircraft noise, would serve to mask much of the construction noise. Aircraft noise patterns shift to match shifts in flight tracks, and sensitive uses newly exposed to aircraft noise are not in the same locations where construction noise would occur. Therefore, there are no significant noise impacts associated with the accumulation of aircraft, roadway, and construction noise.

The analysis of aircraft noise and roadway noise included all of the air and roadway activity that contributes to noise exposure around LAX. That is, no other projects are expected to create additional and cumulative aircraft noise within the noise contours of LAX. Also, the roadway noise analysis was based on traffic analyses that already included the traffic generated by all future regional projects, and was therefore cumulative.

The potential cumulative impacts of construction traffic noise was reviewed, because other area projects, such as Playa Vista, are anticipated to create construction traffic noise at the same time as the No Action/No Project Alternative. Because sound levels increase at a rate of 3 dBA with each doubling of sound energy, traffic volumes would have to increase approximately 3-fold over baseline volumes to reach the CEQA threshold of significance criteria of a 5 dBA increase. It is not anticipated that construction traffic from these projects would triple the existing traffic volumes on these streets, considering the relatively high background traffic volumes they currently experience. As a result, it is not anticipated that Playa Vista or any other area project, alone or in combination with LAX traffic, would generate this large amount of construction traffic on any haul route.

Further, the impacts of construction equipment noise could create a cumulative impact if any other area project were located near the noise impact areas exposed to LAX construction noise. With one possible exception, it is not anticipated that any construction project would take place within the anticipated influence area of any No Action/No Project construction site. The possible exception is a currently vacant site south of LAX, between Nash and Douglas Streets in El Segundo, which could be developed during the Master Plan project. However, no noise-sensitive land uses exist within the combined influence area of these two projects.

Please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for more information on aircraft construction noise and noise-related land use impacts under the baseline and Year 2000 conditions and the various Master Plan alternatives including new Alternative D.

PC00252 Poyourow, Joanne None Provided 6/1/2001

PC00252-1

Comment:

EIR Subsection 4.3.2, page 4-296
"Cutting through" north surface streets

FALSE: ". . . impacts to arterial and local streets - particularly to the north - would be minimized by shifting much of the north airport demand to the new LAX expressway. This reduction in the number of LAX vehicles 'cutting through' the north surface streets is apparent ..."23

How stupid do the Master Plan authors think the Southern California public is?

The EIR (all Alternatives) depicts drivers as preferring to drive several miles out of their way rather than cutting through Westchester on Sepulveda. The Master Plan would have vehicles taking the LAX Expressway, paralleling I-405 east and around the La Tierra curve, down to Arbor Vitae, before turning back west toward the airport. Preposterous!

Computers may crank number charts, but people are not that stupid! Take a basic map of the area, draw a straight line from I-405 in Culver City, to LAX, and there is Sepulveda through Westchester. People will take the straight-line shortcut, en masse.²⁴ Sepulveda will continue to be a major cut-through to access LAX. But with the addition of Alternatives A, B & C, our residential neighborhood will become a cut-through for even MORE volume in taxis, limos, autos, etc.

The LAX Expressway will not eliminate the Sepulveda north cut-through issues.

The impacts of Master Plan Alternatives A, B, C on the Westchester community are intollerable.

23 EIR Section 4.3.2 page 4-296, second paragraph

24 even YahooMaps at Mapquest.com shows this route, instead of recommending that drivers uses Century.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts. Also please see Topical Response TR-ST-7 regarding a brief history of LAX Northside/Westchester Southside, its role in the Master Plan, and the impact/benefits of the proposed airport alternatives. Please note that Alternative D does not include an LAX Expressway or a Ring Road.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00253

Poyourow, Joanne

None Provided

6/1/2001

PC00253-1

Comment:

EIR Subsection 4.1.3.1.1 and Figure 4.2-9
Baseline Noise understated

The noise impact circles drawn on figure 4.2-9 25 are inaccurate. The area truly affected by LAX noise levels is significantly understated.

25 It is interesting that the maps depicting the 65 CNEL contours are not provided in section 4.1 Noise; only a text description of these contours (4.1.2.1.1, bottom of page 4-29) is provided. One must go to section 4.2 Land Use to find the 65 dB contour maps. They have hidden the maps, just like they want to hide the future impact!

Response:

For information regarding noise modeling approach please see Topical Response TR-N-1, particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-1.3. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-87. Please also see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for more information on aircraft noise, construction noise and noise-related land use impacts under the baseline and Year 2000 conditions and the various Master Plan alternatives including new Alternative D.

PC00253-2

Comment:

I live about half way between Grid point H07 and H08 on Figure 4.1-1. The 1996 65dB circle as drawn on figure 4.2-9 would seem to exclude my residence. Yet at current airport activity levels, most days I can hear aircraft over the sound of my appliances 26. Particularly when the weather is under Santa Ana wind conditions, on Monday mornings, Friday afternoons, and during certain hours of day. 27 28

26 According to the "Noise Levels in Decibels" chart at www.temple.edu, if I can hear an aircraft over the sound of my vacuum cleaner, dishwasher or garbage disposal, then it is in excess of 65dB.

27 Overall area noise level is highest on a clear sunny day with a light breeze. Low marine layer dampens the sound, while high marine layer (frequent) amplifies it over the level of a still sunny day. Under Santa Ana conditions, the airport operates "backwards" which means the acceleration and take-off points are all different. This condition is the noisiest of all.

28 These observations are from spring 2001, and thus include "federally mandated phase out of older, noisier Stage 2 jets."

Response:

Even though the commentor's residence is located in Westchester, just north of the noise impact area, she will still be exposed to noise levels that may be louder than certain appliances. During certain weather conditions (such as winds from the south) the commentor will experience an increased perception in aircraft noise. Weather does play a role in periods of Santa Ana winds. The Santa Ana Winds are the principal exception to the use of westerly traffic flow at LAX. When wind speeds exceed 10 kts. from the east, all operations are conducted in that direction. Consequently, areas east of the airport (and south of the airport) will experience take off overflights that are uncommon in the general operating conditions at the airport. These conditions occur between 2-5 percent of the time each year. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures. The 65 dB DNL/CNEL metric has been determined by federal and state governments as the level of significance. For more information please see Topical Responses TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences and TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC00253-3

Comment:

It's great that the EIR preparers utilized the latest INM computer projection system, but has anyone checked actual noise levels? 29 Has anyone checked real LAX airport noise on a day with onshore winds? Santa Ana conditions? How about at 5-9 a.m. on a Monday? Any weekday morning with high marine layer? Before a holiday weekend? Any Friday afternoon, anytime after noon? What about the sound of an aircraft that is called off, does not land, and accelerates over the residences to climb back to altitude? 30 These are not rare spikes in the sound pattern; their sum total, and the fact that one flows into the next, create a constant barrage of airport noise.

29 Appendix K section 4.6.2.5 page 42 would seem to indicate some noise measurements were done. However these were for road noise, and to calibrate the computer!

30 Who selected the "average day" to create the models? What was the weather like on the days the data was accumulated? What proportion of flights actually adhered to noise abatement procedures? What proportion of flights were called off? Were any statistics accumulated from east flow?

Response:

The details of aircraft noise monitoring were provided in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR. As noted on pages 15-16 of Appendix D, there are 25 noise monitors located in communities surrounding LAX that continually (24 hours per day, 365 days per year) record the noise level. The California Airport Noise Regulations require that four times per year public airports in California prepare a map indicating the noise exposure condition for the previous twelve months. The operational data from which LAWA's Noise Management Division prepared its Fourth Quarter 1996 noise contours provides the foundation for defining the environmental baseline. That report relied extensively on the information from the airport's noise monitoring system (25 permanent noise monitoring microphones) and the aircraft operations monitoring system for tracking runway use, flight path utilization, daily distribution of flights, and frequency of operations during that calendar year. As a result, all the weather conditions and times identified by the commentator were included in the calculation. To that analysis was added noise of ground maintenance run-up activity to form a baseline noise condition for comparison with future conditions. Additional noise measurement was done in preparation of the Draft EIS/EIR using noise monitors for roadway noise. This information was provided in detail in Appendix K, Supplemental Environmental Evaluation for LAX Expressway and State Route 1 Improvements. FAA Orders 1050.1d and 5050.4A require use of the average annual day as representative of the conditions at the airport. The average annual day is not a specific day of the year, but rather an average of all conditions and operations experienced during the year divided by 365 days. For a more detailed description please see Section 1.2, Standard Noise Descriptors, and Section 2.1, Data Sources and Assumptions, in Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00253-4

Comment:

EIR Section 4.1.3.1.1 states that "LAX operates in west flow 95-98 percent of the time." I wonder who sat and counted planes, under what perfect weather conditions, to derive this incredible figure. By my personal observation, LAX operates in east flow quite often, a situation that gives rise to extraordinary noise patterns that cannot possibly be reflected in the circles of impact included in the EIR. 31

31 If this 95-98% west flow statistic were correct, that would mean LAX operated in west flow 7 to 18 days per year (365 x 2%, 365 x 5%); no way. If you were to tell me they used west flow 30 to 70 days per year, I would say you were on the low side of accurate.

Response:

At LAX an automated noise and operations monitoring system is in use that provides daily records of flight operations by virtually all aircraft using the facility. The FAA's Automated Radar Terminal System (ARTS) records are accessed by software owned and operated by the Department of Airports' Noise Management Bureau to obtain location and other descriptive information related to each arrival and departure. This information is processed to assign each aircraft to one of several predefined flight track

3. Comments and Responses

corridors and the resultant information is loaded into a relational database. The database includes aircraft type as designated by radar, runway and flight track assignments, user identification and flight number, type of operation (approach or take off), and its time of occurrence. Records of flights are extracted from this database with proprietary software developed for and owned by the Noise Management Bureau to produce a compiled report of operations for any period desired. This processing automatically assigns an INM aircraft type (based on the aircraft fleet records of each carrier) to each operation and summarizes the number of arrivals and departure by each type during day, evening and night hours. Subsequent processing provides take off trip distance assignments based on the scheduled destinations served by each aircraft type/carrier combination, as extracted from the Official Airline Guide for the period under consideration. The data are then compiled into a format that may be processed by the computer noise model to produce patterns of noise exposure. The Noise Management Bureau will continue to use this system in meeting its responsibility to regularly monitor and report on noise conditions in the airport environs. Section 2.1.5 of Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR described this process in greater detail.

During the period 1996 through 2001, the annual data indicates that an average of 4.5 percent of all arrivals were made to the east and 1.3 percent of all departures were made to the east. The noise computations for future years conservatively assume that 5-6 percent of all departures will be made to the east, based on long-term wind conditions and the most efficient operating conditions. Air Traffic Control at LAX purposefully keeps aircraft in westerly flow as much as possible to minimize the impact of departure noise on residential areas around the airport.

PC00253-5

Comment:

LAX is one of the biggest airports in the world. Was the INM computer system created to handle this? Or was this system designed for a more "average" airport. Also, computers calculate based upon data. Has anyone audited the statistics that LAX fed them to achieve these results? We already know what LAX does with statistics! 32

I believe the INM computer is grossly understating the number of acres and number of people significantly impacted by LAX's DNL. And if 1996 noise impact circles on figure 4.2-9 are so grossly inaccurate, then we cannot possibly trust the projected 2005 and 2015 impact circles as drawn.

32 Reference my finding of intentional distortion of parking garage statistics in the EIR, discussed in another Public Comments form.

Response:

LAX is routinely ranked as one of the busiest airports in the world. The INM is used all across the country by all types of airports including those that rank higher than LAX such as Chicago's O'Hare Airport and Atlanta's Hartsfield-Jackson International Airport. The 1996 environmental baseline was based on data that was used in the 4th Quarter 1996 Quarterly Noise Report. LAX is required to provide these reports on a quarterly basis to Los Angeles County and the State of California for their review. For more information on Data Sources and Assumptions please see Section 2.1, located in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR. The commentor alleges that Figure 4.2-9, which shows the contours for the No Action/No Project Alternative vs. 1996 Baseline Areas Newly Exposed, is grossly inaccurate. The contours indicated on the exhibit are an accurate representation of the output of the INM for the two conditions indicated and were prepared using the accepted industry standard methodology for the development of aircraft noise exposure patterns. As such, they are not considered to be inaccurate. For more information on the Noise Modeling Approach please see Topical Response TR-N-1 and Section 2.1, Environmental Baseline (1996) located in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report.

PC00253-6

Comment:

This plan is NOT designed "in an environmentally sound manner that is compatible with surrounding land uses." 33 The LAX Master Plan is out of line with the surrounding community.

33 The Purpose and Objectives of the Proposed Project, EIR section 2.1, first paragraph

Response:

Comment noted. Please refer to Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding compatibility issues.

PC00254 Poyourow, Joanne None Provided 6/1/2001

PC00254-1

Comment:

EIR Subsections 4.1.9.1
Aircraft Noise Key Conclusions

The EIR states:

"Although Master Plan Commitment N-1 and Mitigation Measures MM-N1 through MM-N3 would reduce aircraft noise impacts, the residual impact would not be less than significant. As such, a significant and unavoidable impact from aircraft noise is expected. 32"

The EIR states:

"Alternatives A and C are roughly equivalent to the No Action/No Project Alternative" 33 Based upon their statements about environmental baseline, I don't believe it. 34

The EIR states:

"Alternative B ... would expose considerably more total people to 65 CNEL ..." 35

32 EIR section 4.1.9.1 Level of Significance After Mitigation: Aircraft Noise.

33 EIR section 4.1, page 4-11, paragraph 4

34 reference my Public Comment form on the inaccuracies of Figure 4.2-9 baseline noise exposure.

35 EIR section 4.1, page 4-11, paragraph 5

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC000253-1 regarding noise modeling. For more information on Alternative D, the Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and the related appendices: Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, and S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report.

PC00254-2

Comment:

These impacts are unacceptable.

This plan is NOT designed "in an environmentally sound manner that is compatible with surrounding land uses."36

The Master Plan is out of line with the surrounding community.

36 The Purpose and Objectives of the Proposed Project, EIR section 2.1, first paragraph

Response:

Comment noted. Please refer to Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding compatibility issues.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00255

Poyourow, Joanne

None Provided

6/1/2001

PC00255-1

Comment:

EIR Subsection: Appendix K, section 5.15
Centinela Adobe

The EIR admits that impacts to the Adobe could be "Adverse" under two Alternatives under study.³⁷

The EIR admits that the single viaduct alternative "could result in indirect impacts on the Centinela Adobe . . . due to vibration and potential structural damage."³⁸ The EIR contradicts itself in Table 5.15-1 by saying that the single viaduct would not have adverse effect on the Adobe, a statement that is in direct conflict with the implications of section 5.15.1.3.

The EIR states: "Adverse impacts to . . . the Centinela Adobe . . . would be reduced and possibly mitigated with the implementation of the mitigation measures "³⁹

Adverse impacts of the LAX Master Plan's LAX Expressway on the Centinela Adobe would be substantial, even severe. This is intolerable; the Centinela Adobe is a treasured historical resource, not just to the city of Los Angeles, but in the eyes of California history.

³⁷ under LAX Master Plan EIR Alternatives A and C. reference footnote 1 to Table 5.15-1 (Appendix K)

³⁸ quoted from Appendix K, section 5.15.1.2, paragraph 2, which is incorporated into section 5.15.1.3 by reference: "as with Alternative 2, this alternative [alternative 3 - single viaduct] also involves the use of heavy machinery and equipment to erect the elevated viaducts and associated ramps and overpasses." This heavy machinery and equipment is admitted to cause potential damage by vibration under sec 5.15.1.2 for Alternative 2, yet this fact is slyly not restated under sec 5.14.1.3 for Alternative 3.

³⁹ EIR Appendix K, section 5.15.4, paragraph 1, page 108

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding impacts to the Centinela Adobe.

PC00255-2

Comment:

The EIR would have us believe that "placing [the HOV lane] . . . out of view of both resources' primary elevations"⁴⁰, a visual mitigation, would be sufficient to mitigate impact on the Adobe. Yet the EIR admits that vibration is an issue to the Adobe. Vibration will come not just from construction equipment, but from automobile volume during usage.⁴³ "Out of view" will hardly solve the impact of vibration on the structural integrity of this historic Adobe.

⁴⁰ Appendix K section 5.15.4, bullet point 1, page 108

⁴³ The EIR gives no indication that they have even considered this point

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding impacts to the Centinela Adobe.

PC00255-3

Comment:

The EIR implies under Mitigation Measures that relocating the Centinela Adobe is an option under consideration⁴⁴ I believe that the Missions at Santa Barbara and San Juan Capistrano have experience with rebuilding adobe structures. This is not a simple process, must be undertaken by archeological masons skilled in the specific time period⁴⁵, and of course destroys much historical detail despite the level of care taken. This is not just a matter of popping the structure onto an airport luggage transport tram!

44 Appendix K, Section 5.15.4, bullet point 2, page 108

45 has LAWA consulted with any of these specialists about what is truly involved?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding impacts to the Centinela Adobe.

PC00255-4

Comment:

The EIR acknowledges the substantial impacts to the Centinela Adobe of the Alternatives under consideration, but then cavalierly dismisses them. In an area of the country where we have little depth of history to begin with, LAWA's cavalcade of progress would wipe out our treasures from the past.

The historical impact of this proposal is too severe. The LAX Master Plan is out of line with resources in the area.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding impacts to the Centinela Adobe.

PC00256

Poyourow, Joanne

None Provided

6/1/2001

PC00256-1

Comment:

EIR Subsection 4.17.1
Renewable Energy Sources

LAWA gives lip service to alternative energy with a 4 color bar graph proclaiming their "alternative fuel" consumption projection. Yet every one of the alternative fuels highlighted in this banner display are produced from gas wells, or in conjunction with crude oil production or petroleum refining, i.e. are from non-renewable energy sources.⁴⁶

LAWA's "Environmental Action Plan"⁴⁷ is so minute in its true impact as to be laughable.

What programs does LAWA have toward transitioning their volume and operations to sustainable energy resources, renewable energy sources, fuels derived from biomass feedstock, non-fossil and non-petroleum feedstocks?

LAWA downplays the difference between sustainable and depletable energy sources. They would have us believe that their use of "alternative fuels (CNG, LNG and propane)" is a heroic departure from "petroleum-based fuels"⁴⁸ In fact, both fuel sources remain firmly in the non-renewable category.

No matter how you slice it, the environmental impact of all three Alternatives under study is a dramatically greater draw on fossil fuels, something our society can ill afford.

3. Comments and Responses

As a world leader in the transportation industry, LAWA has a societal obligation to lead the parade toward sustainable fuel sources.

46 reference http://www.afdc.nrel.gov/altfuel/gas_general.html for LNG and CNG, and http://www.afdc.nrel.gov/altfuel/lpg_general.html for Propane.

47 EIR section 4.17.1, page 4-778

48 this contrast is made in EIR section 4.17.1, bottom of page 4-778, second-to-last paragraph

Response:

While still derived from non-renewable petroleum resources, alternative fuels to be used on-site per the Master Plan are intended to reduce air pollutant emissions and increase energy efficiency; "alternative fuels" are not necessarily "renewable" energy sources. Pages 4-778 and 4-782 of the Draft EIS/EIR describe how LAWA will participate in the Green Power for a Green LA program through a Green Power agreement with LADWP. Under the agreement, LAWA agrees to purchase electricity exclusively from LADWP, while LADWP agrees to promote green power by purchasing electricity generated from renewable natural resources, including wind energy, solar energy and, potentially, biomass. In addition, Table S4.6-18, Recommended Mitigation Measure Components, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR includes a measure to install solar panels on parking structure rooftops, where feasible, to supply electricity or hot water to airport facilities.

PC00256-2

Comment:

This Master Plan falls substantially short of its stated purpose and objectives to "provide [airport capacity] in an environmentally sound manner."49

49 EIR section 2.1, paragraph 1

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00257

Poyourow, Joanne

None Provided

6/1/2001

PC00257-1

Comment:

EIR Subsection 5, page 5-16, item MM-ST-1
Emerson off-ramp

The EIR touts the fact that the off-ramp from the airport ring road to Emerson Street will be right-turn only, as if that makes it better. Any Emerson offramp from a high-volume ring road will destroy a neighborhood. It will dump vehicles into the residential neighborhood between LAX and Manchester. And it will invite airport traffic to cut-through the Westchester residential neighborhoods north of Manchester Blvd.50

Emerson Street is a low-volume little street in a residential neighborhood. This proposed off-ramp would take vehicles past a preschool, a church, a grade school, and many single family residences.

If vehicles elect to continue on Emerson beyond Manchester, they would pass a community center, another grade school, multiple single family dwellings.

An Emerson offramp would have vehicles zipping past these residences.

Traffic from the Emerson offramp would pour past this church and connected elementary school

3. Comments and Responses

Emerson, to 83rd street east, and out to Sepulveda, creates a handy cut-through for those who wish to access the Culver City area, or bypass the ridiculous loop-around of the LAX Expressway.

photo shows low-volume intersection of Emerson and 83rd, looking toward Sepulveda

Emerson, to 83rd, street west, and out to Lincoln provides a handy route for residents of Playa Vista, Marina del Rey, and other beach

communities. If there is any slow-down on Manchester at all (delays at traffic lights, construction, etc.) you can be sure that people will use these small residential streets in volume!

An Emerson offramp of ANY form will destroy these neighborhoods. It will invite the kind of traffic issues that have Braddock Street in Culver City constructing speed bumps, traffic circles, additional stop sign intersections. Even with all these constructs, Braddock Street still receives incredible volume cutting through to Sepulveda.

50 This cut-through activity is already acknowledged by LAWA at EIR 4.3.2, page 4-296. The LAX Expressway would be no solution; this issue is discussed in another Public Comments form.

Response:

The mitigation plan includes provision of a westbound off-ramp only, from the Ring Road to Emerson Street. This is the only access provided between Emerson and the Ring Road. It was included strictly to provide the residents living along Emerson an additional route to get home from I-405, in addition to La Tijera. Because of the location of Emerson relative to the other streets in the area, and the location of the off-ramp, it is not expected that this ramp would encourage any "cut-through" traffic on Emerson. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00257-2

Comment:

The Westchester neighborhood that LAWA is proposing to destroy in this fashion is a family neighborhood. Kids ride bikes and scooters on these streets, and walk to school. People jog, and walk their dogs here. The elderly stroll along these streets. This is not the place to dump high volume traffic from an Expressway!

The impact of any offramp at or near Emerson Street on this neighborhood is too significant to be tolerated.

Response:

This content of this comment is similar to comments PC02189-3 and PC01250-5. Please see Response to Comments PC02189-3 regarding Westchester and Response to Comment PC01250-5 regarding Emerson Street. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00258

Poyourow, Joanne

None Provided

6/1/2001

PC00258-1

Comment:

EIR Subsection 4.6, page 4-459
Greenhouse Gasses

The Worldwatch Institute says: "Airplanes can be especially fuel-inefficient . . . they are the primary source of heat-trapping greenhouse gas emissions from humans that are deposited directly in the upper atmosphere, and scientists have noted that these emissions have a greater warming effect than they would have if they were released at the surface."49

3. Comments and Responses

The Union of Concerned Scientists evaluates airborne environmental impact in two categories, Air Pollution and Greenhouse Gasses.⁵⁰ Your EIR touts your commitments and mitigations under SCAQMD and emissions of "five criteria pollutants."⁵¹ This pertains to Air Pollution. What are you doing about Greenhouse Gasses?

49 page 111, State of the World 2001, the Worldwatch Institute, ISBN 0-393-32082-0

50 The Union of Concerned Scientists

51 EIR Section 4.6 page 4-459

Response:

Both the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of the LAX Master Plan alternatives on airport-related emissions in Section 4.6, Air Quality. From this data and information, some important insights are evident in connection with the potential impact on greenhouse gases. As discussed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, operational emissions of the five EPA criteria pollutants (CO, VOC, NOx, SO2 and PM10) are all shown to decline with the adoption of Alternative D (the LAWA-staff preferred alternative) when compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative. Serving as surrogates to CO2, methane and water vapor, the emissions of CO, VOC and NOx are also themselves considered greenhouse gases. Therefore, the expected decline in these airport-related criteria air pollutants portends a similar decrease in greenhouse gases associated with LAX when compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative. Moreover, LAWA is fully committed to its air pollution mitigation program that aims to reduce the dependence on fossil fueled equipment and vehicles at LAX. The phasing in of low- and no-emitting GSE and the incentivized use of electric-powered vehicles are two such examples that will also help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It is worth noting that the environmental effects of aircraft-generated greenhouse gases are the greatest when they are emitted at high (i.e. cruise) altitudes (i.e. 25,000 to 35,000 ft.). The proposed LAX Master Plan will have no impact on aircraft operations, or emission rates, when the aircraft are at cruise altitudes.

PC00258-2

Comment:

How do your Alternatives A, B, C measure up in terms of the 6 major greenhouse gasses, most notably carbon dioxide? How does the increased volume portrayed in your Alternatives A, B, C, measure up to what is quickly becoming the world standard of 6-8% below 1990 emissions levels of greenhouse gasses?⁵²

⁵² reference the Kyoto Protocol, implementation called for by United Nations by 2008- 2012, which is well within your project timeline. Source of my information http://www.state.gov/www/global/oes/fs_kyoto_climate_980115.html Despite current U.S. political climate, the European Union and Australia are carrying this forward to become a world standard. There will be some standard of this caliber incorporated into U.S. law during the duration of the LAX Master Plan.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00258-1 regarding the topic of greenhouse gases.

PC00258-3

Comment:

What are your commitments and mitigations to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00258-1 regarding the topic of greenhouse gases.

PC00258-4

Comment:

Many of your international travelers come from countries that are already committed to positive action on this issue⁵⁵. As a member of the world market, how do you plan to support their efforts? What commitments and assurances can you offer to them?

Other members of the international aviation community are already active in this regard.⁵⁶ Where is LAWA?

⁵⁵ For United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change list of countries that have ratified the treaty to date, see <http://www.unfccc.de/resource/convkp.html>

⁵⁶ The Pew Center on Global Climate Change lists as members of its Business Environmental Leadership Council such aviation industry giants as Boeing and Lockheed/Martin (May 2001). See <http://www.pewclimate.org/index.html>. For the text of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's special report "Aviation and the Global Atmosphere" see <http://www.ipcc.ch/>

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00258-1 regarding the topic of greenhouse gases.

PC00258-5

Comment:

If this plan is truly to uphold its stated objective of "an environmentally sound manner,"⁵⁷ LAWA must make some attempt to bring CO2 emissions from its volume and operations into compliance.

"World airports" call for world-class responsibility and world-level leadership in response to world-class issues. Can you "reduce some of the impacts below the level at which they would be considered significant"⁵⁸ by the United Nations?

⁵⁷ The Purpose and Objectives of the Proposed Project, EIR section 2.1, first paragraph

⁵⁸ quoting your paragraph 1 under EIR Section 4.6

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00258-1 regarding the topic of greenhouse gases.

PC00259 Poyourow, Joanne None Provided 6/1/2001

PC00259-1

Comment:

EIR Page 1-23
"Losses" are a scare tactic

The EIR ominously threatens: "there is a chance that future growth in international service - and the jobs and investment stimulated by this activity - could be lost to airports outside the region, perhaps outside the state."⁵⁷

Yet elsewhere, the EIR states clearly: "LAX . . . is projected to remain as the region's primary international airport, with or without any expansion of facilities."⁵⁸

LAWA is using scare tactics to get us to let them go ahead with a bad plan. They're trying to scare us that the LA area might lose jobs & revenues if we don't get behind LAWA's ill-conceived expansion plan.

3. Comments and Responses

But then LAWA contradicts itself when it admits that the economy & demand for air transport in the LA area is only going to increase.⁵⁹ With or without their expansion plan!

The fact is, there will be no losses. LA demand is not going to decrease. If world demand for air transport is going out of sight like LAWA would have us believe, then even if some companies transfer business to Burbank, Denver, etc., the new demand of other companies will take up the slack!

There will be no net decrease to the City of Los Angeles, even if we decline LAWA's poorly designed Master Plan

"the airlines, and not government, make the decision about which airports they will serve."⁶²

LAWA sounds laughably pathetic about this one. If it were really an issue, if LAWA really feared that major airlines would abandon LA, they would have flooded us with reports, statistics, analyses, graphics, about what if this airline left, what if that one left, what would be the impact? But they gave us no such statistics, which means they really didn't lose any sleep over this issue. Again, they are just trying to scare the reader.

Similarly, several times LAWA cries about losing business and freight. But then they reveal that 50% of LAX users are leisure travelers!⁶³

In short, we cannot believe LAWA's threats about losses to the LA area, because there just won't be any. Even if we reject their outrageous expansion plan.

⁵⁷ EIR section 1.2.3, page 1-23, paragraph 3.

⁵⁸ EIR section 1.2.2.1, page 1-17 paragraph 2. Emphasis added.

⁵⁹ LAX Master Plan, page 1-4.4

⁶² EIR section 1.2.2 page 1-14, first full paragraph

⁶³ EIR section 1.3.4 final page paragraph, 1-29

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00260

Poyourow, Joanne

None Provided

6/1/2001

PC00260-1

Comment:

EIR Subsection 3.1.1.2
Growth constraints at LAX

The EIR says about other local airports: "These airports each have growth constraints arising from some combination of limited physical size; physical, man-made, or natural impediments to expansion; policy limits imposed by ordinances, plans or agreements of the local jurisdiction that operates the airport; capacity limits on surface transportation facilities; and various environmental problems."⁶⁵

And LAX does too! LAX faces just as many growth constraints as other local airports.

LAX has limited physical size. It has already had to reject several Alternatives including ones which involved runway expansion into the Pacific Ocean. LAWA felt compelled to publish 133 pages66 trying to explain away the environmental issues surrounding land use.

65 EIR sec 3.1.1.2, paragraph 2, page 3-2

66 page count, EIR section on Land Use

Response:

LAX faces growth constraints and limited physical size. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative - Alternative D, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. Analysis of Alternative D was contained in the Draft Master Plan Addendum and in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, is designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport capacity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. Alternative D would make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient, and would have the fewest negative impacts to local communities and the region. The No Action/No Project Alternative examined the capacity of all of the airport components and defined the maximum level of activity (approximately 78.9 MAP) that could be accommodated at LAX without improvements. See Chapter V, Concept Development, Section 3.3.2 of the Draft LAX Master Plan and Chapter 3, Alternative D Constrained Activity, Section 3.1 of the Draft Master Plan Addendum for more information on the activity and constraints associated with each alternative. The analysis in the Land Use section of the Draft EIS/EIR followed the guidelines outlined in Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Order 5050.4A, Airport Environmental Handbook.

PC00260-2

Comment:

LAX has severe accessibility constraints as represented by the greater LA Basin freeway infrastructure. It is certainly up against "capacity limits on surface transportation facilities."

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PC00260-3

Comment:

LAX also has "various environmental problems" in the El Segundo dunes and the Centinela Adobe, to name a few.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding potential impacts to the Centinela Adobe associated with one of the proposed LAX Expressway alternatives and Topical Response TR-ET-1 regarding potential impacts to the El Segundo blue butterfly. Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00260-4

Comment:

The local policy limits that LAWA asserts about other local airports⁶⁷ will lessen considerably as the potential passengers from these geographical areas get fed up with LA Basin freeway traffic.

While LAWA does bring to light some of the sticking-points to full regional development, none of the items listed is justification for overdevelopment of a single airport site (LAX) to the detriment of others.

We must work to develop the region as a whole.

67 in Section 1.2.2.2 section 1.2.2.4, section 1.2.2.5 and section 1.2.2.6

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00261 Poyourow, Joanne None Provided 6/1/2001

PC00261-1

Comment:

EIR Subsection 4.2
LAX Northside access

The Master Plan touts roads that "would provide access for the Westchester community to Southside facilities.⁷⁰" This one should be read in reverse: The roadway system LAWA has designed would provide thoroughfares through Westchester residential neighborhoods for the 6,340-7,000 Southside vehicles.

70 Master Plan page V-Q-2 paragraph 2

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of Master Plan Alternatives on the community of Westchester.

PC00261-2

Comment:

LAWA has slipped into their Massive Plan certain land use approvals on a development they have been calling LAX Northside. With a subtle name change, now calling it "Westchester Southside", LAWA would fold airport related business and bustling hotels into quiet residential neighborhoods.

The Westchester neighborhoods that parallel the proposed parcels are communities of single family residences, schools and churches. This is no place for the hustle and bustle of a hotel. This is no place for the traffic of rental car agencies. This is no place for "light industrial". No place for "airport support" which for all we know could be machine shops.

LAX Northside does not meet [Q] conditions of "uniformity of development"⁷¹. The LAX Northside proposal is out of line with the adjoining residential neighborhood!

Ordinance 159,526 [Q] conditions have already dictated to LAWA that their traffic volume from Westchester Southside must be under 6,340 to 7,000 vehicle trips per day.⁷² But 6,340 to 7,000 vehicles is too many for these neighborhoods! These are low volume narrow streets, with children and dogs playing on the sidewalks, and elders taking a daily stroll. This is not the place of 6,340 to 7,000 vehicles per day!

71 {Q} Condition requirement, per EIR page 4-93, first paragraph

72 For some unexplained reason the number of inbound trips is 570 vehicles less than the amount of outbound trips. Also, who would police this, if LAWA slipped in extra traffic volume?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 for a discussion of measures that would be incorporated into LAX Northside/Westchester Southside to ensure compatibility with Westchester neighborhoods to the north. As described in Table 4.2-16 of the Draft EIS/EIR, under Westchester Southside, R&D/Business Park uses are proposed on Lot 7 (generally bounded by Cum Laude Avenue to the west, 91st Street to the north, Reyford Drive to the east, and Westchester Parkway to the south) and Lot 9 (generally bounded by La Tijera to the west and north, Loyola Boulevard to the east, and Westchester Parkway to the south). Under the current [Q] conditions, development in Lot 7 would include a 15 foot landscape buffer setback along Cum Laude Avenue and 92nd Street, adjacent to St. Bernard high school. In addition, all structures would be set back a minimum of 50 feet from the north airport property line between Loyola Boulevard and Hastings Boulevard. There would also be additional height and use restrictions. As described in Section 4.2.6 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the LAX Zone/LAX Specific Plan for Westchester Southside would provide additional development and performance standards, which would incorporate the requirements of existing [Q] conditions, to the extent feasible to ensure that the level of environmental protection afforded by the full set of [Q] conditions is maintained or increased. No airport support uses are proposed for these areas.

The types of airport support uses allowed in Lot 4 would be revised and updated under the LAX Zone/LAX Specific Plan and would not include airfreight uses. As described in Table 4.2-3 and shown on Figure 4.2-4, Light Industrial uses would be developed on Lots 1 and 2 as a Research Park and would include a 15 foot landscaped buffer between Falmouth Avenue and Pershing Drive and along Cum Laude Avenue and 92nd Street, adjacent to St. Bernard High School. In addition, a minimum setback would be provided for airport structures 100 feet from the north airport property boundary between Falmouth Avenue and Pershing Drive and a minimum setback of 50 feet would be provided for all structures north of the airport property line between Loyola Boulevard and Hastings Boulevard. There would also be height and use restrictions imposed on Lots 1 and 2 under existing [Q] conditions. The LAX Zone/LAX Specific Plan would provide additional development and performance standards, which will incorporate the requirements of existing [Q] conditions, to the extent feasible to ensure that the level of environmental protection afforded by the full set of [Q] conditions is maintained or increased.

Regarding traffic of rental car agencies impacting Westchester neighborhoods, as presented in Section 3.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 3.3.2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, under the build alternatives rental car facilities are planned to be consolidated on airport property, but not within LAX Northside/Westchester Southside. In addition, as described in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation (subsection 4.2.3.6) of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, roadway improvements proposed for the build alternatives would direct airport traffic away from neighborhood streets. As also discussed in Topical Response TR-LU-2, impacted intersections would not be located in the proximity to LAUSD schools in the Westchester Community and a Neighborhood Traffic Management Program would assist specific neighborhoods in implementing measures to protect their residential streets from intrusion of airport-related traffic.

Traffic impacts resulting from development of LAX Northside/Westchester Southside and roadway capacity were also analyzed in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation (subsection 4.2.3.6) of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and presented in Topical Response TR-ST-7. As further explained in Subtopical Response TR-ST-7, the 6,340 inbound trips refers to project-generated trips in the AM Peak Hour and 7,000 outbound trips refers to project-generated trips during

3. Comments and Responses

the PM Peak Hour. The addition of the word "daily" is a typographical error, which has since been corrected in the Final EIS/EIR. As shown on Table 4.2-16 of the Draft EIS/EIR, development of Westchester Southside, under Alternatives A, B, and C would reduce the PM Peak Hour of outbound vehicles to 3,060. As described in Section 3.3.2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, under Alternative D, the total amount of traffic generation associated with development of LAX Northside would be reduced to the same level of daily vehicle trips that would have resulted from development of Westchester Southside through implementation of a vehicle trip cap. The traffic volume associated with the development of LAX Northside/Westchester Southside was based on trip generation factors associated with the type of development proposed. Traffic generation would also be defined and monitored as a condition of approval for project development.

PC00261-3

Comment:

The Master Plan reveals LAWA's plan to extend La Tierra to create access to LAX Northside⁷³. The EIR has an Emerson offramp from the airport ring road⁷⁴. The Master Plan implies that the plans for LAX Northside connections to tiny residential streets such as Stanmoor and Rayford are likely⁷⁵.

⁷³ Master Plan page V-Q-2, paragraph 2

⁷⁴ EIR section 5, page 5-16, item MM-ST-I

⁷⁵ reference Master Plan V-Q.2 paragraph, quoted at opening to this Public Comment form.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00261-4

Comment:

LAWA has selected land uses for their LAX Northside parcels that make the project part of the airport, not part of Westchester. Since it's part of the airport, make it part of the airport. LAX Northside should be a limited-access project, accessible only by the major arterials of La Tierra, Pershing and Lincoln.

Response:

See Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects associated with development of the LAX Northside area, including limitations on street access. See also Topical Response TR-ST-7 for further discussion of LAX Northside traffic.

PC00261-5

Comment:

All connections to the residential neighborhoods should be permanently closed off. Trees and landscaping berms⁷⁶ should be permanently installed where the LAX Northside property adjoins with Falmouth, Stanmoor, Rayford, and Emerson. Only permanent physical, visual and sound barriers will protect the residences from the airport-related LAX Northside development.

Any other solution is too substantial an adverse impact on these little neighborhoods.

⁷⁶ like those along 88th street, between Emerson and McConnell, so prominently featured in Photo 2 at EIR Appendix K, section 4.17 These berms should continue across Falmouth, Stanmoor, Rayford, and Emerson, sealing the openings such as the one displayed in Photo 1 at EIR Appendix K, section 4.17

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-6 for a discussion of these issues. Note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or the Ring Road. The potential traffic impacts of the Master Plan

alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00262 Poyourow, Joanne None Provided 6/1/2001

PC00262-1

Comment:

Master Plan Figure 1-3.5
Historical advantages

LAWA touts LAX's history as a reason for expanding this airport site. This is absurd.

LAWA uses charts⁷⁸ to show us LAX's past dominance over air travel in the Southern California area. We know that LAX has dominated the market. And we need to change that, not perpetuate it.

Master Plan Figure 1-3.5 is meaningless to the future. This Figure simply shows LAX's historical monopoly, and the fact that prior to 1994 there was no need to develop other area airports. Times have changed.

LAWA tells us that airport demand for passenger transportation is a "trend line that closely tracks employment and population." This "trend" for using LAX will quickly alter when accessibility becomes an issue. Passenger demand for LAX will quickly plateau, and may taper off, when it becomes impossible to get to the airport to use it.

The LAX Master Plan indicates that population and economic growth in other counties will exceed that in LA County⁷⁹. If population growth in other areas is greater, then why are we considering a plan to overdevelop an airport in this area?⁸⁰

There is no reason to perpetuate LAX's history of dominance when the future is going to be different. Rather than proceeding with a flawed plan that seems designed with the sole objective of maintaining LAX dominance in the region, we need to develop other airports in the area.

⁷⁸ like the bar graph at Master Plan Figure 1-3.5 .

⁷⁹ Master Plan 1-4.4

⁸⁰ discussion of the flaws in LAWAs assertion of greater growth constraints at other local airports is covered in a different Public Comments form.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00263

Poyourow, Joanne

None Provided

6/1/2001

PC00263-1

Comment:

EIR Appendix K, Figure 3.2-4 and -8
Westchester interchanges

The LAX Master Plan would wipe out the heart of Westchester village with massive interchanges and/or cloverleaves.

The stretch of Sepulveda depicted in "Segment C" of both Figures 3.2-4 and 3.2-8 is the heart of Westchester's "business district". Land acquisitions would take out much of the area⁸¹. Noise, traffic, and general proximity to such a major thoroughfare would render the rest of the area unpleasant and undesirable.

Westchester is an all-American neighborhood. This is a community that has the kind of neighborliness that generates an annual Fourth of July parade and Christmas Parade. The Boy Scouts and Indian Guides are huge here, as are school- and kid- centered activities. Many retired people live here. Mom & pop businesses abound. This is apple-pie America, and LAWA wants to wipe it out with massive freeway interchanges.

81 Master Plan Figure 4.2-11

Response:

As disclosed in Appendix K of the Draft EIS/EIR, the proposed SR-1 intersection improvements (if adopted and carried forward as part of an LAX Master Plan alternative), would require the acquisition of both commercial and residential property to allow for its construction. However, the majority of existing businesses and residences along Sepulveda Boulevard would remain in place and would continue to prosper in light of improved circulation patterns resulting from the proposed improvements. The newly-widened Arbor Vitae Street would be aligned to the immediate south of the remaining Westchester residences located south of La Tijera Boulevard and east of Sepulveda Boulevard. Land use impacts to the intersection of Sepulveda Boulevard and Arbor Vitae Street in Westchester are identified in Section 3.2, State Route 1 Improvements and Alternatives, of Appendix K of the Draft EIS/EIR. Noise impacts to remaining businesses and residents were also discussed in Section 5.6, Noise, of Appendix K of the Draft EIS/EIR. Also, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures have been recommended upon implementation of the proposed off-airport roadway improvements, including the interchange at this intersection. Implementation of the proposed LAX Expressway and SR-1 intersection improvements (if adopted and carried forward as part of an LAX Master Plan alternative), would result in less congested local streets by providing more direct access and egress to and from the airport terminals for airport traffic. The SR-1 interchange improvements are intended to avoid misguided use of neighborhood streets to access the airport, which is an existing problem. A discussion of traffic circulation pattern impacts resulting from the LAX Master Plan alternatives was provided in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Further, a discussion of incompatible land use impacts was provided in subsections 4.2.6, Environmental Consequences, of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00263-2

Comment:

LAWA wants to put 6 lane highways between residences⁸², send volume offramps shooting onto tiny streets of houses⁸³, and put big hotels and light industrial buildings in residential zones⁸⁴.

These plans will destroy the heart of Westchester. They yield substantial adverse impact to far more families than the limited count LAWA provides in their reports. They will devastate neighborhoods.

This Master Plan is, plain and simply, out of line with the surrounding community.

82 Arbor Vitae expansion
83 Emerson offramp from LAX ring road
84 EIR Table 4.2-3

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed land use compatibility, community disruption, and surface transportation in Section 4.2, Land Use, Section 4.4.4, Community Disruption and Alteration of Surface Transportation Patterns, and Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix K and Technical Reports 1 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-1 and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As presented in Section 4.3.2.6.2 and Appendix K of the Draft EIS/EIR the Arbor Vitae interchange and other improvements associated with the LAX Expressway and ring road would not split residential neighborhoods and send traffic onto local streets but rather would direct airport traffic, particularly to the north away from residential streets. Access to the ring road under Alternatives A, B, and C would not be provided from Emerson Avenue but rather would connect the LAX Expressway at Arbor Vitae Street to the airport terminal areas. As further described in Section 4.4.2, Land Use and Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR, residential acquisition associated with the ring-road proposed under Alternatives A, B, and C would occur along the northern edge of the airport and would not split residential neighborhoods. The acquired areas would be used for right-of-way, open space and landscaped berms, no hotels or light industrial buildings are proposed in this area. Similarly, as described in Appendix K, Supplemental Evaluation for LAX Expressway and State Route 1 Improvements of the Draft EIS/EIR, under the same alternatives, residential acquisition associated with the LAX Expressway would occur along the rights-of-way of existing freeways or major arterials at the edge of residential areas. In contrast to the other build alternatives, Alternative D, LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative, does not include proposals for the LAX Expressway, ring-road, or residential acquisition.

Regarding overall effects on Westchester neighborhoods, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2.

PC00264 Poyourow, Joanne None Provided 6/1/2001

PC00264-1

Comment:

EIR Figure 4.2-4 and Table 4.2-3
Golf Course

The Westchester Golf Course is one of the few remaining public open spaces in Westchester. And it is pretty clear that LAWA plans to build upon this piece of property.

The current "Westchester Southside" map includes a portion of the golf course⁸⁴, and it is a sure bet that the remainder of this community-cherished open space will soon go the same way.

The EIR makes a big show of the golf course on page 4-89 by designating it "Area 1" at the top of the list of zoning restrictions. Yet it is notable that the Westchester public golf course is not given a separate lot designation on Figure 4.2-4 and Table 4.2-3, but rather portrayed as "lot 12B". It appears as a footnote appendage to Lot 12A at Table 4.2-3, which notes in very contingent language: "assumed to be allocated for the golf course." Reading between the lines, this acreage will not be kept off the "Westchester Center" map for long.

Furthermore, in Figure 4.2-4, LAWA has already taken a portion of this precious open space. The portion of the golf course that borders Westchester Parkway has been scooped into their Lot 12A, as part of their hotel/restaurant/office complex⁸⁵.

84 EIR Figure 4.2-4

3. Comments and Responses

85 Comparison of Figure 4.2-3 and Figure 4.2-4 reveals 2 different shapes for the golf course lot. In figure 4.2-4, the southern third of the golf course is chopped off, and a minor sliver of land off to the side has been substituted into Lot 12B. This is hardly a fair substitute!

Response:

Figure 4.2-4 of the Draft EIS/EIR showed the Northside approved tentative tract No. 34836, of which the Westchester Golf Course is a part. The Final Tract Map for the subdivision of the Northside area shows the Westchester Golf Course is a part of Parcel 13. The current zoning for the Westchester Golf Course is OS-1-XL as shown in Figure 4.2-3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and indicated on page 4-89 of the Draft EIS/EIR. As indicated in the Land Use Technical Report in Appendix 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR, Ordinance No. 169,768, which was approved April 6, 1994, amended the zoning of the golf course from [T][Q] C2-1 to Open Space (OS-1-XL). Parcels 12A and 12B shown on Figure 4.2-5 constitute approximately 102 acres, of which the golf course occupies approximately 78 acres, as indicated in the footnote 7 on Table 4.2-3 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Approximately 24 acres of Parcel 12 of the Northside Plan on Parcel 12 could be developed with commercial uses, which would occur to the east of the golf course. As indicated in Section 4.26, Parks and Recreation, on page 4-1198, of the Draft EIS/EIR, the Westchester Golf Course currently comprises 69 acres. As indicated on page 4-1203 of the Draft EIS/EIR, development of the Westchester Southside includes expansion of the existing Westchester Golf Course by approximately six acres. This same expansion of the golf course would occur under Alternative D, LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative. As demonstrated by the above and in Section 4.2, Land Use and Section 4.26.3, Parks and Recreation of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the golf course would remain as open space.

PC00264-2

Comment:

The Westchester public golf course is one of the last remaining public open spaces in an area that is already short of park space. Comparable communities, such as El Segundo and Culver City, have many parks, each with unique neighborhood flavor. Westchester has none of these, and no green belts in the public domain. The golf course and adjoining recreation area are all we have.

We need more public open space in Westchester, not less!

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed parks and recreation impacts in Section 4.26.3, Parks and Recreation. While there would be a limited increase in demand for park and recreational facilities largely due to off-peak lunchtime passive use by LAX employees, parks and recreation areas would be expanded by approximately 11 acres under Alternatives A, B and C. As discussed in the Draft EIS/EIR under Alternatives A, B, and C, Westchester Golf Course would be expanded by six acres, Carl E. Nielson Youth Park would be expanded by five acres; and additional recreational opportunities would be provided by bike paths, greenbelts, and a possible new park within Westchester Southside. By law, however, in the event of conflicting needs, highest priority on land use must be given to the aeronautical uses of airport property. As described in Section 4.26.3, Parks and Recreation, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, impacts on parks would also be less than significant. While Alternative D would not expand Carl E. Nielson Youth Park, it would generate even less demand for parks than the other build alternatives and would still include expansion of the Westchester Golf Course and provision of a bikeway and other recreational amenities within LAX Northside. Also please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00264-3

Comment:

In evaluating whether LAWA's LAX Northside development has met the Ordinance 159,526 [Q] conditions "to mitigate potential effects on surrounding uses and ensure uniformity of development"⁹², LAWA should be required to double Westchester's 1996 Baseline public open space.⁹³

Converting any part of Westchester's last remaining public open space is absolutely intolerable.

This is a significant impact to the neighborhood in terms of conversion of land use.

92 Description of [Q] conditions per EIR section 4.2, page 4-93

93 The developers of the downtown LA Sports and Entertainment District, near the Staples Center, just promised park space within their development to local residents. Reference LA Times, Saturday, June 2, 2001, Business section page 1, "Staples plan spotlights invisible communities"

Response:

As described on page 4-93 of the Draft EIS/EIR, LAX Northside is an approved project. The purpose of the [Q] conditions of Ordinance 159,526 is to provide additional building height, setback, landscaping, and other development restrictions to the underlying zoning designations. The purposes for the additional restrictions are twofold: 1) to mitigate the potential effects on surrounding uses; and, 2) to ensure uniformity of development. Please see Response to Comment PC00264-1, which indicates that the Westchester Golf Course would remain as open space and would not be converted to a commercial use. Also note that Westchester golf course would be expanded by six acres under all of the build alternatives and Carl E. Neilson Youth Park would be expanded under Alternatives A, B, and C by five acres. The impacts of the proposed project on parks are less than significant as described in Section 4.26.3, Parks and Recreation (CEQA) of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Mitigation measures, such as the provision of park or recreational land, are not required to address less than significant impacts.

PC00265

Poyourow, Joanne

None Provided

6/1/2001

PC00265-1

Comment:

EIR Subsection 1.2.1.2
Accessibility

"The concept of 'market accessibility' applies not only to the distance a passenger must travel, but also to the traffic conditions of the road system and the availability of alternative modes of travel to and from the airport."85

Passengers will go where the combination of ground accessibility and airline schedules is most convenient."86

85 EIR section 1.2.1.2, page 1-13

86 Master Plan section 3.1.2 page 1-3.5

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00265-2

Comment:

LAX has met its capacity. And its capacity is being defined by its accessibility (or lack thereof).

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative - Alternative D, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, is designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport capacity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative and is consistent with the policy framework, of the SCAG 2001 RTP to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. Alternative D would make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient, and would have the fewest negative impacts to local communities and the region. Analysis of Alternative D was contained in the Master Plan Addendum and in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The No Action/No Project Alternative examined the capacity of all of the airport components and defined the maximum level of activity (approximately 78.9 MAP) that could be accommodated at LAX without improvements. For a discussion of the impacts to the surface transportation system, please see Sections 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, and 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00265-3

Comment:

As freeway loads get drastically worse around the LA basin⁸⁷, passengers and freight haulers will quickly look to alternatives to fighting the gridlock to use this airport site. People will book flights using other area airports.

⁸⁷ EIR Section 4.3.2.6.1 projects year 2015 traffic speeds of 12 miles per 60 minutes

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. As a correction to the comment, subsection 4.3.2.6.1 of the Draft EIS/EIR described average freeway speeds to be 23 miles per hour (mph) in year 2020, based on the 1998 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) assembled by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG).

PC00265-4

Comment:

LAWA tells us that airlines will go where the passenger demand is. Well, the airlines will follow the passengers, resulting in a grand exodus away from the gridlock, away from LAX, toward the other area airports.

Most areas of the LA Basin are close to another area airport. Many areas are in closer proximity to another airport than to LAX.⁸⁸ As traffic gridlock around LAX and the overall LA Basin worsens, the inaccessibility of LAX will cause people to select other airports.

⁸⁸ reference EIR Figure 1-3

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00265-5**Comment:**

The Master Plan seems to rely on SCAG/RTP highway projects on freeway sections near LAX⁸⁹. Yet EIR Figure 4.3.2-4 demonstrates that these road improvement projects won't help. There will still be gridlock, given the volume that LAWA plans to dump onto our freeways⁹⁰.

SCAG/RTP highway projects are in the works that will improve traffic flow to Ontario, Burbank, Long Beach, and San Bernardino. Therefore these other area airports, with the benefit of better accessibility than LAX, will receive even more of the area's air business. Passengers and freight shippers will select them for proximity and accessibility.

⁸⁹ Master Plan 4.3.3. These plans are presumably already incorporated into EIR Figure 4.3.2-4 and didn't help a bit!

⁹⁰ freeways currently at LOS-F are projected to receive additional airport vehicle volume of 5,668 to 7,621 vehicles per hour (per comparison of EIR Table 4.3.1-4, Table 4.3.1-10 and Table 4.3.1-12). reference my Public Comment form on LOS-F roadways.

Response:

Please refer to Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. The LAX Master Plan, if implemented, would provide major investments that would greatly improve operations on the freeway system. These proposed improvements would receive airport funding only if the LAX Master Plan is approved. The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00265-6**Comment:**

Master Plan 4.3.4 indicates that rail may one day connect all the areas. This is great, but the rail isn't here yet. And since the rail will connect all the area airports, it will improve area accessibility to other airports just as much as it will improve accessibility to LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

PC00265-7**Comment:**

Overwhelmingly, LAX has met its capacity. Its capacity is being defined by the site of the airport, the fact that it is located in the heart of a city that relies on its freeways. LAX cannot grow bigger than its site; it cannot exceed the capacity of the freeways and "off-airport surface transportation" in the greater LA Basin.

This Master Plan far exceeds the area's full portfolio of resources.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative - Alternative D, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, is designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport capacity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. Alternative D would make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient, and would have the fewest negative impacts to local communities and the region. Analysis of Alternative D was contained in the Draft Master Plan addendum and in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The No

3. Comments and Responses

Action/No Project Alternative examined the capacity of all of the airport components and defined the maximum level of activity (approximately 78.9 MAP) that could be accommodated at LAX without improvements. For a discussion of the impacts to the surface transportation system, please see Sections 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, and 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels.

PC00266

Poyourow, Joanne

None Provided

6/1/2001

PC00266-1

Comment:

EIR Tech Report 2B, Section I.B.
Traffic Analysis Zones

The geographic scope of the LAX Master Plan's off-airport traffic mitigation efforts is entirely insufficient.

In Technical Report 2B, someone has gone to great lengths to define different zones around LAX: the LAX Area, the Focus Area, the Framework Model Area, the Buffer Area and the Outlying [sic] Area. As the entirety of Technical Report 2B seems to be about the setting up and testing of the models, there is no indication of the results derived from the study.

In particular, I find nowhere in the EIR the results of LAWA's analysis of Alternative A, B, C's impact on traffic in the geographical areas that Technical Report 2B places in "3. The Framework Model Area" and "4. The Buffer Area".⁹⁵ The Alternatives A, B, C represent such massive changes that their impact will be felt farther than the narrow area that EIR Technical Report 2B has defined as its model dimensions "Focus Area".

For example, the map on EIR Figure 4.3.2-4 stops at what is basically the border of "the Focus Area"⁹⁶, yet it shows red-marked "more airport traffic with project" freeways extending beyond the borders of the display. Since these same areas of freeway are shown at EIR Figure 4.3.2-2 as Level of Service F, it is significant that the adverse impact the project will have on these roadways is being downplayed!

The EIR focuses on traffic impacts on surface streets in the immediate geographical area of the airport. However, the EIR skillfully avoids directly stating the traffic impact their Plan will have on the LA freeway grid.

LAWA thus gets to dodge the real issue: that their Plan will throw freeway systems in the greater LA basin over the edge of gridlock.

LAWA has provided no mitigations for I-405 between the 90 fwy and the 101. LAWA has provided no mitigations for the I-405 through the South Bay curve. LAWA has provided no mitigations for the I-105 east of Hawthorne.

The lone freeway mitigation that LAWA does provide (the LAX Expressway) is ridiculous in its placement. It basically makes the airport look good, while the rest of the city suffers.⁹⁷

Alternatives A, B, C will create massive gridlock in the greater LA Area. No way!

⁹⁵ EIR Technical Report 2B, section I.B., bullet points 3 and 4, page I-2

⁹⁶ "the focus area is bounded on the south by Artesia Boulevard, on the east by Hawthorne Blvd/La Brea and on the north by I-10/Wilshire Blvd." EIR Technical Report 2B, section I.B., bullet point 2, page I-1

⁹⁷ The EIR captures this attitude in black and white at EIR Section 4.3.2 page 4-299, paragraph 1, when it says that increased traffic congestion on the I-405 north of the LAX Expressway "should not be construed as adverse impacts created by the project. They are inevitable positive responses that occur whenever an effective regional improvement is provided" ! No, I beg to correct this: the traffic

3. Comments and Responses

congestion at the ends of your Expressway is the inevitable result of over-expanding one element of the region's transportation system beyond the capacity that the overall system can bear.

Response:

Section 4.3.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included a discussion of the Congestion Management Program, including an analysis of freeways beyond the immediate study area. The primary focus of the proposed surface transportation changes was to redirect airport traffic onto major arterial streets and freeways, thus away from local roadways. The major arterial streets and freeways are better designed to handle the heavy duty vehicles (e.g., buses and trucks) generated from airport trips. The proposed concept of the LAX Freeway/Ring Road would relieve the airport traffic congestion from the I-405 Freeway along the La Tijera Boulevard curve down to intersection with I-105. Without the proposed LAX Freeway/Ring Road, local traffic congestion surrounding LAX would be far worse than it is today. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Regarding existing traffic concerns surrounding LAX, percent contribution of airport traffic in the adjacent communities, and how traffic conditions around the airport would change with implementation of the Master Plan Alternatives, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4.

PC00267 Abram, Paul None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00267-1

Comment:

As a 37 year resident of Los Angeles (7 of those years right here in Westchester), I oppose the expansion of LAX. I feel the quality of life for all of my neighbors and myself would be adversely effected .

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. Also, Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00267-2

Comment:

The increase air traffic over our city is a real danger to us all .

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00267-3

Comment:

The auto and {Truck} traffic on the I-401, I-105, and most importantly our neighborhood streets would increase causing greater gridlock more pollution danger to our children and our elderly.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed off-airport surface transportation impacts in Section 4.3.2, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 3a and 3b. Air pollution from traffic was addressed in Section 4.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 4. Regarding existing traffic concerns surrounding LAX, percent contribution of airport traffic in the adjacent communities, and how traffic conditions around the airport would change with implementation of the Master Plan Alternatives, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4. Regarding traffic measures to minimize neighborhood impacts.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00267-4

Comment:

The increase noise will adversely impact our students at Westchester High School, Osage Avenue Elementary School Loyola Marymount University and many other schools and day care centers and libraries in Westchester.

Response:

Section 4.2, Land Use, and Technical Report 1, Land Use Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR identified schools, libraries, residential and other noise-sensitive uses that would be newly exposed to the 65 CNEL or greater noise contour or experience an increase of 1.5 dB or greater within the 65 CNEL or greater noise contour. Since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR was prepared to evaluate a new Master Plan alternative (Alternative D), incorporate information on Year 2000 conditions, and provide additional analysis of single event aircraft noise levels that result in classroom disruption. This information was provided in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Thresholds used to identify significant interior noise levels that result in classroom disruption include: 55 dBA Lmax, 65 dBA Lmax, and 35 Leq(h). Please refer to Response to Comment AL00038-6 regarding noise impacts on Los Angeles Unified School District facilities (including those located in Westchester). Due to a recent name change, Osage Avenue Elementary School is identified throughout the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR as Open Charter Magnet School. As analyzed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Open Charter Magnet School is not impacted by existing or future high noise levels (65 CNEL or significant single event or cumulative noise levels).

As presented in Technical Report 1, Land Use Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Loyola Marymount is not exposed to the 65 CNEL or higher noise levels or high single event or cumulative noise levels under 1996 baseline or Year 2000 conditions and would not be exposed to significant high aircraft noise levels under any of the build Alternatives. Please see Response to Comment PC00028-2 regarding the consideration of day care impacts in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Private schools located within Westchester that would be newly exposed to high noise levels, experience a substantial increase in existing high noise levels, or be newly exposed to single event noise levels that result in classroom disruption include St. Bernard High School, Visitation Elementary School, and Escuela de Montessori, as further described below.

Although Westchester Neighborhood School was shown as newly exposed to high single event noise levels under Alternatives A, C, and D, this listing was in error. As shown in Table 4.2-8 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Table S4.2-20 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Westchester Neighborhood School is proposed for acquisition under all the build alternatives for development of uses proposed under the LAX Master Plan. Therefore, Westchester Neighborhood School would not be impacted under Alternatives A, C, and D. This correction has been made in Section 4.2, Land Use, of this Final EIS/EIR. Also Tables S31, S32, and S33 in Appendix SC-1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, have been revised to reflect this change. Please see Appendix F-C, Errata to the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, of this Final EIS/EIR.

As indicated in Technical Report 1, Land Use Technical Report, and Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, St. Bernard High School would be newly exposed to the 65 CNEL or increases of 1.5 dB or greater within the 65 CNEL under Alternatives B and C, compared to Year 2000 conditions. Visitation Elementary School would be newly exposed to the 65 CNEL or increases of 1.5 dB or greater within the 65 CNEL under Alternative B, compared to Year 2000 conditions. Escuela de Montessori would be newly exposed to the 65 CNEL or increases of 1.5 dB or greater within the 65 CNEL under Alternatives A, B, C and D, compared to 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions. As shown in Table S4.2-10 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Escuela de Montessori would also be newly exposed to high single event noise levels under Alternative A, compared to Year 2000 conditions. A noise impact is considered significant if it exceeds the thresholds presented in Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.4), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, in comparison to 1996 baseline conditions. Therefore, only Escuela de Montessori would be considered significantly impacted by high aircraft noise levels. However, since Escuela de Montessori is within the ANMP boundaries, this school is eligible for sound insulation which would mitigate aircraft noise

impacts. See Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the ANMP and Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding noise thresholds and impacts.

Although Table 4.2-8 of the Draft EIS/EIR, Table S4.2-20 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, and Table 22 of Technical Report 1, Land Use Technical Report, in the Draft EIS/EIR, indicate that Escuela de Montessori is proposed for acquisition under Alternatives A, B, and C, no acquisition of the Escuela de Montessori school building would occur, only 0.06 acre of the 1.32 acre parcel would be acquired to provide for airport facilities and improvements. This clarification is reflected in Section 4.2, Land Use, of this Final EIS/EIR. Also Table 22 of Technical Report 1, Land Use Technical Report, has been revised to reflect this clarification. Please see Appendix F-C, Errata to the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, of this Final EIS/EIR. This clarification does not change the conclusions presented in Section 4.1, Noise, or Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, since Escuela de Montessori was analyzed for potential noise impacts.

It should be noted that the overall number of schools exposed to significant noise levels under any of the Master Plan alternatives would be reduced compared to 1996 and Year 2000 conditions.

Construction impacts on Westchester schools are presented in Section 4.2.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

Regarding libraries in Westchester, as identified in Tables S51 and S53 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the Westchester Branch Library would be exposed to a 1.5 dB increase within the 65 CNEL under Alternative D, compared to 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions. However, as further described in Section 4.26.4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, this library closed on March 29, 2003 under a separate program. The new Westchester-Loyola Village Branch Library was constructed on the site of the Loyola Village Branch Library, which closed in 2001. The 12,500 square foot Westchester-Loyola Village Branch Library replaced both the Loyola Village Branch Library and the Westchester Branch Library. As indicated in Section 4.2, Land Use, and Section 4.26.4, Libraries, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the Westchester-Loyola Village Branch Library would not experience significant noise impacts under any of the Master Plan alternatives.

Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding overall noise impacts on the community of Westchester.

PC00267-5

Comment:

Education has been spoken of as the prime concern of today's political leaders. Stopping the LAX expansion would be a fine way to show they put our children and our children's education first.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed impacts to schools in Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use, and Section 4.27, Schools. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00267-6

Comment:

It has been shown that there is a shortage of housing in Los Angeles. Removing entire neighborhoods would only increase our cities housing shortage problems.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00267-7

Comment:

Here in Westchester we recently received a renewed business district , with supermarkets, drug stores ,banks, restaurants, office supply stores and many other greatly needed services in our community. All of these business could be gone if the LAX expansion were to proceed.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00018-1 regarding commercial property acquisition within the Westchester Business District and Response to Comment PC00013-5 regarding collateral development at LAX Northside/Westchester Southside. Also refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding the potential effects of the Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester.

PC00267-8

Comment:

The LAX expansion plan would inhibit the growth of other regional airports. It is only fair that Orange County and the Inland Empire do their shear in alleviating air traffic.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00267-9

Comment:

As a long time resident and employee of the city of Los Angeles (The Dept. of Water & Power 14 years) I ask that you consider my concerns and the concerns of my neighbors and stop the expansion of LAX !

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00268

**Young, Robert A. & None Provided
Roberta H.**

6/9/2001

PC00268-1

Comment:

We are very unhappy neighbors of the Los Angeles World Airport. During the many years we have lived in the surrounding communities, the airport noise and traffic congestion have become significantly worse. The aircraft noise is enough to prevent us from enjoyment of normal outdoor life here in Southern California.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts, including outdoor noise impacts, in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC00268-2

Comment:

We both vote and will fight any expansion plans to the limit of our ability. Our local and national government representatives are aware of our desires.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00268-3

Comment:

In particular, the noise in the evening has become worse over the years. Any expansion to the Los Angeles World Airport is sure to involve even more late night passenger / cargo flights. Some of the ones that operate now, like the typical Mexicana flights after midnight, are particularly noisy. The Los Angeles World Airport personnel we called state that these aircraft are older, generally used for freight, and beyond control. However, we fail to see why our neighborhoods should be solely subjected to such significant aircraft noise impact within the Southern California region. We have called numerous times to report loud aircraft and have NEVER had any written response, although we have always requested one. We would like to ensure that Los Angeles World Airport has an appropriate record of neighborhood complaints, so the Airport cannot claim that complaints don't exist in significant numbers. At this time, we refuse to believe that anyone associated with the Los Angeles World Airport cares about the surrounding area.

Response:

All aircraft over 75,000 pounds that use LAX meet the most stringent noise level requirements imposed by the Federal government. Foreign carriers such as Mexicana, as well as all domestic carriers, are subject to the noise level limits imposed by Federal Aviation Regulation Part 36. LAX has this commentator on file and does keep records of the noise complaint and complainant. In the event that a complainant does request a written response and includes a mailing address, LAWA's Noise Management staff policy is to provide them with written response. However, no more than five noise events will be investigated on a monthly basis. LAWA has also recently incorporated a policy to place the complainant on a monthly mailing list where all incoming identified noise complaint calls are put on a monthly log, are addressed by LAWA Noise Management staff then the responses (broken down by date, time and block address) are sent to the requesting community members. LAWA staff does have concern for the surrounding community and has taken steps (LAX Community Roundtable, Noise abatement rules, etc.) to reduce overall noise impacts where they have control as the airport operator. However, aircraft operate in a complex environment and are regulated by a series of rules and regulations, some of which LAWA has no control over. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations and Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-7.6.

PC00268-4

Comment:

In the last few years, the traffic, particularly on Sepulveda Blvd, has become much worse. We frequently drive miles off the optimum route between areas North and South of the airport, in order to

3. Comments and Responses

avoid airport traffic. The Los Angeles World Airport expansion plan will destroy several the travel routes we use, making the overall experience of living on the West Los Angeles area even worse. The thoughts we have on what the impact on us will be during airport expansion construction are totally negative. Significant work on Sepulveda Blvd would make the delays associated with the existing tunnel refurbishment seem minor.

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Regarding existing traffic concerns surrounding LAX, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4. Regarding construction traffic concerns, please see Topical Response TR-ST-3.

PC00268-5

Comment:

In all other modern / major airport expansion plans, the construction has involved new airports placed in areas where sufficient open land exists and where a new transportation architecture is possible. The Los Angeles World Airport is clearly not such a place, as it is significantly smaller than many other modern airport facilities.

Response:

The LAX land envelope is smaller than most major airports, particularly given the amount of traffic that is served by LAX. There is limited expansion capability at LAX. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. Analysis of Alternative D is contained in the Draft Master Plan Addendum and in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, is designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport capacity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. Alternative D will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient, and will have the fewest negative impacts to local communities and the region. Analysis of Alternative D is contained in the Draft Master Plan addendum and in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The No Action/No Project Alternative examined the capacity of all of the airport components and defined the maximum level of activity (approximately 78.9 MAP) that could be accommodated at LAX without improvements. See Chapter V, Section 3.3.2 of the Draft LAX Master Plan and Chapter III, Section 3.1, of the Draft Master Plan Addendum for more information on the activity and constraints associated with each alternative.

PC00268-6

Comment:

The Los Angeles World Airport has no ability to grow without horrendous negative impact to the surrounding areas.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed environmental impacts both adverse and beneficial in Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00268-7

Comment:

Expansion at the Los Angeles World Airport should not occur until the other airport facilities and areas (Burbank, Long Beach, John Wayne, Palmdale, etc.) are doing their fair share to handle the airline traffic / vehicular congestion in the region.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00268-8

Comment:

Expansion should also not occur until the Los Angeles World Airport behaves like a reasonable part of the West Side community.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00269

Benson, Robert

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00269-1

Comment:

I am currently opposed to the LAX expansion plan as proposed. Having just recently purchased a home in Westchester I was totally surprised at the suddenness of the proposed plan the size and the lack of public input on the plan. We were not advised of the expansion nor its adverse effects on our quality of life by our realators, the sellers nor any organizations such as the governing body of LAX. Not only does this affect us but everyone else that has recently purchased in this area and the long term residents.

Response:

Comment noted. The LAX Master planning effort has been underway for some time. Notice of preparation to the surrounding community and to the local press has occurred on a regular basis. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review. Additional information also can be viewed at the LAX Master Plan website, www.laxmasterplan.org.

PC00269-2

Comment:

I request that the current plan be shelved and a new plan that incorporates the appropriate public input be started in it's place.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00270

Child, Herb

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00270-1

Comment:

I support absolutely no expansion of LAX and believe all expansion should be at regional airport alternatives.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00270-2

Comment:

Let me begin by saying that I have resided in Playa del Rey, at my current address, for thirty years. The noise and air pollution from LAX has dramatically increased within the last two years.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Responses TR-N-6 regarding noise increases and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increases. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2.

PC00270-3

Comment:

I used to be an avid gardener. I worked every weekend on my property gardening, etc. Now, I can no longer stand the incredibly loud, continual noise from the aircraft and have been forced to abandon my passion for gardening. I have to LEAVE my house every Saturday and Sunday during the day just to get away from the noise. My weekend should be time off from work...a relaxing time to enjoy in the backyard. It is a nightmare now, something I should not be subjected to. Environmentally, LAX has destroyed a wonderful residential community environment.

Does this noise extend just to my house? Not a chance. A leisurely walk on Culver Blvd. in Playa del Rey, or on the Ballona Creek bike path near Marina del Rey is now an experience in excessively loud airplane noise.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix SC of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Additionally, please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC00270-4

Comment:

As to air pollution, I can attest that any object like lawn chairs and tables left outside my house is constantly covered in grime from the aircraft.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC00270-5

Comment:

One can easily imagine the amount of pollution dumped and discharged into the Santa Monica Bay on a daily basis from these aircraft.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AR00002-7 regarding impacts to water quality from aerial deposition and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding fuel dumping.

PC00270-6

Comment:

In 1972, the local residents were told not to worry about noise because the newer jets were so technically improved that they would be much quieter, particularly on takeoff. That is not the case in 2001. In particular, air freighter traffic is excessively noisy. Where the last flight at night used to be 12:30AM it now goes on to 2 AM. The doors we used to leave open at night to catch the cool ocean breezes and sounds of the surf are now shut tight to get some measure of sleep.

Response:

It is true that the maximum noise levels of aircraft today are typically much reduced from 1972 noise levels. On the other hand, operations have increased substantially. For information on the current noise at LAX and on limitations on LAWA to reduce that noise, please see Topical Response TR-N-7, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-7.6. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1.

PC00270-7

Comment:

On another issue, I took the time to meet personally with LAWA officials last year concerning the early turns of aircraft off the North runway. I was told they really had no authority over the flights. Further I was told the FAA would merely warn aircraft that were caught turning early.

Response:

The pilot-in-command has the ultimate responsibility of the safe operation of his/her aircraft. The statutory role of the FAA is to ensure the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace. To that end, FAA's Air Traffic Control provides services to pilots to ensure that minimum separations are maintained between aircraft. Normal practice within the FAA is to notify pilots of their deviations from standard operating procedures, such as early turns over the communities and to inform them that the areas are noise sensitive. For further information, see Topical Response TR-N-3, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2 regarding early turns over areas north and south of LAX and Subtopical Response TR-N-7.1 regarding enforcement of noise rules.

PC00270-8

Comment:

Well, John Wayne Airport does take action on noise issues that are raised by their citizens. In fact aircraft have to throttle down substantially over the residential areas to reduce noise. Who made that happen with the FAA?

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Operators of jet aircraft at John Wayne Airport use a departure procedure developed to respond to the specific geography surrounding that facility. The measure was implemented in the 1970s through agreement between the airport, the users, and local air traffic control. To avoid the further proliferation of a multitude of different departure procedures designed for specific airports, the FAA developed Advisory Circular 19-53A to describe acceptable noise abatement procedures. For further discussion, see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.7.

PC00270-9

Comment:

Where should we be headed and why?

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00270-10

Comment:

Freight traffic

I read with interest in the June 7th issue of the Daily Breeze that the Manchester Square and Belford neighborhoods are slated for new freight terminals. Now the question is if you want to reduce traffic, why increase freight traffic? Several years ago there was an extensive article in the LA Times about plans to dramatically increase freight traffic at Ontario Airport. That makes sense. Further, they wanted the freight terminals and they had gone so far as to establish a duty free zone there. Well that was before Mayor Riordan decided to push that freight traffic at LAX. Although there is no proof of the Mayor's intentions, it is clear that he had an interest in expanding freight at LAX. Certainly, he didn't care about the community. Freight has to be shipped east from LAX on trucks. Doesn't it make sense to reduce congestion on the highways and to save gasoline, we should be sending the freight east of the metropolitan area of LA? Why does an L.A. Mayor have the right to control the economies of Ontario and Palmdale through control of their airports from Los Angeles? Send the freight to Ontario and we will have more room for passengers at LAX.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic. Alternative D, which was addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, would not increase cargo handling facilities at LAX. As indicated in Table S3-2 (page 3-23) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, cargo operations are projected to increase to about 3,120,000 tons/year at LAX by 2015 under the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative D. The traffic impacts of this level of cargo activity were described in subsection 4.3.2.6.1, No Action/No Project Alternative, of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00270-11

Comment:

Passenger traffic

This one really gets me. Why would anyone want to travel from Santa Clarita and North San Diego County to fly out of LAX. The transit from outlying counties uses up a substantial amount of our time and vital transportation resources, clogging highways and roads. Did I mention the unnecessary waste of gasoline resources and the resultant pollution from the automobiles on local residential communities? This is all because LAWA refuses to allow a more aggressive plan for regional expansion of airports. With Palmdale expanded and Ontario expanded, a new regional airport at El Toro, perhaps Palomar expanded, and some development of the old military bases, we could see a major reduction on passenger traffic at LAX. LA residential areas are not growing! Why doesn't Santa Clarita begin planning for a Regional Airport? A new regionalization plan will handle the huge growth of population that is building communities north, east and south of us. That passenger traffic will go where the growth

3. Comments and Responses

is. When it does there will be more room using the same facilities that LAX now has. LAX expansion into it's surrounding residential community makes no sense.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00271 Thorsen, Linda None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00271-1

Comment:

I have been a resident of the Osage Community for the last eight years. Until six years ago the airplane noise from LAX was bearable. However, during the last two years, especially during the rains of last Winter and the previous Summer and Fall of 2000, the noise escalated to the point of limiting the use of my patio and interfering with sleep.

Response:

LAWA will be pursuing Federal approval to restrict easterly takeoffs circling back to the west on route to Asia by making over-ocean procedures mandatory when occurring between midnight and 6:30 a.m. During a recent 18-month period, 82 jets departed to the east when over-ocean procedures were in effect, an average of about one per week. As noted by the noise abatement procedures delineated in Topical Response TR-N-7, exceptions to the over-ocean procedures are available when weather or wind conditions require east traffic flow. Please also see Topical Response TR-N-3, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1. Additionally, regarding easterly arrivals at night, please see Topical Response TR-N-5, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-5.2. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1.

PC00271-2

Comment:

During the rains earlier this year the planes seemed to take off every five minutes over my house. This lasted all night. I called the 64-Noise number to complain, and was told that the planes could not take off over the ocean due to headwinds. Therefore the planes were taking off over Osage and my house to the East of the airport. The noise was shattering; even earplugs could not muffle the roaring that took place as the planes flew low over my house all night.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00158-3 regarding easterly departures.

PC00271-3

Comment:

The rumbling of the vibrations was akin to a small earthquake. Two of my circa 1950 windows, which had survived intact during the Northridge quake, cracked sometime during that period. During the Fall

3. Comments and Responses

and Summer I was often forced inside due to the constant airplane noise, apparently the eastern runway was being used quite frequently.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration and Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

PC00271-4

Comment:

I am writing this letter to inform you that I am adamantly opposed to LAX Expansion and to the Arbor Vitae Ring Road. I am deeply concerned that the noise from an expanded LAX will escalate to beyond what we have already experienced this last Winter. The noise monitor that was used to gauge our decibel level was not measuring the levels we experienced this Winter or last Fall or Summer.

Response:

Alternative D, as described and evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, would not include the LAX Expressway or the ring road. Please see Topical Response TR-N-1 regarding the noise modeling approach, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-1.2, and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increases.

PC00271-5

Comment:

In addition, this neighborhood is the home to many young families with children. The additional pollution from jet fuel and residue will only increase the health hazards to them. The residue is very apparent to anyone who leaves their car outside or who gardens. Sticky, black gunk builds up on the finish of the cars and the leaves of plants. I can only imagine what it is doing to our lungs.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC00271-6

Comment:

The increase in traffic both from the proposed Arbor Vitae Ring Road and the 405 Freeway will make commuting in and out of our neighborhood a nightmare. The 405 is already clogged at commute times, and traffic on La Tijera is bumper to bumper at that time as well. It doesn't make sense to overburden this already crowded area with yet more yellow cabs, shuttles and cars.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00271-7

Comment:

I am definitely in favor of a regional airport plan which will allow all areas of Southern California to benefit economically and share in their own transportation needs.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00272 Crovella, Raymond None Provided

PC00272-1

Comment:

Benefits and burdens of solution to LAX overcrowding must be shared with Orange County. FAA & airlines must stick to "regional" solution. El Toro, John Wayne, Ontario and Palmdale should be part of the solution

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the role of other airports.

PC00273 Matta, Victoria None Provided 6/8/2001

PC00273-1

Comment:

If you have children which I'm sure many of you do, how would you feel if your child was exposed 24 hours a day to the crushing crashing noise of the planes not to mention the fuel pollution. Your childrens toys covered in fuel every day. What about the beauty of the ocean. Why would you want to take more of the most natural beauty & scenic area on the west coast away from us.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and coastal impacts in Section 4.14, Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft

PC00274-3

Comment:

and supports efforts to expand the outlying airports and encourage working with the airlines to develop Palmdale airport .

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00274-4

Comment:

The Los Angeles Basin's economic health is dependent upon its transportation infrastructure and air transportation is a major component of that infrastructure. LAX is the region's leading airport and the West Coast's international gateway. LAX is a vital link for trade, tourism, cargo and business travel. Air passenger demand in Southern California will double over the next 20 years to more than 157 million annual passengers. Air cargo demand will more than triple to nearly 9 million tons annually by 2020. Even with maximum expansion and utilization of other airport facilities and sites in Southern California, passenger and cargo volumes at LAX will continue to grow significantly. The last major renovation of LAX was completed in 1984 and, without modernization to handle projected passenger and cargo volumes, the airport faces future gridlock and intolerable inconvenience for passengers, businesses and neighbors. Failure to modernize LAX could mean a loss to the Los Angeles basin of 330,000 jobs and \$33 billion in income annually.

After years of research and planning, a comprehensive Recommended Master Plan has been developed by the Los Angeles World Airport's staff and consultants to prepare LAX to fulfill its mission through 2015. The Recommended LAX Master Plan addresses major surface transportation concerns, as well as accommodating air passenger and cargo needs. The Recommended plan is based on sound principles and careful reasoning.

For these reasons, the United Chambers of Commerce supports the Recommended Master Plan and urge you to vote in favor of its adoption. Thank you for your consideration.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00275

Frankel, Alvin

None Provided

6/8/2001

PC00275-1

Comment:

Traffic on Lincoln Blvd., Sepulveda Blvd. & the 405 freeway has gotten very bad. I hate to leave the house during the morning & evening rush hours. It will be much worse if they expand the airport, add in the effects of Playa Vista and we will have a disaster.

3. Comments and Responses

If the powers that be think they can mitigate the traffic - let them do it now and then we can consider building these projects.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. For details on how the future traffic demand from the Playa Vista development was incorporated in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR traffic forecast years, and technical details on the traffic analysis methodology, please see Topical Response TR-ST-2.

PC00276 No Author Identified, None Provided 6/8/2001

PC00276-1

Comment:

What's in it for me? More noise, more traffic, more pollution, loss of property value, loss of control of my environment, increased control by government and industry, loss of individual freedom, loss of civil rights. The government is not providing equal protection of the law and is preventing the pursuit of happiness. I am withholding my consent to governed in this manner.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00277 Teltoe, E. None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00277-1

Comment:

- This will introduce more noise and air pollution to the neighborhood
- More traffic congestion
- Crime will increase
- Property values will decrease

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and law enforcement in Section 4.26, Public Services. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, and 16 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Impacts to property values are addressed in Topical Response TR-ES-1.

PC00277-2

Comment:

- This will cease to be a "family neighborhood" as families leave to avoid all of the above.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00278

Stefanski, Andrew

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00278-1

Comment:

I recommend that your Plan as written be set aside for the following Reasons:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC00278-2

Comment:

The Basics and Concepts are faulty, unacceptable, & not in the best interests of a people of California. They do not give the public full disclosures of Material Facts, Cost and Liabilities.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00278-3

Comment:

Southern California with almost 20 Million Population and 160 MAP projected needs at least 3 or 4 Major Airports conveniently spaced throughout the Area according to a Regional Master Plan, which has not been presented.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00278-4

Comment:

Without it your present proposals are only short term, stop gap presentations, not a true Long Range Master Plan. Just crowd MAPs into a small, crowded LAX. It is bad to build a Major Airport inside a densely populated area, but it is even worse to keep expanding it.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC00278-3 above.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00278-5

Comment:

Here are some facts concerning LAX impact on Housing. Recently LA Times published an Article indicating that Airport already took thousands of homes and displaced some 20,000 people. This includes the condemnations in early 1970ies and present voluntary acquisitions in East Westchester.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation issues, including affordable housing. It should be noted that the Master Plan is considered separate from growth and expansion that has occurred at LAX in the past.

PC00278-6

Comment:

This is not the end. Airport wants to take more. Caltrans is proposing widening of 405 Fwy to provide better access to LAX (among other things). It will take more homes and businesses.

Response:

Section 5.1, Land Use, of Appendix K of the Draft EIS/EIR provides discussion regarding the number of homes, commercial businesses, public and community facilities that would potentially be impacted by the proposed LAX Expressway along I-405. Please refer to Topical Response TR-APPK-2 for a description of the conceptual nature of the proposed LAX Expressway alignment and next steps regarding LAX Expressway property acquisition and relocation issues. Please note that Alternative D, now the preferred alternative, does not include the proposed LAX Expressway as a project component.

PC00278-7

Comment:

The whole Area East of LAX up to Harbour Fwy and beyond is heavily impacted and depressed by noise and fumes.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00278-8

Comment:

It affects property values, discourages development, creates health hazards and causes Loss of City Taxes, while increasing County Costs of treating people in public hospitals at taxpayers costs. Many residents of these 500,000 living in the Area do not have medical insurance.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed socio-economic and human health impacts in Sections 4.4, Social Impacts, and 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values and Response to Comment PC02399-22 regarding fiscal effects to local municipalities neighboring the airport.

PC00278-9

Comment:

As time goes by some more people will request that their properties be taken and they be relieved from nuisance. Your draft does not disclose these problems & Costs. They far exceed the benefits.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation issues, including affordable housing. The costs associated with the acquisition and relocation of existing residences and businesses are considered construction costs/impacts, discussed in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, of the Draft EIS/EIR and in more detail in the accompanying Technical Report 5, Economic Impacts of Los Angeles International Airport and the LAX Master Plan Alternatives on the Los Angeles Regional Economy.

PC00279

**Carlow, Richard &
Susanna**

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00279-1

Comment:

We do not want expansion in our area! Our neighborhood is congested as is from the promenade of the Howard Hughes Parkway.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Regarding existing traffic concerns surrounding LAX, percent contribution of airport traffic in the adjacent communities, and how traffic conditions around the airport would change with implementation of the Master Plan Alternatives, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4. Regarding traffic measures to minimize neighborhood impacts, please see Topical Response TR-ST-6. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00280

Weinberg, Sheila

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00280-1

Comment:

LAX's current plan was designed for 40 million annual passengers (MAP), and is handling about 67 MAP now, 67% over capacity. This draft plan calls for 89 MAP. I am concerned that the projected capacity figure of 89 MAP will be exceeded in the future. What is to prevent a huge increase, say 67% up to 149 MAP, when 89 MAP cannot handle future growth?

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00008-12 for a discussion on growth beyond the identified capacity for Alternative C. Also, please note that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00280-2

Comment:

Any improvements should alleviate current overcrowding but not add any more MAP. All growth should be handled by development at other airports-Ontario, Palmdale and El Toro. People and businesses in these areas need airports closer to them. LAX should not be expected to handle all the traffic generated by people coming from these outlying areas.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00280-3

Comment:

Surface streets in Westchester cannot handle any more traffic that would result from expanding LAX. Sepulveda Blvd., a major access road to LAX, is very heavily traveled and dangerous already. There were two fatal accidents on Sepulveda between 80th St. and Manchester Ave. this year. Howard Hughes Center has added traffic to Sepulveda and is still under development. Playa Vista will add considerable traffic all through the area. We don't need airport expansion to dump more traffic on surface streets in the area and on the already overburdened I-405 freeway.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00279-1 regarding traffic congestion and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00280-4

Comment:

Westchester is a very livable community with good quality of life and low crime. Westchester already lost thousands of homes and businesses to the airport over the years. It isn't fair to decimate the business district of Westchester and take more homes just to accommodate more air traffic that can be handled by development or expansion of other airports.

Response:

Comment noted. The Master Plan is considered separate from growth and expansion that has occurred at LAX in the past. Please see Response to Comment PC00035-2 regarding residential acquisition; Response to Comment PC00013-5 regarding business acquisition and relocation impacts, proposed collateral development at LAX Northside/Westchester Southside, and the proposed Preliminary Property Acquisition and Relocation Plan; and Response to Comment AL00018-1 regarding commercial property acquisition within the Westchester Business District. Please also refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding the potential effects of the Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester.

The Master Plan acknowledges that other airports throughout the region are expected to serve an increasing share of regional air travel demands. The allocation of air service among regional airports and the feasibility of a regional approach to airport expansion were addressed in Section 1, Regional

3. Comments and Responses

Context, and Chapter 3, Alternatives (subsection 3.1.1.2), of the Draft EIS/EIR. Subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a fourth Master Plan build alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was proposed. Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, has been designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient. Alternative D is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, which calls for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region.

PC00280-5

Comment:

The pollution caused by the airport is bad enough already and will only get worse with airport expansion and additional air traffic.

Response:

Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In general, the predicted air pollution impacts of any of the LAX Master Plan build alternatives are lower than the predicted impacts of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC00280-6

Comment:

I have developed allergies as an adult living in Westchester for almost 29 years that I attribute to air pollution from all the airplanes flying in and out of LAX.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PC00280-7

Comment:

How are you going to improve the air quality and reduce all the pollutants being dumped on the ground from all the planes?

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality mitigation measures in Section 4.6.8, Mitigation Measures, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-E. Please see Response Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollution impacts.

PC00281

Hobart, Jack

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00281-1

Comment:

The enclosed attachment was prepared prior to this meeting. As a result of these discussions, it is clear that a regional plan is needed, not an LAX plan.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00281-2

Comment:

We need some government regulation to enforce/encourage distributed airline scheduling; high capacity aircraft, competitive pricing/scheduling of outlying airport use.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-2 regarding the role of deregulation in aviation planning. Federal regulation of airline service and the establishment of pricing for routes was abolished by the Airline Deregulation Act of 1978. Subsequent to deregulation, airline ticket pricing has decreased as competition has increased. Further, airlines provide service where there is a demand for those services.

PC00281-3

Comment:

Orange County has a 2nd airport - that must be used.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, including the El Toro conversion and constraints at John Wayne Airport.

PC00281-4

Comment:

Pure cargo traffic must be eliminated from LAX: Harbor traffic to LB. Airport, downtown/eastside to Ontario. O.C. to Orange County.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic. Alternative D, which was addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, would not increase cargo handling facilities at LAX. As indicated in Table S3-2 (page 3-23) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, cargo operations are projected to increase to about 3,120,000 tons/year at LAX by 2015 under the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative D. The traffic impacts of this level of cargo activity were described in subsection 4.3.2.6.1 of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00281-5

Comment:

We must have a no traffic increase solution.

Response:

The LAX Master Plan includes an improved traffic solution. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Regarding how traffic conditions around the airport would change with implementation of the Master Plan alternatives, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00281-6

Comment:

Consize Assessment of Airport Expansion Plans and A Proposed Solution

Enclosed is a summary of the current situation, an assessment of the expansion plans and a list of components to an overall solution alternative.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see responses to comments below.

PC00281-7

Comment:

Current Situation

(1) LAX is already one of the densest airport facilities in the world

(2) It is surrounded by vibrant communities with renewed and in-place infrastructures and structures

Response:

Comment noted. The environmental analyses that were presented in the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR take into account the highly urbanized setting of LAX and the nature and characteristics of the surrounding communities.

PC00281-8

Comment:

(3) The freeway structure is at near-maximum capacity with no room for growth

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PC00281-9

Comment:

(4) Past supporting projects have been ill-conceived and ineffective

e.g. the limited line rail system which takes 90 min to go from Hollywood to the LAX area, 105 freeway termination that resulted in 100's of accidents before a lane increase, a cab waiting structure creating guilt and excessive tip demands of local residents, huge numbers of near-empty busses and shuttle vans from each separate site

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00281-10

Comment:

(5) Many outlying airports are available to handle increased traffic while reducing the total freeway driving demand

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00281-11

Comment:

(6) The rapidly expanding Orange County area is refusing to utilize its Air Force base to carry its share of the regional air traffic

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC00281-12

Comment:

LAX Expansion Plan Problems (1) All expansion plans are extremely costly

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00281-13

Comment:

(2) The LA west side will achieve total freeway gridlock

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PC00281-14

Comment:

(3) They will destroy the local communities as well

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00281-15**Comment:**

(4) They ignore the far more cost-effective alternatives

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00281-16**Comment:**

(5) They ignore near-term availability of higher capacity aircraft that use existing run ways

Response:

Only the airlines have the ability to schedule and operate flights with their choice of aircraft. The decisions airlines make as to what type of aircraft and where and when to operate are largely based on the markets they serve, passenger and cargo demands, and profitability. In other words, the airlines would fly a larger aircraft if warranted by passenger demand to stay financially healthy and viable. It is not difficult to control the interests of the flying public and thus difficult to regulate the methods of meeting the demand.

Airlines that increased their fleet mix to include higher capacity aircraft in the near future, despite being able to use the existing runways, might find that there are not enough heavy or wide body gates to accommodate their fleet. Each of the Master Plan build alternatives includes modifications to the existing gates, taxiways, and terminals to accommodate a larger fleet mix. Due to their limited airside and landside capacity, the Master Plan alternatives would not be able to accommodate the unconstrained forecast demand in 2005 and 2015 without changes in the air service profile. As the capacity limit is reached, it is projected that airlines will change their service in many ways, including an increase in aircraft size wherever possible. The Master Plan alternatives' airfields would be able to safely accommodate the larger fleet mix.

PC00281-17**Comment:**

(6) They ignore the needed off-loading of cargo and small aircraft traffic to other airports

Response:

It is important to note that the majority of cargo transported through LAX is carried by passenger airlines. Roughly 40 percent of all cargo shipped via aircraft arrives at LAX as "belly cargo" in the cargo holds of passenger aircraft. While freighter operations currently operate at LAX, roughly 20 percent of these operations are transported by airlines that also have passenger operations at LAX. Therefore, rerouting the cargo is a complex issue that is not easily solved by simply relocating all cargo aircraft.

Air cargo has become an increasingly important growth industry worldwide in response to the globalization of manufacturing and other business activity. This is particularly true in the Los Angeles region, which is one of the most industrialized areas in the world, with leadership in high technology and media industries. These industries export time sensitive goods for which air shipment is essential. LAX today enjoys a dominant position in the world's air cargo market and is forecast to continue doing so in the future. First, LAX is the key U.S. gateway for air shipments to/from the Pacific Rim and Oceania from practically all of North America and Latin America. Other international air cargo also connects through LAX on its way to/from domestic destinations. Second, LAX is a trans-shipment and consolidation point for several major all-cargo airlines. Specifically, FedEx has a domestic hub at LAX and uses LAX as its main Pacific Rim gateway. The international cargo operations are forecast to increase more rapidly than domestic cargo operations and these cargo activities would stay at LAX since there is no other airport in the region that could provide the needed facilities to accommodate the growth.

3. Comments and Responses

The hub and spoke route system offers the most economically efficient system to move passengers and cargo throughout the country and throughout the day. Airlines establish hub and spoke route systems centered at geographical viable locations with direct services to markets where demand is high. The airlines provide connecting services to small markets where demand is not high enough to provide direct services in a profitable manner. By using small aircraft to low demand markets, the hub and spoke operation enables airlines to provide air services to small markets that would not be otherwise served and maintain lower operating costs. To relocate these aircraft operations to other airports by providing direct services is not financially feasible for airline operations. On the other hand, airlines may choose to redistribute connecting passengers through their other hub airports when one hub airport is overly congested. The air service changes predicted by the Master Plan reflect this potential strategy.

PC00281-18

Comment:

Proposed Solution

- (1) Do not add any new runways to LAX
- (2) Do not expand the land area used to the north or south

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient. Alternative D would not add any new runways to LAX.

PC00281-19

Comment:

- (3) Move most or all cargo traffic to Ontario and other airports close to cargo destination points

Response:

Comment noted. There is a perception among many observers and respondents that air cargo and passenger aircraft can be easily split between or among airports in a multi-airport market. While in some cases and for select airlines this may be feasible, there are several significant barriers to this, including but not limited to: Combination Service - Many foreign flag carriers and at least one U.S. carrier (including Northwest Airlines) provide both passenger and all-cargo flights at LAX. Typically, the local management and operations (i.e., ground handling/warehousing, etc.) of this combination of passenger and cargo service is inseparable and economically undesirable. U.S. Postal Service - The U.S. Postal Service (USPS) is a major contractor with both U.S. passenger airlines and more recently FedEx. Splitting all-cargo flights between or among airports would likely degrade air mail service as it has been structured. Promise to Deliver - For express all-cargo carriers, mostly notably FedEx and United Parcel Service (UPS), the relative proximity to population/commercial density is critical to achieve the overnight promise to deliver, the hallmark service of express carriers. For these reasons, among others, it is not feasible to eliminate cargo traffic from LAX.

PC00281-20

Comment:

- (4) Increase the aircraft traffic of all other airports by 5-10% each

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, and the roles and responsibilities of LAWA, the City of Los Angeles, SCAG, and SCRAA in meeting regional demand.

PC00281-21**Comment:**

(5) Spend a small portion of the proposed cost of this expansion on a high speed rail system between the San Fernando Valley and Palmdale to alleviate highway congestion and provide a viable alternative airport

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand.

PC00281-22**Comment:**

(6) Relocate small aircraft not redistributing passengers to other cities to other nearby airports

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00281-17 regarding small aircraft operations. LAWA would not be permitted to prohibit or limit small aircraft operations at LAX through rule.

PC00281-23**Comment:**

(7) Force Orange County to pay the entire cost of all regional expansions until they pay their fair share or implement a new international airport using the former Air Force base

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC00281-24**Comment:**

(8) Get congress to speed implementation of the new high-capacity airplane designs

Response:

Congress is unlikely to intervene in the decision Boeing has made not to develop a new aircraft larger than the 747-400. LAWA would not likely be able to influence the federal government in this regard. However, the new Airbus A380 is scheduled to begin commercial operations in 2006. Several airlines that operate at LAX have signed letters of intent to purchase the aircraft and it is expected that LAX will be on of the first airports in the world to see the A380.

PC00281-25**Comment:**

(9) Get congress to enable and force carriers to spread their scheduling from peak times to achieve higher load factors and reduce peak airport and highway traffic demands.

Response:

Comment noted. The role of the FAA is to ensure the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace in the United States. The role of the airport sponsor is to provide a location for the airlines to conduct their business. The Airline Deregulation Act of 1978 prohibits the federal government from dictating to airlines how they can provide service. There is no federal law or regulation that would permit the FAA or a local airport sponsor to restrict the use of a public use airport as suggested in the comment. The

3. Comments and Responses

decisions airlines make as to where and when to operate and their choice of aircraft are largely based on the markets they serve, passenger and cargo demands, and profitability.

PC00281-26

Comment:

This is just a few thoughts that came to mind this morning. I would be happy to expand on them and incorporate other suggestions into a comprehensive alternative solution.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC00281-1 through PC00281-25 above.

PC00282

Kirksey, A. Diane

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00282-1

Comment:

It is disturbing to see that whatever LAWA and Mayor Riordan want, they are determined to get, despite any health, safety, noise or other ill-effects that may result.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00282-2

Comment:

The expansion of LAX is dangerous, polluting, will cause traffic grid-lock in the area, and is unfair to local residents and businesses.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed safety impacts in Section 4.24.3, Safety, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, S-4, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00282-3

Comment:

The unwillingness to let any other regional airport share in the profits and/or burden of expanded cargo & passengers is appalling. Why on earth LAX, which is filled to capacity and beyond, should be increased in air traffic is ridiculous.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00282-4

Comment:

This expansion will destroy many neighborhoods' quality of life.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. Also, Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00282-5

Comment:

Take a look at Inglewood, for example. Why should they bear the huge noise & health burden of increased air traffic?

Response:

Noise and health implications associated with increases in aircraft activity were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety (CEQA), of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The extent to which these issues fall on Inglewood was addressed in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00282-6

Comment:

If LAWA and Mayor Riordan are determined to increase the size & traffic of LAX, despite the protests of all the local residents, I have a suggestion. They need to purchase every single house & apartment within a 2 mile radius of LAX, and pay full market value for each home; then just tear down all the neighborhoods, and establish a permanent buffer zone.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding current programs and efforts to address existing high noise levels and reduce land use incompatibility.

PC00283

Wenner, Judd

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00283-1

Comment:

SOLUTIONS for LAX EXPANSION

1) Create a transport organization that will act as the designated pick-up and delivery service for all hotels in the area. Each would pay for the service based on their room count. Three routes for this operation are: CENTRAL (Century Blvd.); SOUTHERN and NORTHERN Sepulveda. The number of empty busses going round and round will be gone.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00283-2

Comment:

2) Develop a designated pick-up and delivery service for the rental car companies. All busses for this purpose will pick-up and deliver all rental car customers. Again empty busses going round and round will be gone.

Response:

A consolidated rental car facility is included in each alternative. There are many benefits to consolidating the rental car functions and connecting them via an automated people mover to the terminal buildings, including less traffic next to the terminal buildings. Note that Alternative D, which was detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, includes an expanded consolidated rental car facility on the east side of the airport.

PC00283-3

Comment:

3) Develop a method used at the airport in Washington D.C. to deliver passengers to and from the planes. Planes will be serviced faster and safer as they will not have to come into the passenger loading areas. Reduction of criss-crossing taxiways from main runways will provide improved safety. Less fuel will be used and more gates can be made available. The cumbersome mechanical monsters now used will be gone.

Response:

The type of system used at Washington Dulles International Airports is commonly known as Transporters or mobile lounges. That type of system was discussed during the concept development phase of the project. Due to high operational costs and low levels of passenger service, this type of system was not recommended as a viable solution for LAX. A large redevelopment program is currently underway at Dulles International Airport which will remove the mobile lounges from service.

PC00283-4

Comment:

4) Remove all freight activity to other airports. The resulting openings for additional passenger flights will accommodate the expected increase in passenger travel. Heavy truck traffic near LAX will be gone.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand, Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic, and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00283-5

Comment:

5) Develop decentralized departure and arrival depots at strategic locations around Southern California. (Fly-a-way type) These facilities will provide plenty of parking and all the amenities necessary to satisfy the traveling public. The travelers can say hello or good-bye at these depots and travel to the airport by LAX owned busses. The number of cars going in and out of the airport will be drastically reduced so traffic jams will be gone.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 for a discussion of FlyAway type remote parking.

PC00283-6

Comment:

If those responsible for the LAX improvements do not take heed . . . they too will be gone.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00284

Fredericks, Beverly

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00284-1

Comment:

What a sad day for Westchester, if the latest expansion plan goes thru! We have all worked so hard all these years to make our local communities a comfortable and safe place to live.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00284-2

Comment:

I have enclosed a portion of a letter that I sent to Mayor Riordin a few months ago. I think it fell on deaf ears, no reply. Maybe it will mean something to the No on Expansion movement! Thank you for any help you can give us.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00284-3

Comment:

This about the future of Westchester and El Segundo and the communities around us. We are all very concerned. Many of us have dedicated ourselves to helping each other for almost fifty 50 years now. In recent years, we have been attracting numerous younger families with children who are moving into these communities as well, and they looking forward to a comfortable place to live and grow. All of us have been forced to tolerated each new addition to LAX over the years, and our concerns have been completely ignored.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-121 and Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding opportunities to alleviate impacts associated with past or present airport activities at LAX. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00284-4

Comment:

This final push for another runway will eventually take away all we have worked for, as well as our sanity.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. Please note that Alternative D, the LAWA staff-preferred alternative, would not include the construction of any additional runways.

PC00284-5

Comment:

The latest expansion plans of the airport will completely destroy our communities. Westchester will lose about 250 businesses and be left with a downtown district of only about two city blocks wide, with jumbo jets arriving and taking off continually, almost on top of us. It will become extremely difficult for our schools to operate, church services to be held, and the few shops that will be left, will be trying to survive.

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided additional discussion beyond that presented in the Draft EIS/EIR of potential acquisition effects on the Westchester Business District. As described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsections 4.2.6.2 through 4.2.6.4), acquisition within the Westchester Business District would be about 16 acres or 31 percent of the district under Alternative A, about 11 acres or 21 percent under Alternative B, or approximately 13 acres or 26 percent of the district under Alternative C. Under Alternatives A through C, relocation opportunities would be available for some uses nearby within Westchester Southside. Also, many of the uses that would be acquired are airport related and a number of the community related uses that would be acquired (a bank, an office supply store, a bar and beauty shop) would still remain available through similar businesses that are located in close proximity within the Westchester Business District. Also, as described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6.5), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, in contrast to the other build alternatives, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new Preferred Alternative), does not include any acquisition within the Westchester Business District and no residential acquisition is proposed.

Regarding aircraft noise impacts on sensitive land uses located in Westchester, including schools and churches, see Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6), of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report 1 in the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-1 in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Response to Comment PC00267-4.

Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-2 for further discussion of acquisition and noise effects on the Community of Westchester.

PC00284-6

Comment:

Sound proofing our homes has been useless, and we might as well forget about relaxing in our back yards. At present, the sound levels already reach 65 decibels.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. However, please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. See also Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding residential sound insulation and monitoring provisions under the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP) and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC00284-7

Comment:

Even as things stand today at LAX, there doesn't even appear to be any consistent monitoring of noise from air traffic during the night either. There are fewer flights, but almost every night, at least one jet just sits on the runway at 3:00AM and rev's up it's engines, which vibrate the ground too. There is supposed to be a night time curfew, but it doesn't seem to be enforced.. It makes it hard to get a good nights sleep.

Response:

There is not, nor ever has been, a nighttime curfew in effect at LAX. However, there are special operating rules for night flight activity and ground run-ups. For discussion of night noise and LAWA regulations, please see Topical Responses TR-N-5 and TR-N-7. In addition, please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR, and Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and Appendix SC and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for single event noise impacts on nighttime awakenings.

PC00284-8

Comment:

Many long time residents have been driven out of their homes and forced to relocate, due to this continual expansion all along the airport corridors.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00040-46. Please also see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation issues.

PC00284-9

Comment:

The surrounding communities are also affected by a constant spray of soot and oily residue from the jets exhaust, which settles on cars and homes, causing damage and excess upkeep.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC00284-10

Comment:

Trying to breath fresh air is often difficult, because of the gas fumes which saturate the air around us. It exacerbates the problems many of us have with allergies.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00284-11

Comment:

Traffic is getting to be a major problem too with so much congestion on the highways and people trying to crowd into the airport.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PC00284-12

Comment:

If the newly proposed runway goes into effect, Westchester will almost be wiped out.

Response:

As described in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, under Alternatives A, B, and C, from 239 to 330 businesses located within the Westchester Community would be acquired to allow for airport and transportation related improvements. It should be noted that Westchester Southside, which is proposed under Alternatives A, B, and C, would offset these impacts to some extent through provision of new businesses, including locally serving uses. Additionally, each of these alternatives would involve acquisition of 84 dwelling units.

As stated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the new LAWA Staff preferred alternative, Alternative D, does not propose residential acquisition, acquisition within the Westchester Business District, or a ring road. Also see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts on the Community of Westchester

PC00284-13

Comment:

As far as the noise at night goes, I wish you could send someone important from the Airport Commission to come to my house to spend the night, just to hear what we have to put up with every 24 hours. It's bad enough now, but can you imagine how miserable it would be with another runway cutting through what will be left of Westchester.

Response:

Comment noted. For information regarding future noise increases, please see Topical Responses TR-N-5 and TR-N-6. In addition, please see Alternative-Specific Abatement Opportunities in Section 7.2 of Appendix D to the Draft EIS/EIR, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, in particular Section 7.2.2, Alternative A. Section 4.1, Noise and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided analyses of nighttime single event noise. Appendix S-C1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, discussed noise mitigation for Alternative D.

PC00284-14

Comment:

I wish our city would follow the example of several other major airports in the United States that have limited their size or relocated their sites, like Denver Airport did in Colorado. They had a similar problem there, and they finally moved their facilities about 20 miles outside of the city. The Los Angeles basin has enough other airports in the outlying areas of southern California, like Palmdale, El Toro, and March

3. Comments and Responses

Airforce Base, that could help to carry their load to relieve this terrible congestion and pressure. This issue is long over due!

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00285 Serif, Gene None Provided 6/8/2001

PC00285-1

Comment:

This expansion project will increase noise and traffic in my area. However, a direct MTA (street car) connection is vital to the existing "red line."

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

PC00285-2

Comment:

In addition, a high-speed rail system to the Palmdale, Ontario and O.C. Airport is vital!

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand.

PC00286 Zhou, Shun Southwest China Association of 6/7/2001
USA

PC00286-1

Comment:

I am writing on behalf of the SOUTHWEST CHINA Association of USA (SWCA), to express our support of the LAX Master Plan, Los Angeles World Airport's effort to meet the growing need for air transportation in Southern California.

Most of the SWCA members' businesses engage in trade with Asia and thus rely heavily on Southern California's air transportation infrastructure. With Asia expected to account for more than half of the World's economic growth in the next decade, businesses engaged in trade with Asia will be presented with extraordinary growth opportunities. By doubling LAX's cargo capacity and increasing its passenger

3. Comments and Responses

capacity by 50% over the next fifteen years, Los Angeles World Airports will ensure that local businesses will be given ample opportunity to compete in Asia's growing markets.

The Association of USA Southwest China applauds your efforts to address Southern California's future air transportation needs. We look forward to assisting LAWA in making the LAX master plan a success.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00287

Moses, Elana

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00287-1

Comment:

I write as a resident of Westchester to oppose any expansion of the facilities at Los Angeles International Airport and urge you to adopt the "No Action/No Project" alternative to the LAX Master Plan as it currently exists.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00287-2

Comment:

First, as long as LAX continues to implement "improvements" culminating in its expansion and ability to handle increased passenger and cargo traffic, no serious consideration will be given to the develop other airport facilities and related local commercial and business enterprises. Rather than continuing to dismantle the residential community of Westchester, California and its neighboring communities of Playa del Rey, El Segundo, Lennox and Inglewood, it is time for resources and funds to be directed at a regional solution regarding the accommodation of increased passenger and cargo air travel. Continued population growth and residential and commercial development in the Inland Empire and West Valley regions indicates that there would be sufficient population to support the development of other regional airports, rather than LAX.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00287-3

Comment:

Secondly, when will the improvements end?. What guaranty will be given to the people of the communities surrounding LAX that further improvements [read: decimation] will not be slated after 2015? The answer is "none!" Increased capabilities will beget more traffic and more traffic will beget more so-called improvements.

Response:

Comment noted. LAWA and the FAA have made no determination regarding the need for expansion beyond 2015. The Master Plan considered a horizon through 2015, which is reasonable for planning purposes. It is appropriate for an EIS to consider projects in the reasonably foreseeable future.

PC00287-4

Comment:

Again it is time to divert attention to other regional airports instead of LAX.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00287-5

Comment:

Third, many of the common improvements detailed in the draft EIS/EIR that would be installed to purportedly handle the increased passenger and cargo traffic surrounding the LAX area as a result of the implementation of any of alternatives A, B and C of the master plan are fodder for disaster.

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00287-6

Comment:

Despite the "best intentions" of the group transportation plans, anyone who lives and drives in Los Angeles knows that despite recent strides in the availability and nature of public transportation, Los Angeles is and always will be, the home of the single driver automobile. No amount of improvements to the roadway structures surrounding LAX will ever change that fact.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00287-7

Comment:

Heaped upon the decimation of part of our city for such so-called improvements will be an increase congestion, traffic, noise and pollution.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00287-8

Comment:

Presumably in an attempt to appease the local community, it is noted in the publically available information that the LAWA supports Alternative C as stated in the master plan, (the relocation of one runway and expansion of another), giving the appearance of compromise. However, a report recently released by A.C. Lazzaretto & Associates of its review and analysis of the Draft Environmental Impact Study and Draft Environmental Report contradicts the value of this the Alternative compromise. A.C. Lazzaretto & Associates was retained by the Los Angeles County Chief Administration Office to review and comment on these two reports. That Lazzaretto summary provides that due to such factors as outdated information and inconsistent assumptions, the reports are significantly flawed and do not accurately or adequately address the ramifications of the LAX master plan or the development of other regional airports. Most notably, the summary states that the Alternative C, which is the recommended course of action by the LAWA, would result in the greatest number of serious impacts to the surrounding area while meeting the fewest numbers of project alternatives. Prior to a decision for regarding the expansion of LAX, new and adequate reports which include data regarding the development of other regional airports must be prepared.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comment Letter AL00022 for responses to each of the comments contained in the A.C. Lazzaretto and Associates report. Also, the conclusion of the Draft EIS/EIR that Alternative C would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region has been superseded by that of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D is now considered to be the Environmental Superior alternative and would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region.

PC00287-9

Comment:

I understand that acquisition of the Westchester southside residential area has already commenced and its demise as a residential area seems a foregone conclusion. However, the EIR notes that this area will ultimately be demolished in favor of future "light industrial use" area. This use is for the sole benefit of LAX and not the city of Westchester. Even if the area is no longer available for single family homes, rather further industrializing our city, Westchester would welcome a number of other alternatives, such as a park/recreational area, playground, dog park, skate park, etc. Characterizing the planned development as "light industrial use" is a poor attempt to make this option more palatable,

Response:

The comment is not clear regarding acquisition within the Westchester southside area. However, acquisition is proceeding in the Manchester Square area under LAWA's Voluntary Residential Acquisition and Relocation Program, as was described in Section 4.2.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester and Topical Response TR-MP-3 regarding Manchester Square. In addition, please see Response to Comment PC00261-2 regarding compatibility of Westchester Southside/LAX Northside with adjacent residential uses.

PC00287-10

Comment:

The reality is that this acquisition of homes, and eventual re-zoning is part of an ultimate goal to gradually re-zone and re-develop the city of Westchester into a completely industrial and commercial use area designed to support the continued expansion and growth of LAX.

Response:

As was presented in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, if Alternatives A, B, and C were implemented, they would result in the acquisition of 84 homes and businesses in the Westchester community which would be rezoned under the LAX Zone/LAX Specific Plan. Acquisition within the Westchester Playa del Rey Community Plan would range from approximately 179 acres under Alternative C to approximately 310 acres under Alternative B (or 2 percent and 3 percent of the 9,281 acre Community Plan area, respectively). However, it is important to note, as was presented in Section 4.2.6, Environmental Consequences, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, that under LAWA staff's new preferred Alternative D, the least amount of rezoning would occur, since only 77 acres (or .83 percent) would be acquired within the Westchester Playa del Rey Community Plan. In addition, no homes are proposed for acquisition under Alternative D. Under all of the build alternatives, the majority of acquisition involves industrial uses, which would remain within the City of Los Angeles and largely designated for industrial use. Therefore, the Master Plan alternatives would not result in a rezoning and redevelopment of the entire Westchester community or resulting in a substantial change to existing zoning and land uses.

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00287-11

Comment:

Finally, Westchester is unique in its character and composition and there are few comparable areas in the Los Angeles area. It is a reasonably affordable residential area located just South of the West side of Los Angeles, enjoys the benefits of a coastal climate, and is racially and culturally diverse. It is one of the few middle class areas remaining for those of us choosing to make our home in this diverse area rather than taking flight to the outer West Valley or the Inland Empire. The continued expansion of LAX will drive down property values, negatively impact the quality of life and eventually leave this city with low-quality, non-desirable low-income housing. Worse yet, Westchester may become a ghost town, replaced by an entirely industrial use conglomerate of structures. The socio-economic loss as a result of such an occurrence is immeasurable.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values. Also see Response to Comment AL00018-1 regarding commercial property acquisition within the Westchester Business District. Additionally, refer to Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding the potential effects of the Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester.

PC00287-12

Comment:

To reiterate, enough is enough! It is time for the self interested LAWA and its self serving affiliates to push for other solutions for future increased the regional passenger air travel and air cargo demands. LAX is not and cannot be the only solution to this problem. It is time for the tunnel vision to stop and for the LAWA to either broaden its view and devote time and assets to a regional solution, or for its personnel to be replaced by those whose vision can encompass more possibilities for a regional solution above and beyond the expansion of LAX.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00288

**Glennon, Don and
Ruth**

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00288-1

Comment:

We are opposed to ANY further expansion of LAX. The surrounding communities of El Segundo, Inglewood, Westchester and Playa del Rey have borne the brunt of the noise, traffic and air pollution generated from the airport for YEARS. We CANNOT and shouldn't be expected to stand any more of it if we are to survive as liveable communities.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00288-2

Comment:

These plans sneak around the issue of air safety by proposing to fly the same number of planes, only bigger! That is no solution.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00288-3

Comment:

These plans fully admit that their implementation would add more noise and air pollution to the surrounding areas. That is no solution.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00288-4

Comment:

These plans do nothing to address any health issues, such as asthma, that growing children are increasingly subject to. In Westchester alone, we have 6 elementary schools. These youngsters are entitled to clean air and less, not more, noise.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, impacts to schools in Section 4.27, Schools, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 4, 14a, 14c, and 17 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PC00288-5

Comment:

Compromise is NOT the answer. A new solution is! The only available space big enough for the future needs of air transportation is Palmdale. With 18,000 acres, it can accommodate a state-of-the-art facility which, coupled with a fast and easy transportation system would be welcomed by thousands of travelers. Surely something better can be done with 17 BILLION dollars than to pour it into an over-crowded, small and obsolete facility. No other major city in this country, Europe or Asia has been so short-sighted. Let's plan for the future, not the past!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00289

Sornborger, William E. & Diana M.

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00289-1

Comment:

LAX should be "improved" and "modernized" without negative impacts to the adjacent communities. That means NO EXPANSION... but appropriate improvements such as "safety" and "access." We support the alternative solution of "regionalization"! Residents of Westchester since 1962.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00290

Dixon, Jeff

None Provided

6/2/2001

PC00290-1

Comment:

When my wife Lisa and I decided where we would be purchasing our first home two years ago, we considered several communities. We wanted a safe neighborhood where we could feel secure in raising a family with two children without fear of crime. We investigated school systems to insure a quality education. We wanted to be close enough to the freeway to get to our businesses, but far enough away that we could not hear the traffic. High on our list was a quiet, environmentally clean community. Also important were property values. We knew we would have to be willing to invest a little more to get what we were looking for, but also knew the long term return on our investment would pay dividends toward our family's future. We even went so far as to interview our prospective neighbors surrounding the homes we were most interested in, to insure all of these things. I also went to great length to be sure there would be no development in the near future that might negatively affect these afore mentioned concerns.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00290-2

Comment:

I want to urge the powers that be not to expand the LAX airport North toward my newfound community. If the expansion were to take place, all of the reasons I purchased my home would be up in smoke. Smoke not unlike the smoke created by the hundreds of planes that would polluting the still developing lungs of my three year old son Bryce and my three month old daughter Sedona, as they fly overhead on a daily basis. I am confident that shortly after the approval of the expansion, neighbors who have lived in my community greater than 20 years would quickly sell; realizing home values will be rapidly falling off a cliff. This will in turn affect the crime level, which will create a chain reaction spilling into the level of education within our school system. Aside from the noise created from the cargo and passenger jets, taxis, limousines, buses, and cars, I am sure the view of these impending iron giants from above will be as attractive to my children as the uninvited nightmares that awaken my three year old boy more frequently than I would prefer.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, health and safety impacts in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, public services and law enforcement impacts in Section 4.26.2, Law Enforcement, impacts to schools in Section 4.27, Schools, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.3, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendices D and G, and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4, 14, 16 and 17 of the Draft EIS/EIR, and Appendices S-C and S-D and Technical Reports S-2, S-4, and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values, and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00290-3

Comment:

I have played touch football with Mayor Richard J. Riordan, and at the time I considered him to be all right... ..apparently, as long as his interests are preserved. As a fourth generation Los Angelino, I will not stand by and allow my children's future to be polluted by the ever-deepening pockets of politics. From one simple family man, grateful to be living a life I never dreamed possible, I speak on behalf of the many who are too busy building their own futures to recognize the importance of this issue that

3. Comments and Responses

concerns us all. Who ever reads these concerns, I thank you earnestly for all your tireless efforts and hard work toward preserving our future.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00291 Thornton, Mr. And None Provided 6/8/2001
Mrs. James

PC00291-1

Comment:

Regarding the expansion of LAX, we are very definitely against it for all the obvious reasons, especially added NOISE, POLLUTION from the airplanes, ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT in near residential areas, not to mention the additional traffic leading to and from the airport.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00291-2

Comment:

There must be a more efficient way to solve the problems of today. Why not extend it more eastward, place the present east cargo further east into areas not so highly populated and the areas that are needing repairs, updates, etc. our own neighborhood is dear to us with quality residences and businesses....

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient and efficient. Alternative D includes new airport facilities to the east in the area referred to as Manchester Square. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00292 Frankel, Ross None Provided 6/8/2001

PC00292-1

Comment:

Both the Draft Master Plan and Draft EIS/EIR are fatally flawed documents and should be rejected. They suffer irreparably for several reasons. They fail to accurately assess, estimate the actual impacts of the projects upon the surrounding communities. They fail to accurately assess, estimate the actual impacts of the projects upon available resources, infrastructure. They fail to accurately assess, estimate the actual impacts of the projects upon the natural environment and environmentally related conditions of the surrounding communities. They fail to accurately assess, estimate the actual negative impacts of the projects upon property values, and the financial losses incurred by owners. They fail to accurately assess, estimate the actual safety and margin of safety impacted by these projects.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00292-2

Comment:

They fail to suggest or require a Charter Amendment to the Commission's Charter to clarify, allow, or limit current or future expansion plans and mitigations requirements.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding projected versus actual capacity levels at LAX, the ability to mitigate the impacts of growth in airport activity, and legal limits on the ability to control activity levels at airports.

PC00292-3

Comment:

Thus, these reports must be rejected as incomplete & fatally flawed.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00293

Vezzetti, Joe & Ann

None Provided

6/7/2001

PC00293-1

Comment:

1. If the LAX expands Sepulveda will become a gridlocked LAX freeway. Those who want LAX expanded must drive north from LAX on Sepulveda about 8:00 am to 9:00 am.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00293-2

Comment:

2. The solution to LAX is this: any passenger at LAX who does not reside in Los Angeles should pay a usage fee. In this way Orange County will take responsibility for it's citizens.

Response:

LAX is a public facility and is supported by grants from the FAA. It is illegal to charge different fees to users of the same facility and thus discriminate among users. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC00293-3

Comment:

3. I notice that bees are scarce. They pollinate. Are they hurt by the LAX fumes? Will they become endangered?

Response:

Section 4.11, Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna, page 4-677, of the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects analysis of aircraft emissions on invertebrates. Based on studies conducted at LAX and in other airport studies, it has been found that aircraft emissions do not contribute substantially to background levels of particulate emissions in the vicinity of airports. Therefore, it is not expected that aircraft emissions will noticeably affect invertebrates, including bee species, in the area.

PC00294 No Author Identified, Head To Toe Hair Salon 6/9/2001

PC00294-1

Comment:

As the proprietors of a small business, here in Westchester, and residents of this community, we are in absolute opposition of LAX expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00294-2

Comment:

Not only for reasons including the negative environmental consequences of the expansion, but the horrible economic repercussions that would follow the expansion. Small businesses such as ours, the back-bone of the American economy both on a local scale and national scale, would suffer extensive damage. Don't do it!!

Response:

The economic effects of Master Plan alternatives were addressed in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR with supporting technical data in Technical Report 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00295 Ehret, John None Provided

PC00295-1

Comment:

This is a suggestion to construct a Taxiway on the north side of the existing North North Runway and not move the runway nor add a Taxiway in between them. This is for plan C proposal.

For the following reasons:

1. You will not be increasing the NOISE . A taxing airplane could not be heard over the existing noise.
2. It would a less costly than moving a Runway and still adding a Taxiway down the middle which is unsafe as wing spans increase with the new jumbo jets.
3. Any interruption to existing air traffic would be minimized during construction when comparing to your Plan C, which could be years to complete while traffic is increasing.
4. The Cargo planes could taxi to the new easterly cargo facilities uninhibited by the passenger planes going to the terminals as they do now.

3. Comments and Responses

5. The suggested Taxiway would more compatible with the large draining ditch on the north side as the wing could stick out over it while taxing.

6. Plan C shows the runway extending over the north proposed tunnel that would increase the cost of the tunnel.

7. I feel its unsafe to have a taxiway between two runways especially when the new aircraft will have longer wing spans.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00015-1.

PC00296

Biffar, Woodrow

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00296-1

Comment:

In regards to expansion of L.A.X. Airport, I am firmly opposed to it. Why not distribute the growing business to other airports, instead of funneling it to one and disrupt the life of people in Westchester and surrounding communities and tearing them apart.
We have lost too much of our community to the airport already.

Spend some of the billions of money for ways of transportation to other airfields, L.A. has over a thousand acres in Palmdale, why not spend on building it up for cargo & passengers.

L.A. is expanding outward so why funnel all that traffic to L.A.X. the quality of life in Westchester and other cities will be exposed to more noise and pollution from more planes and traffic that is bad enough now.

No on L.A.X. expansion and Arborvitae interchange

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00297

Brands, Thomas

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00297-1

Comment:

As a resident of Los Angeles, I oppose expansion of LAX and recommend the development of the Palmdale property for these reasons:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below. In addition, it should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00297-2

Comment:

1. SAFETY

The air space around LAX is already over saturated. Witness the Cerritos accident of a few years ago and various recent near misses of midair collisions over the Los Angeles area. Expansion of LAX would exacerbate, and development of the Palmdale facility would alleviate the currently existing safety hazard. The safety problem is not just an LAX problem, it is a Los Angeles and vicinity problem. Airplane crashes are equal opportunity killers, both for passengers and those on the ground, regardless of which part of town gets devastated.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00297-3

Comment:

2. NOISE

There appears to be a discrepancy in the location of the Eastern end of the 65 dB noise contour line. The multi-volume draft in the public library shows the 1996 line about a mile short of the Harbor Freeway, while the General Plan revision dated September 1998 Exhibit B shows the 65 dB noise contour extending East of the Harbor Freeway. Perhaps that was the noise level increase in two years?

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC00171-3; please refer to Response to Comment PC00171-3.

PC00297-4

Comment:

As traffic increases at LAX, air traffic, and therefore noise, increases all over town. Already noise complaints are coming in from as far away as Monterey Park. Soon noise abatement programs similar to those in the immediate vicinity of LAX will be necessary in many parts of town that are many miles from LAX. LAX noise is a problem for the entire city and environs.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC00171-4; please refer to Response to Comment PC00171-4.

PC00297-5

Comment:

3. GROUND TRANSPORTATION

The existing ground transportation congestion will turn into gridlock. I have recently been driving to Claremont from Westchester about once per week in the early morning and each time that I see the traffic crawling West on the I105 and I210 I am thankful that I am headed East. Expansion of LAX can only make these traffic jams worse, all over town, not just in the vicinity of LAX, and not just on those particular freeways. The proposed traffic mitigation plans do not address these situations.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding

3. Comments and Responses

proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00297-6

Comment:

4. BUSINESS

The idea that expansion of LAX will be good for business is a myth, because the ensuing gridlock will send business elsewhere, probably resulting in a net loss of jobs for the area. Also, how many businesses will get displaced by LAX acquiring additional real estate for the planned expansion? That's more job loss. However, at Palmdale, jobs are just as important as they are around LAX, and the potential for growth is much greater.

Response:

This comment is essentially the same as Comment PC00171-6; please see Response to Comment PC00171-6.

PC00297-7

Comment:

5. AIRPORT ACCESS

A significant percentage of the population, and business, in Los Angeles is North of the Santa Monica mountains, and recent projections show that the fastest growth in the near future will be North of that, in the Santa Clarita valley. People in these areas can get to Palmdale just as easily, if not easier than to LAX. This will get even more true as traffic congestion increases and Palmdale access improves.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale for a discussion of multi-airport markets, airline economics and passenger choice.

PC00297-8

Comment:

6. AIR QUALITY

Los Angeles already can not meet federal air quality standards. Expansion of LAX will exacerbate this problem too, especially since gridlock would be inevitable. Increased air pollution is a problem for the entire city of Los Angeles since the prevailing wind tends to send Westside pollution to other parts of town.

Response:

Both the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the impacts of air pollution in and around the airport in Section 4.6. In general, the predicted air pollution impacts of any of the LAX Master Plan build alternatives would be lower than the predicted impacts of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution.

PC00297-9

Comment:

7. COST

According to the Master Plan the proposed LAX expansion is supposed to take care of increased traffic until 2015. Then what? Palmdale? Why not do it right the first time? Why do an expensive and shortsighted plan first?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00297-10

Comment:

Besides, when we hear an estimate as high as 12 billion dollars, based on virtually all previous experience, that number is just for starters. It will inevitably go up from there. How much more money will then be required to alleviate the problems caused by additional traffic jams and pollution? Twelve billion dollars should be more than adequate to develop Palmdale and improve its ground access with money left over.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale for a discussion of Multi-airport markets, airline economics and passenger choice.

PC00297-11

Comment:

8. CONSTRUCTION

During the construction phase, even the current LAX capacity will be reduced as existing runways and terminals are razed.

Response:

The current LAX capacity would be reduced to a certain extent while the runways and terminals are under construction; however, on-airport construction projects, whether for improvement or maintenance are a usual and on-going circumstance. The potential reduction in capacity during construction could not be avoided, but it would be temporary. The phasing and sequencing plan for each alternative is intended to minimize the interruption in operations (see Chapter 3.0 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR). Once the construction period is over the capacity would revert back to previous levels, or higher, and the operational efficiency and safety levels would be increased from the proposed improvements.

In Alternative D, terminal capacity would be able to maintain the same level during the construction and remodeling of the terminal facilities. The runway and airfield capacity would be reduced during construction of runways and taxiways. Please see Chapter III, Section 2.10 of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum for more information.

Because any runway closure would be temporary during construction, airlines are assumed to accept higher delays on a temporary basis in order to serve demand. It is also projected that airlines would choose not to schedule a portion of the commuter activity in response to the capacity constraint during construction. General aviation activity is projected to be reduced in response to the delays and congestion that would result from closure of Runway 25L/7R during construction. For a more detailed discussion of the constrained activity levels as a result of reduced capacity during the interim years of Alternative D, please see Appendix D of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum.

PC00297-12

Comment:

What kind of safety and other problems will that situation engender? Development of Palmdale obviates this concern.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00297-13

Comment:

9. ALTERNATIVES

The alternatives in the Master plan and the EIR are really just variations of the same plan. A true alternative would be to accommodate increased air traffic at other airports

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding the range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00297-14

Comment:

SUMMARY

To summarize, the idea of further expansion of LAX is expensive, dangerous, and temporary. It makes more sense to develop the Palmdale property instead.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC00297-1 through PC00297-13 above.

PC00298

Bobrow, Warren

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00298-1

Comment:

I am writing this in response to the draft environmental impact statement/environmental impact report (EIR/EIS) regarding the expansion of Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). I believe that the needs of the airlines and not those of the people in Los Angeles drive the entire project. The report is based on many rosy and faulty assumptions that will lead to more noise and traffic in the local area than the EIR/EIS admits to. Finally, the plans outlined do nothing to address the regional travel issues in Southern California. Rather, it represents a band-aid approach. In sum, I strongly urge you to reject the LAX expansion plans outright and choose the No Action/No Project Alternative.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below. In addition, it should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00298-2

Comment:

In reading the EIS/EIR one thing becomes clear: LAWA and the FAA are more concerned about airlines profits than the quality of life of people in Los Angeles. Just because the airlines want to fly more into LAX does not mean that they have the right to. The airlines' legitimate desire and ability to make a profit must be balanced with the rights of the people who live in the LAX area. We have a free-market economy of supply and demand. If LAX demand exceeds the projected supply then the airlines can make their money at the under utilized airports in the region, such as Ontario and Palmdale. The citizens of Los Angeles should not have to sacrifice their quality of life to expand LAX when the airlines have existing alternatives. If LAWA and the FAA were truly concerned about the citizens of Los Angeles (note that all of the supporters of the expansion plan listed on the LAWA only includes groups that will profit from the plan and not any citizen groups) they would have supported the No Action/No Project Alternative that tells the airlines that LAX is "full" and the airlines will have to change their schedules (e.g., more flights in/out of Ontario, Long Beach, Palmdale, SFO, etc.). Table 1-10 in the

report shows that the percentage of airport use will go down in LA county, but rise in Orange and Riverside counties. Doesn't it make sense (for the City and the airlines) to increase capacity where the demand is rather than at LAX?

Response:

Since passage of the federal Airline Deregulation Act of 1978, the airlines make the decision about which airports they will serve. As a general rule, airlines will choose to serve the airports near the highest concentrations of conveniently located customers. Within this general framework, however, airlines must make strategic decisions about air service to maximize their investments and gain competitive advantages. For instance, in regions with multiple airports, airlines tend to concentrate their air service at a single, well-located primary airport for reasons of economic efficiency. Concentrating service at a dominant airport also facilitates connecting service, which can significantly increase an airline's market and allow even greater frequencies to more destinations. The airlines will provide service where passenger demand and adequate airport facilities exist. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-2 regarding the role of deregulation in aviation planning that discusses airline response to market demand, deregulation, and airport pricing models, Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding the role of airline economics in shifting operations to regional airports.

PC00298-3

Comment:

The report seems to think that if LAX doesn't expand that the Southern California economy will wilt away. This is clearly preposterous. However, after this assumption is accepted, then it is easy for the FAA and LAWA to insist that the airlines have the right to use LAX to meet their needs, then the expansion plan becomes a fait accompli. All LAWA has done in this document is provide a set of false choices as to how the people living near LAX have to take their medicine.

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. This new option - Alternative D-Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, which calls for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifts the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive analysis of Alternative D and was circulated for public review and comment.

Although the conclusion of the Draft EIS/EIR was that Alternative C would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region, that conclusion has been superseded by the conclusion of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D is now considered to be the Environmentally Superior alternative and would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region.

PC00298-4

Comment:

Of these false choices the report suggests that Alternative C is the best one. However, it is based on the overly optimistic projection that only 5% more aircraft will be needed to service 40% more passengers. One example of how this assumption is clearly absurd when one considers how many 737 aircraft are used by Southwest and Shuttle by United. Their business models (quick turnarounds, standard maintenance, etc.) rest on being able to use an entire fleet these (or similar) aircraft. I doubt that they will replace so many aircraft with larger ones in such a short period of time to handle more passengers with the same number of planes. The reality is that they will fly more of the same sized planes if given the gate space, hence increasing the number of takeoffs and landings. Basic algebra and economics tells you that the percentage of new generation planes designed for transcontinental flight will not be enough to offset the increase in passengers LAWA wants to fit into the airport. A more than 5% increase will be required.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC00599-7 and PC00593-1 for a discussion on the fleet mix assumptions and operational levels. Please also see Response to Comment AL00017-153 for a discussion on New Large Aircraft.

Southwest Airlines is an exception in the forecast future fleetmix because they operate only one type of aircraft. United Shuttle no longer exists. Some of the increase in gauge would come from international carriers and even commuter carriers because of the increasing reliance on RJs, the remaining domestic major carriers would operate larger gauge aircraft to and from LAX as assumed in the forecast.

PC00298-5

Comment:

Even if we take LAWA's recommendation, the EIR/EIS says, "However, by 2015, the lowest total exposure levels would be achieved by the No Action/No Project Alternative followed by either Alternative A or C." So, even by LAWA's estimates, even the "best" alternative will have negative effects on the surrounding areas. Imagine the negative effects if the projections of the number of flights are wrong! It is not as if the airport will be contracted to fit the noise and pollution estimates. Once the expansion is built those in the LAX area will have to live with the consequences. Why do these need to have their quality of life compromised so the airlines can make more money?

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, newly elected Mayor James Hahn directed the Los Angeles Board of Airport Directors to develop a new LAX Master Plan alternative that, consistent with public comment calling for a regional approach alternative, would be designed to accommodate passenger and cargo activity levels at LAX that would approximate those of the No Action/No Project Alternative, have fewer environmental impacts than the No Action/No Project Alternative and, in light of the events of September 11, 2001, would be designed to enhance airport safety and security. This new alternative - Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, which calls for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifts the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive analysis of Alternative D and was circulated for public review and comment.

Although the conclusion of the Draft EIS/EIR was that Alternative C would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region, that conclusion has been superseded by the conclusion of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D is now considered to be the Environmental Superior alternative and would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region.

Also, please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding projected and actual activity levels at LAX.

PC00298-6

Comment:

Also, many of the supposed noise reductions are based on the phasing out of noisier jets. What's the point of making planes quieter if LAWA wants to add flights and more noise?

Response:

One of the reasons that noise impacts would be reduced is due to the year 2000 phase-out of Stage 2 aircraft. LAWA is not the driving force for additional aircraft traffic. These operations will occur as a result of market forces creating the demand for additional aircraft operations whether it be for passengers or cargo traffic. For additional information regarding noise increases and the phase out of Stage 2 jet aircraft please see Topical Response TR-N-6 and Subtopical Response TR-N-7.6.

PC00298-7

Comment:

It is important to consider that LAX does not need these changes to improve safety. Rather, the EIR/EIS states, "...these [current] conditions do not create an unsafe environment..." Additionally, the FAA resources allocated to improved air traffic control systems will improve the efficiency of the airport without the proposed changes.

Response:

The commentor correctly notes the current airport environment does not create an unsafe situation. However, without the proposed improvements, safety would not be enhanced and airport efficiency would not be increased. Nor would the airport be able to accommodate New Large Aircraft (NLA) without disruption of other airport operations. The Airbus A380 (NLA) is scheduled to enter commercial service in 2006. Improved air traffic control systems would improve the efficiency of the airport. However, the less than standard current airfield configuration such as runway to taxiway separation and safety areas would not be changed by the improved air traffic control systems and safety would not be enhanced. Please also see Response to Comment AL00025-66 for more discussion on the need for airfield improvements. In September 2001, the FAA commissioned the Airport Movement Area Safety System (AMASS) at Los Angeles International Airport. AMASS increases the safety of aircraft and vehicles operating on the surface of the airport. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00298-8

Comment:

In sum, I strongly recommend that the proposed LAX plans be rejected in favor the No Action/No Project Alternative. Doing so will protect the quality of life in Los Angeles without having a significant impact on the economy. So doing will also force the FAA and the airlines to consider regional solutions to Southern California's transportation needs.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00299

Elder, Michael

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00299-1

Comment:

1. Why was a full environmental impact study not conducted.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR on which these comments are provided is a full Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report.

PC00299-2

Comment:

2. How will ground traffic at night from the air cargo expansion be addressed to reduce noise.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The planned location of cargo facilities in the LAX Master Plan alternatives, with their improved access to the regional transportation network, as well as a more extensive internal roadway system, will minimize truck use of local streets. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the approach to mitigating traffic impacts and Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic. Comparisons of noise and noise-related land use impacts under the baseline and Year 2000 conditions and the various Master Plan alternatives were provided in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00299-3

Comment:

3. Sound insulation program is only effective if one remains a prisoner in his or her home. Why are we subjected to this noise outside. We can no longer enjoy our home and backyard.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential sound insulation program and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC00299-4

Comment:

4. What is to be done regarding the increased traffic which is already at a stand still.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Please also see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00299-5

Comment:

5. What is to be done regarding a deteriorating health environment.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, Topical Response TR-HRA-4 regarding human health mitigation strategies and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

Alternative D was added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. As stated in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment (subsection 4.24.1.7.3) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAX emissions under Alternative D would reduce cumulative cancer risks for all areas near the airport relative to the other future year alternatives, including the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00299-6

Comment:

We suffer from jet fuel, exhaust and hearing difficulties.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition. Please also see Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding fumes and Response to Comment AL00017-246 regarding the existing and future noise levels at and around LAX which are projected to be well below the OSHA and CalOSHA standards that serve to protect against hearing loss.

PC00300

Halpern, Sam

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00300-1

Comment:

No on Airport Expansion - We don't need any more devastation, pollution, or traffic conjection. Develop Palmdale - expand Long Beach & Ontario & develop Orange County (El Toro).

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00301

Whitmore, Walter

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00301-1

Comment:

Control of traffic is foremost consideration to keep a sense of community intact. Separate airport traffic from local, in as much as possible.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The idea of separating airport traffic from local traffic is the concept of the proposed LAX Expressway/Ring Road combination, which was described and analyzed under Alternatives A, B, and C in the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00302 Lahickey, John None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00302-1

Comment:

Will Falmouth Ave. & Loyola Bl. still have access to Westchester Parkway.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment PC00217-1. Please see Response to Comment PC00217-1. In addition, under Alternatives A, B, and C, direct access to Westchester Parkway from Loyola Boulevard would be eliminated; however, access to Westchester Parkway from Loyola Boulevard would be available via Lincoln Boulevard.

PC00303 Schiller, R. Marion None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00303-1

Comment:

I have lived in Westchester - same house for 50 years - it was a wonderful place to raise our children - the airport at that time was on Century Blvd. with Mike Lihmans restuarant in the front - in fact we used to call the airport "Mike Lihman's". I've seen many changes in "our town", none for the better - now we get the worst request on how to destroy Westchester - El Segundo and other areas - any body with even half a brain knows this is nothing but a political move and a moneymaker serving no "real" purpose!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00304 Cullen, Doris None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00304-1

Comment:

Airport expansion will cause the following:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below. In addition, it should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00304-2

Comment:

- 1) 405 will be total gridlock - approaching from the North & South
- 2) Cars will cause tons of pollutants in gridlock. (Which we already have)
- 3) Waste of gasoline with all the drivers on the roads.
- 4) Wasting our lives sitting on freeway to get into LAX

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Increasing the average speed on the freeways around LAX would reduce fuel consumption and reduce travel times.

PC00304-3

Comment:

5) What if a terrorist destroys LAX in any manner.

Response:

Please see Response to Comments AL00051-93, PC01881-31, PC02131-5, and PC02218-12. Please also see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security issues.

PC00304-4

Comment:

6) What of an Earthquake? We should "not put all our eggs in one basket" The basket being LAX.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed geologic hazards, including earthquake-induced hazards, in Section 4.22, Earth/Geology, with supporting technical data and analysis provided in Technical Report 12 of the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, which calls for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00304-5

Comment:

7) How about the citizens lives being destroyed by a huge Airport?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00304-6

Comment:

8) It is only wise to expand into other areas - North & South.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00305 Culbertson, Barbara None Provided

PC00305-1

Comment:

I AM WRITING THIS LETTER AS A CITIZEN OF EL SEGUNDO IN PROTEST TO THE EXPANSION OF LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00305-2

Comment:

IT SEEM VERY UNFAIR THAT THIS SMALL COMMUNITY MUST TAKE THE SINGLE LARGEST SINGLE SOURCE OF NO_x EMISSIONS AND WITH THE PLAN TO EXPAND THE EMISSIONS WILL TRIPLE.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00014-4 regarding NO_x emissions.

PC00305-3

Comment:

I WISH YOU COULD SEE MY OUTSIDE DECK AND GARDEN FURNITURE. THE UPKEEP IS ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE. I MUST PAINT EVERY 3 YEARS JUST TO TRY AND KEEP MY PROPERTY LOOKING HALF WAY DECENT. I AM A WIDOW AND IT IS VERY EXPENSIVE TO HANDLE THIS BURDEN.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC00305-4

Comment:

I DO WORRY ABOUT WHAT IT IS DOING TO MY LUNGS.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PC00305-5

Comment:

WE ARE ALSO ALREADY EXPERIENCING SO MUCH FAST SPEEDING TRAFFIC I AM AFRAID TO GET OUT ON THE HIGHWAY SO I AM LOCKED INTO THE SMALL DOWNTOWN AREA. OF EL

3. Comments and Responses

SEGUNDO. THE EXPANSION WILL MAKE OUR SEPULVEDA A PARKING LOT AND WE WILL NOT BE ABLE TO GET TO HOSPITALS OR TO SEE OUR DOCTOR.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PC00305-6

Comment:

THEIR ARE PLACES AVAILABLE THAT ARE WANTING AN AIRPORT I THINK THE ONE IN PALM DALE SHOULD BE EXPLORED. I DO NOT THINK IT IS FAIR THAT ORANGE COUNTY SHOULD NOT HAVE TO SUFFER A LITTLE TO TAKE CARE OF THEIR OWN TRAVELERS. WE HAVE CARRIED THE LOAD LONG ENOUGH FOR THE PURPOSE OF GREED.

Response:

The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. It should be noted that Alternative D, Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, has been designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient and efficient. Alternative D is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, which calls for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region.

PC00305-7

Comment:

THANK YOU FOR AT LEAST GIVING ME THE CHANCE TO GET THIS OFF MY CHEST. I HAVE LITTLE FAITH THAT YOU WILL LISTEN TO OUR PROBLEM. IT HAS NOT HAPPENED BEFORE.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00305-8

Comment:

FOR A LONG TIME WE HAVE JUST ASKED YOU TO IMPROVE IMPERIAL HIGHWAY WHICH IS YOUR PROPERTY AND THE TRASH AND LACK OF PLANTING IS STILL THERE.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00150-3 regarding maintenance responsibilities for off-airport roads.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00306 Krizek, Mr. And Mrs. Steven None Provided

6/8/2001

PC00306-1

Comment:

We are very concerned with the proposed expansion of LAX. Our quality of life will be tremendously adversely effected by either of the proposals at this time.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00306-2

Comment:

We are extremely concerned with the "preferred Plan" because this would mean runway expansion to the North, as we are located North of Manchester and West of Sepulveda. We are already dealing with phases of soundproofing and believe that expansion would result in even more noise & "fumes" as well as more traffic and intrusion into our community.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The LAWA staff-preferred alternative has been changed from Alternative C to the new Alternative D - the Enhanced Safety and Security Plan. This alternative does not involve additional runway construction. This alternative relocates Runway 6R/24L to the south to accommodate construction of a parallel taxiway between the two runways on the north side of the airport. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program, Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, and Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding fumes.

PC00306-3

Comment:

We however feel that the "regional approach" expansion proposal is the best option so far, improving capacity at other airports (such as Burbank & John Wayne) and developing new airports seems to have the greatest benefit to our family, our community and the city.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC00306-4

Comment:

We are adamantly not supportive of the LAX Master Plan and any plan in which would include any new runways to be built (north of LAX) or any increase in airport capacity. The city has not taken enough time & care to consider the impact of such proposals, along side Playa Vista project, Hughes Pkwy development and the expansion of LAX on the surrounding communities, their way of life, their property values, commuting congestion and environment.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Response to Comment AL00018-19 regarding the evaluation of cumulative impacts in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values and TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00306-5

Comment:

We ask you to take our opinions & comments as well as others in our community, especially at the public hearings regarding the opposition of expansion into consideration at any of the decision levels of determining the direction the LAWA or others take in regards to expanding LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. Following input from the public on the Draft EIS/EIR, and the events of September 11, 2001, Alternative D was added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00307

**Woodling, Mr. & Mrs. None Provided
Wm.**

6/9/2001

PC00307-1

Comment:

I bought a home on Waterview St. in Playa del Rey in 1963. LAX was located East of Sepulveda Blvd. It was a wonderful neighborhood until LAX expanded West. Unbelievable noise - so the airport bought homes - up to half of Waterview St. Our home was left with the noise, vandals, breaking into empty homes - so much crime. We were promised a golf course thirty some years ago so our house would "increase in value", etc. Nothing ever happened & we lived across the street from a mess.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-121 and Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding the mitigation of impacts to the community from activities at LAX. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation.

PC00307-2

Comment:

The airport put in windows & some soundproofing making a 25% improvement when you stayed inside with the windows closed. Still we couldn't enjoy the yard, talk outside with people, etc.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program. To achieve the full benefits of this program, windows need to be closed. See also Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels.

PC00307-3

Comment:

Also lots of black, fine debris from the Planes.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC00307-4

Comment:

Finally, realizing nothing probably ever would improve & maybe get worse, we sold our home at a much lower price than we could have gotten w/out all the noise. It took a long time to sell - over a year. We bought another home in our lovely Playa del Rey as far from the Airport as we could get on Rees St.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

PC00307-5

Comment:

Now LAX wants to start this all over again? Haven't we had enough? This time will do everything possible legally & every other way to stop any more LAX Expansion making our lives miserable.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00308

Hyra, Joan

None Provided

6/11/2001

PC00308-1

Comment:

Our communities have suffered long enough with traffic, noise, and pollution. No to LAX expansion!

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00309 **Friedheim, Robin** **Alliance for Regional Solution to Airport Congestion** **6/9/2001**

PC00309-1

Comment:

Despite opposition from more than 80 Southern California cities, neighboring L.A. communities, most regional elected officials, the Mayor-elect of Los Angeles (who signed a no-LAX expansion pledge), the Airport Commission still plans to expand LAX, tripling the current cargo and increasing the current 63 million annual passengers (MAPS) to 92 million. (It is licensed only for 40 million.) Two years ago, Mayor Riordan cancelled plans to add a fifth runway, but the Airport Commission persists with this huge expansion, all to be stuffed into one of the smallest airfields in the country -- and one with very poor access. ARSAC's members believe this is very poor policy, based on faulty assumptions and weak, if not nonexistent regional planning-- although SCAG, the planning agency, has approved a 78 MAP cap and a truly regional approach.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels.

PC00309-2

Comment:

Your plans for expansion will only increase already impossible traffic jams, intolerable noise levels and severe environmental pollution in the area and to the east of LAX. (It is noteworthy that those eastern regions are home to many minority citizens who believe their health is being hurt by airborne pollution.)

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed potential disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority and low-income communities in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice. Also, please see Topical Response TR-EJ-1 regarding potential health risk impacts on low-income and minority communities.

PC00309-3

Comment:

It also ignores the experience and models of most cities in the U.S. and worldwide, which are responding to increased demand for air transport by building bigger, more modern airports further away from densely populated areas.

3. Comments and Responses

ARSAC is a nonpartisan citizens group that supports a regional solution to Southern California's air transport needs, expanding international use of regional airports other than LAX, and developing international airports at El Toro and Palmdale (which LAX owns and in fact purchased for the precise purpose of meeting increased demand). We also support improving access to, and infrastructure within, LAX just to handle current air and ground traffic.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00309-4

Comment:

Our group has hundreds of members of all political persuasions, in L.A., and over a wide geographical area.. Numerous elected officials share our goals, including the L.A. mayor-elect, 80+ Southern California city councils, members of the L.A. City Council, Board of County Supervisors, California Senate and Assembly and a nonpartisan coalition of Southern California Members of Congress

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00310

**Sullivan, Gerald and
Nina**

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00310-1

Comment:

We, residents of Westchester and adjacent to LAX, are strongly opposed to more LAX expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00310-2

Comment:

Due to previous expansion of the airport, Westchester and Playa de Rey lost hundreds of homes.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00310-3

Comment:

It is time for city leaders to promote the use of existing airports in the Southern California area. It is unfair to impact the surrounding communities of LAX with further expansion. Ontario, Palmdale, John Wayne airports, along with El Toro, March and George Air Bases could serve their communities as passenger and cargo airports. It is time that the rest of Southern California share the task of transportation.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00310-4

Comment:

The Playa Vista project which is underway will further add undesirable congestion to the area. This is unfair to the residents of Westchester and surrounding communities.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00018-19 regarding the evaluation of cumulative impacts in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00310-5

Comment:

We ask that you vote NO on LAX expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00311

Hill, Roger

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00311-1

Comment:

- Why don't you have up to date information on air quality and partical counts below 10 level? These are the most harmful.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00033-329.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00311-2

Comment:

- Why don't you monitor the air in Ingwood between runways & just east of 405 freeway adjacent to homes, during the day time?

Response:

Dispersion modeling is a more cost-effective option to monitoring. Modeling allows estimation of pollutants at numerous locations for a fraction of the cost of ambient air monitoring. Receptors were located in the area to which the commentor refers and the time period modeled encompasses that which the commentor addresses.

PC00311-3

Comment:

- Why do the people you hire cannot answer questions because they have been directed to not give that information out? I get the feeling when I dealing with airport people that somewhere high in their management they are filtering information to present to the public. These people are being paid by taxes & work for our government. They should be truthful to the people. They have lost my trust.

Response:

Since the scale of this project is so large, the issues are often technical and complex and there are so many people assisting in the planning, research, and review of the project, miscommunications can sometimes occur. LAWA is committed to being available to answer your questions. Please visit our web site at www.laxmasterplan.org for additional information regarding LAX Master Plan efforts.

PC00311-4

The attachment included as part of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00095; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC00095.

PC00312

Pegram, Catherine

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00312-1

Comment:

Master plan of increasing annual passenger trip volume to almost 90 million out of one international airport to serve 5 counties is absurd. Regardless of the effect on our neighborhoods, it's not optimal for 90% of the residents' of these 5 counties in terms of travel time to airports, traffic, pollution, etc. It makes much more sense to increase international, jumbo jet capabilities at other existing airports & especially to take advantage of the availability of El Toro NAS to build a significant airport in Orange County. (I understand John Wayne Airport handles only 8 million passenger trips per year vs. LAX's \$65 million.). I have lived in PDR 17 years & have willingly borne with the increase of passenger trips from ~ 40 million to 65 million. Now we are being asked to bear too much of the burden for 5 counties' worth of jumbo jet travel, while no one else in the 5-county area is helping us out to bear the noise, pollution & traffic burden.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-2, S-4, and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00313-4

Comment:

Removal of even more community homes and businesses to accommodate longer aircraft runways to be moved north plus additional taxiways, terminals, cargo handling facilities and a new airport highway ring road.

Response:

As described in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, under Alternatives A, B, and C, from 239 to 330 businesses located within the Westchester Community would be acquired to allow for airport and transportation related improvements. It should be noted that Westchester Southside, which is proposed under Alternatives A, B, and C, would offset these impacts to some extent through provision of new businesses, including locally serving uses. Additionally, each of these alternatives would involve acquisition of 84 dwelling units. As described in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the new LAWA Staff preferred alternative, Alternative D, does not propose residential acquisition, acquisition within the Westchester Business District, or a ring road. As shown on Table S4.2-20 in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, less land acquisition is proposed under Alternative D compared to the other build alternatives.

PC00313-5

Comment:

Concern for air traffic safety due to over crowded skies.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00313-6

Comment:

In addition to the above reasons, the over-development of the Playa area will bring traffic problems to the breaking point.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment PC00148-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00148-2.

PC00313-7

Comment:

Please vote against LAX Expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00314 **Nathan, Robert** **None Provided** **6/9/2001**

PC00314-1

Comment:

I strongly oppose any further expansion of LAX. The "significant and unavoidable impacts on the environment" can be avoided by limiting expansion now - and for the future.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00314-2

Comment:

Our major arteries - the 405 Freeway and Sepulveda Blvd. - are now at gridlock.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PC00314-3

Comment:

This fact alone contributes to increased air pollution within the airport area.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00314-4

Comment:

To increase passenger number trips - as well as cargo trips - at LAX compounds an already overwhelming problem.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00314-5

Comment:

LAX was not designed to handle the traffic it now tries to accommodate. It was built for smaller, less powerful aircraft. If anything is done, runways and taxiways should be evaluated for safety, not increased traffic.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC00563-2. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

PC00314-6

Comment:

Westchester schools are currently plagued by aircraft noise. Is it fair to expect our students to continue to endure ever-increasing and more frequent interruptions to their learning in class? I say no it is not.

Response:

Section 4.1 and 4.2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included a new analysis of single event noise levels that would result in classroom disruption. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-5 for a discussion of how aircraft noise impacts on schools are determined and mitigated under the LAX Master Plan. See Response to Comment AL00038-6 regarding existing and predicted noise impacts on Westchester public schools within the Los Angeles Unified School District and Response to Comment PC00267-4 regarding predicted noise impacts on private schools within Westchester. With regard to current noise levels at private schools, private schools exposed to high noise levels (defined by the 65 CNEL noise contour) are presented in Table 14 of Technical Report 1, Land Use Technical Report, in the Draft EIS/EIR for 1996 baseline conditions and identified in Table S4 of Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for Year 2000 conditions. Private schools located in Westchester that are exposed to high single event noise levels (defined by the 94 dBA SEL noise contour) are listed in Table S9 of Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Private schools that are exposed to the 65 CNEL contour include: Westchester Neighborhood School, Visitation Elementary School, and Escuela de Montessori under 1996 baseline conditions; and Westchester Neighborhood School, St. Bernard High School, and Escuela de Montessori under Year 2000 conditions. Under 1996 baseline conditions, private schools exposed to the 94 dBA SEL include Westchester Neighborhood School, St. Bernard High School, Visitation Elementary School, and Escuela de Montessori. Under Year 2000 conditions these same schools would be exposed with the exception of Visitation Elementary School. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding overall noise impacts on the community of Westchester.

PC00314-7

Comment:

I urge the Los Angeles International Airport and FAA to work with the surrounding communities to improve the quality of life for everyone, not only future airline passengers and parcels.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00315

**Cassman, Mary
Ellen**

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00315-1

Comment:

The history of LAWA has laid a foundation for distrust. No one believes LAWA will restrain, curtail growth - after earlier promises which have been forgotten as if they had never been made.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-121 and Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding the mitigation of impacts to the community from activities at LAX.

PC00315-2

Comment:

We oppose any expansion. We have lived here 50 years. We like living near the airport. But we totally oppose expansion. There are other alternatives viable alternatives. The models for out-of-city airports can be found in other urban centers, USA & Europe. Other communities have refused to tolerate the blight that inevitably follows heavy air & street traffic.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00315-3

Comment:

Not another runway; no more gates; no more anticipated MAP expansions - none.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00316

Pollino, Peggy

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00316-1

Comment:

I am opposed to the LAX Expansion and the Arbor Vitae plan.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The proposed Arbor Vitae interchange is not a part of the LAX Master Plan and has had the federal funding withdrawn.

PC00317

Burt, Claydine

Historical Society of Centinela Valley

6/9/2001

PC00317-1

Comment:

In 1834, Ignacio Machado built a 3-room adobe residence. After subsequent owners, the final private owner was Daniel Freeman, a founder of Inglewood. This adobe is in Westchester and will be unable to withstand the building of the elevated "405" exit near Florence. People are expendable? Homes are expendable? Historic places are expendable?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding impacts to the Centinela Adobe.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00317-2

Comment:

No. Use the regional airports. Do not expand LAX!!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00318

Wallace, Ken

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00318-1

Comment:

Tell the public above all the zoning codes that will be changed in the airport expansion - like what is P.F. and O.S. zoning.

Response:

As discussed in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6, Environmental Consequences), of the Draft EIS/EIR, zone changes would be required under Alternatives A, B, and C for areas currently located on airport property, as well as acquisition areas. At the time of the completion and circulation of the Draft EIS/EIR, the proposed zoning and land use designations for the implementation of Alternatives A, B, and C were not entirely known. However, Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6, Environmental Consequences), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided additional description of changes to General Plan and zoning designations, applicable to each alternative. The LAX Master Plan would be the guiding document for the preparation of a new Los Angeles International Airport Plan (LAX Plan). The LAX Plan would include the following land use designations: Airport Airside, Airport Landside, Airport Buffer, and Open Space. Corresponding with the LAX Plan land use designations, the LAX Zone/LAX Specific Plan would provide additional performance standards, defined by sub areas, which will incorporate the requirements of existing Tentative [T] and Qualified [Q] conditions to the extent feasible. As presented in Table S4.2-3 and S4.2-20 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, compared to the other build alternatives, Alternative D would result in the least amount of property acquisition and as a result, the least amount of property that would require a zone change. Public review and public hearings on the proposed LAX Zone/LAX Specific Plan map and text amendments are part of the City's review and approval process. As indicated in Figure 4.2-3 of the Draft EIS/EIR, PF is public facilities and OS is open space.

PC00319

Stanton, Michelle

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00319-1

Comment:

Several days ago the FAA released a ten-year study into airport safety & efficiency. The study also noted that new runways at LAX were unnecessary. What is flawed with the FAA study? How can this study be reconciled with expansion plans?

Response:

New runways are not proposed in Alternative D. Alternative D is not an expansion plan. Please see Chapter 2, Purpose & Need, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00320 **Yohourmes,** **None Provided** **6/9/2001**
Mulunesh

PC00320-1

Comment:

My name is Mulunesu Yohoumes. First of all each employee must be alert to any to any action or violation of the law and policy or code.

Employees must attempt to prevent violations and must to prompt corrective action necessary to remedy and present any recurring violations. And also any employees having information or knowledge of any actual or contemplated actions or omission that appears to violate the rule.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00321 **Padlipsky, Michael** **None Provided** **6/9/2001**

PC00321-1

Comment:

My name is Michael Padlipsky. If I wanted to, I could lay claim to Westchester residency since 1946 when my parents moved me into the then brand-new house I am again living in now, despite having spent almost all my time from mid-1956 to mid-1989 elsewhere. As will be seen, my childhood years here bear some relevance to the current proceedings, but first I'd like to address the relevance of the intervening years.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00321-2

Comment:

A number of those years were spent in the employ of a "Federal Contract Research Center", another branch of which performed environmental impact studies, so I came to know a fair amount about just how UN-objective and "political" environmental impact reports can be. Based on that experience, I feel quite strongly that I don't even need to see the latest "EIR" on the airport to know that it's inadequate: the simple fact that we're here implies it, for if it were adequate, expansion would not be permitted and contraction would probably be mandated.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00321-3

Comment:

That might seem somewhat superficial, so let me expand on it a bit. I only have one degree from MIT and it's only a Bachelor's and not even in Chemistry, so I can't claim expert status, but it's abundantly clear to me that given the airport's current traffic load merely the byproducts of the combustion of fuel must be adding so much "gunk" into the surrounding air that if the planes were fuelled by tobacco the state of California in its self-assumed wisdom would ban the airport entirely. (By the way, the metaphor was chosen merely to emphasize how political such matters are, at bottom; but I must say that as a smoker, I'd far rather be subjected to "second-hand smoke" up close than to jet-engine exhaust fumes a

3. Comments and Responses

mile or two away because I have studied just how phony the statistics are which have been used to persecute that particular minority of mine.) All I have to do is look at my front porch to know what a messy neighbor LAX is: the oily, dusty residue on it isn't coming from my car in the driveway, after all.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC00321-4

Comment:

But others are presumably better qualified to address the issues of physical pollution; where my own background, particularly having been a child here, really comes into play is in the area of what might be called psychological pollution. For the very first time the airport expanded, which I back-calculate must have been in late 1953 or early 1954, among the houses that were torn down was the one in which the first great unrequited love of my life lived. Her family wound up moving out to Reseda, and it was so difficult to get there from here by public transportation that I only recall seeing her once during the three years between their departure and my high-school prom, which I'd promised myself I'd take her to when we graduated from junior high school and did manage to achieve. It's an overstatement I won't make to claim that LAX ruined my life, but without going into inappropriate detail beyond mentioning that I found it particularly appealing that she went on to graduate from Stanford at 19 and then to Harvard Med, it's quite fair to say that at some level I never got over the impact of its first expansion.

The point should be clear: There is a "human cost" to expansions of LAX, and even if this time--again, I can't be bothered to dig out the details--all that's targeted turns out to be commercial property rather than more family homes, people's lives will be changed as a consequence of the expansion . . . and not for the better. (Nor should the literal threat to life and limb engendered by all the "airport shuttles" charging along Sepulveda be overlooked, speaking of human costs.)

Despite the MIT degree, by the way, one of the other things I did during my out of Westchester years was to teach Freshman Composition for a time, so I feel obligated to conclude by pointing out that there might appear to be a bit of "special pleading" associated with the psychological pollution argument, and I cheerfully admit to "always" having had a grudge against the airport ever since it cost me Andrea, but I really do believe it generalizes: when families, or even businesses, are forced to leave a vicinity, the area at some very real level IS diminished for those who remain in the vicinity, irrespective of whether the displaced entities wind up in a "better place" or not.

Another way of putting it, perhaps not too fanciful, is that in my considered opinion and after having been exposed to it for some 55 years, LAX does foul the air, both literally and spiritually.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00322 Gonnoud, Kathleen None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00322-1

Comment:

I am a life long - neighbor of the L.A. airport - and have seen it grow from a small hub to international status - some changes to our community have been of advantage But so many have impacted negatively - I do not see any expansion as a positive force for this small suburb - we are at full capacity in terms of traffic, & congestion! - We certainly could do with considerable less noise - and pollution - than we have been living with recently -

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00322-2

Comment:

No - Please do not expand the Airport - you may upgrade facilities Inside the airport - But no new roads - subways railways - terminals - airlines or passengers at L.A.X. - Instead other airports need to be built & or expanded - (ie El Toro Airport in Orange County) -

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00322-3

Comment:

We need & want to preserve our neighborhood parks, schools, churches - homes & way of life

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00323

Margolin, Mitch

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00323-1

Comment:

I 100% strongly oppose any LAX expansion, any LAX Expressway through Airport Blvd and any freeway to Arbor Vitae plans. LAX has already put an overloading burden on this community. My family and I have owned a home at 8712 Wiley Post Ave in Westchester for 8 1/2 years. We do not want any expansion in our community.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The proposed Arbor Vitae interchange is not a part of the LAX Master Plan and has had the federal funding withdrawn. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00323-2

Comment:

Why not follow the plans of other major cities like NYC or Chicago. There, there are 3 or so major airports like Newark, JFK & La Guardia all serving the city of New York. Lets spread some of LA's air

3. Comments and Responses

traffic out to Palmdale or El Toro or Ontario & stop making LAX the end all for all of this cities air traffic. Please think big & outside of the box.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00323-3

Comment:

No expansion at LAX. Leave our wonderful community alone. Leave my family and I alone and take the air traffic and go away! Thank you

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00324

Harvey, Dennis

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00324-1

Comment:

I don't think tearing apart a community and creating more traffic, noise & air pollution is beneficial to the City of L.A. and surrounding communities to LAX.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00324-2

Comment:

I think it better to expand other county airports and make El Toro an international airport for Orange County.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed

3. Comments and Responses

pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00324-3

Comment:

Other alternate to current Master Plan - expand west of Pershing and start ring road at Jefferson to Pershing.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00022-52 regarding expanding the airport west of Pershing.

PC00325

Mahoney, Tania

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00325-1

Comment:

The level of commitment to disburse airline passenger travel throughout So. Calif. is laughable & manages also to be tragic.

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00325-2

Comment:

The very last thing we need are additional, expanded or extended runways - either North or South of LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. Each of alternatives is "constrained" because none have sufficient runway capacity to meet forecast demand in 2005 or 2015 without changes in the activity profiles. Alternatives A and B each include an additional commuter runway and were proposed to accommodate the growing demand at LAX to the extent possible and to serve the Master Plan goals and objectives. Please see Chapter V, Section 3.3.1 of the Draft LAX Master Plan for a detailed discussion on development of the alternatives and Section 3.3.2 for development of the constrained activities. The new Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, Alternative D, analyzed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, has been added to provide a build

3. Comments and Responses

alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to the No Action/No Project Alternative. Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provides extensive information on the formulation of this alternative and its consistency with the SCAG 2001 RTP. Please also see Response to Comment AL00022-188 for a discussion on the need for runway extension at LAX.

PC00325-3

Comment:

Other major cities around the Western world do a lot better, more sincerely to minimize a major airport's noise on surrounding residential neighborhoods.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

PC00326

Hittinger, Gerard

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00326-1

Comment:

Request that L.A.X. expansion not be completed. It will only encourage expansion of use of the airport and resulting congestion of 405 fwy and surface streets will only expand away from the airport and affect an ever larger area of the South Bay.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PC00327

Lensch,

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00327-1

Comment:

I opposed and resent the intrusion of LAX into our community of Westchester: pollution, noise, and especially the increased traffic that will result.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00327-2

Comment:

It's all so unnecessary! Do they have any plans at all to listen to the logic of having at least extra cargo taken care of in Ontario. Palmdale can absorb much of this with limited problems.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements

3. Comments and Responses

and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00327-3

Comment:

That the expansion movement can just abitarily scrap homes is anti-American. Try praying for light.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D does not propose the acquisition of any residences.

PC00328

Arinsberg, Toni

None Provided

5/9/2001

PC00328-1

Comment:

Considering the tens of millions of people (passengers) served through LAX the numbers of potential passengers served through Ontario and Palmdale seem quite low especially with the vast amount of just naked land in those Areas. Why are they not shooting for bigger numbers in passengers and freight out there? To include transportation - mass transit for passengers - and a freight only subway system - to accommodate cargo. (Put the freight underground and the people out in the open.)

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00329

Arinsberg, Toni

None Provided

5/9/2001

PC00329-1

Comment:

In a project of this size I hope the Community will remember How many Large Enterprises will bennefit. And this is the Time to organize Community Demands - money for Schools, Dog Parks, Community Beautification - It is important that the Project make friends with the Community And this is how to do it. Think of private money to improve streets and intersections to clean up Local Beach Parks, Aid to local schools and Chamber of Commerce - All major airlines, including cargolines want to make friends so it is not Limited to LAX alone - Demand! Demand! It is an opportunity to improve the area as you wish to.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:
Comment noted.

PC00330 **Kent, Dorothy** **None Provided** **6/9/2001**

PC00330-1

Comment:
Please consider the following arguments against the further expansion of LAX:

Response:
Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below. In addition, it should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00330-2

Comment:
1. currently 51% of the pollutants in the basin are generated at LAX.

Response:
Please see Response to Comment PC01186-4 regarding LAX as a source of air pollution.

PC00330-3

Comment:
2. The cargo arriving by ground and air, and departing via truck would be better handled at other regional airports.

Response:
Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Please also see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and Demand and Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

PC00330-4

Comment:
3. A study should be made to determine the origin of cargo departing from LAX, as well as the final destination of cargo arriving at LAX. The estimated increase of 500% of cargo handling at LAX, boggles the imagination.

Response:
Please see Chapter II, Existing Conditions, Section 4 of the Draft LAX Master Plan regarding existing cargo facilities and Chapter III, Forecasts of Aviation Demand, Section 9 regarding the LAX air cargo forecast. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding cargo handling.

PC00330-5

Comment:

4. Honesty in estimating the number of jobs that LAX expansion would paint a different picture from the one depicted in the pro-expansion blurbs. The jobs would not disappear. They would be dispersed in other areas of the region

Response:

Comment noted. The economic effects of Master Plan alternatives were provided in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data in Technical Report 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00330-6

Comment:

5. At the time LAX moved west of Sepulveda, the citizens of Palmdale were assured further expansion would be in their city. It has the capacity to handle the overflow. A lower landing fee imposed by the gurus might encourage more airlines to use it and the Palmdale residents would welcome it.

6. March Air-force Base (former) should receive serious consideration since the noise would not adversely affect the residents of the Military cemetery . It would be convenient for shipments from the harbor and from San Diego, as well as Riverside..

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00330-7

Comment:

7. Finally, the outlook should expand to include an honest appraisal of our desires for the health and welfare of future generations, since we do not own this world.. we are only temporary caretakers.

8. Please oppose any expansion at LAX

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 14a and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00331 Leal, Marco None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00331-1

Comment:

I'm an aircraft mechanic and am convinced we have to expand the airport. We take numerous delays for less fortunate airlines it's a logistical nightmare to work on airplanes. Gates are overcrowded with airplanes and people and this is known. Probably the same people protesting today are the same ones that protest to us on why their flights are late. What they don't know is gate problems - you guys know this and that's not the purpose of this letter. The purpose is because I want to make sure it's expanded right.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00331-2

Comment:

When an APU breaks down and an airplane is loaded with 300 people there is no cooling on the airplane I believe that through the jet bridges air conditioned air should be forced into airplane for cooling - this would minimize ground handling and clear up gate space. Two external power chords should be provided to allow for galley power and backup. When the APU is shut down it's easier on the environment - noise etc.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00331-3

Comment:

My job in LA depends on a hangar. We need to make sure that our hangars can accommodate stretched A380's and stretched 747's. They should be capable of jacking them in the hangar. LAVS - we need more places to dump lav water to reduce airport internal traffic. Keep less lav trucks driving back & forth. Aircraft washing and accidental fuel spills. We need to have better facilities because these things are going happen. On airport equipment washing. A ladder gets covered with skydrol - where can we wash it legally? These need to be considered when expanding, Let's do it right.

Response:

Comment noted. Under Alternatives A, B, C, and D, at least one new aircraft maintenance hangar facility capable of accommodating a minimum depth of 300 feet would be constructed. The final design length of the A380 is 239 feet and 3 inches. The proposed, but no longer planned, stretched 747-600X was to be 262 feet and 6 inches.

The location of lavatory trucks and aircraft washing areas will be determined once a final alternative is selected. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR are program level environmental documents intended to analyze the impacts of the LAX Master Plan. It is acknowledged that further documentation may be required to address certain issues in a more specific manner as necessary and appropriate.

PC00332 Richter, Cynthia None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00332-1

Comment:

This neighborhood has had enough. Negative factor have exceed positive factor. Noise & polution is unhealthy. Do not expand LAX. Look at Palmdale, Orange Co. Ontario, & El Toro not our community

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and human health in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government.

PC00333 Smith, Edward None Provided 6/8/2001

PC00333-1

Comment:

Most important task - improve transportation into and out of LAX. Improve transportation between Greater Los Angeles airports - bring light rail into LAX - don't stop it a mile out. What imbeciles did that.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

PC00333-2

Comment:

Establish high speed light rail to outlying airports - Ontario and Palmdale - move all international flights out of LAX.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand.

PC00334 Smart, Greg Red Caboose Ventures

PC00334-1

Comment:

As a PDR landowner, with support of a large portion of our local area (30% of local land mass) I request a meeting with the person spearheading this project. I need to know how this is good for Playa del Rey!!!

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00334-2

Comment:

After reading the plan I believe there are tortes that should be addressed.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00335

Weber, Frank

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00335-1

Comment:

Expansion - Is a NO brainer!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00336

Zaczynski, Edward

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00336-1

Comment:

What are the people of Westchester supposed to do with all the additional noise, polution, and traffic in our community. Enough is enough. Do not destroy Westchester.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00337

**Mahan, Mark and
Terry**

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00337-1

Comment:

We live very near Manchester Bl. (our back yard) and the noise is very loud... why don't we qualify for sound proofing? The noise measuring system needs to be changed or updated.

Response:

The noise impact area which determines residential uses eligible for sound insulation is described in Topical Response TR-LU-3, and is based on the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL noise contour. Noise-sensitive uses exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour under the 1996 baseline were described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3), and shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Noise-sensitive uses exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour under Year 2000 conditions were described in

3. Comments and Responses

Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3), and shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As shown on these respective figures, under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions the area within the 65 CNEL noise contour has decreased compared to the ANMP contour, which continues to define the area of eligibility for sound insulation. Although this is a comment on existing noise levels and conditions, the general focus of the document, pursuant to NEPA and CEQA, is to evaluate the potential future environmental effects of the project and to provide feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts. The Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.2, Land Use, acknowledges that noise levels between 65 and 75 CNEL affect outdoor speech and the quality of outdoor activities, and outdoor noise levels greater than 75 CNEL are considered significant for certain outdoor habitable areas and parks. As stated in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.9.1), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts would remain significant even with implementation of residential sound insulation.

Regarding the noise measuring system, please note that the boundary that defines eligibility for soundproofing is validated through continuous noise monitoring at 25 locations in compliance with Caltrans and County of Los Angeles requirements. See Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding how eligibility for soundproofing is determined and for a description of how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP, including a new mitigation measure for expanding and upgrading the current noise monitoring system.

See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

PC00338 Koga, Rocky None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00338-1

Comment:

The LAX expressway will be connected to I405, which has a bad traffic condition already. The current freeway systems near LAX cannot accommodate any more traffic. Who or what agency will take responsibility to make sure that the freeway systems can handle additional traffic? I think it's not a good idea to expand LAX.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology. The plan for improving the freeways in Los Angeles County is provided in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and the Congestion Management Program (CMP) for Los Angeles County.

PC00339 Evans, Erna None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00339-1

Comment:

I own a white painted home in Playa del Rey and we need to paint the home every year because of the soot, dirt and airplane gasoline dumped daily. This is very expensive to deal with every year.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC00339-2

Comment:

Also, on the window sills we have layers on dirt daily that need to be cleaned. This dirt must be sandblasted with air or water as it will grind into the paint if you try to brush it off.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC00339-3

Comment:

If the furthestmost northern and southernmost runways were used only for small corporate planes and the two center runways were used for large passenger & freight planes then the noise to Playa del Rey homes and El Segundo homes would be greatly reduced and a soundproofing program would not be needed in these areas.

Response:

The outboard runways suggested for use by small aircraft are used primarily for landings, while the inboard runways are used principally for takeoffs, although there is an exception rate of approximately 10 percent. Consequently, the loudest operations already occur primarily on the inboard runways and further modifications would result in little additional noise reduction benefit in the neighboring communities. The use of the runways is governed by the rate of arrivals into the LAX airspace and departures from the airport, combined with the requirement to separate different aircraft types for safety purposes. Please see Section 7.1, Potential Noise Abatement Measures, of Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR which describes this process in greater detail. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addresses noise impacts associated with Alternative D in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00339-4

Comment:

We can't keep our windows open because of the soot & noise. Being awakened in the middle of the night constantly has deprived us of optimal health (as I'm sure the aircraft pollution has also)! We can't even carry on phone conversations because of the noise.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition and soot and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC00339-5

Comment:

Your "actions to improve air quality & reduce noise" is an absolute joke!

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00340 Kallis, James None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00340-1

Comment:

- I oppose any expansion of LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00340-2

Comment:

- I don't believe the EIS/EIR. Instead I believe any expansion of LAX would have a disastrous impact on the environment, which cannot be mitigated.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that subsequent to the publication and review of the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D was added to provide a build alternative designed to accommodate a future (2015) level of airport activity at LAX comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00340-3

Comment:

- Future airport growth should be at distant airports, such as in Palmdale & El Toro.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00341 Lindquist, Michael None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00341-1

Comment:

With the expansion of the Southern California megalopolis it is ridiculous to continue focusing the burden of air travel on LAX. Outlying areas must be given their share of the burden and benefit of more local air travel accessibility. No on L.A.X. expansion.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00342

Griffin, B.

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00342-1

Comment:

Why?? Would you "try" to expand LAX - it is already sooo congested -

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00342-2

Comment:

The noise is almost unbearable - At ALL Times - Day & Night.

Response:

Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increases.

PC00342-3

Comment:

Health - The toxic effects are getting much worse!! OUR AIR is over polluted.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC00342-4

Comment:

What about the possibilities of an earthquake due to the Inglewood Fault!! Then the Airport & Transportation would BE totally cut OFF!

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed geologic hazards, including earthquake-induced hazards, in Section 4.22, Earth/Geology, with supporting technical data and analysis provided in Technical Report 12 of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00342-5

Comment:

HELP - Don't add to problems!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00343

Evans, Thomas

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00343-1

Comment:

I believe that LAX is already handling almost twice the capacity that it should and that it is extremely dangerous to increase usage further. Ontario airport is just 35 miles East of downtown Los Angeles and is grossly underused. Ontario can handle twice as much traffic from the air as it is receiving. Orange County residents are over utilizing the L.A.X. location as nearly 3/4 of Orange County residents are flying out of L.A.X. instead of Orange County or Ontario. Ontario is equi distant from most of Orange County as is L.A.X., but these people are not using Ontario very much. Orange County has a small location at John Wayne airport but will not approve any additional facilities at El Toro; although there was a marine air base facility there for many years they wish a variance too not have any airport use. Orange County residents feeling is let's have airports but not in our backyards. This is a regional problem and should be dealt with on a regional plan basis and Los Angeles should not shoulder the whole problem. The neighborhoods around L.A.X. have been overburdened too long. I wish for L.A.X. to cut back usage.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00344

Cardone, Bonnie

None Provided

6/9/2002

PC00344-1

Comment:

I moved here 21 years ago, never realizing how much airport use would increase. But enough is enough. LAX should not have to accommodate everyone, other communities should bear their own fair share of the noise and pollution that results from air travel

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendices D and G and Technical Reports 2, 3 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendices S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-2 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00345 Feist, Robert None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00345-1

Comment:

The residence of this area should not be forced to supply air travel for the hole L.A. metro area. We need Orange County, Ventura, and San Bernadino to pull there own. I feel a regional plan is the only answer.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00346 Lopez-Reid, Norma Montebello City Council 6/4/2001

PC00346-1

Comment:

It is important for you to address the safety and noise factors for cities to the east of the main area being affected. As I sit at home evenings and weekend mornings I hear (and almost feel) an airplane making a turn above my house about every 5 minutes, during heavy air traffic time.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.6 regarding the effects of elevation on noise contours. Please also see Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration.

PC00346-2

Comment:

We feel for those who live near the airport but those of us who didn't chose to buy here are still being affected by the low & slow flying planes. What plans do you have to mitigate the problem for these cities/areas?

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-5 for a description of how significant noise impact and corresponding mitigation measures are determined and Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program. As shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the City of Montebello is outside the current ANMP boundaries that define areas exposed to high noise levels (based on the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL or greater noise contours). As also shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR as well as on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the area within the 65 CNEL noise contour has decreased from 1992 conditions. As indicated on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the City of Montebello is also outside of areas exposed to high single event noise levels (as defined by the 94 dBA SEL noise contour). Therefore, based on the thresholds presented in Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.4), no significant noise impact from aircraft noise has been identified for the City of Montebello, and no mitigation is required.

PC00347

Harris, M.D., Jeffrey None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00347-1

Comment:

I strongly protest expansion of any kind of the existing airport.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00347-2

Comment:

Any other major city has 2 airports at least to fulfill demand. At least all cargo could go to another facility.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Please also see Topical Responses TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand and TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00347-3

Comment:

This community has & continues to be destroyed by airport expansion & some people will be held accountable this time!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00348

Onorato, Jody

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00348-1

Comment:

As a long-time resident of Westchester, I must express my grave concern about erosion of quality of life for our community and surrounding communities if the expansion plan is carried out as outlined today. I believe our freeways, skyways and surface streets are too congested now, and that any plans to enlarge arteries to accommodate increased traffic will fail miserably. I am distressed especially as I contemplate safety risk in the sky and surrounding neighborhoods, as well as certain increase in insufferable noise pollution.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00348-2

Comment:

My sense is that Palmdale airport expansion would help alleviate much of the concerns so many of us have. This should be considered seriously!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00349

Rettig, Verona

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00349-1

Comment:

Develop Palmdale & Orange County airports.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00349-2

Comment:

Do not expand LAX or create additional roadways or runways. Leave our community intact! Westchester is the best neighborhood around. To expand LAX will destroy this neighborhood.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00350 Callahan, Edward None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00350-1

Comment:

Currently the airport cannot control early turns. Until the airport can show they can control the actions of the airlines using LAX there is no reason to allow growth & further degradation of life for those of us living near LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding the incidence of early turns and measures taken and proposed to address early turns.

PC00350-2

Comment:

Clearly the airlines like the idea of growing LAX. Why else charge prices so much higher for flights from outlying airports.

Response:

The average fare for domestic flights from LAX is higher than for Burbank, Long Beach, Ontario, and Orange County. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding multi-airport markets, airline economics and passenger choice.

PC00351 Callahan, Dianne None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00351-1

Comment:

I work with people who are from the Palmdale area & actually WANT an airport they can use in their area.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00351-2

Comment:

I also work w/people from Orange County who fly for business. Some flights from OC are 2x more expensive than from LAX. Naturally the company will only reimburse the cheaper fair.

Response:

The average fare for domestic flights from LAX is higher than for Burbank, Long Beach, Ontario, and Orange County. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding multi-airport markets, airline economics and passenger choice.

PC00351-3

Comment:

Regionalization is the only sound solution to satisfy more of the populus in LA & surrounding areas.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00351-4

Comment:

This area is already destined for more congestion, we don't need unnecessary expansions.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00352

Doyle, Patrick

None Provided

6/8/2001

PC00352-1

Comment:

1. Will current tennets occupying maintenance facilities on the West end have inputs in there design needs?

Response:

The EIS/EIR is a program level environmental document intended to analyze the impacts of the LAX Master Plan. It is acknowledged that further documentation may be required to address certain issues including design issues, in a more specific manner as necessary and appropriate.

PC00352-2

Comment:

2. Who will fund this?

Response:

The proposed Master Plan improvements will be funded with a combination of monies from FAA Airport Improvement Fund grants, passenger facility charges, general airport revenue bonds, and airline fees. No Los Angeles General Fund dollars will be used to pay for any of the proposed on-airport improvements.

PC00352-3

Comment:

3. What will the lease structure/term be?

Response:

The lease structure and term for tenants of the airline maintenance facilities will be determined upon the selection of a Preferred Alternative.

PC00353

Doyle, Patrick

None Provided

6/8/2001

PC00353-1

Comment:

What will be the area used for maintenance turns/run up? We currently use on site facilities.

Response:

The subject of airline maintenance hangars was included as part of the ancillary facilities component of Alternatives A, B, C, and D. Please see Chapter 3, Alternatives, in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for the ancillary facilities program for Alternatives A, B, C, and D.

The majority of maintenance checks (A & B type checks) that occur at the airport would be conducted at the gate facilities. Airline maintenance managers were interviewed and consulted and it was determined that many of the routine checks that occur could be accommodated at the gate area. This would reduce the airline operating costs associated with taxiing aircraft to the maintenance area. For all non-routine and emergency maintenance checks, adequate maintenance space and facilities are provided in each alternative. Engine run-ups would be conducted in ground run-up enclosures provided in each alternative adjacent to maintenance facilities.

PC00354

Choate, H. Hugh

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00354-1

Comment:

The noise factor is so loud presently that one cannot stand outside or sit on one's balcony and converse with another person.

Response:

Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor

3. Comments and Responses

noise levels and Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding thresholds used to identify significant noise levels.

PC00354-2

Comment:

How will increasing larger cargo aircraft, heavier aircraft operations, more large warehousing and heavy shipping, high truck and cargo traffic reduce the unbearable noise we hear daily?

Response:

Future forecast noise levels are anticipated to decrease for both aircraft and road vehicles. The commentor is a resident of Playa Del Rey and is most closely located to Roadway Receptor site RD13 as identified in Table 4.1-6, Combined Daily Aircraft and Roadway Noise at Receptor Site by Alternative (Leq), in Section 4.1, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Table S-4.1-6, Combined Daily Aircraft and Road Traffic Noise at Receptor Site by Alternative (dBA) 24-Hour Leq, in Appendix S-C1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For information on land use, please see Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Additionally, Subtopical Response TR-N-5.4 addresses cargo operations and Topical Response TR-N-6 addresses noise increase.

PC00354-3

Comment:

The toxicogenic pollution emitting from the airport cause serious respiratory diseases including my wife, that children in schools in Playa Del Rey are at serious risks from the pollutants discharged from airplanes. Citizens can't walk the sidewalks without being overcome by noise and emissions from airplanes.

Response:

Please see Topical Responses TR-HRA-2 and TR-HRA-3 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects and human health impacts.

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 4, 14a, 14b, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00354-4

Comment:

How is enlarging the airport going to improve these factors?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00022-183.

PC00354-5

Comment:

The black soot from airplanes get into our homes, automobiles, clothes so that these become stained and have to be cleaned or wiped almost daily. How does the airport plan to decrease this hazard?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition and soot.

PC00355 Waldman, Ira None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00355-1

Comment:

Palmdale - I am tired of hearing about the airlines don't want to go there. I can't believe that anyone in the North Valley would rather travel the 405 South than the 14 North. The airlines should be encouraged to go out there by limiting the landing slots at LAX, even if it takes Congress to enact a law based on safety & health concerns to do so. If that happens, the airlines will go to Palmdale. The Valley residents will go there & surprise, it will be a success. That will engender its own economic development where there is space for it, an consideration missing in all these plans. So improve, but do not expand LAX.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-2 regarding the role of deregulation in aviation planning and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00356 Harvey, Jeanie None Provided 6/10/2001

PC00356-1

Comment:

I'm against the airport expanding due to the fact that expansion will increase traffic, pollution and noise.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00356-2

Comment:

The community of Westchester cannot permit expansion as it will be overtaken ... unfairly so. Other airports under LAWA should share in the responsibility for air traffic.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00357 Darling, Mary Jo None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00357-1

Comment:

I have lived in Westchester and raised my 4 children here, for 39 yrs. It has always been a safe family community. It will all change if LAX expands! Air pollution, noise, traffic, safety -

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00357-2

Comment:

Westchester suffered when the present no runway was built. No more is wanted or needed!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00358

Shumaker, Deborah None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00358-1

Comment:

Stop LAX expansion before it starts we need regional airports like New York San Francisco. Westchester has already been rapped of it community. Next you will want to take the rest of our community without giving back. How long does this community have to feel the burden of Orange, Ventura & Riverside counties. We all need to support a regional plan that moves freight out of LAX and make it a passengare airport only! Stop LAX expansion now!

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00359

McCutcheon, Jim Westchester Senior Citizens

6/9/2001

PC00359-1

Comment:

South bound traffic on Fwy 405 stops due to 100 car trains crossing Florence/Manchester offramp behind my house. These 100 car trains will cease with the start of usage of Alameda Corridor in about 8 months. This will free up South Bound 405 traffic measurably and is NOT addressed in these EIR documents.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The surface transportation analysis summarized in the Draft EIS/EIR and in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR reflected the conditions on I-405 without a rail crossing impediment. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan for more information on transit.

PC00359-2

Comment:

Proposed routing of Expressway South to Arbor Vitae Interchange is faulty and could be constructed on the East Side only and save purchase price of property and provide improved engineering of such route which is not needed!

Response:

Several alignments of the LAX Expressway were reviewed during the analysis, as summarized in Appendix K of the Draft EIS/EIR. The general alignment selected provided the best combination of effectiveness and minimal environmental impacts. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00360

Lee, Lisa

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00360-1

Comment:

What is the plan to expand Airport Blvd, and opening up the wall that will enable direct traffic flow off the 405 freeway off the Howard Hughes Parkway? Such action will destroy an incredible neighborhood, where we live.

Response:

The LAX Master Plan does not propose expanding Airport Boulevard, nor does it propose any changes to the interchange at I-405 and the Howard Hughes Parkway.

PC00361

Nenme, Dale

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00361-1

Comment:

The expansion is not justified at this airport. It will create more smog and traffic & ruin the existing city of Westchester.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00361-2

Comment:

The city has an airport at Palmdale and this should be utilized to handle any additional anticipated traffic at LAX. No to expansion.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00362 Kanelos, Mary None Provided 6/10/2001

PC00362-1

Comment:

I'm against expansion. Due to more traffic congestion, pollution & noise.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00363 Clark, Charles None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00363-1

Comment:

There does not appear to be any concern in restoring the Westchester Golf Course back to 18 holes. This was promised by the airport when they put the parkway in back in 1991. This is an important issue to Westchester residents.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00364 Shapkin, Barton None Provided 6/8/2001

PC00364-1

Comment:

The amount of airborne particulate matter (soot) increases in direct proportion to the number and size of the aircraft engines flying overhead. At this point, the engines are not getting cleaner in proportion to their development stage (i.e. there about as "clean" as they're going to get).

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC00364-2

Comment:

Just like asbestos and tabberce, this is man-made pollution and it causes harm to humans. Litigation will follow, we both know it.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Human health impacts were addressed in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00365

Peach, Robert

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00365-1

Comment:

No expansion or Alternative "C".

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00366

Lawless, Joe

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00366-1

Comment:

Land near ocean - go drive to dessert or land in dessert go drive to ocean. Got a whole lot of dessert = little coast line. Ontario airport just as close to Pasadena as LAX. San Berbrabu etc.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00366-2

Comment:

35 yrs ago Westchester lost 3M home Sepulved Bvds. section down hill etc. Penny store on Sep close still Eupox for 30 yr or more.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00366-3

Comment:

LAX - 1 of smalles airports can't put 10#'s of that stuff in a 5# bag. Expansion 22 bill?! We get noise polution - traffic.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00367

Hirt, Tina

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00367-1

Comment:

1. What's in it for me?

I get additional plane noise, more pollution, more traffic - angrier drivers... for the convenience of people from Orange County, the San Fernando Valley, Ontario etc.

2. Why is this to my advantage?

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, the Draft EIS/EIR addressed environmental impacts, both adverse and beneficial, in Chapter 4.

PC00367-2

Comment:

3. Will you guarantee the survival of Centinella Adobe? And the survival of long-time business partners, such as Randy's Donuts and Neutrogena?
4. If not why not?

Response:

The Centinella Adobe and Randy's Donuts would not be acquired under any of the Master Plan build alternatives. Impacts to the historic significance of these properties were addressed in Section 4.9.1, Historic/Architectural and Archaeological/Cultural Resources, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Impacts attributable to development of the LAX Expressway (under Alternatives A, B, and C) are discussed in Appendix K, Supplemental Environmental Evaluation for LAX Expressway and State Route 1 Improvements, of the Draft EIS/EIR.

The Neutrogena property would be acquired under Alternatives B and C, as identified in Table B-3, Summary Statistics of Acquisition Areas Alternative B, and Table C-3, Summary Statistics of Acquisition Areas Alternative C, in Appendix P to Chapter V of the Master Plan, Preliminary Property Acquisition and Relocation Plan. As discussed therein, the Westchester Southside development is considered suitable for the relocation of businesses such as the Neutrogena Corporation. A fourth Master Plan build alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, has been proposed since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR and does not involve acquisition of the Neutrogena property. The Proposed Relocation Plan has been updated to reflect Alternative D in Chapters 2.7 and 2.8 of the Master Plan Addendum.

PC00368 Kliever, Waldo None Provided

PC00368-1

Comment:

Why aren't cargo aircraft sent to Ontario, Palmdale, March etc.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand.

PC00369 Mitsakos, Peter None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00369-1

Comment:

OVER THE COURSE OF THE LAST 10 YEARS TAKE-OFF OPERATIONS HAVE CHANGED FOR THE NORTH RUNWAY. INSTEAD OF MAINTAINING THE RUNWAY HEADING AFTER TAKE-OFF UNTIL THE PLANE IS OVER THE WATER, AFTER LIFT-OFF THE PLANES SHIFT TO THE NORTHERN BOUNDARY OF THE AIRPORT, FOLLOW THE FENCE UNTIL THEY ARE OUT OVER THE WATER AND THEN TURN. THE AFFECT OF THIS IS TO BRING THE JETS HUNDREDS OF YARDS CLOSER TO OUR NEIGHBORHOOD AND GREATLY INCREASE THE VOLUME OF NOISE. IF THIS PRACTICE WAS HALTED, IT WOULD GREATLY IMPROVE OUR QUALITY OF LIFE. TO DATE THERE HAS BEEN NO MEASUREMENT OF THIS PRACTICE AND ITS AFFECT ON OUR HOUSES.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding the incidence of early turns and measures taken and proposed to address early turns.

PC00370 Hustin, Carole None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00370-1

Comment:

I watched my parents lose their home in the 70's & saw a community destroyed - have watched traffic increase to saturation - noise & traffic pollution are at maximum.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses is provided in Appendices D and G, and Technical Reports 2, 3 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and in Appendices S-C and S-E, and Technical Reports S-2 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-121 and Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding the mitigation of impacts to the community from activities at LAX. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00370-2

Comment:

Orange County now needs to absorb their share of air traffic flow - regional airports are needed - cargo terminal should be based in Palmdale - instead of enlarging LAX, spend the money on a rapid transit system to link Palmdale/Orange County to the Los Angeles area -

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand, Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00370-3

Comment:

I have seen what expansion does to property values & quality of life - both are compromised.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

PC00371

Tlesnick, Stan

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00371-1

Comment:

I would like a more complete plan, defining exactly when and how you will implement regional airports - not in the future but now alongside a reasonable expansion of L.A.X.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00372

Moreno, Olga

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00372-1

Comment:

Why this change? Why not use other existing Airports?

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00373

Goldheim, Ralph

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00373-1

Comment:

- LAX expansion needs to stop!
- LAX expansion threatens to destroy the 'American Dream' of homeownership and quality of life.

As a nearby (Airport and Manchester) LAX resident, I am particularly concerned about possibility of LAX expanding and adding to the already unacceptable levels of noise and pollution.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00373-2

Comment:

The noise of overhead aircraft in my home is disruptive and dramatically impacts my family's quality of life and the property value of our home. If we wanted to move from the area, we would have trouble selling our home. The airport expansion impact has already cost us tens of thousands of dollars!

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

PC00373-3

Comment:

Aviation noise is a SERIOUS problem at LAX currently, and one which I believe has not been mitigated in the local area residents interests. And now LAX wants to expand? Westchester residents already pay a disproportionate share of the burden compared with other residents in the Los Angeles area who use LAX.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. However, please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding areas exposed to high noise levels under 1996 baseline and Year 2000

3. Comments and Responses

conditions and current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. Due to a shift in the noise contours; the phasing out of older, noisier Stage 2 jets; and the acquisition of residential uses within Manchester Square and Belford, the number of dwelling units exposed to high noise levels (as defined by the 65 CNEL and 94 dBA SEL) would decrease under all of the build alternatives compared to 1996 and Year 2000 conditions, with the greatest reduction in noise exposure occurring under Alternative D. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential noise effects on the community of Westchester, Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding residential sound insulation under the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP), Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels, and Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 regarding existing high noise levels.

PC00373-4

Comment:

Los Angeles and LAX need to do more to mitigate the existing situation and NOT allow things to get worse. Unfortunately, the track history of what LAX has done to work with its neighbors to alleviate the noise issues has been a complete travesty, and has only succeeded in alienating EVERYONE here in Westchester.

Response:

As stated in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.8), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, 2,867 units in the City of Los Angeles had received sound insulation as of June 2002. Of this total, approximately 2,267 units had received sound insulation in the Westchester and Playa del Rey communities under the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP). Please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 for a discussion of current measures to work with affected communities to address existing high aircraft noise levels. Regarding future noise levels in Westchester, although some areas would be newly exposed to high noise levels or substantial increases in existing noise levels with implementation of the Master Plan, overall the number of units exposed to high noise levels would decrease compared to 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions. LAX Master Plan Mitigation Measure MM-LU-1 includes provisions to accelerate the fulfillment of existing commitments to owners wishing to participate within the current ANMP boundaries prior to proceeding with newly eligible properties. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding noise mitigation, Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, and Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

PC00373-5

Comment:

Unless LAX management are forced to reduce noise they will, as they have shown to date, continue to represent only the airlines and business interest in their desire to expand and add passenger and freight traffic as the original plan fostered by outgoing Mayor Riordan.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00373-6

Comment:

What is apparent is that LAX Management has general disregard of the citizens who would be impacted. Incremental expansion has already expanded LAX from the original 35 million passengers a year planned for to over 67 million currently. STOP IT! I don't believe United Airlines and local airport management should be making decisions and implementing plans in direct opposition to local residents. We live here, they don't.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding the past increase in aviation activity at LAX.

PC00373-7

Comment:

Stop any expansion plans at LAX. The local residents have shouldered too much of the burden of growth already. A regional solution regarding airport expansion is the only solution that makes sense.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00373-8

Comment:

Additional points:

1. Aviation noise is a growing problem. We have lived in our residence for over 10 years now and I can testify that it is getting worse, not better.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increases. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00373-9

Comment:

2. The current average noise measurement (CNEL) is unacceptably flawed! It does not represent nor acknowledge peak noise measurements, which is what is so disruptive about airport noise. Since the current standards are being based on old data, establish new noise research studies to update our knowledge of how noise affects people living in the airport environment. Specifically we should change from the CNEL noise standards to SNEL so that single noise events are tracked and recorded.

Response:

The standard cumulative metrics [DNL, CNEL, and unweighted Equivalent Sound Level (LEQ)] are derived on the basis of single events. The most recent and comprehensive scientific study on this subject (FICON 1992 Report) concluded that there were no "new descriptors or metrics of sufficient scientific standing to replace DNL (CNEL)." The study notes that "other descriptors may be useful as supplements to DNL (CNEL) in characterizing the noise environment and assessing impacts of noise exposure." For further information, please see Response to Comment AL00018-65 and Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, Section 5, of the Draft EIS/EIR. Also, please see Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences. Please see Appendix S-C, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-1, Supplemental Land Use

3. Comments and Responses

Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding analysis of single-event noise impacts.

PC00373-10

Comment:

3. Sleep interference during evening and early morning hours is especially a problem and the regulatory measurements and rules need to take it into effect. Limit later hours to quieter aircraft and ban middle of the night takeoffs for cargo planes. Sleep interference results in clear negative medical health issues.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to nighttime awakenings in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations and Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement.

PC00373-11

Comment:

4. Police offending aircraft, pilots, and airlines with an enforcement department that represents the people, not controlled by industry or government agencies with conflicts of interest!

5. Enforce meaningful and serious penalties for abuse of noise abatement rules and regulations. This is a big issue because airlines are not afraid to test jet engines in the middle of the night since there are no penalties or they fail to install noise reduction equipment on older jet aircraft.

6. Enforce meaningful and serious penalties for FLY-OVERS that are outside of the approved existing landing and takeoff corridors.

Response:

The noise abatement operating procedures and restrictions include a set of preferred flight measures, without an enforcement mechanism. They do not include a curfew or requirements for mandatory runway use or flight routes. They do include restrictions on ground run-up operations at night and on ground movement in the Imperial Terminal. Topical Response TR-N-7 delineates the procedures and responds to a number of questions presented by the commentor. As to enforcement of deviations from preferred flight procedures, since the flight measures are voluntary, there is nothing to enforce. However, LAWA Environmental Management staff tracks the deviations from the preferred operating procedures, and when appropriate, initiates communication with the user to seek greater compliance with the preferred measure. Ground run-ups are not allowed at night between 11 p.m. and 6 a.m., but they do occasionally occur. When that happens, Airport Operations personnel are authorized to shut the run-up down on the spot. According to Scott Tatro of the Environmental Management Bureau, abuse of the restriction may be turned over to the City Attorney's office for action in accordance with violations of the users operating agreement. LAWA plans to seek approval to make the over-ocean procedures mandatory when they are in effect. Also see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime run-up activities.

PC00373-12

Comment:

7. Clearly separate the FAA from airline industry interests. It should represent the people first and aggressively mitigate industry. The people need protection!

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00373-13

Comment:

8. Establish a national airport arbitration board with serious authority that citizens can go to for airport complaints. This way there would be a reasonable way to work out problems instead of being forced to litigate to get the airport's attention.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00373-14

Comment:

I challenge you to do what's right and only implement a Regional Airport Solution and not any variation of the LAX "Master Plan". Please represent the people!!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00374

Ramsey, Luke

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00374-1

Comment:

I oppose the LAX expansion. If they expand they will start causing more damage to the environment. They will take out popular restaurants and businesses. The traffic will be worse. The noise would become even more annoying.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed relocation impacts in subsection 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Topical Response TR-APPK-2 regarding LAX Expressway and State Route 1 (SR-1) property acquisition. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00374-2

Comment:

Airports should be made in other regions. The public would be better served if LAX will never expand.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00375 Copeland, Steven None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00375-1

Comment:

I am a new Westchester resident. My wife & I are opposed to any LAX expansion, but especially opposed to any North runway projects. Our votes go to candidates that feel the same way. We all know that not one single resident w/in five miles of LAX is in favor of expansion at all. Our community will fight it by vote, lawsuit or any other legal means.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00376 Saper, Laurence None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00376-1

Comment:

I oppose the expansion of LAX. It is already too congested and will create major traffic problems/noise problems in LAX and surrounding communities.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00377 No Author Identified, None Provided

PC00377-1

Comment:

I am a neighborhood home owner and already the traffic & noise is enough. I do not want to see any more development at LAX. Only idea I can offer is to make a green belt or golf course in the area west of LAX out to Pershing & the ocean. That is all wasted space & unpleasant to look at. Stop LAX expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Restrictions on land uses and natural resources in the area west of LAX were addressed in Section 4.2, Land Use, Section 4.10, Biotic Communities, Section 4.11, Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna, and Section 4.14, Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendices

3. Comments and Responses

E and J, and Technical Reports 1 and 7, of the Draft EIS/EIR, and Appendix S-H of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00378 **Burns, Hugh** **None Provided** **6/9/2001**

PC00378-1

Comment:

High-rise parking structures 3-5 miles from LAX - shuttle passengers in -

Response:

Regarding improved remote parking structures, Alternative D, which is analyzed in detail in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, incorporates remote passenger parking with people mover systems (light rail) to shuttle passengers to/from the terminals. Alternative D would eliminate the need for a "Ring Road" and a western passenger entrance from Pershing Drive. In addition, the Green Line is proposed to be extended north to provide access to LAX. The surface transportation impacts of Alternative D were presented in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00378-2

Comment:

why are bldgs along Westchester Parkway - bringing more crime into the community -

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed airport-related crime in Section 4.26.2, Law Enforcement. As was discussed on page 4-1188 of the Draft EIS/EIR, "Crime statistics at LAX show that between 1996 and 1999 the proportion of overall crime at LAX remained steady even with an 11 percent increase in passengers." During this same period, off-airport crime rates in the City of Los Angeles decreased by 30 percent while the population increased by four percent. Based on these statistics, there is no apparent correlation between increased activity at LAX and crime on the airport and in surrounding areas.

While the comment is not clear regarding buildings along Westchester Parkway, assuming it relates to the proposed LAX Northside/Westchester Southside Project, new development at LAX and increases in activity associated with implementation of the LAX Master Plan would be accompanied by corresponding increases in law enforcement personnel and facilities, including a major new police facility within the LAX Northside/Westchester Southside project area. With a new police facility proposed in the area of concern to the commentor, and implementation of Master Plan Commitment LE-1, Routine Evaluations of Manpower and Equipment Needs, more crime is not expected to be brought into the community. Master Plan Commitment LE-1 ensures that law enforcement personnel and facilities keep pace with forecasted demand for law enforcement services. Furthermore, Master Plan Commitment LE-2, Plan Review, addresses new building construction and associated environmental contributors to criminal activity, such as poorly lit areas and unsafe design.

Mitigation measures discussed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, addressed emergency access and police response times throughout the on-airport and off-airport transportation study areas. With implementation of commitments and mitigation discussed in Section 4.3 and Section 4.26.2, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, project-related and cumulative impacts on law enforcement services are considered less than significant.

PC00378-3

Comment:

pollution from exhaust is stiffling - on hvy. marine layer days very bad - on foggy days its hard to breath

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00088-2.

PC00379 Fries, Samuel None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00379-1

Comment:

Too many expansions in areas as is ie... Marina, Playa, Howard Huges not enough streets to keep up with traffic - not enough clean air to keep up with congestion.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00018-19 regarding the evaluation of cumulative impacts in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00380 Barnes, Edward Local Union 250 6/5/2001

PC00380-1

Comment:

We are sending this letter to express our support for the proposed LAX modernization. We highly endorse the recommended master plan for LAX Airport, including alternatives A, B or C.

We are a Building Trades Union of 4,500 members from the Plumbing and Piping Industry. This membership and our families are a proud part of this community and its' economy. We are not only excited about the possible 86,000 construction jobs, but also the commerce it will bring our city.

As highly trained craftspeople we are looking forward to a positive and rewarding partnership. We will now have the opportunity to show you why we say "we do it right the first time." We look forward to helping with the modernization of LAX.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00380-2

Comment:

However, it should be noted we do oppose the "no action/no project" alternative. We believe this approach would turn LAX into an airport like New York, Boston, San Francisco or Washington, D.C. These airports are already at their maximum capability and some are plagued with gridlock in their surrounding communities.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00380-3

Comment:

In closing, we would like you to know that we are not just excited for ourselves, but for all of Los Angeles and beyond. The flying public as well as business's of the world, shipping cargo through LAX, will also gain greatly from the proposed modernization. Thank you for your consideration.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00381 Brown, David None Provided

PC00381-1

Comment:

I am a 30+ year resident of Westchester, I went to Orville Wright Jr. High and Westchester High School. I am currently Secretary for Westchester Vitilization Corporation. I lived in Westchester during the last major expansion of LAX during the 70's when thousands of residence and businesses were displaced to accomadate the growth of LAX. I am strongly opposed to all the currently proposed concepts and believe the Draft EIR/EIS dramatically understates the impact of the proposed expansion plans. The proposed concepts are not well thought out and will have devastating impact on all areas around the airport.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D, Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, has been designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient and efficient. Alternative D is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, which calls for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region.

PC00381-2

Comment:

LAWA and LAX officials have a long history of ignoring the surrounding communities and continuing to build and expand their facilities with or with out approved Master Plans. Many of the mitigation efforts called for in this round of expansion plans are the same mitigation offered for previous expansions, but have never been implemented.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-121 and Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding opportunities to alleviate impacts associated with past or present airport activities at LAX. Please also note that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00381-3

Comment:

The EIR/EIS does not accurately describe the full impacts we can expect in the surrounding communities because, I believe, it is based on false or flawed assumptions. The baseline or "no-build" option assumes that the maximum capacity of LAX as currently configured is approximately 78 MAP. I believe this to be an exaggeration of the true capacity and thus all of the other assumptions based on this number are incorrect. The existing approved Master Plan under which LAX is operating was adopted in 1980, it identifies LAX capacity as 40 MAP and states clearly that any additional capacity will be taken up by other facilities and specifically mentions Ontario and Palmdale. During the late 80's

3. Comments and Responses

when LAX wanted to expand we in the community were told that the maximum capacity at that time was approximately 67 MAP. Now the EIR/EIS uses the 78 MAP as the assumed maximum capacity, but I find little to no justification or analysis in the EIR/EIS to support this number as the true maximum capacity. I attended a community meeting with the FAA at El Segundo High School a couple of years ago when representatives of the community asked the FAA officials repeatedly what the actual maximum capacity was at LAX. To our dismay FAA officials are either unwilling or unable to answer that question. I believe that there is in fact a study now being done by the FAA as to what is the actual maximum capacity of LAX. According to a press release in April, by Air Traffic Controllers and Pilots, LAX is at or very near maximum "safe" capacity now.

Response:

Detailed analyses of the constraints at LAX under the various Master Plan alternatives, and the capacity of each alternative, were provided in Chapter V, Concept Development, Section 3, of the Draft LAX Master Plan, and Chapter 3, Alternative D Constrained Activity, Section 3.1, of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum. The capacity of the existing facilities at LAX was also addressed in Chapter 2, Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action (subsection 2.2.2), Chapter 3, Alternatives (page 3-25), of the Draft EIS/EIR, and Chapter 3, Alternatives (pages 3-28 through 3-31) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00381-4

Comment:

I believe the true discussion around capacity should be based on maximum operations per hour or per day. Capacity has little to do with the actual numbers of people that go through the terminals but is much more closely linked to the total numbers of planes that take off and land each hour. In the Executive Summary of the Draft EIR/EIS on page ES-8 we are provided with a chart that shows "Summary of Activity Comparison of Alternatives". This chart shows that in the baseline year 1996 Design Day Operations was at 2,235. It shows that the Concept C plan raises that number to 2319 an increase of 84 operations per day per. It also shows that under the "no plan" option, the operations will be about 2279 per day. So Concept C (the preferred plan of LAWA staff) would provide only an additional 40 operations per day over the "no project" plan. At the current rate of growth (see Table I-3.3 LAX Annual Aircraft Operations Forecast) the planned facilities under Concept C will be obsolete by the year 2005, long before the project is ever complete.

Response:

The No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative C are constrained alternatives. Each is limited to a four-runway system; therefore, the activity levels of the two alternatives are similar. The airside capacity of the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative C was defined based on the maximum operations per hour or "peak hour" operations determined by the existing four-runway system at LAX. Peak hour operations in the activity scenarios are assumed not to exceed the levels observed in 1996 because the airfield was operating at its capacity in 1996. The forty additional operations associated with Alternative C as compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative consist of cargo operations, which operate in the off-peak operation hours. The increase in operations in the No Action/No Project Alternative as compared to 1996 is also solely attributable to cargo operations. See Chapter V, Concept Development, Section 3.3 of the Draft LAX Master Plan for a more detailed discussion of the activity profiles. Commercial operations in 1996, the No Action/No Project Alternative, and Alternative C are virtually identical:

Design Day Operations

Alternative	Commercial Passenger Operations	Cargo Operations	General Aviation Operations	Total Operations
1996	2,055	76	104	2,235
2015 No Action/No Project	2,058	117	104	2,279
2105 Alternative C	2,058	157	104	2,319

To say that the planned facilities under Alternative C will be obsolete by the year 2004 does not recognize that Alternative C is a constrained alternative and is not designed to meet the unconstrained annual demand; rather it is designed to maximize the amount of traffic that could be served in the limited space available. Please see Chapter V, Concept Development, Section 3 of the Draft LAX Master Plan for a more detailed discussion of the project's objectives.

PC00381-5

Comment:

In a Memorandum dated 1/31/01 from LAWA Environmental Affairs to the LAX Community Round Table it states that LAX Operations for 1996 were 763,866 for the year, or an average of about 2093 per day. And for 2000 the average was about 2200 operations a day. In the Master Plan Executive Summary, page 39, Section 4.2 Airside System it states "the number of peak hour operations that the system can handle is currently being experienced on a daily basis". If this is indeed the case then, how will capacity at LAX be able to grow from its current 67 MAP to 78 MAP under the "No Project" Plan? If they are at capacity now then the EIR/EIS should be comparing current levels of operation to the varying concepts not the imaginary 78 MAP. How do they plan to increase the numbers of operations to over 2300 per day without increasing the numbers of runways? Some how all these numbers just don't seem to add up. In short I don't believe their numbers.

Response:

The number of seats per departure is projected to increase during the forecast period in addition to an increase in load factors. That is to say that the average plane size will increase with a greater percentage of seats filled per flight to achieve a greater number of passengers per year with approximately the same amount of operations.

PC00381-6

Comment:

The mitigation proposals are completely inadequate and may never be completed. The proposed mitigation concepts of the "ring road", the people mover, and Green Line service to the terminals were all included in the traffic mitigation plans for the Master Plan approved back in 1980. In fact the "ring road" concept was developed back in the planning of the 70's. What is now Westchester Parkway was the 170 (Laural Canyon) Freeway and Pershing Drive was Pacific Coast Highway. Now LAWA is proposing the same mitigation for this round of expansion.

Response:

The improvements identified are actually part of the project, not mitigation measures as the commentor implies. The mitigation packages identified in subsections 4.3.1.9 and 4.3.2.9 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR would mitigate most of the significant impacts. The mitigated levels of service are shown in subsections 4.3.1.10 and 4.3.2.10 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00381-7

Comment:

The Master Plan offers no funding source for the proposed interchange at Arbor Vitae and the 405 or for the proposed "LAX Expressway" or any of the other off-airport improvements. LAWA is not allowed to spend federal dollars for off-airport improvements and recently SCAG has withdrawn support for both the Arbor Vitae interchange and the LAX Expressway in their transportation plan. Without those projects all traffic around LAX will become grid locked. There is currently no mechanism to assure that the proposed mitigation will ever be completed, so all proposed mitigation should be fully funded and built prior to allowing any further expansion at LAX.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00008-6 regarding funding and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00381-8

Comment:

The Master Plan Concepts are poorly planned and do not fully explore all options available. Other than the numbers of runways the three proposed concepts are virtually the same. None of the proposals offer an alternative that will have less of an impact on the surrounding communities than Concept C, the LAWA preferred plan.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding the range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Response to Comment AL00022-3 regarding the number and severity of impacts associated with Alternative C compared to Alternatives A and B. It should be noted that, subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR an additional option -Alternative D, Enhanced Safety and Security Plan- was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Although the conclusion of the Draft EIS/EIR was that Alternative C would have the fewest negative impacts to the surrounding communities and the region, that conclusion has been superseded by the conclusion of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D is now considered to be the Environmentally Superior alternative and would have the fewest negative impacts to the local communities and the region. Alternative D has replaced Alternative C as the LAWA staff-preferred alternative.

PC00381-9

Comment:

I do not believe for an instant that the true maximum capacity of LAX will be limited to 89 MAP under concept C. LAWA has a history of drastically understating the capacity at all of its airports. This serves the purpose of not having to fully mitigate the negative impacts or providing adequate facilities such as parking, which are based on passenger counts.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding projected versus actual capacity levels at LAX and legal limits on the ability to control activity levels at airports. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00381-10

Comment:

None of the concepts propose the use of remote off-airport terminals as have been developed at other airports and as is preferred by the FAA. The early concepts of developing remote terminals and transportation facilities to the east of the Airport have all been dropped. All of the concepts propose development of a new large Western Terminal which then requires access to one of the most remote spots at the LAX site by millions of passengers a year.

Response:

Alternative D, which was added subsequent to the publication and public review of the Draft EIS/EIR, proposes terminal facilities east of the existing Central Terminal Area for the purposes of passenger drop-off/pick-up and check-in. These proposed facilities would be located in proximity to existing freeways such as Interstate 405 and Interstate 105, and also close to public transit services such as the MTA Green Line. Unlike Alternatives A, B, and C, Alternative D does not propose a West Terminal.

PC00381-11

Comment:

All of the concepts create a redundant internal circulation system that requires passengers to access the terminals through long and short term parking facilities, car rental facilities and Green line services at the new western terminal, only to be shuttled back to the east through the proposed people mover.

Response:

The plans provide direct access to the parking facilities. No excessive circulation would be needed. The access plans were discussed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR in Chapter 3, Alternatives.

PC00381-12

Comment:

All of the concepts provide for all future cargo demands to be accommodated at LAX, when much of the cargo demand could be diverted to Ontario Airport which is more conveniently located near freeway and rail facilities.

Response:

Comment noted. There is a perception among many observers and respondents that air cargo and passenger aircraft can be easily split between or among airports in a multi-airport market. While in some cases and for select airlines this may be feasible, there are several significant barriers including but not limited to: Combination Service - Many foreign flag carriers and at least one U.S. carrier (i.e., Northwest Airlines) provide both passenger and all-cargo flights at LAX. Typically, the local management and operations (i.e., ground handling/warehousing, etc) of this combination of passenger and cargo service is inseparable and economically undesirable. U.S. Postal Service - The U.S. Postal Service (USPS) is a major contractor with both U.S. passenger airlines and more recently FedEx. Splitting all-cargo flights between or among airports would likely degrade air mail service as it has been structured. The express all-cargo carriers, mostly notably FedEx and United Parcel Service (UPS), argue that relative proximity to population/commercial density is critical to achieve the overnight promise to deliver, the hallmark service of express carriers. For these reasons, among others, it is not feasible to eliminate cargo traffic from LAX. The new Enhanced Safety and Security Plan Alternative, Alternative D, analyzed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, was added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to the No Action/No Project Alternative. Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided information on the formulation of this alternative and its consistency with the SCAG 2001 RTP.

PC00381-13

Comment:

All of the concepts call for lengthened runways in order to accommodate only one proposed type of airplane, the Airbus 380A. It is foolish to lengthen the runways just to accommodate this one airplane.

Response:

The lengthening of runways in the Master Plan alternatives was proposed in order to accommodate not only the Airbus A380, which is scheduled to enter commercial service in 2006, but also the aircraft in the current fleet such as the Boeing 747s, Boeing 737-300 and MD-11. Runways that are lengthened to 12,000 feet could accommodate departures by the above aircraft at maximum takeoff weight in hot day conditions, reduce airfield congestion, and eliminate excessive coordinated crossings in the air, thus reducing departure delays. Please see Response to Comment AL00022-188 for a more detailed discussion on the need for runway extension at LAX.

In Alternative C, runway 6L/24R is lengthened to 9,400 feet to provide adequate runway length for arrival operations based on the runway length analysis (see the Master Plan Chapter IV, Section 3.2.2). This analysis concluded that Runway 6L/24R, with existing length of 8,295 feet, is not insufficient to

3. Comments and Responses

accommodate fully loaded landings under wet runway conditions by the Boeing 747-200/300 (8,400 feet required length) and MD-11 (9,400 feet required length). These aircraft would have to land on the primary departure runway in the north airfield (Runway 6R/24L), thus decreasing the departure capacity, or land on the south airfield, thus requiring coordinated crossing in the air when the aircraft is coming from the navigational fixes in the north.

PC00381-14

Comment:

All concepts call for the creation of a large freeway type interchange to be built at the Sepulveda BI/Westcheter Parkway intersection, destroying a major section of Downtown Westchester.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 for a discussion of project impacts on the Community of Westchester.

PC00381-15

Comment:

The commercial developments along Sepulveda are just finally starting to return after years of recovery from the last expansion.

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided additional discussion beyond that presented in the Draft EIS/EIR of potential acquisition effects on the Westchester Business District. As described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsections 4.2.6.2 through 4.2.6.4), acquisition within the Westchester Business District would be about 16 acres or 31 percent of the district under Alternative A, about 11 acres or 21 percent under Alternative B, or approximately 13 acres or 26 percent of the District under Alternative C. Under Alternatives A through C, relocation opportunities would be available for some uses nearby within Westchester Southside. Also, many of the uses that would be acquired are airport related and a number of the community related uses that would be acquired (a bank, an office supply store, a bar and beauty shop) would still remain available through similar businesses that are located in close proximity within the Westchester Business District.

Also, as described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6.5), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, in contrast to the other build alternatives, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative), does not include any acquisition within the Westchester Business District. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00381-16

Comment:

All concepts will have a "significant and unavoidable" noise impact on the population of at least 7000 and an additional 5000 who are already impacted would suffer additionally higher noise levels. LAWA has just recently started a soundproofing program for residence as mitigation for expansions that happened 20-30 years ago. Will it take an additional 20 years to "mitigate" the noise impacts from this expansion? Will it ever even happen?

Response:

The commentor appears to be referencing the significant noise impacts presented in Section 4.1, Noise, for population newly exposed to the 65 CNEL or greater and exposed to a 1.5 CNEL increase above 65 CNEL under Alternative C, compared to 1996 baseline conditions. While these impacts were identified as significant, mitigation measure MM-LU-1, located in Section 4.2.8, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, revised the ANMP to encompass uses newly exposed to high noise levels if they are located outside the current ANMP boundaries. It should be noted that under Alternative D, LAWA Staff's preferred alternative, the number of residents newly exposed to the 65 CNEL compared to 1996 baseline conditions would be 5,090 residents and therefore less than identified

3. Comments and Responses

for Alternative C. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding progress in implementing the soundproofing program and estimated timeframe for completion of the current program. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding LAWA's commitment to implementing the noise mitigation measures presented in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As presented in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, mitigation measure MM-LU-1 contains several measures to accelerate the rate of land use mitigation to eliminate noise impact areas in a timely and efficient manner.

PC00381-17

Comment:

Parking allowances are inadequate as proposed in all concepts. The existing Master Plan adopted in 1980 required 750 parking spaces for each 1 million passengers or about 30,000 spaces for 40 MAP. This translates to about 1 parking spaces for every 1300 passengers at the airport. Currently there are approximately 42,000 parking spaces for the public and employees or about 1 parking space for every 1600 passengers according to Table 3 of Chapter 3 - Alternatives of the EIR/EIS. Under Concept C there will only be 54,000 spaces or 1 space for every 1650 passengers. So under this Master Plan, LAX would increase passenger capacity by 225% but only increase parking capacity by 180%. This is not quite so bad if you believe these numbers, but I'm not sure you can. If you look at Table II-6.2 in Chapter 2 of the Master Plan document, it shows that currently there are only about 21,000 public parking spaces. Table II-6.3 shows approx. 6700 employee parking spaces. This would mean there are currently only about 27,700 parking spaces, not even the number required to meet the 40 MAP. Table II-6.2 does say there are an additional 7,000 - 9,000 spaces at privately operated parking lots, but assuming the full 9,000 are available they are still short of the 42,000 identified in the EIR/EIS. Not only that, but the privately operated parking facilities could be removed from service at the owners discretion and should not be counted toward total "required" parking numbers.

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As stated on page 4-238 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the demand for most airport surface transportation facilities is not based on total airport passengers. Rather, it is based on originating and terminating air passengers only, which are the passengers who begin or end their trips in the Los Angeles region. It excludes connecting passengers, which are those passengers who connect from flight to flight, since they do not use the airport's surface transportation system. Connecting passengers are, however, included in many passenger demand figures such as million annual passengers (MAP). The originating/terminating passenger forecasts for the Build Alternatives are similar if not identical in some cases. However, MAP increases for the Build Alternatives indicating that the number of connecting passengers increases. As stated above, connecting passengers do not use the airport's surface transportation system since they only connect from flight to flight on the airside. Therefore, the increase in total passengers has not been the basis for calculating the required increase of the parking supply in the project alternatives; rather the increase in originating/terminating passengers was used.

The employee parking spaces shown in Chapter 2 of the Master Plan document included LAWA Lots D and E, and the primary airline parking lots on the west side of the airport. There are other smaller employee lots around the airport that were not included in the survey conducted for Chapter 2. In total, there are over 10,000 employee parking stalls around the airport.

Also, it is important for the off-airport parking facilities that primarily serve airport parkers to be included in the analysis. If they were not included, it could be mistakenly perceived that the proposed Master Plan needs to provide for all airport-associated parking, even that which is currently served by off-airport commercial parking services. This mistake would result in a severe overbuilding of parking as part of the project. If that large supply was provided on-airport, it would also leave no parking demand for the off-airport parking operators.

PC00381-18

Comment:

There are many more examples of poor planning and questionable numbers and assumptions, but I do not have millions of dollars to pay consultants, years of time to prepare, and 12,000 pages of paper to

3. Comments and Responses

fill with fancy charts and graphs, in order to comment on all the flaws of these documents. The bottom line is that LAWA has a long history of broken promises, uncompleted mitigation plans for past expansions, and dishonest projections of future growth. They should not be allowed to continue with business as usual.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-121 regarding opportunities to alleviate impacts associated with past or present airport activities at LAX and Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity level. Please also note that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00381-19

Comment:

There can be no doubt that some remodel or renovation of existing facilities within existing airport boundaries could provide some greater efficiencies and allow for some increased capacity, but LAWA should focus on truly long term regional solutions. Even if LAX is allowed to grow to its fullest extent under Concept C it will again be undersized and in need of expansion by the time the construction is finished in 2015. Then the people living in the surrounding communities will be faced again with more expansion and land acquisitions. This is already the third major expansion I have lived through, the first was back in the 70's when LADOA promised that "all future expansion" will occur in Palmdale, the second was during the 80's when again we were told 40 MAP is it, all future expansion will be accommodated at Palmdale and Ontario. Will my daughter be fighting the next expansion in 2020 and hearing LAWA promise that all future expansion will be at Palmdale? LAX can not continue to carry the air traffic burden for all of Southern California.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00382 Powers, Eileen None Provided

PC00382-1

Comment:

We who live and work near the airport have learned to accept the noise factor, but the safety factor is beyond reason. The expansion plan violates too many considerations. Please do not allow this fine community to become a wasteland.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00383

Harford, Doris

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00383-1

Comment:

I think LAX is large enough!!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00383-2

Comment:

I live next to the airport. I can't hear my TV, I can't talk on the phone when a plane is flying over which is all day & night -

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. However, please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding areas exposed to high noise levels under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions and current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. Regarding high noise levels at the commentor's address (located at 8500 Falmouth), as shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S1 in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the subject property is located within the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL contour and therefore is eligible for residential sound insulation under the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP) as described in Topical Response TR-LU-3. As also shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S1 in Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the 65 CNEL contour has decreased from 1992 conditions, and consequently under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions the subject property is outside the 65 CNEL contour (but is still eligible for sound insulation). Also relative to single event noise levels that result in nighttime awakening (as established by the 94 dBA SEL noise contour), the subject property is located within the 94 dBA SEL contour under 1996 baseline conditions, but outside the 94 SEL under Year 2000 conditions, as shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. See also Topical Responses TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels, Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding existing high noise levels, and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC00383-3

Comment:

I have double pane windows and keep them shut all the time.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program, which includes the use of acoustically-rated windows to reduce interior noise levels. To achieve the full benefits of this program, windows need to be closed. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00383-4

Comment:

Let some of the other airports take more planes. --

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00384 Miller, Larry None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00384-1

Comment:

Please consider that regional planning - developing other airports such as El Toro, Palmdale, Ontario & Orange Co., rather than LAX - is the only sensible approach for Los Angeles & Southern California. It is the only approach that would utilize & exploit the economic, health and pollution aspects of expansion, modernization and development.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00385 Cruz, Carlos None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00385-1

Comment:

No queremos LAX EXPansion esto nos Afecta nuestra salud no queRemos mas Trafico que nos afecta nuestra Salud les supLico que Paren este Proyecto

We do not want the LAX expansion. This affects our health. We do not want more traffic that affects our health. We plead that this project be stopped.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 2, 3, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts. Alternative D has

3. Comments and Responses

been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00387 Dulley, Steve None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00387-1

Comment:

Totally against expansion LAX has not been a good neighbor.. -

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

PC00387-2

Comment:

Has not baned Phase II jet engines

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-7.6.

PC00387-3

Comment:

Has not allowed blackout periods at night (as do most large airports in the world)

Response:

There are no restrictions on the type of aircraft that may land or depart at LAX during the night hours. The Airport Noise and Capacity Act of 1990 requires that in order for a community to impose any noise or access restrictions, a CFR Part 161, Notice and Approval of Airport Noise and Access Restrictions study must be completed and accepted by the FAA. LAWA has a policy of preferred operating procedures that call for over-ocean procedures to be used at night when practicable. For information on easterly operations at night, please see Topical Response TR-N-5. As part of the Master Plan additional sound insulation is recommended for areas exposed to single event Sound Exposure Levels (SEL) in excess of 94 decibels if a recommended restriction on easterly departures during the night hours fails the required tests under CFR Part 161. Please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Technical Noise Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for more information. Additionally, please see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement.

PC00387-4

Comment:

Large airport is not required here. Should be spread out to other not so populated areas.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with

3. Comments and Responses

the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00390 Sharpe, Elsie None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00390-1

Comment:

Our quality of life is poor now before expansion. Soundproofing is not the answer. One wants to use one's deck or open a window. It is impossible to do so now. We need to find ways to make the noise tolerable, not increase it.

Response:

Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding quality of life, Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program, and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC00390-2

Comment:

Utilize other facilities in other areas. Ours is impacted to the utmost now.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00391 Sharpe, Stan None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00391-1

Comment:

Since there will be more & more flights, cargo, etc. as the L.A. Comm. expands simple economies demand that a regional plan be developed involving S. Calif. communities. LAX, over double in size of its built capacity now, will strangle in 20 years. Then what!! All land & building areas that will eventually be needed will be double or triple the cost now. Keep LAX a functional airport

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements

3. Comments and Responses

and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00392 Jones, Gary None Provided

PC00392-1

Comment:

WILL THERE BE A LARGER TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT UNIT TO HANDLE THE TRAFFIC FLOW IN AND AROUND LAX

Response:

Traffic enforcement would continue to be provided by the Airport police and police officers from Los Angeles and surrounding jurisdictions. Please see Section 4.26.2, Law Enforcement, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for information regarding potential law enforcement impacts.

PC00393 Mitsakos, Peter None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00393-1

Comment:

1 Given that LAX has for a number of years, exceeded the legal limits (imposed on it by the previously adopted Master Plan and associated Environmental Impact Report) for the number of passengers, number of flights and amount of automobile traffic generated, please demonstrate why the citizens of the community should have any faith that the conclusions of the current approval process will be enforced.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding projected versus actual capacity levels at LAX and legal limits on the ability to control activity levels at airports.

PC00393-2

Comment:

2 How have you or will you quantify the following affects to the quality of life in the neighborhoods surrounding the airport; and what, if any measures will you take to ameliorate the anticipated negative impacts? Please give answers that address each example given.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, and please see responses to comments below.

PC00393-3

Comment:

A. The impact of noise as a result of increased frequency of flights and decreased distance from runways and flight patterns to residential communities. The proposed shift of the northern most runway further north will decrease the distance between the aircraft and the residences to the north, therefore inevitably causing an increase in the level of noise. The greater number of flights proposed will

3. Comments and Responses

increase the frequency. If permitted these activities will clearly decrease in the quality of life in the adjacent communities.

Example: If a plane flies close enough to a residential area so that the noise interrupts phone conversations, the quality of life is reduced compared to areas where the plane is further away and phone conversations are not interrupted. The same can be said for watching television, listening to music or simply having conversations. Furthermore, if the interruption lasts a few seconds, it is less detrimental than if the volume remains loud enough to be disruptive for it tens of seconds. Of course, it is also more disruptive and therefore has a greater negative impact on the quality of life if these occurrences happen more frequently.

Example: If residents are able to enjoy the outdoor areas of their properties, to work in the garden, sun themselves on the patio, or watch their children play on swings, the quality of life is better than if they are forced to retreat indoors because the roar of the planes is too loud. Please explain the system you have or are proposing that measures the relative degradation of this quality as the air traffic increases in frequency (from occasional to regular to constant) and decreases in distance to existing residential areas (and therefore become louder and louder).

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For information regarding future noise increases, and their potential effect on the quality of life in the area, please see Topical Responses TR-LU-1, TR-LU-2, and TR-N-6. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC00393-4

Comment:

Example: Particulate matter from jet exhaust precipitating from the air is deposited on all the exterior surfaces of residential areas, including on planting, sidewalks, patios, outdoor furniture, fencing, windows and window sills, and children's play equipment requires these surfaces to be cleaned, repainted and replaced with greater frequency. The greater the amount of particulate, the greater the amount of time and resources needed to mitigate them at both a household and community level, the greater the degradation to our quality of life. If I spend one weekend every three months washing the exterior of my house, the quality of my life is not as impacted as when I spend every other weekend washing the exterior of my house.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition and soot.

PC00393-5

Comment:

B. The impact of automobile traffic as a result of rerouting traffic directly adjacent to neighborhoods of single family houses and increasing traffic on streets that have single family houses and small apartment buildings directly facing and accessed by them.

Example: As the amount of automobile traffic increases on streets that pass by and through our neighborhoods, the smaller our neighborhoods become. This means that children cannot be allowed to walk down the block to play with a neighbor's child and adults no longer feel comfortable walking along a street that now carries much more traffic at higher speeds. This fosters an even greater dependence on the automobile, since it feels safer to be in the car than to walk just a few blocks. It also means that there is a need for increased signalization in our neighborhoods, longer waiting times at traffic signals just to leave our block in the morning, to go to work, to take the kids to the school, to go to the store. How have you quantified this degradation to our neighborhoods?

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts. Note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or the Ring Road.

PC00393-6

Comment:

The premise for these questions is of course that the quality of life has declined in measurable ways as the airport has increased its operations over the years and that those negative affects will be increased under the current plan to increase airport activity. While the work completed on behalf of the airport expansion has documented the number of passengers, cars and flights to be increased and has discussed mitigation of these increases solely in terms of traffic flow, be it on the streets or on the runways, there has been precious little documentation of the real decline in the quality of life for those living within the ever increasing impact zone of LAX. The fact that these impacts have scarcely been acknowledged demonstrates the careless disregard for the concerns of the neighborhoods that surround and are likely to be engulfed by the airport. It may be that it is the wisest and best solution to the air transportation problems facing the Southland to expand LAX; but, that has by no means been clearly demonstrated, much less that the specific plan under consideration is the best way to achieve that expansion. Worst of all, the lack of even an acknowledgement of havoc the proposed expansion will have on the surrounding communities, not to mention an attempt at a fair method of compensation to the residents harmed by it, calls into question the integrity of the entire process.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed community disruption in Section 4.4.4, Community Disruption and Alteration of Surface Transportation Patterns. In addition, the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed environmental impacts, both adverse and beneficial, in Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures.

PC00394

Tolton, Justin

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00394-1

Comment:

The expansion of LAX is illogical. People in the valley need an airport in Palmdale. People in San Bernardino area need Ontario expanded. People around LAX need less traffic. People in Orange County need El Toro. People need a regional solution. People do not benefit from LAX expansion. LAX should not be allowed to expand at all. The airlines may want LAX expansion, but this should be secondary to people.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00395 **Marino, Nancy** **None Provided** **6/9/2001**

PC00395-1

Comment:

Re: Public Hearing at the Furama Hotel Saturday, June 9, 2001.

At approximately 2:45 pm, I was advised that there were over 100 speaker cards submitted to be heard, and each speaker would be given 3 minutes to speak. Since this was over 5 hours of testimony "scheduled" for the remaining 4 ¾ hours of the hearing, I was effectively denied permission to speak. Public hearings are supposed to provide the opportunity for all community members to speak out, and by holding only one meeting (scattered over 3 locations), LAWA and its officers have, in effect, denied the community of Los Angeles greater metropolitan area their right to full participation in the review process.

MORE PUBLIC HEARINGS NEED TO BE HELD to redress this violation of due process.

Response:

As indicated by the FAA representative at the outset of each public hearing, the hearings were held open as long as necessary to allow everyone wishing to have an opportunity to provide oral comments. Having simultaneous meetings allowed for more public input on that one day than would have been available otherwise. Having the public hearings at three locations meant that the hearing process became more accessible to a greater amount of people than would have been afforded the opportunity with only one location. Further, there were six additional hearings on the Draft EIS/EIR for those who could not make the first date or who wanted an additional opportunity to provide oral comments. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding the availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review. Finally, please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process.

PC00396 **Marino, Nancy** **None Provided** **6/9/2001**

PC00396-1

Comment:

This "document" - if the numerous books comprising the 12,000+ page report can be thus described - is a colossal obfuscation of the issues that pertain to the proposed LAX expansion plan(s). I have encountered page after page of methodologies and cross-references in the sections titled "Analysis of ____" with no actual analysis. There is precious little information I can find in sections with labels promising what I seek.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00396-2

Comment:

Since I cannot afford to purchase a copy and cannot pitch a tent in my local library, I have been unable to find "pertinent sections" to reference my commentary on the issues which are of greatest concern to me. Different and better public communication is needed - NOW!

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review.

PC00397

Morris, Kay

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00397-1

Comment:

The purpose of this letter is to express my total opposition to any expansion of Los Angeles Airport for the following reasons:

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC00397-2

Comment:

- Excessive Traffic will be generated on freeways and in the neighborhoods surrounding the airport. Today, without any expansion, traffic is outrageous. The re-routing attempts of the proposed plan do not go to the route cause of the problem.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PC00397-3

Comment:

- Excessive Pollution will result with more vehicular and air traffic.

Response:

Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In general, the predicted air pollution impacts of any of the LAX Master Plan build alternatives will be lower than the predicted impacts of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution.

PC00397-4

Comment:

Today, without any expansion pollution is nearly intolerable with the combination of noise, car fumes and jet exhaust residue which creates a black layer of slime on outdoor furniture and decks.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition and soot, and Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding fumes.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00397-5

Comment:

The Expansion Plan is Myopic. It does not consider all the airport assets and possibilities in Southern California. The plan simply wants to force more air traffic here without consideration of the potential opportunities at El Toro, Palmdale, Ontario and the former air force bases in San Bernadino County.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00397-6

Comment:

My recommendation is to immediately halt LAX expansion plans and with a multi-community task force develop plans for all for Southern California which are more than stop gap and which utilize existing assets

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00398 Rosen, Stan None Provided

PC00398-1

Comment:

A requirement of any airport improvement program should be that federal air quality standards are complied with. None of the proposed projects meet this standard.

Please include this requirement in future projects.

Response:

Airport improvement projects proposed in air quality nonattainment or maintenance areas (such as the South Coast Air Basin) which require FAA funding or approval require that FAA issue a positive general conformity determination prior to approving or funding the project. Please see Response to Comment AF00001-14 regarding the general conformity determination. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-165 regarding the governor's certification, which is no longer required. Please also see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding the air pollution impacts.

PC00399 Waldenmayer, Karin None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00399-1

Comment:

Instead of trying to expand LAX why not build a new state-of-the-art airport in El Toro? People near El Toro should have the benefit of a short commute to an Int'l Airport.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County Transportation Demand.

PC00400 Barondess, Paula None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00400-1

Comment:

After 25 yrs in the area and only occasionally having to deal w/noise or fumes or traffic, we are only now in the last 2-3 yrs considering moving.

The airport expansion is not an expansion - they do not intend to buy our property or close our schools - they merely want to soundproof our houses, make them cages - as say "see we care".

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding fumes and Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

PC00400-2

Comment:

Why should the neighbors of LAX have to deal with increased traffic, pollution, noise in the name of community - whose community? Where do the expansion supporters live? If they moved to 89th St, sent their children to St "A" and dealt w/what we do - I might listen.

Regional!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00401 Chaffers, Marie None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00401-1

Comment:

I reside in the western portion of LA bounded by Westchester Pkwy and Arbor Vitae on the North. Since the number of years living here, my health has seriously deteriorated, as well as my family's and the neighboring children that live here.

I am disabled from a previous injury, however, upon moving here, I had no idea that my remaining health and existing disability would be further compromised and failing; due to the environment and continued stress and neurological problems from the noise.

Our children, as well as myself have largely increased doctor visits and medication due to the constant flying airplanes over our residences. This area SHOULD BE for LAX and the airplanes that must fly through and not for our children and residential areas.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise.

PC00402 Carr, Michael None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00402-1

Comment:

I don't see how anyone living in Los Angeles can justify expanding the number of passengers and cargo flights flying in and out of LAX when future operating capacity expansion capabilities at other airports makes more sense:

SPRAWL

- A recent newspaper article on the latest Census figures shows that population growth forced migration away from coastal cities (i.e. LAX) and pricey suburbs in search of cheaper homes inland.

- A recent newspaper article pointed out that L.A. County's supervisorial districts will have to be redrawn because of the counties that grew the most in the 1990s: the Antelope, Santa Clarita, San Fernando, San Gabriel and Crescenta valleys.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00402-2

Comment:

CONGESTION:

3. Comments and Responses

- A May 2001 newspaper article presented a study from the Texas Transportation Institute, listing the Los Angeles/Orange county region as being THE most congested area in the country in 1999.

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00402-3

Comment:

POLLUTION:

A May 2001 report by the American Lung Association gave the Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County area an F for ozone air pollution aka smog. The Los Angeles Daily News reported that Los Angeles is perennially America's Smoggiest City, though Houston essentially tied in 1999.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00402-4

Comment:

- A recent newspaper article presented a Children's Health Study by USC scientists where they pointed out that smoggy air stunts the growth and development of young children's lungs.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PC00402-5

Comment:

- A newspaper article just this past week pointed out that LAX is the biggest air polluter in Los Angeles County.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01186-4 regarding LAX as a source of air pollution.

PC00402-6

Comment:

- Noise levels affecting Westchester ramp up dramatically when the northernmost runway is used. Even though I live one mile north, it sounds like a freight train is passing outside the house after 11pm when virtually all else is quiet. Soundproofing the bedroom window wasn't enough since the reverberations pass right through the walls and ceiling and still through the soundproofed window.

Response:

Nighttime single event noise impacts and mitigation for LAX Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting

3. Comments and Responses

information in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. At a location one mile north of the airport, there is little that can be done to modify the noise effects perceived at the commentor's residence, other than a greater adherence to the nighttime over ocean procedure that focuses departures after midnight onto the south runway complex, and arrivals onto the north runways. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration, and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of master plan alternatives on the community of Westchester.

PC00402-7

Comment:

AIRLINES:

- In an October 2000 issue of the Daily Breeze, airport officials have underscored the power of the airline industry and the strength of market forces to determine where jets take off and land.

I have lived on the Westside since 1961. If LAX growth is limited to its current capacity, airlines will find a way to profit at other smaller airports, as they did when LAX had much less traffic. As with all other industries, market forces would dictate how to adjust, whether through airline consolidation, increasing ticket prices (which passes on part of the burden to those using airports) or increasing the number of flight times and destination choices to potential passengers at airports other than LAX.

Case in point: my brother lives in San Diego County, yet he travels to LAX periodically since destination choices are far less in his county than at LAX.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-2 and Attachment 2 of this Final EIS/EIR regarding the role of deregulation in aviation planning and the airline response to market demand and deregulation. Also please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the Master Plan's role in a regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00402-8

Comment:

ECONOMIC:

- CIC Research Inc. did a study that was reported in the Daily Breeze October 2000, pointing out that Southern California would enjoy the same economic benefits of airports other than LAX absorbed any future increases.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D, Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, has been designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient and efficient. Alternative D is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, which calls for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region.

PC00402-9

Comment:

- As reported in a May 2001 issue of the L.A. Times, California business forecasters inside and outside government stated that Los Angeles County jobless rate was at a 32-year low.

Response:

Comment noted. The Los Angeles County unemployment rate fluctuates from month to month in response to both national and more local economic conditions. As of December 2003, the County's unemployment rate was 6.1 percent, as compared with 5.1 percent in May 2001, according to the State of California Employment Development Department.

PC00403 Hoebink, Margaret None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00403-1

Comment:

Think regional.

No more expansion at LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00403-2

Comment:

Soundproof my house. You're saying the noise in my neighbor's house is bad enough for soundproofing but not mine.

Response:

This is a comment on existing noise levels and conditions. The general focus of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, pursuant to NEPA and CEQA, is to evaluate the potential future environmental effects of the project and to provide feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts. The noise impact area which determines residential uses eligible for noise insulation is described in Topical Response TR-LU-3, and is based on the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL noise contour. See Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding how eligibility for soundproofing is determined, and for a description of how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

PC00403-3

Comment:

Put your microphones in my yard when the heavies take off at night or you turn the traffic around.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. However, please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC00404 Clark, Anne None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00404-1

Comment:

Is there any opportunity in this "Land of the Free" for the individual's rights to be protected & their voice truly heard.

This "proposal" is one-sided, unilateral & not in the best interest of the community. What can we do to be heard.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00404-2

Comment:

No other sane city officials would permit this expansion amidst such density.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00404-3

Comment:

Go Ontario, El Toro, Palmdale.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00405 Quarnstrom, Dan None Provided

PC00405-1

Comment:

I AM OPPOSED TO ALL THREE OF THE PLANS THAT ARE BEING PROPOSED.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00405-2

Comment:

-THE AMOUNT OF TRAFFIC THAT WILL BE FUNNELED IN TO MY NEIGHBORHOOD BY EACH OF THE PLANS IS UNACCEPTABLE.

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PC00405-3

Comment:

-EXTENDING THE NORTH RUNWAY & MOVING IT NORTH WILL INCREASE NOISE & POLLUTION, BRINGING AIRCRAFT CLOSER TO OUR NEIGHBORHOOD.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Section 7.2 of Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR, in particular Section 7.2.2, Alternative A, and Section 7.2.4, Alternative C. Also, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of master plan alternatives on the community of Westchester.

PC00405-4

Comment:

-ALTERNATIVES EXIST FOR A REGIONAL SOLUTION TO AIRPORT CROWDING.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00405-5

Comment:

-ANY PROPOSAL WHICH INCLUDES A "RING ROAD" OR EXTENDING THE NORTH RUNWAY IS UNACCEPTABLE.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternative D does not include the ring road that is included in Alternatives A, B, and C.

PC00405-6

Comment:

-THE CONDITIONS WHICH ARE BEING PROPOSED ARE UNSAFE.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00405-7

Comment:

-THE COMBINED EXPANSION OF PLAYA VISTA & THE AIRPORT EXPANSION WILL HAVE ONLY NEGATIVE EFFECTS FOR OUR COMMUNITY. THERE IS NO POSITIVE BENEFIT FOR HOMEOWNERS IN THIS AREA.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Response to Comment AL00018-19 regarding the evaluation of cumulative impacts in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00406

Evans, Lynne

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00406-1

Comment:

I am in an interesting position because I live and work in Westchester, but my business is to sell advertising in a trade magazine which serves the airlines. I own a home whose value I want to maintain, I don't want to live with increased noise, traffic, and safety issues... but at the same time, I fly a lot, and I want the airlines to continue to thrive (it's good for my business) and overall consider myself a capitalist who doesn't resist progress. I say this because when I first heard of the resistance to LAX expansion, I thought, "These are the same knee-jerk environmentalists who oppose every project indiscriminately". However, upon studying the facts, I must oppose LAX expansion too.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00406-2

Comment:

Why do I oppose expansion? Simple: It's not the BEST, most FAIR solution to the greatest NUMBER of PEOPLE. My argument is best represented on the website www.goregional.org, although I must say that I was disappointed that I was unable to find any mention of car traffic going to and from LAX on the 405 freeway. For THAT reason ALONE we should be looking at ways to disperse traffic into different directions, NOT bringing everyone into one hub - which is now considered an antiquated system by the industry (the trend now is toward "point to point" service - people want to get on a plane as close to home as possible, and go directly to their final destination). It does not take a genius to see that this is preferable for the MOST people. Yes, the airlines may resist this because it complicates their logistics - to which I say, "Deal with it".

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No

Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00406-3

Comment:

Most appalling in this entire process is the fact that people in Orange County are still driving all the way up to LAX when they fly. THIS MUST STOP. It is NOT FAIR that we should be burdened with this additional demand. LAX will grow, most certainly, due to population and travel growth - but if we do this expansion, it will grow that much MORE. "Give an inch and they'll take a mile" - this has always been the case! It is completely fair and appropriate to develop El Toro into a commercial airport which will augment John Wayne, currently serving an inappropriately small number of Orange County residents' flying needs. Where do these wealthy elite (the ones trying to block the conversion) - where do they get their gall? Are their children more valuable than the children of Inglewood, Westchester, or El Segundo? Of course not. Then why on earth do they 'need' a PARK when that portion of Southern California is grossly underserved vis a vis airport capacity? It's so off-the-wall it belongs in "Through the Looking Glass".

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, that discusses the El Toro conversion and constraints at John Wayne Airport.

PC00406-4

Comment:

I understand that those local residents are fearful of the changes an airport will bring. LIFE INVOLVES CHANGE. The state of California continues to grow and it is ONLY FAIR to DISTRIBUTE the less desirable aspects of civilization among the many - NOT drop it in the laps of the FEW! LAX *is* growing and evolving and it will continue to do so WITHOUT this expansion. I am not resistant to change - but we should not bear the brunt of ALL of it - it needs to be spread according not just to population numbers, but to PASSENGER numbers - as we know, the wealthy fly more often than the poor!

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed environmental justice in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, with supporting technical data and analysis provided in Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00406-5

Comment:

One of the rationales for this proposed expansion at LAX is to accommodate the Airbus A380 aircraft, which will hold 550 - 600 people. Do a poll! Find me ONE PERSON who wishes to FLY on such an aircraft? This is a grand experiment by Airbus Industrie, with about 10 launch customers. Yes, they'd like a Pacific gateway at LAX.. . but they could get the same access at Ontario, El Toro or Palmdale. Ridiculous? How ridiculous is it to think we can have 600 people at a time dumped into LAX and the surrounding area - on TOP of what is coming and going NOW? The airlines will fly the A380 into LAX if we LET them - if not, they will stick with tried-and-true 747's and 777's. So this is a completely bogus and artificial "need" that LAWA is attempting to address.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00406-6

Comment:

The strangest aspect of this entire proposal is that it seems to be completely disconnected and in denial of the REALITIES of TODAY's Southern California living. When my family moved to California in 1967, we flew on a TWA 707 and landed at LAX. It was breathtaking.. . clean, efficient, beautiful, and uncrowded. My dad got us into the car and soon we were on the I-10 on our way to Ontario, where we were to live. Back then the air was clean and the freeways uncrowded.. . the trip took less than an hour, and was pleasant. Somehow the LAWA people seem to be in denial of the fact that we need more airports serving Southern California because car traffic has become such a nightmare, "jumping in the car and running to LAX" is NOT as easy as it used to be. As a result, I can easily argue that LAX has a SMALLER cachement area than it did in 1967 (in mileage, certainly not in population). It is NOT REASONABLE to expect people to drive long distances - ESPECIALLY not up and down the 405 to and from Orange County - thus needlessly crowding the freeways for EVERYONE. WHY? So that LAWA can have an overblown dynasty? So a handful of wealthy OC residents can avoid having an airport there? SPREAD the benefits AND the liabilities, that is what is FAIR!

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the Master Plan's role in a regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC00406-7

Comment:

Think REGIONALLY, and OUTSIDE THE BOX. Why not send A380's up to Palmdale and connect to LAX with a high-speed rail? Passengers on A380's will always be arriving from international destinations.. . meaning if they need to catch a connecting flight, there is always at least 2 hours between flights. Okay.. .make it four! On a trip of that length, the difference is minimal. We are NOT doomed to having the A380 at LAX (and by the way, Palmdale's economy would welcome such a boost in jobs, etc.)!

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00406-8

Comment:

I saw LAWA's propaganda film on TV last Sunday. What a joke! To paraphrase, they're telling us we will miss out on 75,000 additional jobs if LAX does not expand? HUH??? WHERE are these people supposed to park? WHERE do they all eat lunch, etc. and most importantly do we WANT THAT ADDITIONAL CAR TRAFFIC? GET REAL! LAX will continue to thrive, even if we do nothing - because the airline industry is thriving (not at this moment, but overall). The expansion plan is grandiose - I say NO!

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed employment impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and growth inducing impacts in Section 4.5, Induced Socio-Economic Impacts. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 2, 3, and 5, of the Draft

3. Comments and Responses

EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2 and S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00406-9

Comment:

It will be evidence of incompetence at MANY levels if this travesty is enabled to continue. LAX serves MORE than its share of passengers in the REGION. We need a REGIONAL, LONG-TERM solution.. . and THIS is NOT IT!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00406-10

Comment:

*PS The NYC area is served by JFK, LaGuardia and Newark - that is how we need to think - OC needs capacity!

Response:

The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC00408 Salmonson, Arthur None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00408-1

Comment:

I am adamately opposed to Alternative "A".

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00408-2

Comment:

I live near the north end of the airport and the noise would be unbearable.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-5 for a discussion of how aircraft noise impacts are determined and mitigated under the LAX Master Plan. See also Topical Response TR-LU-2 for a summary of noise impacts on the Westchester- Playa del Rey communities. As shown on Figure S4.2-7 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S4 of Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, under Alternative A no areas within Playa del Rey would be newly exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour compared to 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions. In addition, as shown on Figure S4.2-8 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S5 of Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, no areas within Playa del Rey would be newly exposed to the 94 dBA SEL noise contour compared to 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00408-3

Comment:

In addition, I shop at Ralphs & Longs Drug store on Sepulveda and do not wish to lose that shopping area.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00018-1 regarding commercial property acquisition within the Westchester Business District and Response to Comment PC00013-5 regarding collateral development at LAX Northside/Westchester Southside. Also refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding the potential effects of the Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester. The above-referenced Ralph's Supermarket is not proposed for acquisition under any of the build alternatives addressed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00408-4

Comment:

Do not under any circumstances implement Alternative "A". I could live with the options on the south side of the airport.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00409

Bischoff, David

None Provided

PC00409-1

Comment:

Questions - It appears that the fuel farms will stay in their present location, but where will the current maintenance Facilities and Administration west personnel be relocated?

Response:

The subjects of airline maintenance hangars and airport administration personnel were included as part of the ancillary facilities component of Alternatives A, B, C, and D. Please see Chapter 3, Alternatives, in the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for the ancillary facilities program for Alternatives A, B, C, and D.

Much of the airport administration personnel would be relocated into new facilities that are planned for within the Westchester Southside Project under Alternatives A, B, and C. The 42,000 square foot administrative office building at the old air traffic control tower would remain in place under Alternatives A, B, and C. Additional space has been allotted for construction of administrative office space in the Westchester Southside Project for Los Angeles World Airports. The following space has been allotted under Alternatives A, B, and C:

Alternative A: 312,000 square feet

Alternative B: 236,000 square feet

Alternative C: 207,000 square feet

Under Alternative D, the 42,000 square foot LAWA administrative office building at the old air traffic control tower and the 40,000 square foot facility on the west side of the airport north of World Way West would remain in their existing locations.

PC00410 Garcia, Carlos None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00410-1

Comment:

Instead of expanding LAX, it should be removed in its totality to a remote & safe, sparsely populated area such as El Toro.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00410-2

Comment:

It is absolutely unconscionable to hazard the health of children in 40 some odd schools in the area with fuel waste and disturb the the status quo of a region already plagued by noise & danger of falling planes as in the Aero Mexico airplane case.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, impacts to schools in Section 4.27, Schools, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 4, 14a, 14c, and 17 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition, and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00411 Pevzner, Harvey and Holly None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00411-1

Comment:

Don't increase pollution, noise and all the other negative affects of the LAX expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00412 Garcia, Catherine None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00412-1

Comment:

I strongly object to the expansion of LAX which already carries an enormous amount of flights. The burden must be shared with other cities.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00412-2

Comment:

In spite of LAX promises, too many people will be badly affected by the increase in noise, pollution and traffic.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00413 Su, Huey-Jer None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00413-1

Comment:

The local transportation congestion of Westchester in the last couple of years has worsen. If the LAX continue to expand and the number of passenger vehicles to the LAX continues to increase, the local street will be more congested. This is unfair for the local resident.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PC00414 Harris, Irene None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00414-1

Comment:

I am a homeowner and live in Westchester and I am very concerned about the LAX expansion. I am concerned about air safety. Currently, when you look in the skies above our home you see planes, one right after the other as far as the eye can see. I do not see how you can put more planes in the air above L.A. without endangering the lives of the families on the ground and the people in the planes. I

3. Comments and Responses

believe that with the expansion and more planes in the air there will be a much greater chance of crashes and mid-air collisions.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00414-2

Comment:

The second thing I am concerned with is the quality of life for the families in Los Angeles will go down. I know that the airlines believe that it is for the betterment of the community, but I disagree. It helps them and not our community.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00414-3

Comment:

We already have to deal with layers of black pollution from the planes covering out houses and cars. We are worried how the increase affects our children's health in the future. Not to mention all of the pollution from the diesel trucks that will be coming in from all the cargo, plus the cars and buses.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4 and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-4 and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition, Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase, and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PC00414-4

Comment:

When will enough be enough. Los Angeles will always be growing, and the airport will never be satisfied. There must be a better solution then, taking over peoples homes, parks, places the community shops and eats as well as schools. I think it is a sad day when big business and money comes before families and peoples lives.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed property acquisition in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, and economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Report 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR, and Technical Report S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

PC00415

Harris, Justin

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00415-1

Comment:

I am a property owner, and business owner in the Westchester area. I am very concerned about several issues concerning the LAX expansion, and strongly opposed to the expansion.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below. In addition, it should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00415-2

Comment:

The greatest concern being to our health and environment. I have two small children that play outside a lot and will be breathing more airport pollution. I feel the air quality is already poor, and will be much worse with increased traffic to LAX.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00070-1 regarding existing air quality. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution.

PC00415-3

Comment:

I have had breathing problems, including asthma that I fear may worsen with increased air pollution in the area. The last thing I would like is to have my kids growing up breathing more and more airport pollution.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC00415-4

Comment:

How do I know that the water is not affected by all the pollution from the airport?

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed water quality in Section 4.7, Hydrology and Water Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Report 6 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-5 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In compliance with the Clean Water Act, storm water runoff at LAX is currently controlled through adherence to two NPDES storm water permits that require control of pollutants using the best available technology. Storm water leaving the airport is monitored as part of these permits to determine compliance. LAX is in compliance with these permits.

PC00415-5

Comment:

My cars have had very strange deposits since we lived in the Westchester LAX area, which I feel is from airport pollution.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC00415-6

Comment:

Two of my neighbors on my block alone have developed brain tumors since we have lived in the area.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 14a and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please refer to Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PC00415-7

Comment:

The noise level is also a great concern, already the airport is louder than I like. The last thing we want to hear is more airport noise while enjoying our backyard during the day.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC00415-8

Comment:

My office is 5 minutes from my house with no traffic, most of the time, with traffic, it takes almost 20 minutes to get from my house to my office on Sepulveda because of the LAX and 405/Sepulveda traffic. More congestion in this area is not a good thing, we are already beyond normal conditions, and the thought of increasing the travel in the area sounds devastating to the property owners and business commuters in this growing area.

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. In addition please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00415-9

Comment:

Finally I would like to say, that Westchester has been one of the few affordable neighborhoods to own a home on the West Los Angeles area, a lot of new families with lots of kids are occupying this area. Adding more congestion and pollution I think is a very bad idea, not to mention having more planes fly over the homes of all the families in the area.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00416

Cox, Tom

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00416-1

Comment:

I believe the EIR is flawed for the following reasons. The EIR grossly underestimates the damage done to residents and business located near LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed residential relocation in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, and economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 5, of the Draft EIS/EIR, and Technical Report S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00416-2

Comment:

The EIR downplays the levels of cancer causing pollutants released into the air by landing and idling aircraft.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4 and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-4 and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects and Response to Comment AL00034-52.

PC00416-3

Comment:

It underestimates the amount a damaging pollution released by cars, trucks, and buses drawn to LAX.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00416-4

Comment:

Dangerous Mix of Traffic

The EIR totally ignores the dangerous mix of traffic that is drawn to LAX. Low-paid shuttle bus drivers, aggressive cab drivers, so-called courtesy bus drivers, limousine drivers, and maximum sized tractor trailers are all mixed together with private drivers trying to get in or out of the airport. The paid drivers get increasingly aggressive as traffic increases. I have personally witnessed extremely dangerous behavior by the professional drivers. Passing on the right in parking lanes; driving at high speeds through residential neighborhoods, running red lights, cutting through parking lots, grossly excessive speed, and cutting across several lanes at the last minute to cut into a line of traffic entering the airport are examples of the type of driving behavior exhibited hourly during peak traffic periods. This behavior is often accompanied by profanities and gestures aimed at local drivers who are obeying traffic laws. When this type of overly-aggressive driving behavior is mixed into normal residential traffic the mix is potentially deadly. Parents drop off and pick up young children at pre-schools and elementary schools located on streets used as direct airport access routes from freeways. Elderly couples make their way to

doctors' offices and stores located in "downtown" Westchester on Sepulveda. Mothers do their daily errands distracted by one or more infants and toddlers in their cars. High school kids learn how to drive on these streets. All of these local residents are constantly subjected to the ever-present danger of the overly-aggressive professional drivers entering and leaving the airport.

To make matters worse. Air travelers coming from Orange Country, the valley, or far Eastside often underestimate the amount of time required to arrive at LAX for their flight. As they get closer to LAX they are under increasing pressure to hurry to make their flight. They begin to "push the envelope" and drive more aggressively than normal. They are often times even more dangerous than the profession driver who drive aggressively all the time.

And finally, into this whole volatile mix, you have out of town visitors, and foreign drivers picking up cars at the local rent a car locations and released with an unfamiliar vehicle and a poor map into this cauldron of aggressive drivers.

The impact of this mix of traffic is already an unfair and dangerous burden placed on residents who live near LAX. Any increase in this traffic is bordering on homicide.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00416-5

Comment:

Terrorism

The EIR ignores the fact that a single large airport is a more inviting target for domestic or international terrorism. Recently, it was reported in the L.A. Times that the man tried in the "millenium bombing plot" admitted he was targeting LAX. Luckily, he was caught bringing the explosives into the country in Seattle and never completed his plan.

As long as LAX continues to be expanded, it continues to grow as a potential target. Terrorists around the world see LAX constantly in movies and news reports. If efforts are made to increase the amount of traffic, it will become more prominent and it will become increasingly difficult to defend, or maintain reasonable levels of security.

A regional solution, will lesson the impact of a terrorist impact at LAX and reduce the likelihood that LAX would be a target.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comments AL00051-93 and PC02131-5. Alternative D, Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, has been designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient and efficient. Alternative D is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, which calls for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region.

PC00416-6

Comment:

Loss of Community

The EIR doesn't measure the loss of community that results from the constant erosion of livable space within the Westchester and Playa del Rey communities. Row after row of houses have been removed since the latest expansion started in the 1960's. Promises have been made continually that this is the last expansion and they have been broken every time.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

As was described in Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, Alternatives A, B, and C, would involve acquisition of 84 dwelling units, representing conversion of approximately 8.83 acres of residential land use to airport related use.

As was presented in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D does not propose residential acquisition. As shown on Table S4.2-20 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, less land acquisition is proposed under Alternative D compared to the other build alternatives. Also see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding other effects on the Westchester/Playa del Rey communities.

PC00416-7

Comment:

Middle class residents that can afford to move, do so. Lower income residents are stuck to deal with the potentially deadly levels of pollution, and potentially deadly dangerous traffic mix, and a potentially deadly terrorist target in their backyard. The end result is a continued lowering of the standard of living in Westchester and therefore in Los Angeles as a whole.

Affluent and middle class residents relocate to areas outside Los Angeles, lower income residents remain. The per capita income of Los Angeles diminishes. With the middle class and affluent residents goes spending power, jobs, and volunteers to help out in our schools. They take their money, their jobs, and their willingness to help to other communities.

In the past year, we have had several friends and neighbor families move to Manhattan Beach (2), Palos Verdes (2), Utah (3), and Colorado (1). This is eight local families that moved only because they didn't like the direction Westchester is taking. They didn't like the local schools and didn't like the continuing decline of the standard of living brought about by living next to LAX.

Continued expansion of LAX will turn Westchester into a ghetto where no one will live who can afford to live anywhere else. This may be the long term goal of LAWA so they can expand to the bluffs and if that's the case then the EIR is a fraud foisted upon the people of Los Angeles.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed environmental justice issues in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits.

PC00416-8

Comment:

I respectfully request that no further expansion be planned at LAX either in terms of the physical size of the airport, number of passengers, or amount of cargo. I further request that regional airports be developed at Palmdale and Ontario. I request that negotiations be undertaken with Orange Country to open an airport at El Toro. If these negotiations fail, then I request a heavy surcharge or tax be placed on all cargo and passenger traffic through LAX benefiting Orange County.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please

3. Comments and Responses

see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00416-9

Comment:

Finally, I request a reduction of the total traffic currently using LAX and legislation that will allow LAWA to use its profits on local services such as parks, recreation, and cleanup efforts.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00417 **Weir, Jr., Ph.D.,** **None Provided** **Alexander**

PC00417-1

Comment:

The FAA and the City of Los Angeles-Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) should be prosecuted for violation of the Truth In Advertising Laws for their Sunday May 6, 2001 advertisement on page B9 of the Los Angeles Times. This ad states "Under the No Action/No Project Alternative, impacts related to many of these, and other topics, would be comparatively greater (worse) than those of the build alternatives" (The topics include Noise; Surface Transportation; Air Quality; Health Effects of Noise; Human Health and Safety; and Schools.)

Response:

As was documented in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, certain environmental impacts, particularly as related to air quality, traffic, and human health and safety, would be greater under the No Action/No Project Alternative than under any of the build alternatives. This is due to the comparatively greater congestion and inefficiency associated with future (2015) airport operations occurring without the benefit of airfield and surface transportation system improvements that would otherwise occur under any of the build alternatives.

PC00417-2

Comment:

This is certainly NOT TRUE for Air Quality and Human Health in Playa del Rey. All of the "build" alternatives include as a "common improvement" the construction of a new Westside Terminal on Pershing Drive, along with parking and auto rental facilities. The LAX Master Plan even states that half of the surface traffic would be shifted from Sepulveda Blvd to the West (a new exit from the Marina Freeway to Culver Blvd, a new cut through from Culver Blvd (Falmouth??) to the Westchester Parkway and on the Westchester Parkway from Falmouth to Pershing Drive). This increase in surface traffic, coupled with the increase in aircraft takeoffs (due to the increase from less than 68 to 89 million passengers per year, PLUS the increase in Cargo flights) is bound to degrade Air Quality (and thus Human Health) in Playa del Rey.

Response:

Both the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the impacts of air pollution in and around the airport in Section 4.6. In general, the predicted air pollution impacts of any of the LAX Master Plan build alternatives would be lower than the predicted impacts of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00417-3

Comment:

THE WESTSIDE TERMINAL SHOULD NOT BE BUILT.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternative D and the No Action/No Project Alternative do not include construction of a new west terminal building.

PC00417-4

Comment:

Very little environmental data was presented in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement available to the public on CD's from the Library.

Response:

The entire 12,000+ - page analysis was provided in both hard-copy (paper) form and on CDs at numerous libraries and other locations throughout the Los Angeles area. The entire document was also available on the LAX Master Plan website (www.laxmasterplan.org). Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the extent of public outreach associated with the distribution of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00417-5

Comment:

I would like for LAWA to write me, at the letterhead address, the answers to the following fundamental environmental questions:

Response:

In accordance with the provisions of NEPA and CEQA, written responses to all comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR are provided herein as part of this Final EIS/EIR. The Final EIS/EIR has been made available for public review at FAA and LAWA and through distribution to public libraries throughout the area, and is available electronically at www.laxmasterplan.org. Responses to the environmental questions included in this comment letter are provided below.

PC00417-6

Comment:

1. How many pounds of NO_x (as NO) are emitted on each takeoff from the time the engine is started until the aircraft reaches the 3-mile limit from shore. An average by type of aircraft would be acceptable.

Response:

Emission factors during takeoff for aircraft vary widely depending on engine type, from approximately 0.0066 lbs per second for small engines to approximately 0.46 lbs per second. For example a Boeing 737-200 with a JT8D-17 engine type can be expected to emit 0.06 lbs/second of NO_x during takeoff. Additional information on emission factors from the ICAO database can be found on Aviation Emission Individual Datasheets, available at <http://www.qinetiq.com/aircraft/aviation.html>.

PC00417-7

Comment:

2. How many pounds of Particulate Matter smaller than 10 microns in diameter are emitted on each takeoff(as above from engine start until 3 miles from shore)
3. How many pounds of Particulate Matter smaller than 1 micron in diameter are emitted on each takeoff?

Response:

Section 4.6, Air Quality, of both the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided estimates of Particulate Matter generated by aircraft, other airport-related sources (i.e. GSE, motor vehicles, stationary sources, etc.) and off-airport sources (i.e. motor vehicle traffic). The aircraft component of these emissions inventories includes emissions generated during the take-off mode and gives a comprehensive assessment of total particulate matter generated according to each Master Plan Alternative (i.e. No Action/No Project, Alternatives A, B, C and D). Because particulate matter emission factors for aircraft engines do not currently differentiate the particles by size, the breakdown of those particles that are smaller than 10 microns and those that are smaller than 1 micron in diameter is undeterminable. Please also see Responses to Comments AR00003-53 and AL00033-329 regarding aircraft engine emission factors.

PC00417-8

Comment:

4. How many pounds of Sulfur Dioxide are emitted on each takeoff?

Response:

SO₂ emissions, which are dependent on engine types and fuel flow, were calculated in the Draft EIS/EIR using EDMS 3.2. Since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR there have been updates to the emission calculation methodology, including aircraft emissions. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed updates to the methodologies detailed in the Draft EIS/EIR, including the use of the most recent version of EDMS (EDMS 4.11), in Section 4.6, Air Quality, with supporting technical data in Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4. EDMS 4.11 does include changes to the SO₂ emission factors. A detailed discussion of changes and upgrades included in EDMS 4.11 can be found in Section 2.1.3 of Appendix S-E.

As with all aircraft emissions, SO₂ emissions vary widely by engine and aircraft type and fuel usage. An example aircraft SO_x emission rate is 0.003 lbs/second during takeoff of a Boeing 737-200 with a JT8D-17 engine type.

PC00417-9

Comment:

5. How many takeoffs per year are estimated to occur on the two North Runways for each year until 2015? Please specify by type of aircraft for which the emission data was requested above.
6. How many takeoffs per year on the South Runways?

Response:

The number of landing and takeoff operations (LTOs) for the No Action/No Project Alternative and for Alternatives A, B, and C in 2005 and 2015 by aircraft type are presented in the Draft EIS/EIR Technical Report No. 4, Attachment I. Note that Runways 24L, 24R, and 24C (Alternative A) are on the North Airfield and Runways 25L, 25R, 25C (Alternative B) are on the South Airfield. In summary, the LTOs of passenger and cargo aircraft on the North and South Airfield for each alternative are shown below:

No Action/No Project 2005: North = 198,508 LTOs; South = 197,626 LTOs

A,B,C 2005: North = 178,755 LTOs; South = 215,124 LTOs

3. Comments and Responses

No Action/No Project 2015: North = 197,969 LTOs; South = 193,509 LTOs

Alt A 2015: North = 221,643 LTOs; South = 245,316 LTOs

Alt B 2015: North = 225,074 LTOs; South = 241,886 LTOs

Alt C 2015: North = 208,262 LTOs; South = 189,734 LTOs.

Estimates for the number of LTO's were made only for these years, and not on a yearly basis.

Information regarding LTO's and Alternative D can be found in Technical Report S-4 in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00417-10

Comment:

7. What will be the estimated concentration of NO_x and SO₂ in ppm in the schoolyard of Paseo del Rey School (by year until 2015)?

Response:

The focus of the air quality impact analysis was to identify the relationship between concentrations modeled and the applicable California and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS). The AAQS apply equally to all receptors including schools. The information requested is not readily available or necessary to determine project impacts relative to the standards. The maximum, mitigated NO₂ and SO₂ concentrations (at all receptors) can be found in Table S4.6-22 of Section 4.6, Air Quality, in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As shown in this table, NO₂ and SO₂ concentrations for Alternative D, the LAWA staff preferred alternative, are predicted to be below all applicable AAQS, and are, therefore, less than significant under CEQA.

PC00417-11

Comment:

8. What will be the estimated concentration of particulate matter smaller than 10 microns in diameter and smaller than 1 micron in diameter in micrograms per cubic meter in the schoolyard of Paseo del Rey School?

Response:

The focus of the air quality impact analysis was to identify the relationship between concentrations modeled and the applicable California and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS). The AAQS apply equally to all receptors including schools. The information requested is not readily available or necessary to determine project impacts relative to the standards. The maximum, mitigated PM₁₀ concentration can be found in Table S4.6-22 of Section 4.6, Air Quality, in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As shown in this table, PM₁₀ concentrations for Alternative D, the LAWA staff preferred alternative, are predicted to be below the environmental baseline. Please note that particulate matter smaller than one micron in diameter (PM₁) is not a criteria pollutant and, therefore, was not analyzed.

PC00417-12

Comment:

I am an Environmental Scientist and a former President of the Civic Union of Playa del Rey. I have lived in my present home for 43 years and when I bought my house the airport was East of Sepulveda - Terminal, Tower, and Runway. Since then, the Airport has moved next door to me. Please do not injure me further by building the Westside Terminal.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternative D and the No Action/No Project Alternative do not include construction of a new west terminal building.

PC00418

Margolin, Deena

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00418-1

Comment:

I'm 12 years old. I have lived in this house all my life. My favorite sport is softball. I live about 600 feet away from the field. I also like basketball. I live only 4 min. away from the gym. I also live very close to my school. If you think about it, I've got everything I need in this community. Well anyways, I sold my house for L.A.X. (hope you're happy) (I'm not)). Moving on!

So, now I have a new house and everything's great, right? Nope, the nightmare keeps going! I have found out that the highway is going to knock down my new house. What should I do? My older house, not the new one, is already sold. Do I move into the new house and then have to move out? That's not fair at all. I'm very sure you wouldn't appreciate that at all. There is so much stress on my mom. She has to decide whether to move in and take a chance at you ruining us or move in real quick and by another house ASAP. They created this for no reason. What did I do? Last I checked nothing for my houses to be destroyed.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-APPK-2 regarding the LAX Expressway, State Route 1 (SR-1), and associated property acquisition; and Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation. Additional mitigation specific to the LAX Expressway was provided in Section 6.0, Inventory of Mitigation Measures, in Appendix K, Supplemental Environmental Evaluation for LAX Expressway and State Route 1 Improvements, of the Draft EIS/EIR. Refer also to Response to Comment AL00040-46.

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D would not involve development of the LAX Expressway or the ring road, thereby precluding any of the associated impacts.

PC00418-2

Comment:

There are other little airports that need to be bigger. LA's is big enough. Please NO LAX EXPANSION.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00419 Chandler, Stuart Ballona Wetlands Land Trust

PC00419-1

Comment:

This idea of expanding an already vicious Jumble is a more of the same imperialist Attitude of Playa Capital.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00419-2

Comment:

Stop. think. Develop outlying Facilities. Palmdale actually wants an airport! Build high-speed rail to El Toro, Riverside, etc. to diffuse the impact of fraud on the Human Beings who live here.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00419-3

Comment:

CITIZENS FIGHTING PLAYA VISTA AND
CITIZENS FIGHTING LAX EXPANSION:
We stand together in opposition to LAX expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00419-4

Comment:

Playa Vista would be the #4 polluter in LA. LAX is already the #1 polluter in LA.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01186-4 regarding LAX as a source of air pollution. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding increased air pollution.

PC00419-5**Comment:**

The proposed expansion of LAX would cause:
- Increased and concentrated noise, air and water pollution.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality and water quality in Section 4.7, Hydrology and Water Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 4, and 6 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-4, and S-5 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00419-6**Comment:**

Increased air traffic would result in thousand more vehicles added to already gridlocked streets and freeways.

Expanded arterial highway projects would cu throughout our neighborhoods.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PC00419-7**Comment:**

- Concern about air traffic safety due to overcrowded skies.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00419-8**Comment:**

The proposed LAX expansion is:

Bad for the environment, including our already threatened coastal wetlands.

Response:

Potential impacts of Master Plan Improvements to wetlands was analyzed in Section 4.12, Wetlands, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Mitigation measure MM-ET-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR would reduce impacts to wetlands to a level that is less than significant. Please see Section 4.14, Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for additional information regarding potential impacts of Master Plan improvements to coastal resources.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00419-9

Comment:

- Bad for communities & neighborhoods.
- Bad for Los Angeles!

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. In addition, the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed environmental impacts, both adverse and beneficial, in Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures.

PC00420

Logrip, Alice

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00420-1

Comment:

I have been a resident of Westchester since 1972. My family and I have been adversely affected by the expansion of LAX to its present size.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-121 regarding the mitigation of impacts to the community from activities at LAX. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00420-2

Comment:

We have had to put up with pollution of our air from planes that has resulted in our having to remove vinyl siding that turned from green and white to a moldy gray-black. The damage done by polluting sources is not covered by the 50-year warranty that we thought was such great protection for our home.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC00420-3

Comment:

We have also put double-pane windows throughout the house in order to fend off the noise from planes flying overhead, especially when it rains. These are not much help, however, when it is also quite warm and the doors need to be open for ventilation.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program. Although the program includes the use of acoustically-rated windows to reduce interior noise levels and requires that windows remain closed, the program also provides alterations to existing ventilation systems or a new system to maintain fresh air circulation.

Regarding the effect of rain on aircraft noise, due to the prevailing winds, planes at LAX normally approach and depart to the west (westerly operations). When weather conditions (such as rain) require, operations are reversed, with planes arriving and departing to the east (easterly operations). Because departure operations use more power than arrivals, the easterly operations are louder for those residing east of the airport. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

PC00420-4

Comment:

The expansion of LAX that has been done already seriously affects our ability to get around; the 405 Freeway is a parking lot much of the day, and that was not the case in the 70s and 80s.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PC00420-5

Comment:

Adding the huge numbers of people and cargo that is proposed in the planned expansion would so adversely affect our environment and neighborhoods by increasing the pollution already very serious and the crowding that is even more than most of us can bear currently.

Response:

Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. Also, please note that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00420-6

Comment:

We are in total agreement with the coalition of cities and counties that propose expanding Ontario and El Toro airports to take some of the pressure off LAX and to at least preserve the quality of life we have currently despite the difficulties with air and noise pollution and the truly excessive crowding of our streets and highways.

We urge all politicians and officials to preserve our quality of life by stopping any more expansion and developing other regional airports instead!!

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00421 Fisher, Arlene None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00421-1

Comment:

Expansion of LAX is like putting 3 gallons of gas into a 2 gallon tank. LAX has considerably less physical space than airports like Denver, Pafr, etc., yet it is so trying to be a "bigger" airport HOW? Modernize, yes, but do not expand. Keep @ current scope of planes flying.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00421-2

Comment:

A regional approach is what is needed. Build Palmdale. A Palmdale resident wrote recently to the LA Times (Peg Spry of Aqua Dulce) quote: "Presently it takes us @ least 3 hours to get to LAX from our home in Aqua Dulce, and that is if we can find a parking space @ the fly away in Van Nuys & there are no hang-ups on the 405." Work with all communities to make it worthwhile to have an airport here. And work with the airlines monitarily to make it worth their while to go there (money talks to everyone). The FAA's plan (as per the LA Times of June 7th) endorses "greater use of secondary airports to help relieve congestion @ major airports." It's like anything else a person decides. If you decide that this approach "is the Best" you will find reasons TO make it happen - not the other way around. Make this your approach!

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale that discusses multi-airport markets, airline economics and passenger choice. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00422 Garrison, Stuart OSAGE Neighbors Association 6/9/2001

PC00422-1

Comment:

1. I am concerned about the expansion of LAX either incrementally or by design. The int'l air transport assn labeled LAX as one of the most dangerous com'l airports in the world due to most aircraft landing with the wind (less lift under airframe at low speed). Nothing has changed to ameliorate this condition.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. Also note that the primary approach and departure direction for aircraft operating at LAX is toward the west, given that the predominant winds flow toward the east.

PC00422-2

Comment:

2. I am not against all LAX expansion but I do favor other airports within the Southern California region picking up their fair share of both passenger, & more importantly, freight traffic. I am in favor of diverting freight air & ground traffic to Ontario El Toro & Burbank.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00422-3

Comment:

The 405 fwy is too congested as it is now. The 105 fwy cannot handle the increase of ground vehicular traffic alone.

Response:

Please see Topical Responses TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and TR-ST-2 regarding the Congestion Management Program.

PC00422-4

Comment:

3. Most of all as a Westchester resident, & a member of ONA, I am great concerned by the degradation of the quality of life in my neighborhood by increased ground traffic congestion, increase veh (both air & ground) emissions, increased low level aircraft noise.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester.

PC00422-5

Comment:

4. I favor making the Manchester Square into a Federal park because I do not trust the LA Airport Authority to not convert that land into an airport freight terminal by default. I am concerned that the airport commission will bypass the plan & expand by small increments despite plan constraints.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00423 Wright, Grant None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00423-1

Comment:

The LAX expansion plan does not take into account the increase in air pollution. Any increase in the amount of air traffick, and ground traffick will also increase the amount of air pollution, which is already very bad.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses were provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment PC00070-1 regarding existing air quality. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution.

PC00423-2

Comment:

The regional approach makes much more sense to me.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00424 Basinger, Ryan None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00424-1

Comment:

I am against LAX expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00425 Wille, Tom None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00425-1

Comment:

Minimize additional growth at LAX & coordinate the development of other regional airports like Palmdale, San Diego, Orange County.

Continued development of LAX only destroys the quality of life all across LA. Why do we need to continue developing only one area so extensively? Any development needs to be coordinated with the needs of the rest of the city including mass transit.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00426 Richardson, Simon None Provided 6/8/2001

PC00426-1

Comment:

- We currently have a film of jet fuel in our yard, porch and cars. How do you plan to mitigate increased jet fuel?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC00426-2

Comment:

- We cannot open our windows on summer nites - would you provide noise proofing and air conditioning in every home that requests it?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels, including thresholds used to identify significant noise levels and Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program.

PC00426-3

Comment:

- I am from London, we have 3 major airports in a space as small as Southern California.

Why can't you?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the roles and responsibilities of LAWA, the City of Los Angeles, SCAG, and SCRAA in meeting regional demand.

PC00427 No Author Identified, None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00427-1

Comment:

I'm part of a communittee uprising which is protesting The expansion. The invormment will take a bit hit - both noise & air pollution - not to mention the added traffic & loss of part of our busines section. I Think it is outragous.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 through 5, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1 through S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment PC00374-1 regarding residential and business relocations. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00428 Gold, Marilyn None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00428-1

Comment:

I am not only a resident but a teacher at Bnai Tikvah NS on Manchester. Our children are exposed to all the pollution & noise, with the proposed expansion. Health of our community, our children are at High Risk. Relocate!

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 4, and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-4, and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding LAX Master Plan role in regional approach to meeting demand, and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00429 Graham, Mary Ann None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00429-1

Comment:

Impacts: Noise, Pollution, Traffic

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00429-2

Comment:

Will destroy my property value, which presently feels the noise, vibration (cracks) & pollution, disturbs sleep @ night

Response:

Comment noted. Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the

3. Comments and Responses

Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values, Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration, and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations .

PC00429-3

Comment:

Information false & inadequate!

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00429-4

Comment:

Regional is the only way!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00429-5

Comment:

I've already felt the EPA adverse effects, even my plants die! Thank you

Response:

Comment noted. Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00430

Petti, Lynne

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00430-1

Comment:

I think you should locate the airport at El Toro. You wouldn't have to move people out or businesses. There is much more room there.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC00430-2

Comment:

I'm worried about my property value! I'm worried about the noise! I'm worried about our schools!

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and impacts to schools were addressed in Section 4.27, Schools, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

PC00431 Fredericks, John None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00431-1

Comment:

MEASURED NOISE LEVELS NORTH OF THE EXISTING N. RUNWAY ARE NOT ACCURATELY REPORTED IN THE DRAFT REPORT.

Response:

Noise levels used in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR were modeled according to FAA guidelines, as opposed to using noise monitoring data. Please see Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, Section 2.2, Comparison of Environmental Baseline Noise To Quarterly Noise Report of the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 2.1.7, Relationship of 2000 Contours to 4th Quarter 2000 Report Contours of Section S-C1, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, and Topical Response TR-N-1 regarding the noise modeling approach.

PC00431-2

Comment:

THE NOISE LEVEL NOW AT NIGHT IS UNBEARABLE! ESPECIALLY BETWEEN 11 PM & 5 AM.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1.

PC00432 Burns, Edgar None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00432-1

Comment:

No airport expansion!
Too much traffic in the area
Too much exhaust pollution in the area
Too much noise north of the airport
Too much money for polititions!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in

3. Comments and Responses

Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00433 Ford, Pamela None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00433-1

Comment:

The Washington DC, Northern Virginia & Western Maryland areas have (3) three major international airports - Dulles, National & Baltimore Washington-

I would be interested to know what that population is compared to LA/So California's - I would be very surprised if it even comes close!

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the Master Plan's role in a regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00433-2

Comment:

Yet, you want to continue to keep only one international airport to serve our huge population.

Stop the expansion! Develop the regional airports!

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00434 Burns, Freda None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00434-1

Comment:

NEGATIVE!!

Increased pollution!

" Traffic!

" noise!

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00434-2

Comment:

Palmdale airport on land owned by L.A. would eliminate above problems.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00434-3

Comment:

Politicians have financial (campaign money) interest in airport expansion.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00435 Cassidy, Megan None Provided

PC00435-1

Comment:

I've Live in West Culver City for 18 years. About 4 years ago increased traffic at LAX has caused a loss of quality of Life. The noise pollution interferes with sleep & human interaction. Jets "Power up" Before landing in my Backyard.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts to quality of life and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC00435-2

Comment:

LAX owers & The FCC are insensitive to the stress & degradation of quality of Life. The Noise, traffic (cars) & pollution poison the community.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00435-3

Comment:

My home is My future Financial security & LAX Expansion Ruins my Property Values - Pay Me To Move -

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding the effects of LAX on property values.

PC00435-4

Comment:

You are well come to sleep over & suffer any time.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC00436

Spann, Chelsea

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00436-1

Comment:

We live right up the hill from Pershing Drive. Every morning, now, we have to leave an hour and a half earlier to get to the city of Santa Monica by 8:30 a.m. This traffic is currently from Manhattan Beach. If LAX puts a new entrance on Pershing Drive, imagine the additional traffic. Not only do we already have to deal with the noise, and the jet fuel in our air - but an additional problem (traffic) as well?

Response:

This comment is similar to comment AL00018-30. Please see Response to Comment AL00018-30.

PC00436-2

Comment:

It is not right to the home owners who live in that area. I am morally opposed to the LAX expansion plan. STOP THE LAX EXPANSION PROJECT FROM TAKING PLACE! DO NOT OPEN AN ENTRANCE ON PERSHING DRIVE. Give these ideas the attention they deserve!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00437

Spann, Lindsay

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00437-1

Comment:

I want to let the City of Los Angeles know that the expansion of LAX greatly affects my education. It takes me over an hour to get out of my house for school in the morning. I want you to know that this

3. Comments and Responses

may be easier for people all over Los Angeles to get to LAX, but it greatly affects the citizens of Playa Del Rey and neighboring communities to have the peace and quiet we deserve.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PC00438 Spann, Aviva None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00438-1

Comment:

I am vehemently opposed to the expansion of LAX and an increase in the number of runways. The traffic that currently goes through our Playa del Rey community (Vista del Mar, Culver, Pershing and Manchester) is so crowded from the short cut from Manhattan Beach to the 90 and 405 freeway toward the Westside. Our community cannot handle the traffic. As it is I must get out of the house at 6:55 am to get my children to school in Santa Monica at 8:30 am. Most of this traffic is from Manchester & Pershing to the Marina Fwy on Nicholson & Culver. It can only get worse with Playa Vista. I am severely opposed to the OPENING TO THE AIRPORT ON PERSHING. This is a residential area and not for all the confusion and traffic that an entrance to the airport creates.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding Airport Area Traffic Concerns.

PC00438-2

Comment:

Further the natural environment will be effected adversely. Please stop any expansion!

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed environmental impacts both adverse and beneficial in Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00439 Gugliezmo, Joseph None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00439-1

Comment:

Why do you have to land more cargo planes at LAX? Why can't you land them at Palmdale and have storage facilities there, then truck the cargo from there. Maybe that will open up jobs for truckers. Or - you could use railways to transport cargo -

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00439-2

Comment:

I feel the airport is fine as it is. If you take away cargo planes, maybe you can utilize the space for passengers.

Just a thought.

Response:

Comment noted. There is a perception among many observers and respondents that air cargo and passenger aircraft can be easily split between or among airports in a multi-airport market. While in some cases, and for select airlines this may be feasible, there are several significant barriers including, but not limited to: Combination Service - any foreign flag carriers and at least one U.S. carrier (Northwest Airlines) provide both passenger and all-cargo flights at LAX. Typically, the local management and operations (ground handling/warehousing, etc) of this combination of passenger and cargo service is inseparable and economically undesirable. U.S. Postal Service - The U.S. Postal Service (USPS) is a major contractor with both U.S. passenger airlines and more recently FedEx. Splitting all-cargo flights between or among airports would likely degrade air mail service as it has been structured. Promise to Deliver - The express all-cargo carriers, most notably FedEx and United Parcel Service (UPS), argue that relative proximity to population/commercial density is critical to achieve the overnight promise to deliver, the hallmark service of express carriers. For these reasons, among others, it is not feasible to eliminate cargo traffic from LAX.

PC00440 Kapp, Carol None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00440-1

Comment:

My concerns are many.

#1 - No project No Expansion

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00440-2

Comment:

Because there is no mention of Coastal Commission Permit. You must have one!!

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The regulatory provisions concerning the coastal zone were discussed on page 4-753 in Section 4.14, Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers, of the Draft EIS/EIR. Included in this discussion was a description of the California Coastal Commission's (CCC) authority over the project and the need to obtain a Coastal Development Permit when modifying land use or water use in a coastal zone. For the purposes of this EIS/EIR a consistency finding from the CCC is necessary before a decision can be made to implement the proposed action. As appropriate, LAWA will apply to the CCC for a Coastal Development Permit for any development or change in intensity of use within the coastal zone.

PC00440-3

Comment:

Noise is already so loud that it disrupts teaching time in surrounding schools. Lennox Dist estimates 2 wks lost due to LAX noise.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00034-36 regarding interruption in teaching time for schools within the Lennox School District. Since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR was prepared to provide more detailed analysis of single event aircraft noise levels that result in classroom disruption. This information was provided in Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use, Appendix C-1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, and Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Lennox School District facilities exposed to high single event noise levels under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions are identified in Table S9 in the Supplemental Land Use Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As indicated in Table S9, the following schools within the Lennox School District are exposed to high noise levels under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions: Buford Elementary, Felton Elementary, Jefferson Elementary, Lennox Middle School and Whelan Elementary. Also see Response to Comment AL00034-38 regarding mitigation of noise impacts to schools within the Lennox School District.

PC00440-4

Comment:

The Air Issues seem to be minimized by "Pushing it West." That is irresponsible!

Response:

Comment noted. Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00440-5

Comment:

The exhaust particulate on our decks, patios is already too much. Bringing more planes will bring more noise and particulate deposits for us to live and recreate in.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC00440-6

Comment:

Asthma is already a problem in my family - this would exacerbate the problem.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC00441 Mulvaney, Ana None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00441-1**Comment:**

The air pollution is already too much in the area. It must be reduced by slowing down the planes coming into the airport.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-3.

PC00441-2**Comment:**

Children in Inglewood School which border the airport, Oak St School & Inglewood High are exposed to deadly black dust which must be wiped off the textbooks every morning.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC00441-3**Comment:**

Planes scream over the playground every 25 seconds. Students should be tested for hearing damage.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-246 regarding the fact that existing and future noise levels at and around LAX are projected to be well below the OSHA and CalOSHA standards that serve to protect against hearing loss.

PC00441-4**Comment:**

Early turns over El Segundo have shown that the same will happen over Westchester.

Response:

Early turns over El Segundo have been a focus of public complaint for years. The airport has attempted to deal with the issue for years through the posting of signs at the end of each runway calling for flight to the coastline prior to turns, but occasional deviations from the procedure continue to occur. A part of the reason is the alignment of the runways relative to the community. The west end of the runways nearest El Segundo are closer to the community than the east ends (the runways are aimed more toward the community's west end), while the north runways are both farther away (except in Alternative A) and aimed away from the community. Consequently, it is much less likely that Westchester will be affected by early turns than El Segundo, particularly by aircraft that follow or attempt to follow the flight to the coastline procedure before turning. For further information, please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00441-5

Comment:

My neighborhood was wiped out in 1960, I don't know where my friends are that I went to elementary school with. The airport breaks up neighborhoods and impacts children's lives immensely - How to mitigate the dreams I have of streets of boarded-up houses where I can't find any of my childhood friends?

Response:

Comment noted. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00442

Hastings, Valerie

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00442-1

Comment:

Expanding LAX is simply a manifestation of greed and, if it happens, lack of understanding about the quality of life enjoyed by all those who live and work and even visit L.A.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00442-2

Comment:

Go and expand where it's REALLY NEEDED!!

EL TORO
PALMDALE
JOHN WAYNE

LAX?? NO!!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00443

Gauthier, Donald

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00443-1

Comment:

This is a badly misconceived plan to address present and future air transport needs. It ignores a regional solution that would curtail freeway traffic, improve local street circulation and enhance our neighborhood and property values.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master

Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00443-2

Comment:

The environmental consequences of a decision to increase the number of flights into and out of LAX are simply not acceptable! Nor does the draft master plan realistically represent the effects of further growth on the Westside and South Bay in the coming years.

Response:

Comment noted. The LAX Master Plan developed a 20-year land use plan. The Master Plan was based on reasonable planning assumptions. The unconstrained demand forecast prepared as part of the Master Plan was accepted by the Federal Aviation Administration. The Draft EIS/EIR evaluated the environmental impacts of the proposed expansion identified in the Master Plan. The environmental analysis followed all of the Federal guidelines under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the state guidelines under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Draft EIS/EIR was prepared in coordination with local planning agencies. Also, please note that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient. The environmental impacts of Alternative D were analyzed in the Supplemental Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00443-3

Comment:

Finally, here's a word that needs to be mentioned - LIMITS. We are beyond the existing capacity of the airport now and I can find no mention of limits to future expansion of the airport.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. The No Action/No Project Alternative examined the capacity of all of the airport components and defined the maximum level of activity (approximately 78.9 MAP) that could be accommodated at LAX without improvements. See Chapter V, Section 3.3.2 of the Draft LAX Master Plan and Chapter 3, Section 3.1 of the Draft Master Plan Addendum for more information on the activity and constraints associated with each alternative. Also please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00444 Loveall, Ken None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00444-1

Comment:

No on expansion, to much traffic & noise. Drop in property value.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding residential property values. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00445 Figueroa, Harold None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00445-1

Comment:

Oppose expansion due to noise and traffic 405 is directly across from my house.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00445-2

Comment:

Traffic on La Tijera is excessive now.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Responses TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology and results.

PC00445-3

Comment:

I have mitigated some what the noise by double paned house windows and wall insulation.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. However, please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

PC00445-4

Comment:

At this time when the take off pattern is reverse - and take off is to the East the jets come roaring across my roof.

Response:

Due to the prevailing winds, aircraft at LAX normally approach and depart to the west (westerly operations). When weather conditions require, operations are reversed, with aircraft arriving and departing to the east (easterly operations). Because departure operations use more power than arrivals, the easterly operations are louder for those residing east of the airport. Please see TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement and TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

PC00445-5

Comment:

And jet exhaust soot falls heavier.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC00446

Clark, John & Floy

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00446-1

Comment:

Please use regional approach. No Ring Road.

No Expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternative D does not include a ring road. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00447

**Dugan, Linda and
Dennis**

None Provided

6/7/2001

PC00447-1

Comment:

Expanding LAX will not solve the need for more air transportation.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00447-2

Comment:

1. Expansion will only cause more traffic, confusion, and frustration for those who live here and those who have to travel so far to get here.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PC00447-3

Comment:

2. Expansion will cause more pollution and noise in this area. Already You have spent several dollars to sound proof homes in this area because the noise is so so bad.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the current ANMP.

PC00447-4

Comment:

3. Expansion will not make enough difference in the amount of people it will be able to accommodate. Compared to the greater problems it will create here in Westchester.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00447-5

Comment:

You will only delay the need to expand other airports such as EL TORRO, ONTARIO, or PALMDALE. They will need to be expanded eventually.

LAX can not accommodate the travel needs of all the people here in California.

Please do not expand LAX. IT is a waste of money and time. Put your money into the areas that will make a difference such as ELTORRO airport. We in Westchester have been doing our share in tolerating the LAX and its problems.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale and TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00448 Dugan, Annika None Provided 6/7/2001

PC00448-1

Comment:

Don't put a new airport lane because your going to destroy lots of other buildings.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00448-2

Comment:

Why don't you just make more room at another airport.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00448-3

Comment:

You need to think about other people. I bet you wouldn't like it if people destroy buildings near your house. Havent you heard the expreshon treat other people how you want to be treated. It's realy rude to destroy other people property. It'll be to noisy and irritating. And you'll give out lots of pollution.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment PC00374-1 regarding residential and business relocations.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00449 Fischer, G. None Provided

PC00449-1

Comment:

The graphs on air pollution omitted any discussion of particulates (which any local resident knows is a serious problem).

Response:

Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided estimates of total particulate matter generated by aircraft, other airport-related sources (i.e. GSE, motor vehicles, stationary sources, etc.) and off-airport sources (i.e. motor vehicle traffic). These emission inventories provide a comprehensive assessment of total particulate matter generated by the airport according to each Master Plan Alternative (i.e. No Action/No Project, Alternatives A, B, C and D). More detailed information on particulate matter emissions are contained in Attachment N, Incremental Emissions by Alternative and Year, of Technical Report S4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00450 Saenz, Patricia None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00450-1

Comment:

No on LAX expansion. Enough is enough. Move on out!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00451 Fischer, G. None Provided

PC00451-1

Comment:

My neighborhood does NOT have to bear the brunt of the Southern Calif air traffic load. I'm certain that more equitable regional distribution is possible.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00451-2

Comment:

I will vote for any candidate that supports this.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00452

Levine, Daniel

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00452-1

Comment:

I am fearful that the presence of a Parking garage will swamp

Culver
Pershing

Response:

The traffic studies and parking analyses have been careful to fully assess the impacts of the alternatives on surrounding communities. The traffic impacts on off-airport roadways are discussed in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR. Specific traffic impacts and level of service summaries for Culver and Pershing are presented in the Appendix of Technical Report 3b, Off-Airport Surface Transportation Technical Report.

PC00452-2

Comment:

So I am against any West terminal.

Build East or South

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00453

**Hamor, William &
Virginia**

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00453-1

Comment:

It will compound traffic problems already existing. Cause our community of Westchester to be downgraded in regard to downtown area. Cause more air pollution. It will take away our daughter's home.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also, please refer Response to Comment Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative

3. Comments and Responses

designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00454 Williams, Douglas None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00454-1

Comment:

I believe the plan will alleviate much of the problems around LAX now. It will take 10 years to do, but it is for the good of the whole area.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00455 Mellody, Peggy None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00455-1

Comment:

Clarification:

- I oppose any expansion of LAX.
- I support regional expansion of non-LAX airports only.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00456 Young, Jeanne None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00456-1

Comment:

I do not want ANY expansion at LAX. I only want expansion at non-LAX airports.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00457 Becker, Lois None Provided 6/8/2001

PC00457-1

Comment:

Friends: I am concerned about LAX Expansion & most concerned re Traffic Mitigation. Generally, I understand getting LAX traffic off Sepulveda/Airport Bl/La Tijera etc., is critical for both the community(ies) & LAX (hopefully @ minimum land acquisition & community interference). Direct connection from freeways to LAX is logical & beneficial.

3. Comments and Responses

The Arbor Vitae connection seems least abusive & intruding.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00457-2

Comment:

Also, future expansion must also include & encourage Palmdale etc. Regional use.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00457-3

Comment:

Thanks for including the opportunity for community info & "letting off steam" in your plans -

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00458

Pinho, Alan

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00458-1

Comment:

Please build in Palmdale/El Toro and Decrease traffic in and around LAX. Connect new airport development by high speed rail.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The

3. Comments and Responses

Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. See also Topical Response TR-RC-3 which discusses high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand.

PC00459 **Edison, Naomi** **None Provided** **6/9/2001**

PC00459-1

Comment:

We have Too much Traffic we do not need anymore!

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00460 **Beaver, Richard** **None Provided** **6/9/2001**

PC00460-1

Comment:

I am favor of the LAX master plan,

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00460-2

Comment:

however, I think the LAX expressway should start further south rather than right @ Howard Hughes center which will become congested when fully built.

Response:

Several alignments of the LAX Expressway were reviewed during the analysis, as summarized in Appendix K. The general alignment selected provided the best combination of effectiveness and minimal environmental impacts. However, details regarding the alignment will be refined during the design phase of the project. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00461 **Abraham, Cora** **None Provided**

PC00461-1

Comment:

What noise is to be directed west? We can hear & see in Venice the planes taking off from LAX now. They come over my house all day and all night. At night they come in and land on the sand dunes. In Venice we have jets taking off plus small trainer planes circling & helicopters.

Response:

Due to the prevailing winds, aircraft at LAX normally approach and depart to the west (westerly operations). When weather conditions require, operations are reversed, with aircraft arriving and departing to the east (easterly operations). The aircraft that the commentator refers to hearing and seeing departing LAX are in a west flow and turning away from her residence. Turbo-jet aircraft destined for LAX are arriving from the Pacific Northwest and Asia are routed over the Santa Monica

3. Comments and Responses

VOR. The commentor is probably observing this arrival flow. These aircraft cross a point 10 miles west of Santa Monica at altitude of 10,000 feet and then descend to cross Santa Monica at or above 7,000 before proceeding eastbound. As far as easterly operations, LAWA has a policy of preferred operating procedures that call for over-ocean procedures to be used at night when practicable. For information on easterly operations at night, please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations. Furthermore, as part of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, a mitigation measure (MM-N-5. Conduct Part 161 Study to Make Over-Ocean Procedures Mandatory) was incorporated for each build alternative to provide for a Part 161 study in an attempt to restrict easterly departures when over-ocean procedures are in effect. The commentor resides in Venice, near Santa Monica Airport and may be experiencing small aircraft and helicopter operations as a result of her proximity to this general aviation airport. For further information, please see Response to Comment PC03025-2.

PC00462 Hoffman, Joan None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00462-1

Comment:

Traffic is already terrible in Westchester & on the 405. Expansion will only make it worse.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology and results.

PC00462-2

Comment:

If the airport expands farther north the business section will be all but removed! Our community will not be a community anymore.

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided additional discussion beyond that presented in the Draft EIS/EIR of potential acquisition effects on the Westchester Business District. As was described in Section 4.2, Land Use, (subsections 4.2.6.2 through 4.2.6.4), acquisition within the Westchester Business District would be 16 acres or 31 percent of the District under Alternative A, about 11 acres or 21 percent under Alternative B, or approximately 13 acres or 26 percent of the District under Alternative C. No shopping centers are proposed for acquisition and Ralph's Supermarket is not proposed for acquisition under any of the build alternatives. Alternative A would include acquisition of Longs Drugstore and Office Depot. Office Depot would also be acquired under Alternative C. Longs Drugstore would not be acquired under Alternative B or C. Alternative A would also acquire the Mayfair Square Shopping area. Under Alternatives A and C, relocation opportunities would be available for some uses nearby within Westchester Southside. Also, many of the uses being acquired are airport related and a number of the community related uses that would be acquired (a bank, an office supply store, a bar and beauty shop) would remain available through other similar businesses located in close proximity within the Westchester Business District.

Also, as was discussed in Section 4.2, Land Use, (subsection 4.2.6.5) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative, Alternative D does not include any acquisition within the Westchester Business District. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 for further discussion of effects on the community of Westchester.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00463 **Wiltz, Pamela** **None Provided** **6/9/2001**

PC00463-1

Comment:

Under no part of this plan has the traffic congestion been addressed. To say that it will be taken care of "later" is to be dishonest with the people of this community.

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00463-2

Comment:

We do not want more traffic, pollution, noise, congestion than was allowed under the 40 MAP plan this airport was originally designed for.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that under Alternative D, air pollution and noise pollution are expected to be less than under the No Action/No Project Alternative. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected airport activity levels.

PC00463-3

Comment:

This is NOT a plan to benefit the city or it's citizens, but a plan to pander to the airlines.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00464 **Walton, Leah** **None Provided** **6/9/2001**

PC00464-1

Comment:

Object to LAX expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00464-2

Comment:

We live just north of where the runway will be expanded and we are suffering from the airplane exhaust. We have Bronchitus and we do not want more airplanes PLEASE FOR THE WELLNESS OF MY FAMILY.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC00464-3

Comment:

ALSO THE NOISE IS OUT OF CONTROL.

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00464-4

Comment:

MOVE the airtraffic somewhere else. It should never be growing where it is.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00465

Brown, Lea

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00465-1

Comment:

Plan D: Develop Palmdale Airport for all freight.

1. Feather river project is completed.

3. Comments and Responses

2. Freeways are readily accessible.
3. "We the people" already own the land in Palmdale!
4. Why is there such a problem with reason? Is it GREED!

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00466 Antablin, Phillip None Provided

PC00466-1

Comment:

The expansion will make traffic worse, make the streets more crowded, increase airport-airplane noise, increase air pollution.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00466-2

Comment:

Everyone in Westchester I know is against this expansion. It will damage our community. We have a family neighborhood and don't want it damaged by expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00467 Antablin, Drew None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00467-1

Comment:

Against Airport Expansion: We have a family neighborhood/community. There is already too much noise & airport traffic. The proposed expansion will make these problems much worse. Please don't trash our neighborhood.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PC00468 Madden, Dynevor None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00468-1

Comment:

Orange Co., (El Toro) would benefit greatly from a airport.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00468-2

Comment:

We who have to put up with noise, traffic & the constant threat of this monstrous mess of an airport taking over our lives completely is not the American Way of life.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00469 Komoc, Bashar None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00469-1

Comment:

Any expansion of LAX means more pollution, terrible traffic increase, and much more noise.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00469-2

Comment:

You can find a solution by addressing those regional airports as Ontario, Palmdale...

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00470

Choate, Dotti

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00470-1

Comment:

No increase in air traffic and that includes cargo and any extension of the airport.

Go to Palmdale, Ontario and El Toro.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00470-2

Comment:

We have lived in Playa del Rey for 30 years. We had a good environment back then.

Today with all the increase in air flights, the quality of life has decreased to:

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00470-3

Comment:

1. Breathing problems, sortness of breath then it developed in to asthma and severe respiratory problems and I am on a breathing machine. No more walking for me in Playa del Rey.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC00470-4

Comment:

2. Oily soot like dust penetrates our home daily from the airplanes. It even gets into our cabinets and closets

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC00470-5

Comment:

3. Many days we have a terrible petroleum odor penetrating our rooms

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00045 - 4 regarding odors.

PC00470-6

Comment:

4. We have two room purifiers trying to make our rooms livable. I recently, June 7, 2001, cleaned the filter and my disbelief was, both machine filters had almost 1/4" of oily soot covering the filters from the airplanes.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC00470-7

Comment:

Noise Factor:

The noise, from the planes are so bad, we can no longer:

1. Sit on our patio
2. Use the pool
3. Communicate with friends and neighbors outside.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels.

PC00470-8

Comment:

4. When the planes are taking off, we cannot talk on the phone or talk with each other

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels, Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding thresholds used to identify significant noise levels, and Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program. Also see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

PC00470-9

Comment:

5. In just this last year, flights have increased, day and night to the point I am having daily headaches and I won't mention what it does to my nervous system.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise.

PC00471 Mellody, Peggy None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00471-1

Comment:

-I oppose LAX expansion because it would:

Response:

Comment noted. See Responses to Comments below. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00471-2

Comment:

Increase air safety risks with more planes operating in close quarters.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00471-3

Comment:

Dramatically worsen traffic congestion on I-405, I-105 and local arterials from the increased number of passengers cars, vans and cargo - carrying trucks.

Response:

Please see Topical Responses TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and TR-ST-2 regarding the Congestion Management Program.

PC00471-4

Comment:

Result in greater air and noise pollution damaging and/or aggravating local resident's health.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use and in Section 4.24.2, Health Effects of Noise, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition, Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase and Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding land use and noise mitigation.

PC00471-5

Comment:

Create more airport noise.

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00471-6

Comment:

Reduce property values.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding the effects of LAX on property values.

PC00471-7

Comment:

Destroy local homes, schools, libraries, parks and businesses to provide room for more airport support facilities.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00035-2 and Response to Comment PC02302-11 regarding residential acquisition and residential relocation, respectively; Response to Comment PC00013-5 regarding business acquisition and relocation impacts, proposed collateral development at LAX Northside/Westchester Southside, and the proposed Preliminary Property Acquisition and Relocation Plan; as well as Response to Comment AL00033-120 and Response to Comment PC01879-11 for discussion of the mitigation of potential acquisition and relocation impacts.

Of the businesses affected by the Master Plan, two schools and one public library would be acquired under Alternatives A, B, and C, and an additional law school would be acquired under Alternative C; the newly proposed Alternative D would involve the acquisition of one school. Every effort would be made to identify suitable relocation sites for and facilitate the relocation of these facilities in conjunction with implementation of the Preliminary Property Acquisition and Relocation Plan (included as Appendix P to Chapter V of the Master Plan and updated in Chapters 2.7 and 2.8 of the Master Plan Addendum). No parks would be acquired or relocated as part of the Master Plan; on the contrary, as was described in Section 4.26.3, Parks and Recreation, of the Draft EIS/EIR, Westchester Golf Course and Carl E. Nielsen Youth Park would be expanded and improved, and open space and recreational amenities would be developed within LAX Northside/Westchester Southside.

As was discussed in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, a voluntary residential acquisition program is currently underway, independent of the proposed Master Plan, as part of an existing Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program. This program involves the acquisition of 2,568 residences in the Manchester Square and Belford neighborhoods in the City of Los Angeles, and an existing relocation plan is in place to facilitate the relocation of affected households. With the exception of one elementary school, all of the property planned for acquisition is residential.

PC00471-8

Comment:

-I support a regional plan for expanding airport services across all of S. California.

3. Comments and Responses

-I support the using El Toro as a regional airport.

Response:

The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC00471-9

Comment:

I oppose incremental expansion of LAX.

All LAX expansion activities must only occur after the final Master Lax plan and EIS/EIR plans are approved.

Response:

Comment noted. The Master Plan will not be implemented unless, and until, the Los Angeles City Council certifies the Final EIS/EIR and approves implementation of one of the alternatives, makes written findings, and adopts a statement of overriding considerations, if needed, and the FAA issues a Record of Decision.

PC00471-10

Comment:

I oppose expansion/completion of the following RTP - arterial projects.
* I-405 Airport Connector Rd. from Howard Hughes Pkwy to Arbor Vitae St.
* I-710 MIS Corridor Arterial Improvement Recommendations
* Imperial Hwy from Sepulveda Blvd. to I-5

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The proposed Arbor Vitae interchange is not a part of the LAX Master Plan and has had the federal funding withdrawn.

PC00471-11

Comment:

In order to preserve the quality of life of the residents residing in any of the communities impacted by the proposed expansion plan - the plan must be revised to a regional model.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00472

Young, Jeanne

None Provided

6/8/2001

PC00472-1

Comment:

I am a Westchester resident and taxpayer. I am against any expansion of LAX because it will be negative for our neighborhood (air pollution, noise pollution and traffic).

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00472-2

Comment:

I agree with a regional solution. Expand airports in San Diego, Palmdale, Ontario & put a new airport in El Toro. That's where the population is growing.

Response:

The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00473 Farris, James None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00473-1

Comment:

I, as a resident of Playa del Rey (10 yrs), do not support the expansion of LAX. I run a business from my home and have enough grief as is with plane noise.

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00473-2

Comment:

Expansion and greed would not be beneficial to the future of Playa del Rey. I love our home and the thought of expansion is reducing the value in our home daily. If a goal in life is to work hard and gain equity, how could this expansion make sense. Any expansion would greatly effect the quality of my life.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00474 Holt, Joyce OSAGE Neighbors Association 6/9/2001

PC00474-1

Comment:

I oppose LAX expansion because,

Response:

Comment noted. See Responses to Comments below. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00474-2

Comment:

(1) Traffic will be intolerable, therefore, streets will be impassable. My kids already can't cross major arteries like Sepulveda, Lincoln, La Tijera. We don't need more traffic.

Response:

Please see Topical Responses TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and TR-ST-2 regarding the Congestion Management Program.

PC00474-3

Comment:

(2) Smog will be generated by additional flights, and traffic will be stopped & generating additional pollutants.

Response:

Comment noted. Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In general, the predicted air pollution impacts of any of the LAX Master Plan build alternatives will be lower than the predicted impacts of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution.

PC00474-4

Comment:

(3) NOISE: More flights and more traffic create more noise. The stress level is already at a level which is detrimental to everyone, not only to residents but to employees of business operating anywhere in this vicinity.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise.

PC00474-5

Comment:

(4) Safety: More flights & more traffic will lower our standard of living of the peace & enjoyment of our homes by risks for our safety

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00475

Farris, Lisa

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00475-1

Comment:

As a resident of Playa del Rey for 10 years, it's devastating to imagine that the city of Los Angeles would even consider to ruin more property values of neighborhoods & taxpaying homeowners.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

PC00475-2

Comment:

The quality of life living in Playa del Rey has already gotten worse over the years due to noise. It's difficult to even entertain in our yards, leave windows open while watching Television, or calling for a child playing outside due to the increased noise.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels. As was shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S4.2-2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, noise levels continue to decrease over time over the Playa del Rey area. However, as was shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, under 1996 baseline conditions some areas of Playa del Rey are exposed to significant high single event noise levels (shown as the 94 dBA SEL) that are currently outside the residential sound insulation or ANMP boundary (defined as the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL noise contour). Under the LAX Master Plan, the ANMP boundary would be revised to include those areas exposed to the 94 dBA SEL and outside the current ANMP boundary. For more information on noise impacts on Playa del Rey, see Response to Comment PC00499-1 and Topical Responses TR-N-3, TR-N-6 and TR-N-7.

PC00475-3

Comment:

The City of Los Angeles is responsible for protecting both the property value and neighborhoods in Los Angeles, before supporting the expansion of an Airport which is unnecessary!

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. In addition, Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00476

Alexander, Edward

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00476-1

Comment:

I find it interesting that the master plan committee and the assorted acronym groups have made and continue to make it as difficult as possible for the people who live in the area to find out what the plan really is about and more importantly to stop it. For example, there are 3 separate sites today for the community to come out and express their views. 3 sites look like lower numbers. Seems to me like this expansion project knows it will meet with resistance and is trying to "divide and conquer."

Response:

Commented note. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process.

PC00476-2

Comment:

LAX expansion really means more money for those who stand to profit from increased revenue. For the rest of us, it means more noise, pollution, traffic, etc.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00476-3

Comment:

Bottom line is, no! LAX! Expansion. We! Don't want it here!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00477

Revuelta, Ivania

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00477-1

Comment:

Problem:
NA/NP) No solution!
Alt A-C)- Health hazard continues!

Response:

Comment noted. Human health impacts were addressed in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00477-2

Comment:

Solution: 1. Regional expansion or 2. Complete new airport e.g. Dulles in Washington DC - !

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00478

Sheldon, Fisher

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00478-1

Comment:

The one interesting thing is that everyone representing the airport lives far away from the airport and has no clue as to overall impact.

The charts are pretty but have no foundation in reality.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00478-2

Comment:

A 5th runway will yield more air traffic imaginable and accidents.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00478-3

Comment:

The increase in noise, pollution, congestion and quality of life in this area will be ruined.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00478-4

Comment:

You must look towards location alternatives as El Toro and Palmdale via high speed bullet train.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00479 No Author Identified, None Provided

PC00479-1

Comment:

Longer runways for longer planes more noise more pollution

5th runway No. or south - more noise more pollution

Response:

The aircraft noise analysis estimated that in 2015 three of the Master Plan alternatives, Alternatives A (Added Runway North Alternative) C (No additional runway) and D (No additional runway) would reduce the total number of people exposed to aircraft noise above 65 CNEL compared to current conditions as represented by the 1996 environmental baseline. The reduction in noise exposure is the result of a federally mandated phase out of older, noisier Stage 2 jets. Alternatives A and C are roughly equivalent to the No Action/No Project Alternative, while Alternative D reduces the population exposed to 65 CNEL when compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternative B (Added Runway to South complex)), would expose considerably more total people to 65 CNEL compared to the environmental baseline Alternatives A, C, D, and the No Action/No Project Alternative. Although Alternative B also

3. Comments and Responses

includes the phase out of Stage 2 jets, the estimated noise reduction would be more than offset by increased noise exposure due to the southern location of that alternative's additional runway that creates new flight paths over communities to the southeast of the airport. Although total exposure would drop for three of the Master Plan alternatives, the 65 CNEL contour would shift in various ways for each alternative due to runway extensions or additions. As a result of this shift, each of the build alternatives would expose some people to 65 CNEL that had not been previously exposed. Some others who live within the 65 CNEL noise contour would be exposed to a 1.5 decibel or greater increase in noise levels. A much more substantial shift in flight patterns under Alternative B would create much greater noise impacts than any of the other conditions studied.

The extension of the LAX runways, or an additional runway itself would not contribute to an increase in air emissions. The increase in landing/takeoff operations (LTOs) and the changes in aircraft fleet mix that are accommodated by such modifications would result in increased air emissions. LTOs for the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternatives A, B, C, and D all include an increase in LTOs and an increase in larger (i.e., long range) aircraft in the future and, therefore, an increase in aircraft emissions of oxides of nitrogen and sulfur dioxide as compared to the 1996 Baseline. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a thorough description of air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-E, and Technical Report S-4. Additionally, please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding the increase in noise and TR-AQ-3 regarding the increase in air pollution.

PC00479-2

Comment:

Homes moved?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation issues, including affordable housing.

PC00479-3

Comment:

Congestion already unacceptable ie. Flight 15 minute early - will be 10 minutes late awaiting available gate.

Impact of not doing program - El toro/palmdale

LAX putting 3 Gallons of fuel into 2 Gallon tank

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00480

Starr, Lisa

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00480-1

Comment:

Pollution: With the current airport there is sute in our backyard. Anymore airport traffic we will be covered.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00480-2

Comment:

Traffic: Traffic on Sepulveda & the freeways is always congested how could having more traffic ever be resolved.

Response:

Please see Topical Responses TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and TR-ST-2 regarding the Congestion Management Program.

PC00480-3

Comment:

Why won't the train go to the airport.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan for more information. Alternative D would connect a people mover to an Intermodal Transportation Center near the Aviation station of the Green Line, with no extension of the Green Line necessary for terminal access.

PC00480-4

Comment:

Noise: If there is more space for planes there will be more noise. What will be done?

Response:

Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase and Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation.

PC00480-5

Comment:

Travel: Populations are spread in favor of expanding Ontario.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the Master Plan's role in a regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00480-6

Comment:

Once you build this expansion what's to say in even 10 years you will need more space? NO! Please.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding projected versus actual capacity levels at LAX.

PC00480-7

Comment:

Our property values will plummet & our children will breathe more pollution.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 14a and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding residential property value and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PC00481

Moore, Stuart

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00481-1

Comment:

We have been living at the above address since 1957.

At that time Lincoln emptied into the end of Century.

We were part of a well planned much large community.

The airport has increasingly grown gobbling the community & houses and getting closer to us and noise in despite "quieter jets", soundwalls etc.

Each time the airport asks for a little bit "and this will be the last" (Ha-Ha)

Its the old camel putting his nose in the tent story.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-121 and Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding the mitigation of impacts to the community from activities at LAX. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00481-2

Comment:

Absolutely no expansion. Put it out at Edwards AFB or the marine base @ Toro. We need circle development not star.

Response:

The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

3. Comments and Responses

In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC00482 Flynn, Daniel None Provided 6/8/2001

PC00482-1

Comment:

The LAX expansion project will reduce the quality of life in Westchester. It will increase traffic congestion, pollution, and noise.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00482-2

Comment:

There are more suitable sites in the outlying areas of L.A. for airport expansion. It would be better for all if expansion occurred elsewhere.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00483 Friedland, Virginia None Provided 6/8/2001
Lee

PC00483-1

Comment:

I am opposed to all expansion of the LAX - we already have noise and "soot" fall-out from the air traffic from LAX

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00483-2

Comment:

We need to develop a regional approach to airports in So. Calif. - We have El Toro, Ontario or Palmdale that could easily be developed.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00484

Diette, Joan

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00484-1

Comment:

I strongly oppose expansion of LAX. There is no sensible way to adequately mitigate the safety, traffic & pollution problems that are sure to result from this plan.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-2, S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00484-2

Comment:

Please reject these proposals & consider regional solutions.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00485

Bender, Sydni

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00485-1

Comment:

THIS PLAN IS DEVASTATING TO AIR QUALITY AND NOISE ABATEMENT IN THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, ODDLY, IT WILL DECREASE PROPERTY VALUES IN THE WESTSIDE AS AIR QUALITY DETERIORATES.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

PC00486

Junod, George

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00486-1

Comment:

We have lived in a most pleasant community since Nov, 1947 and have watched the airport expand, and expand some more. We have seen many homes and areas eaten up by "progress". Now big money people want to say homeowners don't count for anything. We can buy their land and evict them from their homes whenever we want. The people say "No"; "STOP"; we pay taxes, keep up our homes, enjoy our area and neighbors.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00040-46. Please also see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation issues.

PC00486-2

Comment:

Don't we have any rights at all. Besides what is taken, the rest is messed up by more noise, pollution and traffic.

Voters will not forget who allowed this to happen.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation. As indicated in TR-RBR-1, Alternative D does not propose residential acquisition. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00488

Healy, H.

None Provided

6/8/2001

PC00488-1

Comment:

Regionalism is the only rational decision!!

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided

3. Comments and Responses

in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00489 Bowen, Eve None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00489-1

Comment:

Pershing Dr. & Culver Blvd. are maxed-out at this time - it will be impossible to move out of Playa! Where will it stop!

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00489-2

Comment:

We can't use our yards & patios now. Insulating our homes is not the answer -

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels and Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program. Noise impacts and 1996 baseline and Year 2000 noise levels were presented in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00489-3

Comment:

In the 1960s LAX promised that the north & southern most runways would only be used for emergencies! What a lie!

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00489-4

Comment:

We need to face facts - Los Angeles City does not have the capacity to keep expanding LAX. We need to utilize outlying areas with International travel being removed to those airports with rail travel between.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00489-5

Comment:

What is happening to our communities? They will not be fit to live in!

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00489-6

Comment:

Negative Environmental Impact:
Noise - High decibals
Air - Unhealthy black soot in our homes - lungs
Traffic Congestion: Lowering property values

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding soot, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, and Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding residential property values

PC00490

Waldenmayer, Karin None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00490-1

Comment:

I am against the expansion of LAX!!

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

PC00490-2

Comment:

Has anyone every considered doing a study of filling the existing aircraft that lands at and departs from LAX?? I have flown numerous times where the aircrafts are not even @ 50% capacity.

Response:

The percentage of seats filled on any given flight, known as the "load-factor" varies and is driven by market dynamics. Individual air carriers determine which routes to serve, what type of aircraft to use and with what frequency. The LAX Master Plan forecasts include consideration of load factors when projecting the number of future aircraft operations at LAX.

PC00491 Hall, Dave None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00491-1

Comment:

I live 6 miles from LAX but my neighborhood is impacted by being under the flight path & the clogged 405 freeway. During the summer months the flight noise is continuous. It's had to slept with the constant noise of jets. Two of my neighbors have moved already because of the noise. Please do not expand LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. Impacts associated with noise are described in Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.6), and Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6) of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00492 Gebhardt, Jerry None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00492-1

Comment:

1. The LAWA has promised twice before that this would be the last expansion. Both times LAWA lied.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

PC00492-2

Comment:

2. LAWA can not keep expecting LAX to handle all the airport burden for L.A., Orange, Ventura, Riverside & San Bernardino Counties.

3. People will go where the jobs are whether those jobs are in LAX or in Ontario or Palmdale.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00492-3

Comment:

4. LAWA has never done enough to mitigate traffic.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding LAWA's proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00493

Johansen, Daniel

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00493-1

Comment:

As a resident, property owner and frequent flyer, I am very much opposed to the LAX expansion. The following reasons.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below. In addition, it should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00493-2

Comment:

1. The increased congestion and pollution in the area. I'm not buying the EIR report and do believe that obviously congestion will get worse.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00493-3

Comment:

2. It's less efficient to have everyone in the surrounding areas ie (Orange County, etc.) coming here than using local airports.

3. The new Boeing concept for next generation planes recognizes smaller regional airports are the future and the designs are geared for smaller, faster planes. They recognize this is the future that will satisfy flyers.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00494 Stiles, Molly None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00494-1

Comment:

I'M AGAINST THE EXPANSION OF THE LOS ANGELES WORLD AIRPORT AS A PROPERTY OWNER FOR THIRTY ONE YEARS.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00494-2

Comment:

OVER THE YEARS THE NOISE LEVEL HAS INCREASED.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 Noise Increase for more information. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00494-3

Comment:

THE TRAFFIC IN OUR AREA IS SO HEAVY IT IMPACTS ALL OUR NEIGHBORHOOD STREETS.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PC00494-4

Comment:

The air quality continues to effect the area more with fumes and soot.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping and Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding fumes.

PC00494-5

Comment:

I FEEL LOS ANGELES WORLD AIRPORT SHOULD LOOK AT EL TORO, PALMDALE, AND ONTARIO TO HELP SHARE THE RESPONSIBILITY, WESTCHESTER CAN'T HANDEL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE OR ANY MORE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT TO THE AREA.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional

3. Comments and Responses

approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00495

Torres, Maria

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00495-1

Comment:

I am a hairdresser in the Westchester area and own a home on Airport Blvd. Most of my customers are senior citizens and a lot of them hardly walk, but they still attend the meetings on NO LAXEN. They want to educate themselves on ways of saving their neighborhood, just like me. It's hard to think that we have to pack and move because the Airport needs our land to make room for more airplanes. I really think humans don't count to big businesses when money is involved.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00495-2

Comment:

My family and I will be greatly affected because I will loose many clients. Don't ruin our lives and our community because we already have enough traffic, enough noise and enough pollution. I'm concerned about the extra hazardous pollution and noise that will affect the health of my family.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and human health and safety in 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00495-3

Comment:

Please take this into consideration and extend the Airport NOT in Westchester, but in Ontario or El Toro.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00496

Reed, Mary Ann

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00496-1

Comment:

I have lived in Westchester for over 50 years. Airport Junior High was closed because of the noise pollution. Manchester Square looks like a war zone.

Response:

Comment noted. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00496-2

Comment:

Airport Blvd. and connecting 74th & 76th Streets show increase traffic and congestion in the early morning traffic commute.

Response:

Please see Topical Responses TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the congestion management program.

PC00496-3

Comment:

Here is my suggestion: split the 98 million annual passengers by adding the new runway to the south (El Toro). 4.2 million annual tons of cargo and a north airfield runway to increase lateral spacing between all three runways would be lengthened 12,000 feet to accommodate larger aircraft in Palmdale. Thus other communities would be taking their fair share of the 2,700 daily flights by 2015. This is fair and equitable. Leave Westchester Parkway on the north and Pershing Drive on the West for people to walk their dogs.

Response:

The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00496-4

Comment:

And what ever funds are allocated (Bond Issues,Etc.) put these monies into rejuvenating Downtown Westchester. Instead of a Norstrom's Rack, Howard Hughes could have turned this into a beautiful park and recreation area, or a residence for seniors.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00497

Perryman, Wyoma

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00497-1

Comment:

I have lived in Westchester 50 yrs. and the airport has already taken many homes and caused much worry and trouble for many of us in the past years. The noise and resulting damage to the environment has been enough.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-121 and Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding opportunities to alleviate impacts associated with past or present airport activities at LAX. Please also note that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00497-2

Comment:

It is time to stop this expansion and look for accommodations elsewhere. There are other alternatives to LAX expansion here - try Palmdale, San Gabriel, etc.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00497-3

Comment:

The traffic is getting impossible and the residents are fed-up!!

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00498 Ingle, Jennifer ZooLife International 6/9/2001

PC00498-1

Comment:

Born in Santa Monica, I have lived in this area for over 47 years. I am sickened by the lack of thoughtless development all in the name of economic growth. This used to be a beautiful place to live. Now, the quality of life is getting pathetic. No more open space, no more green, just cars & more cars buildings & more buildings, people on top of people. How foolish! This is my home and I deserve to live in an environment that I feel I can breath & move around in. I am outraged at this last maneuver by the LA City Council who could care less about their constituencies and the health & well-being & respect for the local public. Costco, Play Vista, Marina and Now LAX expansion. Get real or get out of town You obviously don't live here & care about those who do, not to mention the devastating effect these developments are having on wildlife and the natural environment around us that So. California should be so proud of. Shame on you.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed cumulative impacts in Chapter 4. In addition, the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed impacts to biological resources in Section 4.10, Biotic Communities, Section 4.1, Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna, and Section 4.12, Wetlands, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix J and Technical Report 7 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-H of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00499 Weiss, Barry None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00499-1

Comment:

We moved to Playa del Rey in May of 1994. It took about 3 years for the noise from airplanes turning north too soon to double the noise from these over flights. By the fourth year, noise had tripled. Obviously there is insufficient monitoring of the take-off pattern of airline flights. The continued increase in these violations shows that no action has been taken effectively. The impact of additional flights will really make the noise from larger planes and longer runways unbearable.

Response:

Early turns over El Segundo, Westchester and Playa Del Rey have been a focus of public complaint for years. The airport has attempted to deal with the issue for years through the posting of signs at the end of each runway calling for flight to the coastline prior to turns, but occasional deviations from the procedure continue to occur. A part of the reason is the alignment of the runways relative to the community. The west end of the runways nearest El Segundo are closer to the community than the east ends (the runways are aimed more toward the community's west end), while the north runways are both farther away (except in Alternative A) and aimed away from the community. Consequently, it is much less likely that Westchester and Playa Del Rey will be affected by early turns than El Segundo, particularly by aircraft that follow or attempt to follow the flight to the coastline procedure before turning. For further information, please see Topical Responses TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase and Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00499-2

Comment:

Traffic along Lincoln Blvd. to and from the airport both north and south is stop and go throughout the day. The contention that airport traffic is only an "insignificant" 9% during "light" midday hours flies in the face of our experience. We always try to drive at "light" traffic times, and we still get caught in grid-lock.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PC00499-3

Comment:

We are seeing attempts to expand incrementally, as in Westchester Square, where the airport people say that no EIR is required. That is subterfuge. These EIR's must take into account Marina del Rey growth, Playa Vista, and the airport TOGETHER.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00018-19 regarding the evaluation of cumulative impacts in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As was described in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the voluntary acquisition program for Manchester Square is a separate action by LAWA and completion of that program is proposed to occur independent of, and prior to, implementation of the LAX Master Plan. As such, the most notable potential for cumulative impacts, such as from the potential for demolition activities at Manchester Square to occur concurrent with construction activities for the LAX Master Plan, is minimal. The two activities are separate and sequential, not concurrent. The cumulative impacts analyses for the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR specifically accounted for the Playa Vista project and other projects contributing to regional growth in the area.

PC00499-4

Comment:

This is not just NIMBY. An equitable regional solution will distribute passenger flights to El Toro, John Wayne, Ontario, and Palmdale for both passenger and cargo. That will help shorten the drive time to airport for many other people. The airline interests should not be allowed to subvert our interests. In the past we saw a lobbying effort by the shuttle services stop mass transit into the airport. The public interest should not take a back seat to those interests.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please

3. Comments and Responses

see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00500 Smith, Edson None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00500-1

Comment:

You're going to get a lot of comments about safety, traffic, noise and environmental issues. I agree with the bulk of these.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00500-2

Comment:

What I'd like to point out is that I've visited many of the world's great cities: London, Tokyo, Rome, Paris, Amsterdam. The one thing these cities have in common is that their large airports are out of town, in some cases 50 miles out. These cities have all recognized the follow of maintaining large international airports in crowded urban areas, and it is my hope Los Angeles will to. There's plenty of room in El Toro, March, George and Palmdale. LAWA should have more than a 20 year vision and consider the long run, not just the next couple decades. Regional airports work.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, for information on El Toro, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario International Airport.

PC00501 No Author Identified, None Provided

PC00501-1

Comment:

STOP THE EXPANSION LIFE IS VARY BAD IN THIS AREA DUE TO LAX

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00502

Ruger, David

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00502-1

Comment:

HAVING LIVED IN WESTCHESTER FOR OVER 51 YEARS AND WORKING IN ORANGE COUNTY FOR NEARLY 25 YEARS, I HAVE SEEN THE GROWTH AND CONGESTION GROW IN BOTH COUNTIES. HOWEVER, WHILE LAX SEEMS AND IS OVERUTILIZED BY THE PUBLIC, JOHN WAYNE AIRPORT SEEMS TO HAVE MAINTAINED A SLOW GROWTH STATUS. I UNDERSTAND "NIMBY" PHILOSOPHIES, BUT A REGIONAL AIRPORT EXPANSION INVOLVING ALL MAJOR AIRPORTS IN THE LA, ORANGE, AND SURROUNDING COUNTIES IS THE ONLY REASONABLE SOLUTION. TO EXPAND LAX AS IT IS PROPOSED IS NO SOLUTION AT ALL, IT JUST CREATES MORE PROBLEMS THAN IT SOLVES. SURROUNDING COUNTIES MUST ACCEPT THE BURDEN IN THEIR BACKYARDS AS WELL.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 for information on El Toro, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario International Airport.

PC00503

Mathias, Richard

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00503-1

Comment:

A GENERAL COMMENTARY ON ANY EXPANSION OF LAX

I AM A GENERAL AVIATION PILOT, CERTIFIED COMMERCIAL & CERTIFIED FLIGHT INSTRUCTOR. I HAVE TAUGHT AND FLOWN OUT OF ALL GA AIRPORTS IN THE LA AREA. I AM CONCERNED ABOUT THE CONTINUING LOSS OF GA AIRPORTS. I LOVE FLYING & REJECT THE COMPLAINTS OF HOMEOWNERS THAT CHOOSE TO LIVE NEAR AIRPORTS AND THEN WORK TO CLOSE THEM DOWN. I APPRECIATE THE NEED & VALUE OF LAX AS WELL. OUR FAMILY APPRECIATES THE CONVENIENCE OF THE LAX PROXIMITY TO OUR HOME. I ACCEPT THE NOISE & STREET TRAFFIC - ALTHOUGH OFTEN GREATER THAN WHEN WE MOVED HERE IN 1984. IT IS "MAXED OUT." HOWEVER, I DO NOT ACCEPT THE ARGUMENTS FOR FURTHER EXPANSION OF LAX. EVEN IF WE COULD TOLERATE THE INCREASED AIRCRAFT NOISE, THERE IS NO WAY WE CAN ACCEPT THE IMPACT TO OUR COMMUNITY DUE TO INCREASED STREET TRAFFIC

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00504 Crovella, Raymond None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00504-1

Comment:

The F.A.A. and the airlines must be held to the mandate for a regional solution to the LAX overcrowding problem. People in Orange County must bear both burdens and benefits of a solution to the LAX overcrowding. El Toro, Palmdale, John Wayne, and Ontario airports can contribute to the solution.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, for information on El Toro, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario International Airport.

PC00505 Avila, Mickie None Provided 6/10/2001

PC00505-1

Comment:

OPPOSED TO EXPANSION! WILL BE MORE TRAFFIC, NOISE AND HOME VALUE WILL GO DOWN

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00506

Hart-Smith, Heather None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00506-1

Comment:

When we first started looking for a house in 1989 - 1990 we found many areas in West LA that we had heard of and liked but nothing that struck as a neighborhood in the true sense of the word. Then we came upon Westchester. Now after living in Westchester for 11 years and owning two homes in two different parts of Westchester we are still in love with the area. The expansion of the airport and all of the attempts to ease the growth already experienced threatens the unique way of life and joy we've found here. The airport is a necessary part of the city but it can not be expanded at the expense of the surrounding neighborhoods. Neighborhoods filled with people who love the way of life they have here and love it the way it is. Without these people the city will decline. We've already seen people moving out of the area as a result of the current overcrowded conditions of LAX. Why can't you see that so many things will be lost. So many people will be hurt and Los Angeles will not be the city it once was if this expansion happens.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00506-2

Comment:

This does not even take into account the issues of safety, pollution and congestion.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-2, S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00506-3

Comment:

We need a regional expansion plan that holds LAX back to its original planned for capacity and includes development at Ontario and Palmdale. So many other major cities of the caliber of Los Angeles have multiple airports.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00506-4

Comment:

Let's join the ranks of these forward thinking, safety and way of life concerned city planners and bring more prestige to the city not more decline and loss of its neighborhoods and people.

Response:
Comment noted.

PC00507 Hormann, Pierre None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00507-1

Comment:
This L.A.X Masterplan is obviously and clearly an issue of L.A.X wishing to retain and increase revenue.

Response:
Comment noted. The economic impacts of the project were addressed in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR with supporting technical data in Technical Report 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00507-2

Comment:
All of L.A.X. traffic and pollution mitigation and improvents are clearly flawed and unworkable, as well as ridicilous.

Response:
Comment noted. Mitigation measures for impacts to traffic and air quality associated with the LAX Master Plan build alternatives were initially presented in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and subsequently refined and supplemented in those same sections of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and this Final EIS/EIR.

PC00507-3

Comment:
Just one ex. shown at LAX's workshop today "LAX Masterplan will reduce pollution" the information explained by LAX's staff was ludicrous and any body with half a brain can see trough it.

Response:
As was discussed on page ES-34 in the Executive Summary of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the Master Plan alternatives would affect air quality by changing the amount of emissions released by sources at or near LAX, as well as by changing the locations of those emission sources. The changes can be positive or negative. The Executive Summary of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided an overview of the air quality impacts associated with each alternative. A more detailed discussion of the air quality impacts associated with the Master Plan alternatives was provided in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00507-4

Comment:
There are plenty of additional concrete facts brought forth by others that I do not have to repeat.

"LAX's Master Plan wont work and is unacceptable"

Response:
Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00508 Ruiz, Chris None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00508-1

Comment:

My whole family is opposed to LAX expansion. It is unfair to shove a larger LAX down the throats of Westside residents and subjects the City to huge monetary exposure.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00509 Lum, Brenda None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00509-1

Comment:

OPPOSED TO EXPANSION

TRAFFIC, NOISE, ENVIROMENTAL REASONS

PROPERTY VALUES WILL DECLINE

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00509-2

Comment:

AIRPORT BOARD IS SCHEMING AGAINST RESIDENTS

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00510 Rosie, Izzo None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00510-1

Comment:

The airport is large already, we don't need any more Expansion people are having a hard time sleeping now at night or day for working people.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with

3. Comments and Responses

supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00511 Gabelman, Brian None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00511-1

Comment:

Have you tried to enjoy the outdoors - living in lovely Westchester - you can't spend more than a few mins. (1-2 max.) without jeopardizing your hearing - severe hearing loss will result with over or prolonged any exposure to 90 dB this is an audiological fact - ASHA member & ASA as presented by LAX jet noise pollution.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-246 regarding the fact that existing and future noise levels at and around LAX are projected to be well below the OSHA and CalOSHA standards that serve to protect against hearing loss. Also, please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC00511-2

Comment:

Please listen to us & help the residents.
No more LAX expansion - our health, ears have had it!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health impacts in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1 and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1 and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00511-3

Comment:

Why not use/extend air traffic to nearby Long Beach airport - it is currently under used!

Response:

Comment noted. LAWA has no control over the operation or expansion of Long Beach Airport. Long Beach Airport is legally restricted to 41 large commercial aircraft departures per day. All 41 slots are currently being used for commercial passenger and cargo flights. An additional 25 departures by smaller commuter aircraft are also authorized and most of these commuter slots are not used at this time. It is up to the individual airlines to decide when or if they will utilize the remaining commuter slots. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the Master Plan's role in a regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00511-4

Comment:

Pls. listen - our ears, hearing is precious - once the hair cells (cilia) are destroyed by prolonged 90 dB noise exposure, your hearing cannot be restored. This is potential class action health lawsuit -

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-246 regarding the fact that existing and future noise levels at and around LAX are projected to be well below the OSHA and CalOSHA standards that serve to protect against hearing loss.

PC00512

Sakamoto, Donald

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC00512-1

Comment:

I would like to see that the Draft EIR adequately address issues that I feel were omitted in its original form. One issue is that the effects of the airport expansion would have a negative impact on the surrounding businesses within the perimeter of the airport expansion. Also, the negative effect on the health of the local residents is not adequately discussed. What about the effects of the encroachment of the airport on the endangered butterflies in the Playa Del Rey area? The mitigation measures that were discussed did not adequately address these issues.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed impacts to business and residences in the local area in Section 4.4, Social Impacts, Human health effects in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, and impacts to the El Segundo blue butterfly in Section 4.11, Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna. Supporting technical data and analysis are provided in Appendix J and Technical Reports 5, 7 and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-H and Technical Reports S-3 and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00512-2

Comment:

The No Project Alternative should be amplified to address issues such as the alternative of regional planning of other sites such as Palmdale, and Orange County sites.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00512-3

Comment:

Alternative C (no additional runway) reconfigures the existing runways but doesn't that still require mitigation measures?

Response:

Mitigation measures for Alternative C were identified throughout Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures, and are summarized in Chapter 5, Environmental Action Plan, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00513 Bishop, Sandra None Provided 6/9/2001

PC00513-1

Comment:

Neither the EIS/EIR nor the Master Plan for LAX expansion adequately address the further degradation of the coastal environment.

Response:

Impacts to the coastal environment were addressed in Section 4.14, Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00513-2

Comment:

Also, as an airport adjacent homeowner I strongly object to the proposals to expand into what is currently downtown Westchester and to the proposed new roads.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. As indicated in Topical Response TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not include acquisition within the Westchester business district.

PC00514 Tate, Tracey None Provided 6/6/2001

PC00514-1

Comment:

I am quite disturbed to learn of the proposed expansion of LAX. As a resident of Westchester, I am concerned about quality of life issues such as traffic congestion, air & noise pollution and air traffic safety.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00514-2

Comment:

Please consider expanding airports in Orange County and the inland Empire to handle increased traffic.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional

3. Comments and Responses

approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC00515 Hoffman, Walter None Provided 6/5/2001

PC00515-1

Comment:

This proposal is ludicrous! For fifty years our area has been exposed to increasing noise, filthy air, traffic!! Now is the time to reduce all of the above. Spend your funds on new airports, new quieter planes (don't accept the old ones here) traffic mitigation, and the present airport congestion!

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses in Appendices D and G, and Technical Reports 2, 3 and 4. The Airport Noise and Capacity Act of 1990, as amended, required the phase out of Stage 2 aircraft weighing more than 75,000 pounds operating in the continental United States. This phase out was completed at the end of December 1999. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase. It should be noted that under Alternative D, air pollution and noise pollution are expected to be less than under the No Action/No Project Alternative. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00516 Hyra, J. None Provided 6/5/2001

PC00516-1

Comment:

Our whole family is opposed to any LAX expansion. The traffic, pollution, and noise are already a threat to the health of the citizens of our community and all the communities surrounding the airport. These communities have been suffering the ill effects of pollution for years. Now is the time to say NO to LAX expansion! We need a regional airport plan.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00516-2

Comment:

Also, the Manchester Square property should be turned over to the federal government for a park. The communities directly affected by airport traffic, pollution, and noise deserve some much-needed green space.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00517

Weiss, Zeli

None Provided

6/5/2001

PC00517-1

Comment:

I oppose LAX expansion because: It will destroy not only my home and quality of life, but also my neighbor's lives, the local schools, the parks, and the libraries and local businesses.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, impacts to schools in Section 4.27, Schools, impacts to parks in Section 4.26.3, Parks and Recreation, and impacts to libraries in Section 4.26.4, Libraries, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 5, 16c and 16d of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts to quality of life and TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00517-2

Comment:

Traffic increases will become a nightmare, especially the 405 and 105 due to the fact that they are already overcrowded, and no plans have been drafted to expand them.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PC00517-3

Comment:

Commercial traffic, already a problem on my street will also become worse.

Response:

The primary surface transportation components of the alternatives, such as the Ring Road and LAX Expressway, would encourage commercial vehicles to use the primary freeways and arterial routes and stay off local streets. Combined with the locations for the two commercial vehicle staging areas, it is anticipated that most commercial vehicles would find it beneficial to use these new facilities, rather than off-load onto surface streets. In Alternative D, which does not include the Ring Road or LAX Expressway, most commercial vehicles would use a staging area south of Arbor Vitae, which would be near I-405. This location should encourage many commercial vehicle drivers to stay on I-405 and not off-load onto adjacent surface streets. See also Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

PC00517-4

Comment:

Noise pollution, air pollution and the general trash people leave behind will all increase. This will effect not only my health, but that of my neighbors as well.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and human health and safety in

3. Comments and Responses

Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00517-5

Comment:

The outlying communities, especially around Ontario, Palmdale and Orange County will be denied the convenience and economic opportunities properly and fairly planned expansion of their airports would bring.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00518 Gomez, Humberto Asbestos & Toxic Abatement 6/5/2001
Employees Local 882

PC00518-1

Comment:

The Local 882 fully supports the Los Angeles International Airport Recommended Master Plan. Our members will be the ones who help build the airport and we will do so under wage and benefit conditions that is a standard for our industry.

It is clear to anyone who uses the airport that the current infrastructure is inadequate. In an increasingly competitive and global economy, this major public asset needs to be of the highest quality and restructured for efficiency. The Master Plan will allow our regional economy to remain competitive and will increase jobs throughout the region.

We cannot just listen to the voices of the nay-sayers and opponents of progress. We need to invest in our transportation infrastructure to prepare for the future. If we stand still, the jobs and wealth will go to other major cities on the West Coast. We strongly support the Recommended Master Plan and urge the Los Angeles City Council to endorse this critically needed project.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00519 Gomez, Humberto Asbestos & Toxic Abatement 6/5/2001
Employees Local 882

PC00519-1

Comment:

Laborers' Local 882 strongly supports the Los Angeles International Airport Recommended Master Plan. The rebuilding of the airport will bring tremendous economic benefits to our region. It is clear that the airport is a major source of jobs and economic activity. But in order to compete for business in the Asian Pacific Rim, we need to upgrade and modernize this major asset.

Our members will be working under a project labor agreement, which means that their wages and benefits will be based on a union standard. When our members go to work, our communities thrive. Our 600 members live all over this region and invest their time and money in their communities. If the Master Plan is adopted by the Los Angeles City Council, our cities will benefit, our economy will grow and the flying public will be better off. We need an airport we can all be proud of. Moving forward on LAX modernization will take us a step closer to that goal.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00520

Weiss, Matt

None Provided

6/4/2001

PC00520-1

Comment:

I was born March 4, 1956. One of my first waking memories was as a toddler, looking through a knothole in the back fence of our house on Ceylon Avenue. Past that hole suddenly drove the huge wheel of a tractor. I can still remember the distorted proportion of my young brain thinking the WHEEL of this thing was as tall as the fence. If you lived in the area at that time, you may have my scream. . . That tractor was grading the North runway of LAX, and that house on Ceylon stood, essentially right where the painted numbers designate the East end of the runway. Of course I was too young to understand any of that, but I feel that story somewhat justifies inclusion of my opinion about any LAX expansion. My parents still live a few blocks from Orville Wright Jr. Hi, in the house we were "displaced" too. I was most fortunate to grow up in Westchester, and feel blessed to have settled here with the wife and 2 dogs.

40+ years later, I'm looking through a much larger and better-understood knothole, and if I see another tractor drive by, again you'll hear me scream, though this time, actions will accompany my impassioned cries.

I've never been driven to political activism, but tomorrow, Election Day, I will vote for those who support limiting LAX expansion. This issue will continue to guide my actions in an effort to preserve what is left of the Westchester I've known all my life.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00520-2

Comment:

My first job at around age 12 was working on the boat rental and bait dock in Marina del Rey that is now the Marina Village. The water of the channel was blue, and clear enough to see the bottom. Schools of Bonita inhabited the channel, and my friends and I used to rock-hop out the breakwater (before it was filled with cement) and catch small bass with hand lines in the rocks. . . Look at it now.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00520-3

Comment:

I fully realize that there have been, are, and will continue to be more and more people moving to So. California. I've seen it, and accepted it all my life. I've also heard about Environmental Impact Studies and projections about traffic and pollution, how everything has been worked out. . . . Let me save everyone a lot of time and money on the next study. For whatever formula you come up with, for whatever "precautions" are put in place, the simple fact is the total number of humans is directly proportional to the final outcome of the equation. Period. It's actually quite simple. If you try and stuff more humans here day in and day out, they will ALL be miserable. Not only those of us who live here, but those who have to travel to the area as well. The LAX area is maxed-out as far as the number of people it can handle every day without making a MAJOR NEGATIVE IMPACT ON THE QUALITY OF THE LIVES OF THOSE WHO LIVE HERE.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed growth in Section 4.5, Induced Socio-Economic Impacts (Growth Inducement). In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00520-4

Comment:

By now I'm sure I've lost any chance of getting a direct pont across, so let me say: Share the load regionally. Expand Ontario, Palmdale and El Toro in well-planned manners. The Master Plan for LAX is ill-conceived, and does anyone doubt it will be ill-executed, over budget and complete AGONY for those of us who live here. The same businesses who are making money at LAX will open up facilities there as well, and they will grow and make money hand over fist in each of those new markets. Those communities will be well and fairly served. In 10 years you'll look like heroes to all for your decisive insight and forward thinking... and you may still hold office because of my vote

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00521

Cullen, Doris

None Provided

5/29/2001

PC00521-1

Comment:

What good will it be to build 2 new entrances to LAX, when our roads will still be impacted with drivers coming from the south & north trying to beat a deadline to the airport? Have you tried driving the roads to LAX from Mission Viejo or Santa Ana, or from the north from Thousand Oaks, Saugus, Valencia? I have - it is a nightmare. Can't you see you are over-building LAX?

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00521-2

Comment:

What of a terrorist - we caught one with the intention of blowing up LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00521-3

Comment:

What of an earthquake which could destroy LAX. Look to Seattle with that small quake.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed geologic hazards, including earthquake-induced hazards, in Section 4.22, Earth/Geology, with supporting technical data and analysis provided in Technical Report 12 of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00521-4

Comment:

Does money mean more to you people than common sense?

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00522

Curtiss, D.

None Provided

6/4/2001

PC00522-1

Comment:

I am strongly opposed to all of the currently proposed concepts for LAX. First the evaluation should be done on aircraft movements (Take off/ Landing) not on the number of passengers. There should not be any changes until a complete study has been completed on the Air Space Capacity and on the Ground Space Movements. None of the proposals increase either of these.

Response:

The evaluations in the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR were conducted based on aircraft movements and the number of passengers. An airside capacity assessment using the simulation model, SIMMOD was conducted for each alternative and its projected schedules. The airside capacity assessment used a 24-hour flight schedule representative of movements for a peak month average day. Please see Chapter II, Section 2 of the Draft LAX Master Plan for a discussion of the airside assessment. Please see page ES-9 of the Draft EIS/EIR for a table including the projected operation and passenger activity levels associated with each Master Plan Alternative.

PC00522-2

Comment:

The plan does not adequately address the concept of off site check in terminals that are connected with people movers to connect with the airplanes. This would at least alleviate some of the traffic nightmares that currently exist.

Response:

Off-site check-in terminals were reviewed during the analysis. The most feasible type of off-site check-in terminal was found to be the FlyAway service, which is connected to the airport via dedicated bus. Expanded FlyAway service was assumed to exist in the analysis. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding rail/transit plan, for a discussion of FlyAway services.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00522-3

Comment:

There should be a maximum number of operations scheduled per hour not per day. This would insure better on time operations. Only so many planes can take off in an hour, so why schedule more than that?

Response:

Because Alternative D, the No Action/No Project Alternative, and Alternative C only have four runways, the peak hour as a function of the airfield, would be constrained to the existing level of peak hour activity. Alternative C does provide increased terminal and landside capacity. However, the airfield constraints would still limit the amount of activity that can be served at LAX under this alternative. Alternative C would increase by forty additional cargo operations scheduled at off-peak hours. Peak hour activity would increase in Alternatives A & B with the addition of a fifth runway. Please see Section 1.5.3, Peak Hour Throughput and Delay, in the Master Plan Addendum for the peak hour activity of each of the Master Plan Alternatives.

PC00522-4

Comment:

The particulate pollution has not been adequately addressed. Bigger planes burn more fuel and therefore dump more carbon (soot) in to the air. I live two blocks east of the YMCA. In two weeks my white truck is grey and my blue car is black. Enough is enough.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC00522-5

Comment:

You are proposing to increase the distance between the run ways to accommodate a plane that hasn't been built. If the Europeans want that big an aircraft, let them build the runways over there.

Response:

The decision to relocate Runway 6L/24R (the northern most runway) 350 feet north in Alternative C is to enhance safe aircraft operations by providing a taxiway between the parallel runways. The purpose of this safety enhancement is to reduce the potential for runway incursions. At the same time, the proposed center taxiway would be designed to accommodate New Large Aircraft (NLA) based on the forecast which anticipates NLA operations in the future. Please see Response to Comment PC00015-1 for a discussion on the need of a center taxiway.

PC00522-6

Comment:

This will bring the noise and pollution that much closer to the community.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00522-7

Comment:

LAX is notorious for not completing any of its mitigating measures on traffic, noise, pollution, etc. Over a year ago, you took over control of the Sepulveda tunnel. The lighting is worse now than ever.

Response:

Comment noted. Recent improvements to the Sepulveda Boulevard tunnel included installation of new lighting fixtures, which substantially increased light levels within the tunnel.

PC00522-8

Comment:

Many of the traffic mitigation is not under your jurisdiction and there is no funding to complete it.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00008-6 regarding funding.

PC00522-9

Comment:

It is said that the airlines do not want to support Palmdale. That is simple. Put a surcharge on every passenger that lives in Southern California. If you live in Los Angeles City, it would be one dollar. If you live in Los Angeles County, it would be one hundred dollars. Elsewhere in Southern California, it would be two hundred dollars

Response:

LAX is a public facility and is supported by grants from the FAA. It is illegal to charge different fees to users of the same facility and thus discriminate among users. This regulation also applies to the other commercial service airports in the region.

PC00522-10

Comment:

It is time that we had a regional airport system. Let the rest of California share the noise, the pollution and the traffic.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendices D and G and Technical Reports 2, 3 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendices S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-2 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00524

Mannos, Allison

None Provided

6/1/2001

PC00524-1

Comment:

Can it be possible to develop & expand an airport in an endangered species' habitat without losing the trees & the animals?

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed impacts to biotic communities and sensitive listed flora and fauna in Section 4.10, Biotic Communities, and Section 4.11, Endangered and Threatened Species of flora and fauna. Mitigation measures have been designed to minimize or eliminate potential impacts to endangered species. Those mitigation measures were described in subsections 4.10.8 and 4.11.8 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00524-2

Comment:

Not only is expansion expensive, but the already congested existing airport will not be alleviated by allowing more people to come.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00524-3

Comment:

Many examples of highway expansion & creation shows that pollution and delays increase. This is an incredibly bad idea, without the science it needs to back itself up.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00524-4

Comment:

I advise that no expansion, no campaign to slaughter the last wild & endangered creatures we still have should occur.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed impacts to biotic communities, and sensitive and listed flora and fauna in Section 4.10, Biotic Communities, and Section 4.11, Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna.

PC00525 **Fox, W. Guy** **Global Transportation Services, Inc.** **1/3/2001**

PC00525-1

Comment:

I am writing this letter in support of the new proposed Master Plan for Los Angeles International Airport (LAX).

My company is engaged in the transportation of international freight, both by sea and air, and it is critical that air freight move on the first available flights and receive proper attention through proper receiving facilities that offer security and protection to the goods that are shipped.

LAX is still working with the same infrastructure that was implemented in 1984, prior to the Olympic games in Los Angeles. The cargo facilities were adequate for that period of time, but have not been improved to keep up with today's business environment. Many other airports all over the country have improved their infrastructure, while LAX has stayed in the status quo and all of the cargo facilities are bursting at the seams. If LAX stays in the status quo, then business that would ordinarily come to LAX, would be diverted to other airports who have the capacity and facility to handle such increases of air cargo.

Los Angeles is an international economic center and is considered the edge of the Pacific Rim, but this could deteriorate due to the lack of proper facilities to handle both passengers and cargo. This could also deteriorate the economic role of Los Angeles and all of Southern California.

I am also Chairman of the Board of the Los Angeles Air Cargo Association, and our membership is quite excited about alleviating congestion and gridlock around the airport, not to mention air pollution. If the trucks can not move into the terminals and discharge their cargo in a timely manner, then we can not be competitive with the rest of the air cargo industry in other cities. We are at a great disadvantage and will certainly lose market share.

I would hope that the "Nay Sayers" would try to be part of the solution rather than part of the problem. This plan "Can" work if given the proper support from everyone. I wish to give you my full support and will assist in any way I can. I am looking at the future of our community where I do business and where I live. You may count on me!

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00526 **Wallace, Daniel** **FedEx** **6/4/2001**

PC00526-1

Comment:

I don't see my hangar, nor my career in Lydia H. Kennard's brochure map. I would like to know what you plan to do with my career? Where did all the hangars go?

Must I suffer along with thousands of others, just because of you're greed?

What's in it for us?!

Response:

The subject of airline maintenance hangars is included as part of the ancillary facilities component of Alternatives A, B, C, and D. Please see Chapter 3, Alternatives, in the Draft EIS/EIR for the ancillary facilities program for Alternatives A, B, and C, and Chapter 3, Alternatives, in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for the ancillary facilities program for Alternative D.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00526-2

Comment:

LAXDANIEL@AOL.COM I wish to maintain my screen name

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00527

Cook, Leslee

None Provided

6/3/2001

PC00527-1

Comment:

I am writing to you as a tax paying citizen who uses LAX at least six times a year. I am writing this for my many friends and relatives that also use our airport. We are asking that you do not build up this airport do not develop hundreds of acres along side the airport. These acres are the habitat for the San Diego Blacktailed jackrabbits, Loggerhead Shrike, 300 trees used as nesting sites for raptors (the birds can't use navigational aids as nesting sites). Besides many critters' homes would be paved over for parking spaces, the air pollution would be significant and unavoidable from the increased traffic. This is mentioned in the EIR!

These dunes must be protected for future generations. We need more open space not less, we are interconnected with all of nature. Do you have children?

Did you ever see the film Soylent Green? Let's avoid this future and keep the air clean and the critters thriving.

Response:

Please see Section 4.10, Biotic Communities, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for the discussion of potential direct (habitat conversion) and indirect (air emissions) impacts to the San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit, loggerhead shrike, mature trees, and nesting raptors. Implementation of mitigation measures MM-BC-3 and MM-BC-4 would reduce impacts to sensitive faunal species and mature trees to below the level of significance. Implementation of mitigation measures MM-BC-5, MM-BC-6, and MM-BC-7 would reduce impacts to habitat units to below the level of significance.

Section 4.10, Biotic Communities, and Section 4.11, Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR discussed potential impacts to state-designated sensitive habitat within the Los Angeles/EI Segundo Dunes. Implementation of MM-BC-1, MM-BC-10, MM-BC-11, and MM-BC-12 would reduce impacts to state-designated sensitive habitat to below the level of significance.

PC00528

**Blankenship,
Candace**

None Provided

6/15/2001

PC00528-1

Comment:

I was born & raised here in Westchester - I have grown up with the traffic & noise pollution from LAX

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00528-2

Comment:

- not to mention the jet fuel fall-out - it cakes my screens & windowsills -

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC00528-3

Comment:

I am sure eventually I will die from lung cancer -

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC00528-4

Comment:

and I am sure I have suffered hearing loss.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-246 regarding the fact that existing and future noise levels at and around LAX are projected to be well below the OSHA and CalOSHA standards that serve to protect against hearing loss.

PC00528-5

Comment:

Now you are telling me that I have to put up with more traffic, more noise & more air pollution? No way. You take that LAX Master plan & shred it. Use it for packing material.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase. It should be noted that under Alternative D, air pollution and noise pollution are expected to be less than under the No Action/No Project Alternative. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00528-6

Comment:

Playa Vista & the expanding marina are enough major blunders already.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00018-19 regarding the evaluation of cumulative impacts in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00528-7

Comment:

HAVE YOU PERSONALLY SAT IN TRAFFIC ON SEPULVEDA & LINCOLN BOULEVARDS? - I THINK NOT.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Responses TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the Congestion Management Program.

PC00528-8

Comment:

After the anti-LAX meetings at the Furama Hotel last Saturday, the many council members & representatives from surrounding cities & residents who so vociferously expressed their opinions against LAX expansion - I would consider it a flagrant act of corruption & illegitimacy, if you were to pass such a plan to expand LAX!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00528-9

Comment:

There are other airports situated in less populous regions - go there!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00529

Wolk, Patricia

None Provided

6/21/2001

PC00529-1

Comment:

I strongly oppose further expansion of LAX. Westchester has already taken more than our share of the burden. I believe other airports could be expanded to take care of the problem.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00529-2

Comment:

Westchester is still a desirable community, but more noise from aircraft & more pollution of our air & a decrease in our already inadequate business district will surely have a negative impact on the area.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As described in Section 4.4.2.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR, under Alternatives A, B, and C, from 239 to 330 businesses located within the Westchester Community would be acquired. Under LAWA Staff's new preferred Alternative D only 38 businesses would be acquired. It should be noted that a number of the acquired businesses would be able to relocate to the LAX Northside/Westchester Southside development. Under Alternative D no residential acquisition, acquisition within the Westchester Business District or ring road is proposed. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00529-3

Comment:

Another serious problem is the increased traffic which will occur if this expansion is allowed!

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00530

Clark, Ruth

None Provided

6/19/2001

PC00530-1

Comment:

I agree that it is time to improve airport facilities and the 7 items listed in your Draft Master Plan published on January 18, 2001 are important, and would certainly make LAX more convenient and efficient... but:

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00530-2

Comment:

Please do not disturb the Historical Centinela Adobe Complex!

This is an important part of our history. Surely you can plan an expressway that will not adversely affect this wonderful old adobe complex that so many people visit and enjoy, and learn of California's rich and complex history.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding impacts to the Centinela Adobe.

PC00531 French, R. None Provided 6/18/2001

PC00531-1

Comment:

The Master Plan is a short-term, quick fix solution. I favor the regional solution which is more long-term oriented. It is more efficient to develop Ontario, Palmdale, and El Toro in Orange County.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale and Topical Response TR-RC-4 for information on El Toro, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario International Airport.

PC00531-2

Comment:

Our community in Playa & Westchester already has too much air pollution, black jet dirt, noise & traffic

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC00531-3

Comment:

In addition, we do not want to lose any more homes or businesses!

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D does not propose the acquisition of any residences and would require the acquisition of the fewest number of businesses of the four build alternatives.

PC00532

French, June

None Provided

6/18/2001

PC00532-1

Comment:

I am not in favor of LAX expansion. Please change the focus to a regional airport plan. Other outlying areas need the convenience, and this area already has adequate services.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00532-2

Comment:

Expansion means more air pollution, traffic, noise, overcrowding and further development of the surrounding area for commercial needs.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00533

Grasso, Mitzi

Los Angeles Police Protective League

6/19/2001

PC00533-1

Comment:

After reviewing the Master Plan Proposal, the Los Angeles Police Protective League, representing more than 8,000 rank-and-file members of the Los Angeles Police Department, supports the concept. The plan addresses several of our safety concerns and improves the efficiency of LAX, making the airport a safer and friendlier place to operate.

Gridlock both in and outside of the airport make police response difficult at best. Providing dedicated freeway access to LAX, as well as a ring road around the airport and Green Line operations to the airport will help alleviate traffic congestion. It is essential to public safety that the police are able to respond to all calls of service in a timely manner. The expansion of surface road and freeway access will surely assist in addressing this type of problem. The Los Angeles Police Protective League sees the Master Plan Proposal as a positive move toward ensuring public safety needs are addressed in LAX expansion and supports Los Angeles World Airways in its implementation.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Law enforcement issues were addressed in Section 4.26.2, Law Enforcement, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data in Technical Report 16 of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00534

Lindner, Dorothy

None Provided

6/16/2001

PC00534-1

Comment:

Some years back, I became involved in attending airport commission hearings due to LAX purchases (via inverse condemnation) in the Emerson Manor area of Westchester. Back then at the meetings, I witnessed my submitted questions for the commission being hand shredded and pitched in the nearby round file. (By color coding the papers submitted, it became very easy to observe the destruction of my proposed questions.)

At that time, Clifton Moore was the LAX general manager, and he often referred to LAX being "a good neighbor" (unheard of now!) and about LAX staying at 40 million annual passengers. (Are you laughing yet? Some people believed Moore, but I was not among the trusting.)

Our Emerson Manor home was purchased by LAX after at least one insultingly low offer. We waived the condition that LAX had air rights as part of the sale. (Picture, if you will, a helicopter crash or otherwise during the escrow period. What then?)

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00534-2

Comment:

The airport continues its disregard for surrounding areas of LAX and they continue to feel unanswerable to anyone or any government or civic/public agency. With more power, money, attorneys and time, LAX will continue its expansion and use any property, anytime, any way it sees fit for its own purposes.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00534-3

Comment:

As a result, the so called "Palmdale Airport" is more of an urban legend than anything else. Forewarned is forearmed. This "touch of history" goes into the record as notice/warning about Los Angeles "World" Airports ruthless approach to ruining any neighborhood.

It reads: their way at any cost.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00534-4

Comment:

I really miss my former auto license plate, BAH LAX. It was appropriate while registering for a commission meeting in "the tower." (I signed in with Red Ink for very good reasons!) Good luck and keep excellent records: phone conversations, dates, places (visited or proposed for destruction, er, re-use), persons--as the courts require accurate information.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00534-5

Comment:

Delay delay delay may just eventually read: delete delete delete expansion plans, so other outlying areas will be forced into sharing the greed and added "MAP's as well.

Long long over due!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00535

Tanner, Carol

None Provided

6/16/2001

PC00535-1

Comment:

Rick and Carol Tanner want NO Expansion at LAX. Expand other area airports.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00535-2

Comment:

Playa del Rey and El Segundo already suffer from emissions from the sanitation plant,

Response:

As noted in the Draft EIS/EIR Appendix G Section 2.1.3.2, there are four major stationary point sources located off airport within two miles of the LAX property boundary, including the Hyperion Treatment Plant. There are also three major freeways and several heavily traveled major arterial routes that generate emissions in the vicinity of LAX. In the air quality analyses, contributions to ambient pollutant concentrations from nearby but off-airport emissions sources, as well as from distant emissions sources, are accounted for in the background concentrations, as noted in the Draft EIS/EIR Appendix G Section 2.4.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00535-3

Comment:

traffic from beach city commuters on Vista Del Mar and Pershing,

Response:

Beach access would remain available in all alternatives. In fact, the ring road in Alternatives A, B, and C would tend to draw traffic away from Vista del Mar, since access to the west terminal would not be allowed on Sandpiper and Imperial Highway towards the beach. Further, west terminal access would also not be allowed from Pershing. Therefore, the traffic impacts on these roads are small. Also, in Alternative D, airport traffic is generally oriented toward the east, near the Ground Transportation adjacent to I-405. Therefore, this alternative also has little impact on Pershing and Vista del Mar.

PC00535-4

Comment:

and continuous noise from LAX take-offs.

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00535-5

Comment:

We are burdened from more than our share.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00535-6

Comment:

We also have Playa Vista traffic congestion in the future.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment PC00148-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00148-2.

PC00535-7

Comment:

NO EXPANSION!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00536 **Morris, Mathias** **None Provided** **6/20/2001**

PC00536-1

Comment:

LAX in the last five years has had more near misses or runway incursions than any airport in the United States.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00536-2

Comment:

The LAX, and surrounding communities are already saturated with ground traffic.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PC00536-3

Comment:

While I understand the need to upgrade LAX and improve what we have, it is unrealistic to consider any significant expansion to LAX, primarily due to the fact that the future users of LAX will only come from farther away. A regional approach is the only alternative looking beyond 2015.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00536-4

Comment:

The surrounding communities continue to suffer from escalating noise due to increased air & ground traffic.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface

3. Comments and Responses

Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00536-5

Comment:

Yet while I live merely a few blocks from the flight path, LAX refuses to soundproof my home. If LAX wants to be a good neighbor then start listening to the home owners. And help them out.

Response:

The noise impact area which determines residential uses eligible for sound insulation is described in Topical Response TR-LU-3. Noise-sensitive uses exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour under the 1996 baseline were described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3), and shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Noise-sensitive uses exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour under Year 2000 conditions were described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3), and shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As was shown on these respective figures, under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions the area within the 65 CNEL noise contour has decreased compared to the ANMP contour. Although this is a comment on existing noise levels and conditions, the general focus of the document, pursuant to NEPA and CEQA, is to evaluate the potential future environmental effects of the project and to provide feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts. See Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding how eligibility for soundproofing is determined and for a description of how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

PC00536-6

Comment:

There has been a significant increase in the number of go-arounds in the last few years coupled with an increase in traffic especially large truck traffic which has increased the noise level in our community significantly it is time that LAX looks seriously at reducing not only noise but the congestion. The Master Plan does not come close to addressing the concerns of the surrounding communities effectively.

Response:

Comment noted. The incidence of go-arounds is very small. Aircraft are instructed to execute a go-around maneuver only when the runway is occupied by a preceding arriving or departing aircraft, vehicle or person. Even when a go-around is required, the standard procedures is fly runway heading to the shoreline, and turns prior to that point are very unusual. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding increases in traffic in already congested areas.

PC00537

Crigger, Bill

**El Segundo Chamber of
Commerce**

6/12/2001

PC00537-1

Comment:

Based upon our review, we reluctantly find we cannot support this Master Plan and your preferred alternative (Alternative C) due to the inadequacy of proposed ground access mitigation measures. In this regard, we respectfully request you address our concerns identified in this letter and the more detailed comments on specific portions of the referenced documents in the enclosure to this letter.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00537-2

Comment:

As a representative of the business community, we understand how important international trade is to this region's and our community's current economy and future economic growth. We believe LAX, along with other regional airports, provides a vital international trade link for the region in terms of air passengers and cargo.

We also believe future economic growth in the region will place increased demands on the region's air traffic handling capability, and, while a regional approach to deal with this demand for air transportation is essential, some of this demand must be met by LAX. In this regard, we find the Regional Context presented in Chapter 1 of the Master Plan and EIS/EIR to be a reasonable first step in allocating projected regional demand among all regional commercial airports. Because the airlines and other political entities will make the final determination as to this allocation, we believe your assessment went as far as it could go.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00537-3

Comment:

This assessment vividly points out the need for some entity other than the airlines to determine which airports are served. We are not advocating the return to a regulated environment and reestablishing the Civil Aeronautics Board abolished by the federal Airline Deregulation Act. However, we are pointing out that under the current unregulated environment any identified caps on numbers of flights are meaningless. Additionally, the suggested allocations of future demand are meaningless unless and until the sponsors of the other regional airports make changes to their airports to handle their allocation.

Response:

The comment does not address the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. The City of Los Angeles, as airport sponsor, owns and operates four airports in the Los Angeles Basin including LAX, Ontario International, Palmdale Regional and Van Nuys Airport. The decision to further develop these four existing airports is the responsibility of local government, in this case the City of Los Angeles. Neither the City of Los Angeles or the FAA has the authority to require sponsors of other airports to expand or otherwise further develop their airport in an effort to enforce a limit at LAX. Each of the various airports in the Los Angeles Basin serves a unique role in providing air transportation services. One of the primary reasons that LAX accommodates a large number of passengers is that the competition between airlines drives ticket prices down. As a result of comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR and the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, Mayor Hahn directed LAWA staff to develop a new alternative that focused on safety and security. This new Alternative D - the Enhanced Safety and Security Plan - reduces the number of gates at the airport and provides safety enhancements that will accommodate 78.9 MAP which is the approximate number of passengers accommodated by the No Action/No Project Alternative. As demand for air transportation services increases at airports such as Ontario International, airlines will be able to accommodate that demand with the existing infrastructure. Further, Ontario also has the ability to construct an additional terminal to accommodate increased passenger.

PC00537-4

Comment:

Because of our proximity to LAX, many of our business members participate in international trade and will benefit from increased air transportation into and out of LAX. Yet because of this proximity, they feel the negative impacts of increased automobile and truck traffic into and out of our area due to past and

3. Comments and Responses

future growth at LAX. For this reason, our detailed assessment is focused on those portions of the Master Plan and EIS/EIR dealing with surface transportation and ground access.

In our assessment we find it especially disturbing that costs and funding sources have not been identified for recommended traffic mitigation measures and that previously approved ground transportation projects of other jurisdictions are used to mitigate impacts without any discussion of their funding and expected completion dates.

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Sections 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, and 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00008-6 regarding funding. Also, the ground transportation projects of other jurisdictions referred to by the commentor are not used as mitigations. Rather, they are included as background roadway improvements that must be included in the modeling in order to properly analyze project impacts.

PC00537-5

Comment:

We also find disturbing that mitigation measures are primarily north of the airport to the detriment of our area. Little attention is paid to streets and freeways south of the airport. More significantly, mitigation measures appear to be limited to Los Angeles Department of Transportation jurisdictions with little regard to traffic problems elsewhere.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PC00537-6

Comment:

This is especially evident by the lack of analysis of traffic conditions into and out of the Sepulveda Boulevard Tunnel. The tunnel is already a major bottleneck during peak airport traffic periods.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00236-1 regarding the Sepulveda Tunnel.

PC00537-7

Comment:

Previous experience strongly suggests that our concern about the caps on the number of flights, the inadequacy of identified traffic mitigation measures, and the lack of funding for these mitigation measures is completely justified. When the airport was expanded in the early 1980s, the EIS/EIR called for expansion to be capped at 40 MAP. That cap proved meaningless; hence, our concern about the caps proposed in the current Master Plan. Moreover, the traffic mitigation measures identified at that time were inadequate (and similarly not funded) at the 40 MAP level, let alone at today's 67 MAP level of operation. No measures have been implemented to mitigate this 27 MAP increase over the early 1980s EIS-approved level. It is our view, therefore, that traffic mitigation measures for the current Master Plan must be developed using 40 MAP as the baseline to resolve current traffic problems in addition to Master Plan-generated increased traffic.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00008-6 regarding funding. Also, there are no caps proposed in the Master Plan. In fact, caps on aviation activity at commercial service airports are currently illegal. However, it is believed that facility constraints will ultimately limit the airport activity at acceptable delay levels, as discussed in the Master Plan. Please also see Topical Response TR-GEN-1 regarding baseline issues and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00537-8

Comment:

In addition, conditions of approval must contain specific funding sources, schedules, legally binding commitments to implement signed by the responsible agencies, and remedies in the case of non-performance. Without such funding sources, implementation commitments and remedies, any traffic mitigation measures must be considered illusory.

Response:

Comment noted. A fully-enforceable Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program will be prepared for the project.

PC00537-9

Comment:

For the reasons previously stated, we would like to be supportive of this Master Plan and your preferred alternative. However, we cannot until the issues we raise in this letter and enclosure are resolved. We will work with you as necessary to see to their resolution.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00537-10

Comment:

LAX Master Plan/EIS Issues
Ground Access

General

1. Costs associated with the recommended mitigation measures have not been identified nor have funding sources.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00008-6 regarding funding.

PC00537-11

Comment:

2. The majority of off-airport ground access mitigation measures is north of the airport. Little attention is paid to streets and freeways south of the airport. More significantly, mitigation measures appear to be limited to LADOT jurisdictions with little regard to traffic problems created in surrounding, non-LA jurisdictions.

Response:

Please refer to Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00537-12

Comment:

3. Traffic conditions for the Sepulveda Boulevard tunnel have not been analyzed. Since this arterial provides the main access to the Central Terminal Area from the south and is already a major concern, it must be included in any assessment of impacts and mitigation measures.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00236-1 regarding the Sepulveda Tunnel.

PC00537-13

Comment:

Master Plan Chapter 2, Existing Conditions

1. Appendix L, Previously Proposed Mitigation Measures - Many of these measures are included in either Chapter 5, Appendix L or are identified as mitigation measures without identification of costs and sources of funding.

2. Appendix L, Previously Proposed Mitigation Measures - Identify completed projects and expected completion dates, lead agencies, and funding sources for programmed projects.

Response:

The subject appendix lists several documents that were reviewed in conjunction with the preparation of the Draft Master Plan and the Draft EIS/EIR relative to identifying potential transportation system mitigation measures for the proposed project. To the extent such measures are incorporated into the final mitigation program for the selected alternative for the LAX Master Plan, the approach to, and timing of, implementing the measures would be defined in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, as required under Section 15097 of the CEQA Guidelines and required in conjunction with FAA's Record of Decision for the project. The funding of mitigation measures would occur through a number of potential sources including, but not limited to, airport revenues, and bonds, federal and state grants.

PC00537-14

Comment:

Master Plan Chapter 4, Facility Requirements

1. 8.2.3. Coastal Transportation Corridor Specific Plan Implementation, 8.2.3.1 Projected Revenues from Future Developments within the CTCSP, 8.2.3.1.1 Calculation of Future CTCSP Revenues, page IV-8.35 - If the mitigation measures identified by this master plan to be included in subsequent CTCSPs, LAX must provide revenues for their completion. The formula for calculating LAX-provided revenues must be based upon increased vehicle trips from 40 MAP.

2. 8.2.3. Coastal Transportation Corridor Specific Plan Implementation, 8.2.3.1 Projected Revenues from Future Developments within the CTCSP, 8.2.3.1.1 Calculation of Future CTCSP Revenues, Table IV-8.17, Proposed Implementation Plan - Provide the status of the projects identified in this table.

Response:

A discussion of the Coastal Transportation Corridor Specific Plan is provided in the Draft EIS/EIR Technical Report 3b, Off-Airport Technical Report. The status of the CTCSP projects is available from the California Coastal Commission.

PC00537-15

Comment:

Master Plan Chapter 5, Concept Development

1. 3. Constrained Alternatives Evaluation, 3.3 Final Iteration Alternative Development and Refinement, 3.3.1 Final Iteration Alternatives Off-Airport Public Roads (Including Regional Roads), page V-3.157 - Here and elsewhere the completion of assumed projects identified in Appendix L has not been substantiated. Without completion of this extensive list of projects, ground access impacts resulting from Alternative C cannot be mitigated. Many of these projects were included in Chapter 2, Appendix L, Previously Proposed Mitigation Measures. Without funding sources, implementation commitments and remedies, any mitigation measures must be considered illusory.

Response:

The surface transportation analysis followed industry-accepted procedures and techniques, under the requirements of CEQA and NEPA. The related projects and assumed future improvements were those that are included in the region's transportation improvement plans for each area jurisdiction and regional agency. This is documented in Technical Report 3b, Off-Airport Ground Access Impacts and Mitigation Measures. Please also see Response to Comment AL00008-6 regarding funding.

PC00537-16

Comment:

Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Report, Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures

1. 4.3.1. On-Airport Surface Transportation, 4.3.1.6 Environmental Consequences, 4.3.1.6.4 Alternative C - No Additional Runway, Roadways, page 4-267, second paragraph, last two sentences - The conclusion here raises a concern not addressed by this EIS/EIR, i.e., traffic conditions through the Sepulveda Tunnel. Apparently, as concluded here, the proximity of the tunnel to the inbound upper level ramp from south Sepulveda precludes the widening of this ramp to mitigate peak hour traffic. That being the case, traffic can be expected to back up into the tunnel, thus making an already intolerable situation worse. None of the alternatives' analyses address traffic conditions through the tunnel. Since this is already a major bottleneck during peak periods, impacts under each alternative must be addressed.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00236-1. Although Alternative C would result in a significant impact on the inbound upper level ramp, that would be a temporary condition that would be alleviated when the west terminal begins operations. All other alternatives, including Alternatives A, B, and D, would not result in a significant impact on the ramp in question.

PC00537-17

Comment:

2. 4.3.2. Off-Airport Surface Transportation, 4.3.2.2 General Approach and Methodology, page 4-276, third bullet, last sentence . This assumption indicates a return to incremental growth without mitigation, as occurred between 1984 and today.

Response:

The sentence the commentor refers to is a description of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The definition of that alternative is established under NEPA.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00537-18

Comment:

3. 4.3.2. Off-Airport Surface Transportation, 4.3.2.2 General Approach and Methodology, page 4-281, third bullet, Refine Mitigation Plan with Los Angeles Department of Transportation - Many of the impacted intersections are outside of the jurisdiction of LADOT. Consequently, LAWA must coordinate in a similar manner with neighboring jurisdictions to mitigate impacts on these affected intersections.

Response:

LAWA will coordinate closely with affected jurisdictions outside the City of Los Angeles when designing and installing traffic mitigations in those areas.

PC00537-19

Comment:

4. 4.3.2. Off-Airport Surface Transportation, 4.3.2.2 General Approach and Methodology, Existing Route Conditions, bottom of page 4-284 and top of page 4-285 - The argument that "little cut-through airport traffic is on South Bay arterial routes" has not been substantiated. Motorists will generally "bailout" of congested freeways onto surface streets as necessary to reach destinations in a timely fashion. The excellent Thomas Guides offer this option even to motorists unfamiliar with the area.

Response:

This comment is similar to Comment PHM00008-1. Please see Response to Comment PHM00008-1.

PC00537-20

Comment:

5. 4.3.2. Off-Airport Surface Transportation, 4.3.2.10.3 Alternative C - No additional Runway, Table 4.3.2-23 on page 4-334 . Here and elsewhere, intersections of north-south El Segundo Streets with Imperial Highway and the Ring Road relationship to Imperial Highway under Alternative C are not defined. Access to the Ring Road has not provided from north-south streets such as Aviation, Douglas, Sepulveda, and Main in El Segundo.

Response:

East of Sepulveda Boulevard, the Ring Road is essentially Imperial Highway with no improvements other than mitigation measures. Access to the Ring Road from Aviation Boulevard, Douglas Street and Sepulveda Boulevard would be via existing signalized intersections. West of Sepulveda Boulevard, the Ring Road functions like a freeway. Access to the Ring Road from Main Street would be via two new signalized intersections, one on each side of the Ring Road. Note that Alternative D does not include the Ring Road.

PC00537-21

Comment:

6. 4.3.2. Off-Airport Surface Transportation, 4.3.2.10.3 Alternative C - No additional Runway, Table 4.3.2-23 on pages 4-335 and 436 . The absence of mitigation measures for Sepulveda and Aviation south of the airport and for the Sepulveda Tunnel are indicative of an unwillingness to accept responsibility for existing traffic congestion and increases thereto resulting from Alternative C. By contrast, considerable attention is paid to mitigation measures within LADOT jurisdiction.

7. 4.3.2. Off-Airport Surface Transportation, 4.3.2.10.3 Alternative C - No additional Runway, Tables 4.3.2-25 and 26 on pages 4-347 and 4-347 - Again, it is apparent little regard has been given to mitigation of traffic along the Sepulveda and Aviation corridors south of Century.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PC00537-22

Comment:

Technical Report 2b, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, LAX Master Plan Off-Airport Existing 1996 Transportation Conditions Report

1. 7.3.2. LAX Airport Traffic on Roadways within the LAX Study Area, 7.3.2.1 Locations of Survey, page II-7.33 and Figure II-7.11 - Intersections surveyed are biased toward freeway access to LAX. None of the intersections surveyed is west of the 405 Freeway and south of Imperial. Consequently, no data has been collected regarding airport traffic from the Palos Verdes Peninsula, Beach Communities, and bailouts from the 405 Freeway northbound onto surface streets. This may have led to the unsubstantiated the argument that "little cut-through airport traffic is on South Bay arterial routes". (See EIS/EIR Chapter 4 comment 3 above.)

Response:

As shown in Table II-7.13, the survey included Aviation Boulevard north of Rosecrans Avenue (#14), Sepulveda Boulevard north of Rosecrans (#15), and Vista Del Mar south of Grand Avenue.

PC00537-23

Comment:

2. 7.3.2. LAX Airport Traffic on Roadways within the LAX Study Area, 7.3.2.2 Methodology, page II-7.33 - Since airport peak traffic differs from rush hours, it would appear to be more meaningful to survey during the airport peak hour for an assessment of airport traffic on roadways.

Response:

The point of the analysis described in Section 7.3.2 of Technical Report 2b was to determine how closely the LAX Ground Access Model estimated airport trips at various locations throughout the study area. The analysis concluded that the model provided acceptable estimates for the tested AM and PM peak hours. This exercise occurred prior to the decision to include the airport peak hour in the analysis. At the time the LAX Ground Access Model was enhanced to forecast traffic operations during summertime airport peak conditions (described in Section VII of the LAX Ground Access Model Calibration and Validation Report (attached to Technical Report 2b, following attachment II-O), the surveys had already been completed and no comparable information was available for the 11:00 AM noon time period.

PC00537-24

Comment:

Technical Report 3a, On-Airport Ground Transportation Report

5. Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures, 5.3 Alternative C, page 5-1 - The suggested mitigation measure of widening the inbound upper level ramp from south Sepulveda is not possible per the discussion in the main document. (See comment 1 under EIS/EIR Chapter 4 above.)

Response:

The commentor is correct that there is no feasible mitigation measure for the inbound upper level ramp from south Sepulveda. This was acknowledged in Draft EIS/EIR subsection 4.3.1.9.3. As a result, this

3. Comments and Responses

would remain a significant and unavoidable impact. This ramp would be removed in Alternative D, as discussed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00537-25

Comment:

Technical Report 3b, Off-Airport Ground Access Impacts and Mitigation Measures

1. 2. Analytical Procedures and Assumptions, 2.5 Objectives of Off-Airport Ground Access Plan, Criteria for Identifying Additional Ground Access Improvements, page 2-20, last sentence - Throughout the discussion of mitigation measures, the steps taken to develop recommendations to improve critical intersections without unreasonably disrupting the adjoining properties or neighborhoods have not been identified. Also, specific neighborhoods and intersections must be identified.

Response:

When developing the mitigation plan for intersections, the first priority was to mitigate without affecting adjacent properties. This was done with addition of ATSA, ATCS, or restriping. When those measures were unavailable, widening within rights-of-way was explored. As a last resort, widening outside rights-of-way was recommended when feasible; otherwise, an intersection would potentially remain unmitigated.

PC00537-26

Comment:

2. 5. Off-Airport Ground Access Plan, 5.1 Year 2005 Ground Access Plan, Neighborhood Traffic Management Measures, page 5-2 first paragraph - A scope for the neighborhood traffic management program should be provided. Many of the traffic impacts on neighborhoods currently exist. In the past, LAWA has shown little interest in working with surrounding communities to mitigate traffic concerns. Prior to approval of the Master Plan and EIS, the intended program must be outlined. Without such a program, mitigation measures are incomplete and cannot be evaluated completely. At a minimum, neighborhoods and streets should be identified.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PC00537-27

Comment:

3. 5. Off-Airport Ground Access Plan, 5.1 Year 2005 Ground Access Plan, Neighborhood Traffic Management Measures, page 5-2 General Process, second paragraph - This paragraph can be interpreted such that the proposed program will be limited to LADOT governed neighborhoods and will not include surrounding jurisdictions such as El Segundo and Hawthorne.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR do not limit neighborhood traffic management measures to any specific jurisdiction or area.

PC00537-28

Comment:

Additionally, because mitigation will be only as successful as funding permits, funding sources for recommended mitigation measures must be included in this Master Plan/EIS.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00008-6 regarding funding.

PC00537-29

Comment:

4. 5. Off-Airport Ground Access Plan, 5.1 Year 2005 Ground Access Plan, Neighborhood Traffic Management Measures, page 5-2, Problem Areas, first paragraph - See the previous comment. It appears the neighborhood traffic management program will be limited to LADOT jurisdictions.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR do not limit neighborhood traffic management measures to any specific jurisdiction or area.

PC00537-30

Comment:

5. 5. Off-Airport Ground Access Plan, 5.1 Year 2005 Ground Access Plan, Neighborhood Traffic Management Measures, page 5-2 and 5-3, Solutions - Good words, but the devil is in the details. Specific neighborhoods and streets must be identified along with agencies to manage the monitoring program.

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Sections 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, and 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts. Specific neighborhoods and streets would be identified as part of the program itself, but are not included in this program-level EIS/EIR.

PC00538

Brueck, Donald

None Provided

6/22/2001

PC00538-1

Comment:

I live at 823 Maryland Street in El Segundo. My wife and I have two children, and many other children live on our block. In the early morning, I have smelled a strong odor of jet fuel when I go outside my house. Since it has been established that exposure to hydrocarbon vapors is hazardous, I request that measures be taken to eliminate this hazard.

The specific measures I request are:

1. Establish monitoring for hydrocarbon vapors at appropriate locations in residential areas adjoining the airport.

Response:

Dispersion modeling is a more cost-effective option to monitoring. Modeling allows estimation of pollutants at numerous locations for a fraction of the cost of ambient air monitoring. Health risks

3. Comments and Responses

associated with migration of airport emissions were presented in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Assessment (CEQA), of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00538-2

Comment:

2. In cooperation with local city governments, establish a fee system for the emission of hydrocarbon vapors that is payable by the operators of the airport to the appropriate city government. This fee system should be at a level that will minimize the hazards of hydrocarbon vapors to the residents near the airport.

Response:

Currently no fee system is proposed in the LAX Master Plan related to emissions of hydrocarbons.

PC00538-3

Comment:

An alternative to this is to tow airplanes to the runways and to provide for vapor recovery during all fueling operations.

Response:

Vapor recovery systems are already in place during fueling operations. There are significant safety and timing concerns regarding towing aircraft to the runways, therefore, this is not a feasible option to consider.

PC00539

Capo, Helen

None Provided

6/21/2001

PC00539-1

Comment:

I AM DEEPLY OPPOSED TO ANY L.A. AIRPORT EXPANSION.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00539-2

Comment:

L.A. IS ALREADY THE MOST DANGEROUS RUNWAY IN THE COUNTRY.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00539-3

Comment:

I LIVE ON WALNUT AVE. IN EL SEGUNDO AND WHILE THERE WAS SOME NOISE WHEN I PURCHASED MY HOME IN 1962, IT DID NOT BLAST MY WINDOWS OUT OF THEIR FITTINGS,

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise based vibration.

PC00539-4

Comment:

NOR DID IT RELEASE JET FUEL ALL OVER MY HOME AND CAR AS IT NOW DOES.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC00539-5

Comment:

PLEASE CONSIDER OTHER AREAS SUCH AS PALMDALE WHERE THERE ARE WIDE OPEN SPACES.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00539-6

Comment:

EXPANSION - NO - WHERE ON EARTH COULD YOU EXPAND.

Response:

Each of the build alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIS/EIR would require land acquisition in order to expand. In each of these alternatives, land to the east of the existing airport would be needed. As was discussed in Chapter V, Concept Development, Section 3.3.1 of the Draft Master Plan, Alternative A would require 273 additional acres of land to be acquired, Alternative B would require 345 acres, and Alternative C would require 224 acres. Expansion as depicted in Alternative C would allow LAX to serve approximately 89.6 million annual passengers (MAP) and Alternatives A and B could serve approximately 98 MAP if the airlines were to make air service changes. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, is designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport capacity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. Alternative D will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient, and will have the fewest negative impacts to local communities and the region. Analysis of Alternative D was provided in the Draft Master Plan Addendum and in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The No Action/No Project Alternative examined the capacity of all of the airport components and defined the maximum level of activity (approximately 78.9 MAP) that could be accommodated at LAX without improvements. Alternative D would require the acquisition of approximately 77 acres of property, the least amount of land acquisition of the four build alternatives. Please see Chapter V, Concept Development, Section 3.3.1. of the Draft LAX Master Plan and Chapter 2, Alternative D Development and Refinement, Section 2.7 of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum for more information on land acquisition.

PC00539-7

Comment:

THE PLANES ARE ALREADY FLYING (ILLEGALLY) OVER MY HOME.

Response:

Please Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures and TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00539-8

Comment:

THE BLACK JET FUEL IS ALL OVER MY WINDOWSILLS AND TAKES CONSTANT CARE AND I'M NOT EVEN TALKING ABOUT WHAT THIS IS DOING TO MY HEALTH AND THE HEALTH OF ALL MY NEIGHBORS.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC00539-9

Comment:

PLEASE HAVE MERCY ON THE SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES. I AM IN THE HIGHEST DECIBAL AREA AND CANNOT TAKE MORE THAN THAT.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase and Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00539-10

Comment:

PLEASE CONSIDER NOT TO CONSIDER EXPANSION.

Response:

It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00540

Bahr, Corena

None Provided

6/21/2001

PC00540-1

Comment:

I oppose the expansion of LAX. Updating the flow of traffic on the current plan using shuttle buses and/or people movers is a great idea. However, the burden of future growth should be distributed regionally to other airports - not funnelled into LAX!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00540-2

Comment:

The fact that the list of individuals & organizations that support/endorse the LAX Master Plan is comprised solely of businesses & contractors leads me to believe that the LAX Master Plan is not in the

best interest of the citizens of Los Angeles. It is the surrounding neighborhoods that will be negatively impacted with noise, pollution, & traffic congestion.

Stop making Los Angeles an ugly place to live!

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00541 Robb, Merlene None Provided 6/20/2001

PC00541-1

Comment:

Los Angeles Times, Health Section, 6-19-81 [article attached]

As a resident of an apt. bldg. directly under the flight path of north runway at LAX, this article's information adds to my dismay at having to live in such an unhealthy environment. Residents are assaulted 24/7 by not only the roaring jet noise, constant rain of soot on homes, clothing & vehicles, traffic congestion, on & on, but now the added curge of particles in the air causing heart attacks. We live in a toxic brew in order to have an "affordable rent" & be closer to our low paying jobs.

Response:

Please refer to Topical Responses TR-HRA-2 and TR-HRA-3 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects and human health impacts.

The AQMD completed a study in the Inglewood area in Year 2000 responding to resident's complaints of fine black dust on their property. Results of this study are available on http://www.aqmd.gov/news1/LAX_study.htm. During Year 2000, particulate collection plates were placed at 28 residences in the flight path area during the last week of April and the last week of May. The study's principal findings were the following:

1. Samples from the LAX flight path did not show any pattern indicating that aircraft are the predominant source of particulate fallout.
2. The composition of the fallout is similar to that typically found in other areas of the Los Angeles metropolitan area.
3. Motor vehicles, and tire rubber particles from them, appear to be a larger source of particulate fallout than aircraft.
4. The concentration and growth of vehicle traffic and resulting emissions around the airport area is of concern.

Please refer to Topical Response TR-HRA-4 regarding human health mitigation strategies. Reducing traffic congestion near the airport and reducing exhaust emissions from mobile sources associated with airport operations are significant proposed mitigation measures. In addition, please refer to Section 4.1, Noise, regarding noise impacts and Section 4.4, Social Impacts, regarding environmental justice.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00541-2

Comment:

Not one of the residents of the apt. bldgs. east of Airport Blvd. & south of Manchester would remain in this area except for the fact we cannot afford to live elsewhere. I accepted the noise of planes coming through my livingroom in order to be within walking distance to my workplace. Our bldg. has been retrofitted with the LAX Noise Abatement Project "soundproof" windows & doors. This helps some but does nothing to mitigate the outdoor pollution 24/7. Our landlord seldom bothers to visit this bldg. on site and is extremely reluctant to provide proper maintenance, i.e. I have been pleading with him for seven years to reroof, in order to stop the water leaking through the ceiling. He makes excuses, but, in reality, he is, or has already, sold out to LAX expansion & could care less about.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. However, please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC00542

Jigamian, D.

None Provided

6/20/2001

PC00542-1

Comment:

As a concerned citizen, I urge the following steps to be considered:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC00542-2

Comment:

Avoid expansion of LAX. Instead pursue a regional approach to airport expansion. e.g. a) build up Ontario, Palmdale, El Toro; b) charge higher landing fees to use LAX

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale and Topical Response TR-RC-4 for information on El Toro, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario International Airport.

PC00542-3

Comment:

Focus on safety through improved technological advancements, rather than expansion (LA Times 6/20/01)

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00542-4

Comment:

Consideration & alarm is warranted for endangering the quality of life for Westchester citizens (noise, air pollution, loss of homes, etc.)

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. As indicated in TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not propose residential acquisition. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00543

Stone, Russell

None Provided

6/24/2001

PC00543-1

Comment:

Airport Commission president John Agoglia doesn't know how someone can look at the report on LAX's nation-leading number of near-misses and say that we don't need to upgrade the airport. I ask how someone can look at the report and say we should bring more planes into an airport that is already far beyond its safe capacity. Everyone wants a safer LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. Alternative D, the Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, has been added and was addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR in light of the events of September 11, 2001, and is specifically designed to protect airport users and crucial airport infrastructure, and to incorporate federal security recommendations as they are developed to the greatest extent possible.

PC00543-2

Comment:

We can start by putting a cap on the number of flights.

Response:

Though the Alternative D airfield would be constrained it would not result in any sort of numerical cap on the number of flights. Capping LAX at a given number of operations during a given period of time would require an act of congress.

The existing (Year 2000) number of daily design day operations is 2,275. The Master Plan analysis determined that LAX was at its peak hour operational capacity in 1996. Because the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative C do not consider the addition of a new runway, both are constrained

3. Comments and Responses

to the peak hour operational capacity of the existing airfield. Therefore, neither can accommodate a significant increase in operations beyond existing levels. Alternative C would include only 44 additional operations consisting of cargo flights scheduled during off-peak times. With the addition of a fifth runway, Alternatives A and B could accommodate over 440 additional daily operations as compared to Year 2000 daily operations levels. Please see Chapter V, Section 3.3.2 of the Draft LAX Master Plan for more information regarding the activity levels of the Master Plan alternatives. Please see Response to Comment PC00281-25 regarding the ability of the airport to limit operations.

PC00543-3

Comment:

Palmdale and inland empire facilities can take up the slack.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00543-4

Comment:

Similarly we are told that the airport master plan, while greatly increasing the number of flights, will help relieve traffic around LAX. If you believe that, I've got a bridge I'd like to sell you.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00544

St.Pierre, Florian

None Provided

6/20/2001

PC00544-1

Comment:

There is already too much pollution, fumes, noise, traffic conjection in the area, it just doesn't make any sense to add more to it.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding odors. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00544-2

Comment:

The solution to progress is to make good use of other nearby area such as the Ontario Airport, the El Toro base or even Palmdale, connecting to the heart of the city by High Speed Monorail.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand.

PC00545

Dawson, Ruth

None Provided

6/23/2001

PC00545-1

Comment:

NO EXPANSION at the present site of LAX. We have lived in this community for 30 years. Our home on 92nd Street was taken in 1970 because of LAX expansion (north runway). Westchester is a very special place . . . as is Play Del Rey, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach and so on down the way and around Palos Verdes. AND . . . I feel great sympathy for those who live in Inglewood who for many, many years have had noise and pollution over their homes.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00545-2

Comment:

WHY don't you really plan ahead for the future??? Use TRAINS and transport people (Passengers, crew etc.) to other sights . . . and build on the "land in the Valley" that YOU have owned for years.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00545-3

Comment:

Do you "in high places" really drive on Lincoln and Sepulveda Blvds. know of the congestion (at all hours) that we have now?

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00545-4

Comment:

AND do you ever go to the Airport Post Office (new location of not more than 1 1/2 years old) at Arbor Vida and Airport Blvd. and hear and feel the planes so low overhead as they come in for landing???

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00545-5

Comment:

Think of the pollution that comes down many, many times a day . . .

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC00545-6

Comment:

and if ever a crash . . . would you please wake up and plan ahead . . . TODAY about working with regional solutions???

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00545-7

Comment:

I like to fly. It is nice to be near an airport. My brother is a retired captain with American Airlines out of O'Hare. O'Hare was built out of the city, Chicago, as was Dulles from D. C. and the new airport near Denver. Please plan ahead . . . we don't need expansion at LAX for many reasons . . . health, pollution, noise, congestion just to name a few!!!

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00545-8

Comment:

I sincerely feel that this planned expansion of LAX or LAWA is only a matter of MONEY and BIG BUSINESS! I do hope you will consider . . . HEALTH AND SAFETY as your number "1" priority.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed health and safety impacts in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 14. Please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00546

Wolf, Frank

None Provided

6/25/2001

PC00546-1

Comment:

The Daily Breeze reported, June 18, 2001, of a survey conducted by LAWA on the availability of home within ten miles of LAX. The Breeze stated, according to your survey, there are plenty of available homes in surrounding communities.

WHERE ARE THEY?

The Focal Point on Aging, 1339 Post Avenue, Torrance, receives some 40 calls a month requesting information on affordable housing. If as the Breeze reported that your survey found plenty of available homes, why would the Focal Point on Aging receive a preponderance of requests for information on Housing?

Please, publish the location these homes.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation issues, including affordable housing.

PC00546-2

Comment:

Why is LAWA expanding LAX creating new problems for the surrounding communities when it fails to correct existing problems?

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels.

PC00546-3

Comment:

All too frequently the local media reports of an incident involving aircraft maneuvering within the confines of the airport. What is currently being done to minimize accidents on the ground between behemoths aircraft at the gates and on the taxiways.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00547 Meyer, Cherrill None Provided 6/18/2001

PC00547-1

Comment:

Westchester and its residents should not have to suffer for all of Southern California. I grew up in Westchester, attended Westchester Lutheran School and twenty years ago, inherited the house my parents purchased in 1951. I have lived with increasing pollution from jet fuel and vehicles, increasing noise from aircraft, transcient traffic and cargo trucks, plus, year after year, the burden and stress of hearing expansion plans, and threats from LAWA as it slowly eats away at surrounding homes and the business district of my community. Now their sixty million dollar plus "Master Plan" suggests the Westchester Little League field down the street from my house would be just perfect for cargo facilities and an extended north runway. They are not going to take my house, my garden and my trees. I've had it and so have my neighbors who have LAX Expansion NO signs on their lawns. Our neighborhood is predominantly white, with house prices from 365,000 to 575,000 dollars, not the poor areas described in occasional L.A. Times articles.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and residential and business relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester and Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand.

PC00547-2

Comment:

One of my most vivid childhood memories is a woman being pulled out of her house on the corner of Kittyhawk and Interceptor by airport goons who had condemned her home for a parking lot. It was televised on local black & white TV. Then the house was bulldozed down in front of her. That's the arrogance of our neighbor,L. A. Airport. President Bush said in a recent radio address that home ownership is the most important and "hottest" investment in the American economy. The airport wants to destroy our homes and our business district to solve their problems.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00040-46.

PC00547-3

Comment:

Their Master Plan doesn't even entertain the regional approach so the burden of air traffic and passengers is shared throughout Southern California. The FAA, plus our local, state and federal elected officials, should demand LAWA focus on regional solutions with properties they already own, such as Ontario and Palmdale.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1, regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, for more information about regional airports, airport system scenarios, airport governance, and the role of local and regional agencies in meeting regional aviation demand. The role of the FAA is to ensure the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace in the United States. The role of the airport sponsor is to provide a location for the airlines to conduct their business. The City of Los

3. Comments and Responses

Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government.

PC00547-4

Comment:

Nearly 30 percent of LAX's current traffic comes from Orange Co. and, as it is considered one of the "growingest" regions in the state, a new airport using El Toro's land or expansion of existing facilities should be considered. However, an L.A. Times article June 17 reported that, although an airport in Orange Co. has many advocates and plenty of undeveloped land, many residents don't want it because of noise, traffic and pollution. The Irvine Co. is quickly trying to push through development of more than 2,000 new homes so a new airport can't be built on the land. How come new homes can't be condemned but ours can?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC00547-5

Comment:

LAWA has owned more than 17,000 acres of flat, undeveloped land in Palmdale for thirty years, once earmarked for airport expansion. Send the cargo facilities and trucks there and eliminate the need for increased traffic and pollution in Westchester. Palmdale residents want the work.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00547-6

Comment:

Chicago has more than one airport, Kansas, Dallas and even Hong Kong had to build new airports away from residential communities. Westchester has been forced to carry an unfair burden for more than fifty years. As California's population and air traffic grows, the FAA and LAWA are going to have to bite the bullet and focus on alternatives, to properties they own in Ontario and Palmdale, plus abandoned Air Force bases such as El Toro and other Southern California airports.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale and Topical Response TR-RC-4, regarding Orange County air transportation demand. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00547-7

Comment:

Our elected officials need to be visible, outspoken and take a stand for us, their constituents and not allow LAWA to destroy our quality of life anymore:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00547-8

Comment:

no extended north runway, which would take homes, businesses and a Little League field,

Response:

Comment noted. Each of the build alternatives would involve extension of the existing north airfield runways, and Alternative A would also involve development of a new, shorter third runway in the north airfield. Acquisition impacts associated with such improvements were addressed in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses (subsection 4.4.2.6), of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment PC00035-2 and Response to Comment PC02302-11 regarding residential acquisition and residential relocation, respectively; Response to Comment PC00013-5 regarding business acquisition and relocation impacts, proposed collateral development at LAX Northside/Westchester Southside, and the proposed Preliminary Property Acquisition and Relocation Plan; as well as Response to Comment AL00033-120 and Response to Comment PC01879-11 for discussion of the mitigation of potential acquisition and relocation impacts.

The Carl E. Nielsen Youth Park, which presently includes a soccer field and two baseball diamonds, is a private facility located on LAX property and leased by LAWA. This park would not be converted to airport uses as part of the Master Plan, but rather would be expanded by an additional five acres under Alternatives A, B, and C and would continue to be used for organized youth sports, as described in Section 4.26.3, Parks and Recreation, of the Draft EIS/EIR. Under Alternative D, no changes to the park would occur, as stated in Section 4.26.3, Parks and Recreation, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00547-9

Comment:

plus alter flight paths over surrounding communities;

Response:

The development of Alternative A could result in additional takeoffs nearer Westchester, but the new northernmost runway in the north runway complex is planned for arrival use and departure operations would be conducted from the existing runways (24R and 24L on the north airfield; 25R and 25L on the south airfield). Therefore, it is less likely that small aircraft departing either runway in the north complex would turn across the landing course of aircraft using the new north runway. The development of Alternative C would move Runway 24R north 350 feet, however, new procedures would ensure that all westerly departures reach the coastline before initiating turns. Alternative D would not move 24R to the north. For further information, please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2. In addition, potential noise abatement measures were addressed in Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR, in particular Section 7.1.1.3, Noise Abatement Flight Routes, and Section 7.1.2, Airport Regulation Changes and in Topical Response TR-N-7.

PC00547-10

Comment:

no cargo facilities which would add to the noise and pollution of our neighborhoods;

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand.

PC00547-11

Comment:

no expressway or ring road, which, with the already gridlocked freeways and surrounding streets, NOT mitigate traffic.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PC00547-12

Comment:

The skies are already overcrowded and no amount of new facilities on the ground can eliminate concerns about air traffic safety.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00547-13

Comment:

LAWA has always been a lousy, intimidating neighbor and bully. But we're as mad as hell and we're not going to take it -- anymore.

Those of us in Westchester need our representatives to vigorously oppose all aspects of the LAX Expansion Plan and help us save the biggest investment people make: our homes.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00548

Lindquist, Erik

None Provided

PC00548-1

Comment:

I AM AGAINST LAX EXPANSION

3. Comments and Responses

I AM FOR QUIET LEAFBLOWERS AND LAWNMOWERS.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00549 Parsons, Dorris None Provided

PC00549-1

Comment:

Retired

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00550 No Author Identified, None Provided

PC00550-1

Comment:

Please be aware of the meeting to be held tomorrow at the Furama Hotel from 12-7pm. They will have the environmental impact report for LAX expansion available for review and comment. Public comment begins at 2:30pm. This is the LAST public meeting to express concerns, opinions, options, etc.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00550-2

Comment:

Issues for consideration:

1. The plan allows for "imminent domain" all the way to Manchester from Inglewood to Playa Del Rey. They say they will not need as much; however, if imminent domain is issued, they can, without public protest, change their mind and use this land as they choose for airport expansion. Bye bye Ralphs, Starbucks, Office Depot, PetCo, Pacos Tacos, Mervyns, Longs, Westchester Golf Course, Westchester Park, Westchester Library, etc Bye, bye neighborhood.

Response:

Acquisition was addressed in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition or any acquisition within the Westchester Business District. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00550-3

Comment:

2. The FAA released a 10year plan yesterday recommending regional plan NOT LAX expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project

Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00550-4

Comment:

3. United and American Pilots have told me that the pilots unions do NOT want LAX expansion as they believe that LAX management has allowed the unsafe 60% overcapacity to fly into LAX instead of restricting volume to meet safety guidelines. What will prevent management from continuing this trend generating even more volume than is projected in report. Besides, the pilots believe that this could easily be solved by moving cargo to outlying airports with little or no expense and impact to the LAX area communities.

Response:

Comment noted. FAA has determined that Los Angeles International Airport is safe to use. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed safety impacts in Section 4.24.3, Safety, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 14c and S-9b. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. Much of the air cargo that is processed at the airport arrives in the belly of passenger aircraft rather than in all-freighter aircraft. In regards to relocating cargo operations, please see Response to Comment PC00381-12 and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding a regional approach to meeting aviation demand.

PC00550-5

Comment:

4. With the onset of H. Hughes offramp, the volume of airport traffic through the Sepulveda corridor has increased far above projections. Taxis, busses, rental car travelers are in a race against time running red lights all the time. In particular, Manchester and 77th intersections have at least 2 reported accidents a day some minor and many more requiring hospitalization and even death. When a neighbor wrote a letter to Dept. of Transportation and Mayor requesting to do something to improve the dangerous intersections, the response back (I have a copy if you'd like to read it) was that not enough deaths occur throughout all times of the day to warrant further consideration (meaning they only occurred morning and afternoon-evening instead of every hour). Read this and learn what kind of response we can expect to get if further expansion/retro-fit occurs resulting in more car trips and significant problems to our community.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00550-6

Comment:

5. On a personal note, it makes no logical sense for expanding LAX instead of regionalizing the air volume. Regional airports want regional air expansion, the communities they are in want it, the pilots want it, they are owned by same owner-LA County thus no net financial loss, the FAA wants it....so what am I missing? There must be a financial carrot that is being hidden from us.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please

3. Comments and Responses

see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00551 **Garcia, Manuel** **None Provided** **6/9/2001**

PC00551-1

Comment:

I am concerned resident of Westchester. The expansion of LAX into my neighborhood would drastically affect my life.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00551-2

Comment:

As it is, I deal with the increased traffic from the airport shuttles,

Response:

Comment noted. The primary surface transportation components of the alternatives, such as the Ring Road and LAX Expressway, would benefit commercial vehicles by encouraging them to use the primary freeways and arterial routes and stay off local streets. Combined with the locations for the two commercial vehicle staging areas, it is anticipated that most commercial vehicles would find it beneficial to use these new facilities, rather than off-load onto surface streets. In Alternative D, most commercial vehicles would use a staging area south of Arbor Vitae, which would be near I-405. This location should encourage many commercial vehicle drivers to stay on I-405 and not off-load onto adjacent surface streets.

PC00551-3

Comment:

hear the flights that come in late at night and others that fly at times when they are not supposed to be flying.

Response:

There are no restrictions on the type of aircraft that may land at LAX during the night hours, nor are there any restrictions on the hours during which operations may occur. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations and Topical Response TR-N-7 for additional information about the preferential over-ocean procedures that are in place in an attempt to mitigate noise during the late night hours. Please see Appendix S-C, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, and Appendix S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding analysis of single-event noise impacts including potential impacts on nighttime awakenings

PC00551-4

Comment:

If the need for more space is in question, I do not understand why Lancaster/Palmdale or even El Toro are not being considered more seriously. It seems to me that the expansion of LAX into this neighborhood is only a temporary solution for a problem that demands a more permanent solution. Before you take much more time debating about expanding LAX, shouldn't you consider and think about long-term growth to make a better decision?

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00552 Winters, Nancy None Provided 6/18/2001

PC00552-1

Comment:

I am against LAX expansion even though I fly for business a lot & work in El Segundo.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00552-2

Comment:

I live in Hermosa Beach & for the last 3 years, airplanes have gotten closer & noisier.

Response:

The commentor may be affected by easterly takeoffs circling back to the west on their departures to Asia. During a recent 18-month period, 82 jets departed to the east when over-ocean procedures were in effect, an average of about one per week. As noted by the noise abatement procedures delineated in Topical Response TR-N-7, exceptions to the over-ocean procedures are available when weather of wind conditions require east traffic flow. LAWA will be pursuing Federal approval of a restriction to alleviate that situation by making over-ocean procedures mandatory when they are in effect between midnight and 6:30 a.m. Please see Topical Response TR-N- 3 regarding noise mitigation, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay.

PC00552-3

Comment:

I call the LAX NOISE line & complain at 12:05 AM, & the usual 2-3 AM international flight that rattles my windows.

Response:

Please see Topical Responses TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations and Subtopical Response TR-N-8.2 regarding vibration effects like rattling and shaking. In addition, please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR, and Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for single event noise impacts on nighttime awakenings. Supporting information is provided in Appendix SC and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00552-4

Comment:

I would rather take light rail to Burbank & fly for business than have more noise, traffic, & jets over my home! Please do not expand LAX - put more flights in San Bernardino, Riverside, & Orange County! Reduce congestion - don't make it worse...

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan, Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendices D and G and Technical Reports 2, 3 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendices S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-2 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00553

Mathias, Richard

None Provided

6/18/2001

PC00553-1

Comment:

SEPULVEDA & LA TIJERA & MANCHESTER BLVDS. HAVE BECOME VERY CROWDED. OUR OWN RESIDENTIAL ST (78TH BETWEEN SEPULVEDA & LA TIJERA) & NEARBY AIRPORT BLVD. HAVE BECOME INCREASINGLY BUSY. OUR PET DOG WAS KILLED ON 78TH ST.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00553-2

Comment:

WE HAVE THE CONTINUAL SOUNDS OF AIRCRAFT AT LAX. WE CAN ALSO HEAR 405 TRAFFIC. MOVING THE N. RUNWAY COMPLEX BOTH FURTHER NORTH & EXTENDING IT EAST WOULD ONLY INCREASE NOISE.

Response:

With regard to aircraft noise moving further north, please see Response to Comment PC00405-3. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00553-3

Comment:

INCREASING ANNUAL PASSENGERS TO 89 MILLION (&THIS IS ONLY "PLANED" NOT STOPPED @ 89 MILLION) WOULD DRASTICLY IMPACT OUR ALREADY BAD TRAFFIC - EVEN WITH ADDED "RING ROAD.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00553-4

Comment:

"REGIONAL" AIRPORT RELIEF SHOULD INVOLVE OTHER AREAS OF THE REGION NOT JUST LAX.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00554

Lear, Herb & Merla

None Provided

6/18/2001

PC00554-1

Comment:

I'm writing this note for my 85 year old parents. They built their home in 1950 and have lived on Airport Blvd. for over 50 years. Now, their quiet neighborhood is in danger of becoming an expressway that would connect the traffic from the 405 freeway to Westchester Parkway to LAX. PLEASE STOP this expansion project as it would cause many negative effects on this community in the form of diesel soot, noise, and air pollution as well as destroying quiet neighborhoods and the quality of life people have worked hard for.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts to quality of life, Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping, and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts on the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D added subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, does not include the LAX Expressway or the Ring Road.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00554-2

Comment:

PLEASE WORK TOWARDS alternatives that would reduce the traffic and provide access to regional airports.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00555

Speer, Jan

None Provided

6/14/2001

PC00555-1

Comment:

I am against the LAX expansion because of the impact it would have on the traffic in our community. With the Howard Hughes complex almost completed I believe that the airport expansion would be too much! P.S. I have been a resident of Westchester for 25 years and the traffic keeps getting worse!

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. For details on how the future traffic demand from the Playa Vista and Howard Hughes developments were incorporated in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, please see Topical Response TR-ST-2. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-7 regarding Westchester Southside traffic.

PC00556

Stenglein, Ann

None Provided

6/21/2001

PC00556-1

Comment:

I am opposed to the expansion of LAX for the following reasons:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comment below. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00556-2

Comment:

1. Southern Calif. should be served by 2 international airports -not 1 the size of a postage stamp. No other major city in the U.S. has an international airport in the heart of the city.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00556-3

Comment:

2. Expanding the airport will damage 1 of our natural resources, the beach, and hurt tourism.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AR00003-42.

PC00556-4

Comment:

3. The existing infrastructure surrounding the airport, i.e. freeways, city streets can not support an increased passenger amount. How many more cars can you fit onto the 405 freeway?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PC00556-5

Comment:

4. All of Southern Calif. should bear the burden and reap the benefits of an airport closer to their homes.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00557

Uchima, Ray

None Provided

6/7/2001

PC00557-1

Comment:

I am opposed to LAX Expansion & have the following concerns in the Report:

Response:

Comment noted. See Responses to Comments below. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00557-2

Comment:

1) Noise impacts analyzed in the LAX Draft EIS/EIR have flaws. They use a unreasonable base year & poor analysis of overflight noise

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-1 regarding the noise modeling approach and Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences. In addition, please see Response to Comment AR00003-39.

PC00557-3

Comment:

2.) Surface traffic impacts to South Bay. The report fails to consider effects of south of Rosecrans Blvd. traffic.

Response:

Rosecrans Avenue formed the south edge of the Tier 1 study area. The percent of airport traffic on local roads south of that boundary is very low (less than five percent), as was illustrated in Figure 4.3.2-3 of the Draft EIS/EIR. However, the percent on I-405 is higher, as was also shown on Figure 4.3.2-3. Therefore, I-405 was analyzed south of Rosecrans, as was provided in the discussion of the Congestion Management Program in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the study areas.

PC00557-4

Comment:

3.) Air quality tends to omit types of emissions that could affect the So. Bay such as emissions from Reverse thrust operations.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AF00001-21 regarding the use of reverse thrust in air quality emissions estimates.

PC00557-5

Comment:

Additionally the report uses incorrect or outdated emissions databases for its calculations.

Response:

Since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, several of the methodologies used have been updated to include recently available emission factors and models. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed updates in methodologies used to analyze air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4.

PC00557-6

Comment:

Please include my opposition & concerns when you review the Draft LAX Master Plan & Draft EIS/EIR.

Response:

Comment noted. Responses to individual comments included in this comment letter are provided above.

PC00558

**Brathwaite Burke, County of Los Angeles
Yvonne**

6/9/2001

PC00558-1

Comment:

I am Yvonne Brathwaite Burke, Second District Supervisor, County of Los Angeles. I appreciate the opportunity to offer preliminary comments on the DRAFT EIS/EIR for the Los Angeles World Airport's (LAWA) Proposed LAX Master Plan, however, I must register my opposition to the decision by the FAA and LAWA to schedule only a single public hearing, conducted concurrently at three separate locations. This decision is contrary to your stated commitment to foster "...the broadest possible participation process...".

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 for a listing of all public hearings. The three hearing approach was followed up by several other single hearings.

PC00558-2

Comment:

Our review of the Draft EIS/EIR indicates the report is seriously compromised by ERRORS, OMISSIONS, & BIASES. My concerns are particularly pressing on the many issues associated with Environmental Justice, and I want to focus my comments on that issue this afternoon, with just a few brief comments about traffic.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed environmental justice in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix F and Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D and Technical Reports S-2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00558-3

Comment:

The Draft EIS/EIR does not meet CEQA and NEPA requirements for the ASSESSMENT of ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE. In fact, the intent of the Environmental Justice analysis in this document seems to be to conceal the SERIOUSNESS of the impacts and the ABSENCE of mitigation in a LENGTHY and CONFUSING ANALYSIS. We can see no other explanation for the discussion provided in this EIS/EIR, which includes statements like the following:

Response:

LAWA recognizes the importance of environmental justice and has placed particular emphasis on addressing environmental justice in a thorough and responsive manner. These efforts are evidenced by an extensive public outreach effort, including seven environmental justice workshops; establishment of an Environmental Justice Task Force; and direct meetings with neighborhood groups, homeowner associations, small business groups and local political leaders. With input received from the workshops and during circulation of the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA developed an Environmental Justice Program that was presented in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As further described in Topical Response TR-EJ-2, public input was also received in association with public circulation of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, through additional environmental justice workshops, public hearings, and comments on the EIS/EIR. Furthermore, environmental justice outreach was

3. Comments and Responses

conducted more recently through meetings with local organizations, environmental groups, and civic, religious, and business leaders in adjacent communities. This additional input was considered and evaluated through a process similar to that undertaken prior to circulation of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The final Environmental Justice Program is presented in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.7), of this Final EIS/EIR, with supporting information provided in Appendix F-A, of this Final EIS/EIR.

While it is accepted that the analyses and issues associated with environmental justice for this project are complex, efforts were made to balance the need to communicate important technical data and also present information in a manner understandable to the lay reader. The Overview of environmental justice that was presented on pages 4-395 through 4-397 of the Draft EIS/EIR was a special effort undertaken in this regard. While the comment is noted, LAWA has undertaken a full and good faith effort to identify and address disproportionate effects on minority and low-income communities. Please see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits.

PC00558-4

Comment:

Air Quality and Health Effects

- "Due to the lack of available background data and limited information on the cumulative effect of multiple air pollutants, the effect of the LAX Master Plan on cumulative health risks among minority and low-income population cannot be quantified or fully analyzed."

The fact that the Draft EIS/EIR preparers weren't able to quantify or analyze the impact IS NOT an acceptable reason to exclude further discussion of impacts, particularly for a critically important issue such as this.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-190.

PC00558-5

Comment:

The EIR preparers should do their homework. And what about this statement:

- "Due to the lack of available background data, the cumulative or synergistic health effects of TAP emissions associated with the build alternatives and other environmental hazards could not be quantitatively analyzed within the scope and timeframe of this EIS/EIR."

Scope and timeframe ARE NOT reasons to avoid discussion of an impact. ASSUMPTIONS CAN and SHOULD HAVE BEEN MADE to determine impacts. We have no idea how adverse these air quality and health effects are. How can LAWA choose an alternative with so little information?

Response:

Please see Response to Comments AL00017-190 and AL00022-69.

PC00558-6

Comment:

The EIR DOES identify one specific adverse health impact:

- "In 2015, all of the build alternatives would exceed thresholds of significance for non-cancer health risks, with the areas of significant impact falling on minority communities east/northeast of the north runway and largely west of I-405."

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-190. Chapter 6, Other NEPA/CEQA Topics, in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR discussed the various implications of significant environmental effects as a result of the implementation of the proposed alternatives.

PC00558-7

Comment:

Relocation. The discussion of Environmental Justice relocation impacts offers the following incomplete data:

- "Minority-owned businesses or businesses with a high proportion of minority employees or minority/low-income customers may face special challenges that need to be considered in developing a Business Relocation Plan."

This is where the discussion ends. How are we to know what these special challenges are? And how are we to know which alternative has the least impact with respect to these special challenges?

Response:

As was more specifically described on pages 4-370, 4-379 and 4-380 in Section 4.4, Social Impacts, of the Draft EIS/EIR, the special challenges referred to focus on the need for the Relocation Plan to ensure that the relocation process does not result in different or separate treatment because of race or other arbitrary circumstances, and that the plan provides assistance and materials in Spanish and other languages as necessary. Alternative D requires the least overall property acquisition and therefore the least potential for affecting minority-owned businesses. However, the potential effects of relocation are considered less than significant effects due to the implementation of a Relocation Plan in compliance with the Uniform Relocation Act, state and local regulations, and FAA Advisory Circular 150/5100-17. Furthermore, as was provided for in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences and Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Master Plan Commitment RBR-1, ensures that the relocation process would not result in different or separate treatment because of race or other arbitrary circumstances, and that the plan provide assistance and materials in Spanish and other languages as necessary.

PC00558-8

Comment:

The EIR also states that:

- "Data is currently not available regarding the number of minority-owned businesses or minority employees that might be affected..."

This data IS AVAILABLE for most project areas, and in those few areas where data is not available, assumptions need to be made to analyze the impacts and compare them among alternatives.

Response:

Public information on the demographics of minority business ownership and employment is limited. As a result, and based on issues related to privacy rights and the difficulty of completing a survey within the study area, this information was not included in the Draft EIS/EIR or the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. However, the potential for relocation effects on minority businesses or residents was identified on pages 4-428, 4-430 and 4-432 of the Draft EIS/EIR and on pages 4-336, 4-337 and 4-339 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As stated in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, relocation would be undertaken in compliance with the Uniform Relocation Act and pursuant to a LAWA Relocation Plan that would include special provisions to assist minority owned businesses or residents to the extent necessary. To the extent that there could be a disproportionate effect on minority businesses or residents, the effect would be addressed through these provisions contained within LAWA's Relocation Plan and through the Environmental Justice Program described in subsection 4.4.3.7 of the Final EIS/EIR, including Mitigation Measure MM-RBR-2 and the job related provisions for disadvantaged business enterprises described under the environmental justice benefit, "Job Outreach Center." As demonstrated by the provisions outlined

3. Comments and Responses

above, the lack of greater specificity on demographics has not compromised the environmental justice analyses or the adequacy of LAWA's Environmental Justice Program, Mitigation Measures or Master Plan Commitments that address and offset potential disproportionate effects.

PC00558-9

Comment:

Noise. The following significant Environmental Justice noise impacts were listed in the Draft EIS/EIR:

- "Certain areas affected by noise would still be faced with significant impacts due to constraints that apply most directly to minority and/or low-income communities. These include residential areas ineligible for mitigation due to inconsistent zoning or land use designations and substandard housing that may be infeasible to insulate."

This sobering statement needs further discussion. Where are these areas of inconsistent zoning and substandard housing? How big an impact is this? Why would inconsistent zoning mean there can be no mitigation for noise impacts? We have no way of knowing with the analyses contained in this EIS/EIR.

Response:

It is noted that there would be unavoidable impacts due to noise on certain residential properties ineligible for mitigation and infeasible to insulate due to inconsistent zoning or land use designations and substandard housing. It is beyond the scope of this document and considered infeasible to evaluate thousands of properties in order to identify the extent to which certain individual properties under the various Master Plan build alternative scenarios may or may not be feasible to insulate. Furthermore, individuals who elect not to participate in the soundproofing program due to code violations may be reluctant to participate in such a survey. LAWA's existing policy provides that as property owners apply for participation in the sound insulation program, inspections and evaluations are undertaken to determine their eligibility. As was presented in the Draft EIS/EIR, as part of Mitigation Measure MM-LU-1, LAWA will reduce or eliminate, to the extent feasible, structural and building code compliance constraints to mitigation of sub-standard housing. Areas with inconsistent zoning or land use designations largely exist as a reflection of policies and plans within areas of Inglewood where residential uses currently exposed to high noise levels are proposed for recycling and conversion to uses more compatible with high noise levels (i.e., commercial and industrial uses). The proposed acquisition and conversion of these areas to more compatible uses is a means for mitigating existing aircraft noise impacts. Although acquisition of noise impacted uses has been initiated in some of these areas, the conclusion that impacts on such uses would be unavoidable is based on the potential for such uses to still be in place when impacts associated with the LAX Master Plan occur. Please also refer to Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding land use/noise mitigation.

PC00558-10

Comment:

Mitigation Measures

This EIS/EIR offers NO ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE MITIGATION MEASURES - even though mitigation is required by CEQA and NEPA. The Draft EIS/EIR states:

- "Once LAWA has committed to specific [mitigation] measures as part of its Environmental Justice Program, the FAA will make its final determination as to whether the Master Plan has a disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effect on minority or low-income populations..."

The Draft EIS/EIR MUST include Environmental Justice mitigation measures and these measures need to be presented for comment NOW! Although not identified as such, some partial Environmental Justice mitigation measures were outlined in the Draft EIS/EIR to provide "a starting point for the public involvement process that will lead to the development of the Environmental Justice Program." The measures contained in the Draft EIS/EIR are required to be MORE than just a starting point. They have to be real solutions. Some of the "starting point" mitigation measures are listed in the subsequent bullets:

Response:

Extensive mitigation measures were provided in the Draft EIS/EIR, as found throughout Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures, and as provided in the Executive Summary, and in Chapter 5, Environmental Action Plan. While mitigation measures were accounted for and discussed in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR, the reason the section did not include a program with mitigation measures and benefits fully reflective of community input, was because the preliminary findings on environmental justice were not known until the document was finalized. It was appropriate, and a clearly stated intent in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (page 4-433), that the Environmental Justice Program would be further developed and implemented in coordination with affected minority and low-income communities and their representatives in order to ensure that their unique issues and needs would be fully accounted for. As previously indicated, the final Environmental Justice Program, with applicable mitigation measures and benefits is presented in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of this Final EIS/EIR, with supporting information provided in Appendix F-A, of this Final EIS/EIR.

PC00558-11

Comment:

Noise

- "Accelerate or expand sound insulation offered under the existing LAX Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program."

There is no discussion in the Draft EIS/EIR of when and how this acceleration or expansion will occur. How does this "suggestion" tie in with "areas ineligible for mitigation due to inconsistent zoning or land use designations and substandard housing"? Without details, this is just a half-baked measure that means nothing.

Response:

Please see Section 4.4.2, Land Use, (subsection 4.2.3) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and the discussion of existing conditions which demonstrates that LAWA is already accelerating its Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program with more than 3,845 residential units having become compatible since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR (January 2001). Furthermore, as was stated in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, (subsection 4.4.3.3) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was entered into between the City of Los Angeles and the City of Inglewood to establish cooperation in pursuing and implementing certain new measures designed to study and mitigate the possible environmental impacts of existing and potential future operations and improvements at LAX on Inglewood. As further described in Technical Report S-1, Land Use Technical Report (subsection 2.2.2.2), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the MOU includes actions to extend and expedite sound insulation as well as reduce exposure to high levels of aircraft noise. These measures include the lifting of requirements for signing of aviation easements with receipt of sound insulation for residential properties within the City of Inglewood.

Acceleration of the sound insulation program through the means that were identified in Mitigation Measure MM-LU-1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR includes reduction or elimination, to the extent feasible, of structural and building code compliance constraints to mitigation of sub-standard housing. Areas ineligible for mitigation due to inconsistent zoning or land use are largely residential properties targeted by local jurisdictions for conversion to compatible uses. The conclusion in the EIS/EIR that impacts on these uses would be unavoidable assumes that such conversion may not occur prior to exposure of these properties to impacts associated with implementation of the LAX Master Plan. Importantly, subsequent to publishing of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, criteria under LAWA's 2001 ANMP was changed to now authorize mitigation of residential properties regardless of general plan or zoning inconsistencies. This change and the availability of funding to address such properties may not influence the decisions of jurisdictions other than the City of Los Angeles, if they view it inappropriate to soundproof properties proposed for conversion of use. Nonetheless, this was an important change in policy. LAWA has and will continue to work with other jurisdictions to accelerate the rate of soundproofing and the FAA has increased the rate of funding to jurisdictions such as Los Angeles County, when they have demonstrated progress and expended available funds.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00558-12

Comment:

- "Offer increased opportunities for residents to move out."

What are these "increased opportunities"? The Draft EIS/EIR never says.

Response:

The reference cited is from page 4-395 in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR and it applies to "increased opportunities for residents to move out" of the most heavily noise-impacted areas through a voluntary acquisition and relocation program. This program, known as the Voluntary Residential Acquisition/Relocation Program for Manchester Square and Belford, is a current effort being undertaken by LAWA, as was described in Chapter 3, Alternatives, Section 4.2, Land Use, and Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The program, which is separate program from the LAX Master Plan, was instituted based on interest from homeowners and residents in the Manchester Square and Belford area who requested that LAWA purchase their properties in lieu of soundproofing under the LAX Residential Soundproofing Program. Prior to LAWA instituting the program, soundproofing was LAWA's preferred option for mitigating qualifying properties within these areas. As a result, the Voluntary Residential Acquisition/Relocation Program for Manchester Square and Belford increased opportunities for residents to move out. Also please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1, regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

PC00558-13

Comment:

- "Increase annual funding."

Again, without details this is just another wishy-washy mitigation measure that sounds good but means nothing. The Draft EIS/EIR needs to indicate how much the funding for noise impacts would be increased, and how it will be made available, and to whom!

Response:

LAWA is in the process of defining mitigation funding. Available funds for noise mitigation will be clarified prior to the record of decision on the project.

PC00558-14

Comment:

Air Quality and Health Effects

- "Support and participate in long-term studies that would contribute to an understanding of air quality and health effects on low-income and minority populations."

When and how will these studies be accomplished? Who will do the studies, and what will they study? And how do studies and "understanding" actually mitigate air quality and health effects? The Draft EIS/EIR never says.

Response:

Prior to events of September 11th, LAWA had undertaken coordination with the FAA, the EPA and other parties to define the scope of a long term study to evaluate air quality and health effects associated with air emissions in the vicinity of LAX. Although the study was delayed, LAWA remains committed to working with the EPA to further define and complete this study. However, as stated in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, in the absence of definitive long-term study, the lack of available background data and limited information on the cumulative effect of multiple air pollutants makes it impossible to quantify with any accuracy the

incremental contribution of the Master Plan build alternatives to cumulative health risks among minority and low-income populations. Although potential cumulative health risks cannot be quantified at this time, a mobile health clinic is proposed as part of the final Environmental Justice Program, as described in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), and Appendix F-A of this Final EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-EJ-1 regarding potential air quality and health risk impacts on low-income and minority communities.

PC00558-15

Comment:

Surface Transportation

- "LAWA will take into consideration the special needs of minority and low-income individuals who rely heavily on public transportation in implementing traffic mitigation measures."

This sounds great, but says nothing. How will it be accomplished? What kind of traffic mitigation measures would be implemented? And why does the EIS/EIR keep referring to all of these "specials" (special challenges, special concerns, special needs) without defining them?

Response:

Details regarding the surface transportation needs of minority and in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, low-income residents and how they would be served were provided on page 4-426, page 4-427 and page 4-433 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Also see Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.5.4.1), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and note provisions for improvements to public transportation included in Alternative D associated with the MTA Greenline connection, the Intermodal Transportation Center, and the people mover. Regarding traffic mitigation measures, see Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Regarding special concerns and needs, input in understanding the issues of minority and low-income communities located in proximity to LAX was gathered during the environmental justice task force meetings and other public outreach efforts. This input was instrumental in development of the Environmental Justice Program that was presented in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and this Final EIS/EIR. Also please see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits.

PC00558-16

Comment:

Remote Terminals

- "LAWA would undertake to avoid locating remote terminals in locations where they might have disproportionate adverse environmental impacts on minority or low-income communities."

The problem is that we don't know where these remote terminals are. How can LAWA avoid the impacts of remote terminals if their locations are not identified?

Response:

The identification of remote terminal locations requires a process that is beyond the scope of the EIS/EIR. However, LAWA will continue to address environmental justice concerns as it proceeds with such programs.

PC00558-17

Comment:

TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION

The EIR proposes an extensive traffic mitigation plan that includes grade-separated interchanges at key intersections on the Westchester Parkway/Arbor Vitae Street portion of the ring road. After reviewing

3. Comments and Responses

this package, it is clear that the improvements would significantly reduce traffic congestion and back-ups in the area - especially on the I-105 extension, and on the Ring Road near the new East Terminal. We have two main concerns and questions:

- These traffic improvement programs appear to entail a significant cost: How is LAWA going to fund such a costly program?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00008-6 regarding funding.

PC00558-18

Comment:

- The traffic problems around LAX are already a major problem, and this mitigation package is needed NOW - regardless of the outcome of the proposed Master Plan. What are LAWA's plans in the event the expansion project is not approved?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding what would happen if the Master Plan is not approved.

PC00558-19

Comment:

I also want to raise a concern that does not appear to have been addressed in the EIR. As you know, I-405 is heavily congested north of Century Boulevard. It does not matter what day of the week, or what time of day - it is a bottleneck year round. This problem has a direct adverse impact on airport traffic, because a lot of freeway traffic exits at Manchester in order to avoid this congestion. But in avoiding the bottleneck on I-405, this pattern places an added load on the airport access roads. This problem also needs to be addressed by LAWA - apart from the outcome of the current project proposal.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the Congestion Management Program.

PC00558-20

Comment:

CLOSE

I want to Reiterate: This EIS/EIR shortchanges the public in its assessment of Environmental Justice. The impact assessment is incomplete, and the mitigation measures are wholly absent. This document WILL NOT BE ADEQUATE until these problems are remedied. And slipping the information into the Final EIS/EIR WILL NOT BE ACCEPTABLE. We will provide our detailed written comments to LAWA by July 25th, and we thank you for the opportunity to provide preliminary comments this afternoon. Thank you.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments AL00022 for responses to comments provided by, or prepared on behalf of, the County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors.

PC00559

Thornton, Todd

United Airlines

6/7/2001

PC00559-1

Comment:

I have been based at LAX since becoming an airline pilot back in 1989. At present, I am a B-737 captain for United Airlines. I have extensive, first-hand experience with flight operations at LAX.

Each year delays at LAX get worse, and worse. A typical day goes like this: We are flying SFO to LAX. The marine layer blankets the coastal areas of Southern California. We call San Francisco ground control for taxi-out, and are informed we have a "wheels up time" for Los Angeles some forty five to fifty minutes later. I taxi my B-737 to a remote taxiway, and wait.

The cause of this delay is not the lack of cargo facilities or parking spaces at LAX. It will not improve with a Green Line extension, expanded FlyAway Program, a new airport Ring Road, or any of the other particulars of the 'Staff Recommended Alternative.' It will only improve with additional runway capacity for arriving aircraft. An additional runway at LAX is the only viable answer. That is why airport officials at delay-prone SFO are studying plans to build new runways.

Response:

Comment noted. As was summarized in the Master Plan Chapter V, Section 3.3.3 and Section 2.1, The Purpose and Objectives of the Proposed Project, of the Draft EIS/EIR, delay reduction is not the intended purpose of the proposed project, it is rather to satisfy regional demands for global air transport of passengers and cargo by adding new and optimizing existing facilities at LAX in a cost effective manner. The final iteration of analysis of the Master Plan placed a higher priority on environmental and community objectives over economic and air service objectives. Alternatives were developed for evaluation that minimize environmental and community impacts. Alternative C was intended to achieve a balance between increased LAX activity and environmental, social, land use, ground access, economic, and air commerce impacts; however, subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D was introduced to better respond to the desires of the local community. Alternatives A and B that both include the addition of a fifth runway would be able to meet the aviation demand of the region, however, ongoing environmental analysis indicates that the potential impacts relating to air quality, noise, business interruption (land acquisition), and disruption of airfield operations would be greater under Alternatives A and B than Alternatives C and D. Please also see the new Enhanced Safety and Security Plan - Alternative D, analyzed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. This alternative has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00559-2

Comment:

Your plan to have the market share of LAX drop dramatically is questionable. I noticed that your regional map of Southern California shows Orange County's closed El Toro Marine Base as a commercial airport. Current plans call for El Toro to eventually handle over 30 MAP, drawing on a substantial portion of LAX passengers. However, due to growing community opposition, El Toro International Airport will never be built. In all likelihood, a ballot initiative in March of 2002 will pass in Orange County that will change the zoning of El Toro to that of a Great Park. Do your LAX plans and forecasts take this into account?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, that discusses the El Toro conversion, constraints at John Wayne Airport, and the Ontario Master Plan.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00559-3

Comment:

At the end of the day, the success of LAX will be measured by how safely and efficiently air operations have been conducted. Not expanding the 'foundation' for these operations will not solve current and future problems.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC00559-1 for a discussion on the purposes and objectives of the proposed project and development of the Master Plan alternatives.

PC00560

Olson, Dennis

**Los Angeles Airlines Airport
Affairs Committee**

6/7/2001

PC00560-1

Comment:

The Los Angeles Airlines Airport Affairs Committee (AAAC) represents all of the domestic and foreign flag carriers serving Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). LAXTEC is an organization which also represents virtually all carriers serving LAX to international destinations. In conjunction with the public comment period for the Draft LAX EIR/EIS and Draft LAX Master Plan which expires in July, 2001, I am pleased to submit the following supporting statement on behalf of the AAAC and of LAXTEC:

1 The airlines view the modernization and improvement of LAX as a project of national and international significance and will encourage support for the plan and its funding with federal and state agencies as appropriate.

2 The airlines recognize the role of each commercial airport in Southern California in providing airport capacity and support airport planning from a regional perspective as dictated by market forces.

3 The airlines also recognize the unique role that LAX plays in meeting the region's passenger and cargo air service demands and serving as a major international gateway.

4 While LAX cannot and should not be expected to accommodate all of the future air transportation demands in Southern California, it is also understood that the unique LAX infrastructure cannot be replicated elsewhere in the region. Under any regional planning scenario the LAX infrastructure should be modernized and upgraded to accommodate its reasonable share of the additional demand.

5 The airlines also endorse the modernization of LAX as a key element of the growing global trade and tourism that benefits all of Southern California.

6 The airlines believe that the recommended conceptual Master Plan proposed by LAWA is a reasonable and necessary step towards a long-term plan to improve LAX, subject to a fiscally responsible financial plan which fully maximizes PFCs, federal, state, and local funding.

7 The airlines understand that any major improvements at LAX will include appropriate ground access, environmental, and other mitigation measures.

8 The airlines are committed to continued participation with LAWA in all aspects of the LAX Master Plan process.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00561 Fox, W. Guy The Los Angeles Air Cargo Association 6/6/2001

PC00561-1

Comment:

The Los Angeles Air Cargo Association (LAACA) understands that there will be a hearing this weekend regarding the improvements of Los Angeles World Airport. Unfortunately, I will be out of town and will not be able to attend, however, we would like to go on record in support of the proposed Master Plan .

The LAACA is very much concerned about the lack of cargo facilities for the airlines and service providers. Most major airports in the United States have first class cargo facilities, and we are sadly lacking in Los Angeles, and we would like to see that change. We feel that the Master Plan is an excellent start and would put us into the 21st century, where we need to be since Los Angeles is the gateway to the Pacific Rim.

Presently, we are still working in the same environment that was implemented for the 1984 Olympic Games. Perhaps the facilities were adequate for that time period, but the volume of cargo has increased tremendously, and the infrastructure has remained in the status quo. We are very much concerned that if we stay in the status quo, so will our business, as well as the City of Los Angeles. We need up to date, modern cargo facilities otherwise our whole economy will suffer.

We know that you are aware that you can not have a specific airport just for air cargo. What people do not realize, is that most of the air cargo that arrives, or is shipped, is in the belly of the passenger aircraft. There are very few aircraft built specifically for air cargo as it is not economically sound for the airlines.

The LAACA is also concerned about the major airlines moving their cargo hubs to other airports in the United States that have the proper infrastructure to handle growth, such as they have done with the passenger business. Needless to say, this will take away many jobs and revenue from the Los Angeles area.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00562 Russell, Jon Air Line Pilots Association, International 6/8/2001

PC00562-1

Comment:

The Air Line Pilots Association, representing more than 59,000 pilots at 49 airlines in the US and Canada, after reviewing the master plan proposal, supports the concept. The plan addresses several of our safety concerns and improves efficiencies at LAX, making the airport a friendlier place to operate.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00562-2

Comment:

LAX ranks number one in the runway incursion arena, a dubious distinction the airport can ill afford. Improperly placed high speed turn offs, runway location to the existing terminals, language barriers, and the approaches themselves, have led to these systemic incursion problems. The master plan inserts taxi ways between the North and South parallel runways. With this tool, landing aircraft will transition

3. Comments and Responses

onto the taxi way instead of holding short of the departure runway as they do today. Aircraft can continue their taxi west bound and clear the far west end of runway 25R under most circumstances, without delay.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00562-3

Comment:

The antiquated terminals at LAX fail to meet airport, airline and passenger needs. The finger designed terminals do not allow aircraft to ingress and egress gates simultaneously. Aircraft pushing off the gates are often met with resistance and incur delays because they must wait for inbound landing aircraft. Conversely, landing aircraft wait for outbound jets. If the gates and alley ways are blocked, aircraft crossing runway 25R have no place to go, and this manifests into a controller nightmare. The high concentration of aircraft on taxi ways Bravo and Charlie in front of terminals 5,6 and 7 compromises safety, wastes fuel and causes delays. A new terminal at the West end of the field, which would allow aircraft to perpetually move, addresses these concerns and issues.

Response:

Alternatives A, B, and C all place new terminal and automobile parking facilities on the west side of the airport off of Pershing Drive. The new facilities are intended to accommodate between 55 and 60 percent of the passenger activity. By moving the greater percentage of activity to the west side it will alleviate some of the congestion problems at the existing terminals buildings. In addition, it will provide opportunities to make modifications to the existing terminals and to do so with minimal disruptions to the operations in the terminals.

Alternative D would construct additional gates on the west side of TBIT, eliminate Terminals 1, 2, and 3 and replace them with a linear concourse in addition to adding a satellite concourse west of TBIT. These changes would redistribute the gauge of aircraft gates at LAX so that Terminals 4, 5, 6, and 7 would primarily accommodate smaller narrow body aircraft. This would provide a reduction in aircraft pushback onto Taxiway C and generally improve the operation of the south side terminals.

PC00562-4

Comment:

Extending runway 24L will also reduce ground movement congestion. International flights located on the North complex will no longer need to use runway 25R for departure. The performance available for runway 24L will mirror runway 25R eliminating unnecessary taxiing between complexes.

Response:

Comment noted. Extension of Runway 6R/24L to 12,000 feet as depicted under Alternatives A, B, and C would permit departures by the largest aircraft from either the north or south airfield complex. Runway 6R/24L would be extended to 11,700 feet in Alternative D and would have a 300 foot clearway at the west end providing for a take-off distance allowed of 12,000 feet with application of Declared Distances. The increase in length would reduce airfield congestion and eliminate excessive coordinated crossings in the air, thus reducing departure delays. Please also see Response to Comment AL00022-188 for a more detailed discussion.

PC00562-5

Comment:

The Air Line Pilots Association sees the Master Plan proposal as positive and supports Los Angeles World Airways in its implementation.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00563 Foote, Michael National Air Traffic Controllers Association

PC00563-1

Comment:

The controllers at Los Angeles Tower (LAX) are not here to support any particular plan thus far put forth. We are here to discuss the safety and delay problems that exist today.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC00563-2

Comment:

LAX was built to handle aircraft that no longer utilize our airport. These aircraft were smaller, slower and there were far fewer of them. The aircraft of today simply do not fit on this airport. Several types do not fit in between our runways while some are so long their tails stick out onto taxiways. Several aircraft have actually been hit on our taxiways because of insufficient taxiway widths. The next generation of aircraft will not be able to taxi on this airport. This day is coming soon.

Response:

An upgrade of existing facilities and proposed construction of new facilities was incorporated into each of the Master Plan build alternatives to provide sufficient taxiway clearness for all aircraft types and enhance operation efficiency and safety. In the Master Plan build alternatives the distance between the closely spaced parallel runways would be increased to include a taxiway between both sets of parallel runways and the center taxiways were designed to accommodate operations of NLA. Modifications to current taxiways would also be made generally to accommodate the Boeing 747-400 as a design aircraft (Group V) and the potential use of NLA (Group VI). For a more detailed discussion on the airfield and safety improvements proposed in Alternative D, please see Chapter 2.1 of the Draft Master Plan Addendum.

PC00563-3

Comment:

Last year 26 aircraft crossed runways when they were not supposed to. Of these, only eight were termed runway incursions. The fact is that every time an aircraft crosses when they should not have, it is a potential accident. Luck will determine how many of these incidents will become runway incursions, and inevitably accidents. Last year we were lucky, so far this year the incursion rate is much higher. How much longer can we be at, or near the top of runway incursions and continue to be lucky?

Response:

Comment noted. As indicated in TR-SAF-1, under each of the Master Plan build alternatives, changes to the taxiway system configuration would be implemented to reduce the potential for runway incursion and to enhance the safety of aircraft operations at LAX. The specific changes to the taxiway system configuration under Alternatives A, B, and C were described and illustrated in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Draft EIS/EIR. The specific changes to the taxiway system configuration under Alternative D were described and illustrated in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00563-4

Comment:

There are many problems with airport configuration that lead to our safety problems. The runways and taxiways are too close together. We have far too few gates to accommodate the traffic. LAX has "ally

3. Comments and Responses

ways" that force one aircraft to block up to ten gates causing traffic jams on taxiways and preventing controllers from "clearing" our runways. The problems are too numerous to discuss them all.

Response:

The commentor is correct in observing some of existing airfield deficiencies at LAX. Every effort was given to improve the airfield operation and efficiency when the Master Plan build alternatives were developed. As a result, the Master Plan build alternatives propose many upgrades to the existing airfield and construction of new facilities to remedy the airfield deficiencies which would lead to more airfield congestion by imposing slower taxi speeds. In each build alternative, the distance between the closely spaced parallel runways would be increased to include a taxiway between each set of parallel runways. New taxiways would be built and existing taxiways would be modified generally to accommodate the Boeing 747-400 as a design aircraft (Group V) and the potential use of New Large Aircraft (Group VI) which is projected to begin service in 2004. Additional high-speed exit taxiways and connector/bypass taxiways would be added to improve airfield circulation. Also new and improved passenger terminal space and reconfigured aircraft gates would be provided with construction of the new West Satellite and North Linear Gates and modification of TBIT and Terminals 4, 5, 6, & 7. With dual taxi lanes and sufficient contact gates and passenger loading space, these new terminals would operate more safely while maintaining efficiency helping to alleviate airfield congestion.

PC00563-5

Comment:

The controllers of LAX Tower understand that there are many political problems and valid complaints with "expansion". We are not saying that you must build more runways. That is a capacity issue but the people of Los Angeles must know that without modernization they will have to live with ever mounting delays. Not modernizing this airport, however, is not an option. The airport must be made safe. History and statistics are against us if we don't.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00564

Kozberg, Roger

**Marsh USA Risk & Insurance
Services**

6/8/2001

PC00564-1

Comment:

Commenting as a private citizen, but with a background as a member and immediate Past Chair of the California Transportation Commission, and with over forty year's business experience in Southern California serving virtually all aspects of transportation, hospitality development, entertainment and manufacturing interests, I wish to enter the following statement of strong support for the LAX Master Plan on the public record.

LAX must be allowed to improve its quality and capacity to the greatest extent possible. There are no realistic alternatives, nor can any be developed within a time frame that can prevent virtual gridlock and irreparable social and economic harm. If we have learned nothing else from the current energy crisis, we at least realize that politics cannot long alter the laws of supply and demand.

Passengers and shippers will ultimately dictate where airplanes will land. If we make it expensive and difficult to use LAX they will change the way they travel and do business, and it will be Seattle, Vancouver, San Francisco, Denver, Phoenix and other destinations that benefit from that change.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00564-2

Comment:

The Master Plan does indeed call for realistic development of Palmdale, Ontario and Van Nuys, but over the next twenty years - even if the airlines and their customers might somehow comply - there is no solution to the extensive and severe surface traffic problems that would be created by prematurely relying on them for greater growth. A significant portion of the applicable surface roadway is already at Level of Service F.

High Speed Public Transit and Cargo systems between airports, while desirable and ultimately essential, simply cannot be delivered with known technology and resources soon enough to avert our impending gridlock. Beyond the considerable planning, design, environmental, route selection and right of way issues, there is no funding source. Resources are currently scarce, and competition for them will surely increase in the future. Los Angeles can anticipate no sympathy for social and economic problems caused by our own failure to help ourselves while it was still possible.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand and Topical Response TR-GEN-4 regarding potential environmental impacts at surrounding other airports as a result of the LAX Master Plan.

PC00564-3

Comment:

Alternatively, the recommended ring road, I-405 and Green Line extensions set forth in the Master Plan should improve surface traffic conditions near LAX. These are improvements that can be quickly accomplished with existing technology and known funding sources.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00564-4

Comment:

The Master Plan does a good job of balancing necessary growth with environmental, social and safety concerns, and I urge its adoption. Significant alterations for political expedience will ultimately harm everyone, and I encourage the leadership of Los Angeles World Airports, the Board of Airport Commissioners and the City Council to proceed with approval and implementation.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00565

Kil, William

**Korean-American Chamber of
Commerce of Los Angeles**

6/8/2001

PC00565-1

Comment:

On behalf of the Korean American Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, I would like to communicate our support of the Los Angeles International Airport Recommended Master Plan. The LAX Recommended Master Plan will bring unprecedented economic opportunities to communities

3. Comments and Responses

neighboring the airport such as Inglewood and South Central Los Angeles, ultimately benefiting the entire Southern California region.

Perhaps the most exciting benefit for our communities will be the creation of hundreds of new jobs and small business opportunities unlike anything many of our local communities have seen before. It will be wonderful to see familiar faces among the myriad of airport employees and to know that many of our businesses will have a chance to participate in an arena previously reserved for large corporations.

We appreciate Los Angeles World Airports' willingness to work closely with the Korean American community in order to make decisions that are informed by our neighborhood's specific needs. When the Master Plan is finally complete, I am confident that LAX will be an airport all of us can be proud of.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00566 Czyzyk, Joseph Mercury Air Group

PC00566-1

Comment:

The LAX MASTER PLAN is the only solution for the residents, businesses and their communities surrounding LAX especially since it incorporates a regional airports solution as well.

The battle lines are drawn but the picture is murky; the victimized community, its residents and elected officials in one camp and mighty business and labor in the other camp. This picture has been purposely distorted! The regional airports solution won't happen overnight, but the growth of Southern California's vibrant economy is growing as I speak, and the only current outlet for that growth is LAX; and which person, politician or group wants to hamper our economic growth while we wait many years for a functional regional airports solution to be accomplished?

I've lived in Playa del Rey for 11 years and have worked in Westchester since 1985 and I hear the jets loud and clear in my bedroom as they take off from the North Runways of LAX. I even hear them occasionally through my doubly insulated office window and in my car when I drive home in the evenings.

One would think that I've gotten used to them by now. I haven't and the last thing I want to see is more noise and traffic in my residential or business community. Then why didn't I become an anti-LAX growth proponent? Simply, because I'm a pragmatist!

Let me further qualify myself. My company is a large employer at LAX and would probably benefit from LAX expansion. We're also a large employer at most other commercial Southland airports and would therefore benefit as well, or more if the Master Plan opponents had their druthers and growth would be dispersed among many airports in the region. My company would win either way! My opinion brings thirty-one years of experience in aviation as a means to improve my family's quality of life near a growing airport.

Can we stop the airport from growing? Can we stop our local economy from growing? The answer is no. LAX will continue to expand organically even without a Master Plan. Make no mistake of it, you can't stop the airlines from increasing flights! Without a Master Plan, communities surrounding LAX will experience ever increasing freeway and street congestion as well as the added potential of aircraft-involved disasters due to tighter operating proximities. Should we compromise Southern California's growth until a regional airport solution is accomplished, or should we work the Master Plan process in tandem with a regional solution? It's obvious to me or any pragmatist.

If we work within the Master Plan process, the congestion on the runways and taxiways will be improved due to additional terminals and widened runways, higher capacity access in and out of the airport will be created by a new ring road which will take the pressure off the 405 and 105 Freeways. Century and Sepulveda Blvds. through encircling the airport and guiding traffic in and directly back onto these freeways; the extension of existing metro lines into and within the airport will help move people more efficiently.

3. Comments and Responses

Even with all the regional airport expansion plans taken into account, the estimates for growth at LAX will be 90 million passengers per year by 2010. That's only 9 years from now! Will LAX be able to handle that many passengers in the interim without a progressing Master Plan? Not easily! If the Master Plan is not implemented soon, the street traffic will resemble Thanksgiving Day and Labor Day Weekend combined, every day, 365 days a year. The 405 and 105 freeways, as well as Century and Sepulveda Blvds. will be jammed and most surrounding streets in Westchester, Playa del Rey and El Segundo will experience a spillover. Aircraft operations on the ground will be nose to tail, causing more delays for arriving and departing flights which will further congest airport surface traffic. Make no mistake about it, the airport will grow internally because it is driven by a booming and continually growing Southland economy.

Neighbors, don't be polarized! We have everything to lose and nothing to gain if we don't allow ourselves and our communities to become part of the LAX Master Plan.

Response:

Comment noted.

**PC00567 Cheng, AIA,
Raymond Chinese American Construction 6/6/2001
Professionals**

PC00567-1

Comment:

I am writing on behalf of the Chinese American Construction Professionals (CACP), to express our support of the LAX Master Plan, Los Angeles World Airport's effort to meet the growing need for air transportation in Southern California.

Many of CACP's members' businesses engage in trade with Asia and thus rely heavily on Southern California's air transportation infrastructure. With Asia expected to account for more than half of the world's economic growth in the next decade, business engaged in trade with this great region will be presented with extraordinary growth opportunities. By doubling LAX's cargo capacity and increasing its passenger capacity by 50% over the next fifteen years, Los Angeles World Airports ensures that local businesses will be given ample opportunity to compete in Asia's growing markets.

The association of Chinese American Construction Professionals applauds your efforts to address Southern California's future air transportation needs. We look forward to assisting LAWA in making the LAX master plan a success.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00568 Hsiao, Ph.D., Paul NIC Microsystem Inc. 6/7/2001

PC00568-1

Comment:

I am writing on behalf of the NIC Microsystem Inc., to express our support of the LAX Master Plan, Los Angeles World Airport's effort to meet the growing need for air transportation in Southern California.

Most of our company's businesses engage in trade with Asia and thus rely heavily on Southern California's air transportation infrastructure. With Asia expected to account for more than half of the World's economic growth in the next decade, business engaged in trade with this great region will be presented with extraordinary growth opportunities. By doubling LAX's cargo capacity and increasing its passenger capacity by 50% over the next fifteen years, Los Angeles World Airports ensures that local businesses will be given ample opportunity to compete in Asia's growing markets.

3. Comments and Responses

NIC Microsystem Inc. applauds your efforts to address Southern California's future air transportation needs. We look forward to assisting LAWA in making the LAX master plan a success.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00569 Zhou, P.E., Shun USA Southwest China Association 6/7/2001

PC00569-1

Comment:

I am writing on behalf of the USA Southwest China Association (USCA), to express our support of the LAX Master Plan, Los Angeles World Airport's effort to meet the growing need for air transportation in Southern California.

Most of USCA's member's businesses engage in trade with Asia and thus rely heavily on Southern California's air transportation infrastructure. With Asia expected to account for more than half of the World's economic growth in the next decade, business engaged in trade with this great region will be presented with extraordinary growth opportunities. By doubling LAX's cargo capacity and increasing its passenger capacity by 50% over the next fifteen years, Los Angeles World Airports ensures that local businesses will be given ample opportunity to compete in Asia's growing markets.

The Association of USA Southwest China applauds your efforts to address Southern California's future air transportation needs. We look forward to assisting LAWA in making the LAX master plan a success.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00570 Lester, Tim Greater L.A. African-American Chamber of Commerce 6/8/2001

PC00570-1

Comment:

Good afternoon. My name is Tim Lester, and I am here today representing the Greater Los Angeles African-American Chamber of Commerce (GLAAACC).

Our organization, with a membership of 500, was established by a group of business owners and executives to promote the growth of black-owned enterprises and to expand them into the international arena. Our business Assistance Programs is designed to help small and start-up businesses grow and prosper. Our Education Fund, a 501c(3) non-profit public benefit corporation, provides scholarships for high school students. We are committed to helping fellow and future business owners.

GLAAACC supports the Recommended Master Plan. Aviation services, both passenger and cargo, not only make a tremendous contribution to our regional economy; they are a necessary part of doing business for many of our members. Business owners often have to fly to meet with a client, pitch new business or provide services and goods in other cities, states or countries. Many businesses depend, either directly or indirectly, on the ability to send or receive air cargo and will fail without that ability.

As anyone who uses LAX knows the situation is growing worse every week. Delays are costing businesses millions of dollars, not just here in Los Angeles, but in other cities as well since delays cause inevitable ripple effects.

The idea of a regional solution to our aviation needs is one that will no doubt be realized in future years. The proposal to reject modernization of LAX in favor of a regional solution is simply unrealistic and will

3. Comments and Responses

only lead to more crowding, more congestion and more gridlock. The master Plan will alleviate these problems at LA X.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00571 Hing, Vincent ISU Insurance Services 6/8/2001

PC00571-1

Comment:

The Los Angeles area is going to continue to grow and needs an airport to keep up with the demand, which is why the Los Angeles Airport Master Plan is a good idea. We need to be seen as a premier place to do business with easy access for local, national, and international travelers.

We need to implement this plan now so we do not fall behind the curve and risk future decisions, which become more Band-Aid than global. The Master Plan will allow for this step forward, in a timely fashion.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00572 An, Annie Nanning-Los Angeles Friendship 6/7/2001
Association

PC00572-1

Comment:

I am writing on behalf of the Nanning-Los Angeles Friendship Association (NLFA), to express our support of the LAX Master Plan, Los Angeles World Airport's effort to meet the growing need for air transportation in Southern California.

Most of NLFA's member's businesses engage in trade with Asia and thus rely heavily on Southern California's air transportation infrastructure. With Asia expected to account for more than half of the World's economic growth in the next decade, business engaged in trade with this great region will be presented with extraordinary growth opportunities. By doubling LAX's cargo capacity and increasing its passenger capacity by 50% over the next fifteen years, Los Angeles World Airports ensures that local businesses will be given ample opportunity to compete in Asia's growing markets.

The Association of Nanning-Los Angeles Friendship applauds your efforts to address Southern California's future air transportation needs. We look forward to assisting LAWA in making the LAX master plan a success.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00573 Chok, Gerald CHOK Design Associates 6/7/2001

PC00573-1

Comment:

As a business owner and a resident of Los Angeles, I would like to express my support for the Los Angeles Airport Master Plan. Los Angeles is a World Class City and the Los Angeles International Airport is a World Class Airport. It needs to maintain that profile to continue to provide the kind of service and facilities necessary to serve the people of Los Angeles and the world.

3. Comments and Responses

Its ability to perform not only for it traveling customers but for the good of its neighbors and for the whole city, is critical. To do this requires the commitment to update and improve all aspects of this facility and the surrounding areas. The LAX Master Plan is a decisive step in this direction. Not only will it benefit the productivity and functionality of the Airport, it will create an economic uplift for the whole region.

I look forward to being both a supporter and benefactor of this enterprise. The LAX Master Plan will create a facility I can be proud of.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00574 Cullen, Doris None Provided 6/25/2001

PC00574-1

Comment:

Need the intelligent thinking people of Los Angeles say anything more of the expansion of LAX? (See attached articles from the L.A. Times.)

Would it not be more intelligent to branch out with our airports?

Response:

Please see Response to Comments AL00051-93 and PC02131-5.

PC00575 Bible, Darlene None Provided 6/26/2001

PC00575-1

Comment:

The master plan to expand LAX is ridiculous! LAX is right in the middle of a crowded neighborhood and we are all affected negatively by it now. If it enlarges, the value of our homes will plummet. The smell from fuel and brakes is already toxic and the sound, although we get used to it, is very disruptive. You can't get used to the pollution though.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding residential property values and Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding odors. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00575-2

Comment:

Please help us fight this expansion. For the health of the people of Los Angeles and our children, expand each of the neighboring airports slightly or build a new airport far from existing neighborhoods.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Human health impacts were addressed in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical

3. Comments and Responses

data and analyses provided in Technical Report 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PC00576 Christy, Kay None Provided 6/24/2001

PC00576-1

Comment:

Please stop the LAX Expansion in Westchester! We do not want more runways, more noise & more pollution in Westchester.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase, and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00577 Lyon, Ph.D., Irving Senior Citizens Center 6/15/2001

PC00577-1

Comment:

After wading through reams of pro-expansion propaganda, my son, David Lyon, and I wish to emphasize the following concerns and issues.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC00577-2

Comment:

The residents of Westchester and the surrounding areas can smell the unburned jet fuel and see evidence of its presence on our houses.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition and Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding odors.

PC00577-3

Comment:

Unburned particles of fuels, including jet engine fuels, have been proven to cause severe health impairments, including the formation of cancers.

Response:

Please refer to Topical Responses TR-HRA-2 and TR-HRA-3 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects and human health impacts.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00577-4

Comment:

We know that this dumping of unburned fuels is not only dangerous, but potentially deadly for many people.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, Topical Response TR-EJ-1 regarding potential air quality and health risk impacts on low-income and minority communities, and TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC00577-5

Comment:

When will LAX and FAA agree to enforce stopping of fuel tank dumping of raw fuels over populated areas immediately adjacent to and surrounding LAX?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC00577-6

Comment:

Regionalization of our airport system would help to prevent localized increases in the burdens of air pollutants, especially of carbon monoxide (CO), unburned hydrocarbons, and nitrogen oxides (NOx). The hydrocarbons and NOx react with sunlight to produce photochemical smog which can entrain and entrap additional air-borne pollutants, thereby worsening a near-intolerable situation with regard to air quality.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. See also Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the regionalization of the area airport system under Alternative D.

PC00577-7

Comment:

Omission from the Master Plan EIS/EIR of consideration of the cumulative impacts on air and water quality of Playa Vista, the Hughes developments, and the proposed conversion of sewage water to drinking water on both air and water quality in the region is scandalous and unconscionable.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00018-60 regarding cumulative impacts.

PC00577-8

Comment:

Why should anyone endorse or vote for airport-related mitigation or expansion if the dumping of unburned fuels over populated areas is allowed to continue?

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC00577-9

Comment:

Or if mitigation ignores the cumulative impacts of all developments and projects affecting overall air and water quality of the area?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00018-60 regarding cumulative impacts.

PC00577-10

Comment:

We all look forward to your answers.*

*The suggestion that airport expansion at LAX will (somehow) alleviate air and water quality problems in the area that would be affected is ludicrous and not a meaningful answer.

Response:

Air quality and water quality impacts related to the LAX Master Plan are being mitigated to the maximum extent feasible. The new LAX facility will be built with the most state-of-the-art improvements for traffic, air quality, and building design. Airport demand exceeded airport capacity long ago and these improvements are meant to accommodate this demand. The Draft EIS/EIR acknowledges and discusses the predicted air quality and water quality impacts before and after mitigation.

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed water quality in Section 4.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4 and 6 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-4 and S-5 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00578

Gorelick, Robert

None Provided

6/26/2001

PC00578-1

Comment:

First, I would like to congratulate you on your election as Mayor of Los Angeles. It has come to my attention that you have signed a pledge to prohibit the expansion of LAX. . I supported you in the election, and this is just one more reason that I am glad I did.

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, newly elected Mayor James Hahn directed the Los Angeles Board of Airport Directors to develop a new LAX Master Plan alternative that, consistent with public comment calling for a regional approach alternative, would be designed to accommodate passenger and cargo activity levels at LAX that would approximate those of the No Action/No Project Alternative, have fewer environmental impacts than the No Action/No Project Alternative and, in light of the events of September 11, 2001, would be designed to enhance airport

3. Comments and Responses

safety and security. The new alternative, Alternative D-Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, which calls for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region. A Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive analysis of Alternative D and was circulated for public review and comment.

PC00578-2

Comment:

I also am against the LAX Master Plan, and strongly feel that expansion of LAX would be at the detriment of greater Los Angeles for many reasons. The LAX Expansion Plan would have a negative impact on ground traffic, air traffic, noise and air pollution, and negatively impact the small community airports in the area as well.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and human health and safety in 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-GEN-4 regarding impacts on other airports and environs. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00578-3

Comment:

LAX is already running at 50% above its intended capacity. California is a huge state. Let's spread some of the traffic around, easing the ever-growing congestion in this county! The regional expansion plan seems like a much better idea to me.

It is important for you to know that I, along with countless others who supported you in becoming mayor of LA, appreciate your position of denying LAX expansion, and will look to you for continued support for regional development of reliever airports throughout the Southland. Thank you in advance for your attention to this issue.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00579

Davis, Richard

None Provided

6/28/2001

PC00579-1

Comment:

For LAX not to move ahead would be criminal in economic terms. Every day and every plan element delayed translates directly to loss of jobs in the LA basin and all of California.

. . . Let's get moving. . . We're already in the 21st Century.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00580 Peattie, Laurie None Provided 6/27/2001

PC00580-1

Comment:

I am a resident of Westchester a have been for the past 16 years. I am violently opposed to the expansion of LAX for many reasons. A few of the obvious ones are:

- (1) TRAFFIC!! - already far more than we can handle!
- (2) Congestion
- (3) Noise
- (4) Property Value decrease
- (5) Safety issue
- (6) Pollution

All not an asset to the Westchester Community & surrounding areas.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and human health and safety in 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester and Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to property values. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00581 Cosgrove, Thomas None Provided 6/27/2001

PC00581-1

Comment:

My family, and the families of my neighborhood, are concerned with the environmental impact of the proposed expansion of LAX. Already on the west side, there exists an excessive level of noise pollution and congestion, the magnification of which by the proposed expansion will only serve to lessen the quality of life of its residents.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00581-2

Comment:

At the same time, LA area residents at the eastern side of the city, and those to the North, will only face a more difficult time accessing an already crowded and congested airport. Please, respect the citizens

3. Comments and Responses

of the West side, and those to the east and North, will an alternate air traffic solution - one that will decrease noise pollution and congestion, and provide a much needed improvement in access.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PC00582 Cosgrove, Kathy None Provided 6/27/2001

PC00582-1

Comment:

I am currently living on 77th Street in Westchester, which is a lovely family neighborhood. I am greatly concerned about the possible expansion of LAX and what that would mean to this neighborhood. The environmental impact would be devastating due to the increased noise and pollution. There are many small children here; my son is 9 months old. I am worried about the increased pollution and what that would mean to his health. Please, understand that the people of Westchester DO NOT want this expansion. It does not make sense to expand. Please, no expansion, think of the children!

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00583 Moore, Jacqueline Kelso Elementary School 6/26/2001

PC00583-1

Comment:

We the undersigned are teachers at William Kelso Elementary School located in Inglewood. Our school lies directly under the flight path leading to LAX. We are therefore very concerned and very much opposed to the plan to expand the Los Angeles Airport. We believe the proposed expansion will be detrimental to the children in our school; the expansion will increase noise pollution, air pollution and increase the chances of a potential air disaster.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed impacts to schools Section 4.27, Schools, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 4, 14a, 14c, and 17 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00583-2**Comment:**

Those of us teaching at Kelso have had to learn to live with the constant noise generated by the stream of jets flying overhead during instructional time. We have had to stop our lessons on many occasions and wait for the noise overhead to subside before we could continue teaching. Our main concern is that an increase in air traffic will make the noise level even more intolerable, decreasing further the ability for teachers to relate material clearly. Concentrating on ones studies or listening to instruction at present is difficult, to increase the level of noise would make it almost impossible.

Response:

Since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR was prepared to provide more detailed analysis of single event aircraft noise levels that result in classroom disruption. This information was provided in Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use, Appendix C-1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, and Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As identified in Table S9 under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions in the Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, Kelso Elementary is exposed to high cumulative noise levels that result in classroom disruption. Please see Response to Comment AL00035-23 regarding avigation easements, prior noise mitigation payments, and other provisions of the "Settlement Agreement" which resolve land use incompatibility and aircraft noise mitigation issues associated with airport operations and the Inglewood Unified School District (including Kelso Elementary). In addition, the projected noise levels under the Master Plan alternatives are well within the existing easement limits.

Please see Response to Comment AL00035-36 regarding the impact of the Master Plan Alternatives on Inglewood Unified School District facilities and mitigation of noise impacts. As indicated therein, under Alternatives A and B, Kelso Elementary would be newly exposed to the 65 CNEL or greater contour or experience an increase of 1.5 dB or greater within the 65 CNEL or greater contour compared to 1996 baseline conditions. Under the "Settlement Agreement" this school is not eligible for further aircraft noise mitigation.

PC00583-3**Comment:**

Air pollution is a second major concern. The children who live and go to school in Inglewood are already breathing polluted air which is in part created by the constant stream of jets flying into LAX. The pollutants from jet fuel emissions create a terrible health hazard and our children are suffering. Do we really need to add to this problem with more air traffic?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00070-1 regarding existing air quality. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase, Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PC00583-4**Comment:**

Safety is a major issue facing the faculty and children at Kelso Elementary School. The skies are already too crowded above Inglewood. Adding more planes to an already crowded area is just asking for a potential disaster that is putting our children and our school at risk.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00583-5

Comment:

While it is necessary to manage the growth of air travel, it is clear that expansion at LAX is NOT the answer.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00584

**Borre, James &
Lisbeth**

None Provided

6/27/2001

PC00584-1

Comment:

As long time residence of Westchester, we strongly oppose any expansion of LAX - It is the last thing this community needs!

NO TO LAX EXPANSION

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00585

Petti, Lynne

None Provided

6/27/2001

PC00585-1

Comment:

The air space over LAX is already saturated with planes. The noise and pollution are at a maximum. If there is more expansion it will only get worse. We love our city of Westchester and we don't want to see it gobbled up by LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00585-2

Comment:

I vote for a regional plan; one shared by other airports in the Southland.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00585-3

Comment:

If the airlines would have more economical fares & more flights to these smaller airports, it would remove some of the congestion at LAX.

Response:

Actually, the average fare for domestic flights from LAX is higher than for Burbank, Long Beach, Ontario, and Orange County. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale that discusses multi-airport markets, airline economics and passenger choice.

PC00585-4

Comment:

I vote NO to expansion!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00586

Lincoln, Dale

None Provided

6/19/2001

PC00586-1

Comment:

The lovely, restored Centinela Adobe and its museum and grounds are an extremely rare remnant of nearly 200 years of history of the south west portion of Los Angeles County. It is of immense historical value and the site is a beautiful, peaceful oasis in the midst of the ever increasing noise, pollution and chaos of the LAX area. It is located just west of the 405 Freeway near Florence Avenue.

The LAX expansion draft plan calls for the Ring Road to run right through the complex taking out the historic land office, the hill side, and the grove of trees. Thousand of cars a day would drive almost over the top of the Adobe on a noisy, polluting elevated highway, causing the Adobe structural damage over the long term and destroying its attractiveness and unique values.

As the only historic Spanish era building left in a region of over 1.5 million people it is probably illegal, certainly socially destructive and totally irresponsible to even think of harming any element of this facility. The EIS/EIR needs to fully present the value of the site and the negative impacts to it. Any mitigation measures developed need to guarantee to maintain the values of the entire complex. For starters that means don't put the road anywhere near the facility.

I respectfully request, in fact I demand, that the City of Los Angeles, City of Inglewood and the United States government do nothing to in any way harm this special site.

3. Comments and Responses

Thank you very much. I appreciate your understanding of the situation.

Response:

A programmatic level analysis was completed for all listed and eligible historic and architecturally significant properties within the study area of the proposed Expressway and SR-1 roadway improvement projects. The Centinela Adobe and museum were included in the analysis. Similarly, project-specific impacts to the Centinela Adobe will also be assessed at the Caltrans Project Development process and CEQA review stage when initiated. Please refer to Topical Response TR-APPK-1 for clarification on supplemental project specific CEQA analysis of cultural and historic resources and Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding impacts to the Centinela Adobe.

PC00587 Ehrler, Daniel Santa Monica Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors 5/25/2001

PC00587-1

Comment:

This communication is to inform you the Santa Monica Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors unanimously approved a motion to support the proposed Los Angeles World Airports Master Plan Alternative "C".

Following two Chamber Special LAX Task Force Meetings and your presentation to our membership at a recent SMCofC Membership Breakfast, the Task Force forwarded the following motion to our Board for consideration and action. Following two meetings of the Board of Directors on this issue, the Board's response was unanimous support. Here is what the Task Force recommended and passed unanimously by the Board:

B. SUGGESTED MOTION: Move to support the proposed Los Angeles World Airports Master Plan Alternative "C".

DISCUSSION: This Item was continued from your April 24 Board Meeting. Los Angeles World Airports Deputy Executive Director Jim Ritchie gave a detailed presentation on this extraordinary issue during your April 24 Board Meeting. Because of the necessity to focus almost exclusively on this topic, your action on this Item is requested to be continued to your May Board Meeting. A task force was formed following a request to the Government Affairs and Environmental Affairs Committees for participation. It met twice with Mr. Ritchie and attended the April 3 Membership Breakfast before moving the recommended motion on to the Board for consideration and action. The following addresses the reasons for the recommended motion as provided by the task force:

Importance of LAX to Santa Monica:

Tourist industry is dependent upon easy access to LAX.

Businesses of all types have increasing need of access to LAX.

Air travel by the general public has been increasing steadily, and the affluence of Westside residents have contributed in measure to the increase.

The Master Plan Addresses:

The need to complete the I-105 and Green Line connections to LAX.

The need to create a ring road and proper interconnection with present area traffic arteries.

The need to adequately buffer the surrounding communities.

The need to expand passenger handling ability to accommodate larger aircraft.

3. Comments and Responses

Efforts to stall and frustrate the Los Angeles World Airports Master Plan will:

Force travelers to and from the Westside to endure longer ground travel to and from facilities in Palmdale and Ontario.

Further exacerbate traffic congestion between Santa Monica and LAX.

Given the simple alternatives, Master Plan or no Master Plan, the Santa Monica Chamber of Commerce must support a complete and comprehensive planning effort to mitigate the existing hardships and prevent future congestion caused by the inevitable increase in passenger usage at LAX.

Jim, on behalf of the Santa Monica Chamber of Commerce officers and Members of the Board and Special LAX Task Force, I want to express our deep and very sincere appreciation to you and Shirlene Sue for your invaluable time and efforts. We wish you the very best as this very significant plan continues to move through the necessary steps to becoming a reality.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00588

Roh, Chun

**L.A. Korean Senior Citizen
Mutual Club**

7/2/2001

PC00588-1

Comment:

The L.A.Korean Senior Citizen Club, established in 1974, is a 501-C-3 non-profit organization, with a membership of more than 2,200 in Los Angeles. As you know, in the Asian culture, seniors, are an important and revered part of society. SINCE Asians make up a considerable part of the population in the Los Angeles area, we senior ASIANS are also an important voice in this city.

In my opinion, LAX is outdated structure. I believe the new master plan will benefit for the future of general public. - Park

I believe LAX is really worn out. So I support the LAX Master Plan - Chae

I support the LAX Master Plan to improve LAX. Please proceed it as soon as possible to benefit Los Angeles - Hahn

I support the Master Plan to improve LAX. I believe it will benefit our communities in the future. - Kang

There is no doubt that the LAX Master Plan brings benefit to the communities and many business opportunities to the public. - Choi

The last time I went to LAX, it was very crowded and very hard to find parking. LAX really needs to be developed - Kim

I strongly believe that we need to develop LAX for the future. The LAX Master Plan will bring economic benefits to the communities - Lee

I think LAX needs some form of development and changes. It's so crowded and badly needs of new project - Kim

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00589

Kidd, K. Richard

None Provided

6/28/2001

PC00589-1

Comment:

I wish to voice my opposition to the present Draft LAX Master Plan whose comment period expires July 25, 2001. I have been in the real estate investment profession for over 25 years, representing pension and other institutional funds in all types of institutional quality real estate nationally and in all of Southern California as well. Based on my professional experience, I believe the present and future air transportation needs of Southern California require a regional approach. All the cities and communities in Southern California are inextricably linked economically and by infrastructure (i.e. the freeway system). The reality is that the urban sprawl genie is out of the bottle and has been for decades. Proposing to expand LAX to meet a sprawling region's present and future air transportation needs ignores the present, and in particular the future economic growth patterns for Southern California.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00589-2

Comment:

Where is the greatest economic growth occurring in Southern California? The fastest economic and real estate growth is occurring in San Bernardino County, Riverside County and Southern Orange County. These areas are 50 to 70 miles removed from LAX. Which airport is presently closest to the largest amount of industrial space in the region? The Ontario Airport is closer than LAX to the largest concentration of industrial inventory space in the region, which is located in the City of Industry, Pomona, Ontario and Chino.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00589-1 above.

PC00589-3

Comment:

The Airlines are just going to have to get over their obsession with LAX. While I am sure having the Airlines operations concentrated at LAX is much more convenient for the Airlines, it does not make sense for the Southern California economy.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the Master Plan's role in a regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00589-4

Comment:

To transport people and cargo 50 to 70 miles from the areas of the largest population growth and present industrial inventory does not make any common or economic sense for Southern California. I Live in Playa del Rey; however, I want to see the entire Southern California economy and infrastructure work as efficiently as possible. Every community in Southern California is economically linked, as I have learned in my over 25 years of real estate experience. The present Draft LAX Master Plan does not address the reality that a regional solution is required for present and future air transportation issues in Southern California; not a local LAX solution.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00589-1 above.

PC00589-5

Comment:

Southern California's leaders need to have the same prescience as the leaders in the Dallas area had approximately 25 to 30 years ago. If the leaders in Dallas had utilized the same myopic local approach as is being proposed in the present Draft LAX Master Plan, then Love Field would have been expanded. Instead they had the foresight to see where the growth was going to occur in the area. They predicted that the growth was going to occur between Dallas and Fort Worth. The building of the DFW Airport between Dallas and Fort Worth, where the growth actually did occur, is an excellent example of a regional approach to future air transportation needs rather than a local myopic approach.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00589-1 above.

PC00589-6

Comment:

Please just say "no" to the Airlines for the good of all Southern Californians and do not implement the LAX Master Plan as presently proposed. Everyone in Southern California who presently needs or will need air transportation service in the future should expect the implementation of a wise air transportation plan. That plan should recognize where the growth is going to occur along with recognizing the future limitations of our freeway system. Based on projected future use of the freeway system just getting to and from LAX from even 20 or 30 miles away (let alone from 40 or 50 miles) will be an ordeal. Please display the wisdom that the leaders in Dallas displayed, and design and implement a regional air transportation solution, not a local myopic fix that will not efficiently handle a regional problem.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00589-1 above.

PC00590

Mark, D.

None Provided

7/1/2001

PC00590-1

Comment:

It has been proven without a doubt that diesel residue falls on and around the airport hourly, but what the heck, if they don't like it let them move, what! not in my back yard!

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00590-2

Comment:

We do not want the pollution noise, traffic etc!!!!!!!

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00590-3

Comment:

For the first time in my life I feel sorry and disatzted to be a American veteran of Nam - every one wants what he wants and could give a damn about their brother unless it's a situation that they want and then it's help us!!! The only good thing to wish for is for the return of a sence of morals and not the green back - which is wishing for a money tree! the reality is no one cares about their neighbor becaus no one has a correct answer except how do we fill our wallets and kill only a few of the people which is what will happen with this expansion!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00590-4

Comment:

Why not Palmdale where there is ample air, & space! What? to far to drive?!

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00590-5

Comment:

Charge a fee (4) every one outside a certain radius to L.A.X. and listen to the screams!!

Response:

LAX is a public facility and is supported by grants from the FAA. It is illegal to charge different fees to users of the same facility and thus discriminate among users.

PC00590-6

Comment:

The whole thing is F _ _ _ the people around the airport's and make sence of this, so we can sleep at nite with our decision and money gains!!! The way I see it - Dmark in El Segundo. now you can put in the round file where this is intended to go!!!!

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00591 **Kennedy, Robert & Diana** **None Provided** **7/3/2001**

PC00591-1

Comment:

We have been residents of Westchester since 1970 and have tolerated the airport noise and traffic to remain in this wonderful community. We are retired and hope to stay in our home. The expansion of the airport would make our life here much more difficult.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00591-2

Comment:

We are of the opinion that a regional expansion plan as suggested by Jane Harmon is a more intelligent method of handling the current and future problems.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00591-3

Comment:

Airfreight consumes much of LAX to the east and south of the current facility. Freight needs to be moved out of LAX as much as possible. It is senseless to deliver freight for the Inland Empire, Antelope Valley, Orange and San Diego Counties to LAX and then clog the freeways with truck traffic to those areas.

Response:

Comment noted. There is a perception among many observers and respondents that air cargo and passenger aircraft can be easily split between or among airports in a multi-airport market. While in some cases and for select airlines this may be feasible, there are several significant barriers including but not limited to: Combination Service - Many foreign flag carriers and at least one U.S. carrier (i.e., Northwest Airlines) provide both passenger and all-cargo flights at LAX. Typically, the local management and operations (i.e., ground handling/warehousing, etc) of this combination of passenger and cargo service is inseparable and economically undesirable. U.S. Postal Service - The U.S. Postal Service (USPS) is a major contractor with both U.S. passenger airlines and more recently FedEx. Splitting all-cargo flights between or among airports would likely degrade air mail service as it has been structured. Promise to Deliver - The express all-cargo carriers, mostly notably FedEx and United Parcel Service (UPS), argue that relative proximity to population/commercial density is critical to achieve the overnight promise to deliver, the hallmark service of express carriers. For these reasons, among other, it is not feasible to eliminate cargo traffic from LAX. Please also see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00591-4

Comment:

With their removal additional passenger service areas could be constructed on the east, west and south sides of LAX. Westchester Parkway to Pershing Drive or an extension of the 105 to Pershing with exits along the way would make the West Terminal accessible.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand at LAX.

PC00591-5

Comment:

Developing Ontario, John Wayne, Palmdale and El Toro Airports seems practical so the International services could utilize these airports. People dislike driving to LAX from these outlying counties. Why not bring the airlines to them? It might cost the airlines, but so what!

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00591-6

Comment:

Finally the airlines themselves could help the congestion on the runways, streets and terminals if they could make staggered flight times. It is only obvious that many flights are scheduled at 8:00am, 12 noon, 4:00pm, 8:00pm, and midnight, while the airport is almost idle mid-morning and mid-afternoon. We know this because we are aware of the varying noise levels, traffic congestion and by personal observation at LAX of planes coming and going.

Response:

The content of this comment is similar to comment PC00281-25. Please see Response to Comment PC00281-25 regarding the airlines scheduling flights during peak hours.

PC00591-7

Comment:

We are sorry that we could not attend the public response meeting on June 9th but ask you to read and consider our opinions on issues that may have already been presented.

Response:

Comment noted. Responses to individual comments included in this comment letter are provided above.

PC00592

**Rodriguez-Lara,
Christine**

**South Bay Association of
Chambers of Commerce**

7/3/2001

PC00592-1

Comment:

Due to the inadequacy of proposed ground access mitigation measures and our concern that regional air transportation requirements will not be met by your preferred alternative, we reluctantly conclude we cannot support the Master Plan and EIS/EIR without extensive revision. In this regard, we respectfully request you address the concerns expressed in this letter and the comments addressed to specific portions of the referenced documents in the enclosure.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00592-2

Comment:

We recognize the importance of international trade to the South Bay's, the Greater Los Angeles Metropolitan Area's, and Los Angeles County's current economy and future economic growth. While LAX provides a vital international trade link in terms of air passengers and cargo, it can no longer be the sole link for Los Angeles and surrounding counties.

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) projects significant increases in air traffic into and out of the five county region between now and 2015. While a regional approach to deal with this demand for air transportation is essential, we recognize some of this demand must be met by LAX. In this regard, we find the Regional Context presented in Chapter 1 of the Master Plan and EIS/EIR to be a reasonable first step in allocating projected regional demand among all commercial airports in Los Angeles and surrounding counties. Because the airlines and other political entities will make the final determination as to this allocation, we believe your assessment went as far as it could go.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00592-3

Comment:

This assessment vividly points out the need for some entity other than the airlines to determine which airports are served. We are not advocating the return to a regulated environment and reestablishing the Civil Aeronautics Board abolished by the federal Airline Deregulation Act. However, we are pointing out that under the current unregulated environment any identified caps on numbers of flights are meaningless. Additionally, the suggested allocations of future demand are meaningless unless and until the sponsors of the other regional airports make changes to their airports to handle their allocation. In this regard, we are advocating in separate correspondence to elected representatives, at the federal, state, and county levels that they take the steps necessary to distribute the increased air traffic fairly among all regional airports.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00537-3.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00592-4

Comment:

Because of our proximity to LAX, many of the businesses our members represent participate in international trade and will benefit from increased air traffic into and out of LAX. Yet because of this proximity, they feel the negative impacts of increased automobile and truck traffic into and out of our area due to past and future growth at LAX. For this reason, our detailed assessment is focused on those portions of the Master Plan and EIS/EIR dealing with surface transportation and ground access.

In our assessment, we find it especially disturbing that costs and funding sources have not been identified for any of the proposed mitigation measures and that ground transportation projects of other jurisdictions are simply listed as mitigation measures without documentation of funding sources and expected completion dates.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment PC00537-4. Please see Response to Comment PC00537-4.

PC00592-5

Comment:

We also find it disturbing that little attention is paid to streets and freeways south of the airport. More significantly, mitigation measures appear to be limited to Los Angeles Department of Transportation jurisdictions.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PC00592-6

Comment:

This is especially evident by the lack of analysis of traffic conditions into and out of the Sepulveda Boulevard Tunnel. The tunnel is already a major bottleneck for South Bay users of LAX during all periods.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00236-1 regarding the Sepulveda Tunnel.

PC00592-7

Comment:

Previous experience strongly suggests our concern about the caps on the number of flights, the inadequacy of identified traffic mitigation measures, and the lack of funding for these mitigation measures is completely justified. When the airport was expanded in the early 1980s, the EIS/EIR called for expansion to be capped at 40 MAP which proved to be meaningless. Moreover, traffic mitigation measures identified for the 40 MAP level were inadequate and not funded. Also, no measures have been implemented to mitigate from the 40 MAP level to today's 67 MAP level. It is our view, therefore, that traffic mitigation measures for the current Master Plan must be developed using 40 MAP as the baseline to resolve both current traffic problems and any Master Plan-generated increased traffic. Most importantly, conditions of approval must contain specific funding sources, schedules, legally binding

commitments to implement signed by the responsible agencies, and remedies in the case of non-performance. Without such funding sources, implementation commitments, and remedies, any traffic mitigation measures are illusory.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00008-6 regarding funding. Also, there are no caps proposed in the Master Plan. In fact, caps on aviation activity at commercial service airports are currently illegal. However, it is believed that facility constraints will ultimately limit the airport activity at acceptable delay levels, as discussed in the Master Plan. Also, please see Topical Response TR-GEN-1 regarding baseline issues and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00592-8

Comment:

For the reasons previously stated, we would like to be supportive of this Master Plan and your preferred alternative. However, we cannot until the issues we raise in this letter and enclosure are resolved. We will work with you as necessary to see to their resolution.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC00592-1 through PC00592-7 above.

PC00592-9

The attachment included as part of this comment letter is identical to the attachment to comment letter PC00537; please refer to Responses to Comments PC00537-10 through PC00537-30.

PC00593

Shaushkin, Michael

None Provided

7/5/2001

PC00593-1

Comment:

1) Alt - C considers that a 4 % increase in number of flights per annum translates to a 40 % increase in number of passengers. Yet in Alt - A & B, a 20 % increase in number of flights translates to only a 53 % increase in number of passengers. These comparisons mathematically do not compute ratio-wise and are thereby suspect as the airport management could not possibly have much of an influence in airplane sizes from one alternative to the another to skew the ratios noted as varied as Alt - C is to Alt - A & B.

Response:

Each of the Master Plan alternatives is considered constrained because none have sufficient runway capacity to meet forecast demand in 2015 without changes in the activity profiles. Different levels of runway capacity constraints would result in different levels of activity constraints because of the different degrees of anticipated air service adjustments. The more constrained the alternative is, the more air service adjustments the airlines would likely undertake in response.

The Master Plan does not assume that airport management or local or federal governments would in any way cap activity or in any other way constrain activity at LAX. Rather, the aviation activity profiles were tailored to match the capacity of each alternative and are based on the anticipated air service adjustments that would occur over time in response to the capacity constraints.

The runway capacity of Alternatives A and B would be higher than that of Alternative C because Alternatives A and B would have an additional runway in 2015. Therefore, the aircraft operations constraint is greater for Alternative C than for Alternatives A and B. The Master Plan has projected that the airlines would adjust air service patterns in several ways in response to the capacity constraints. The projected air service changes include growth in international service, a focus on O&D passengers, a reduction in commuter service, and reduced service to short-haul markets with high levels of air service (or an increase in the size of the aircraft serving these markets). See Draft LAX Master Plan

3. Comments and Responses

Chapter V, Concept Development, Section 3.3.2, Final Iteration Constrained Activity, on page V-3.181 for more information on the projected air service adjustments. One of the implications of the described air service changes is an overall increase in the average size of the aircraft using the airport (while the number of flights would remain within the limits of the airfield's practical capacity based on maximum tolerable average delays of 10 to 15 minutes) in order to maximize the use of the limited airspace capacity. The average aircraft size would not have to increase as much with Alternatives A and B as with Alternative C. The design day passengers/departure ratio is projected to increase from 90.76 in the 1996 baseline to 145.09 by 2015 in Alternative C (60 percent increase) and to 133.09 in Alternatives A and B (47 percent increase) with the projected air service changes. The increase in average aircraft size would not happen immediately, but would more likely occur over time throughout the planning horizon.

Summary of Activity Levels for Each Alternative

	Annual Passengers	% Of Change	Annual Operations	% Of Change	Enplanements Per Departure	% Of Change
1996	57,974,559		763,866		90.76	
Unconstrained	97,960,339	69%	1,004,591	32%	122.98	36%
Alternatives A&B	97,903,262	69%	935,140	22%	133.09	47%
Alternative C	89,553,215	54%	797,249	4%	145.09	60%
Alternative D	78,864,100	36%	713,100	3%	127.68	41%

Based on the unconstrained forecasts (Chapter II, Existing Conditions, of the Draft LAX Master Plan), aircraft size was projected to increase gradually over time based on market demand - the enplanement/departure ratio is projected to increase to 122.98 in 2015, without considering the constraints of any of the alternatives. The higher enplanement/departure ratio with the Alternative C activity scenario reflects that under constrained conditions, the airlines would focus on the most profitable routes and service and attempt to serve as many passengers as possible, through the use of larger aircraft, within reasonable limits. In order to do so, a reduction in commuter operations is projected. Therefore, while the enplanement/departure ratio was not permitted to increase beyond the unconstrained forecast ratio for any particular air service region (commuter, international, domestic) the overall enplanement/departure ratio is higher with Alternative C than the unconstrained forecast because of the shift to domestic and international air carrier service over commuter service. See Chapter V, Concept Development, page V-3.195 of the Draft LAX Master Plan for a summary of the enplanement/departure ratios for each region.

The projected air service changes are reasonable assumptions because they are based on historical observation and aviation industry trends. The Draft LAX Master Plan acknowledges that these air service and activity levels are dependent on the collective decisions of the airlines and the projected adjustments may not be fully realized. For example, if the airlines do not choose to reduce commuter service, the average aircraft size would be smaller and fewer passengers could be served with Alternative C than is projected in the Draft LAX Master Plan (although operations levels would be similar). The environmental analyses in the Draft EIS/EIR, including noise and air quality, have addressed the potential impacts under the most practical and most likely activity level for Alternative C. This fulfills the requirement of National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate reasonable alternatives.

Following the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA developed a new alternative that, consistent with public comments calling for a regional approach alternative. Alternative D, Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, has been designed to serve a level of future (2015) passenger and cargo activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, has fewer environmental impacts, and improves airport safety and security. Alternative D, the LAWA staff-preferred alternative, would have a four-runway system similar to that of Alternative C. However, contrary to Alternative C, the Alternative D airfield would not constrain the passenger activity at LAX. The passenger activity constraint at LAX with implementation of Alternative D would be the number of and design of the aircraft gate facilities. Alternative C includes a total of 222.2 NBEG gates while Alternative D includes 178.9. The passenger activity forecast for Alternative D assumes that the airlines would make adjustments in the type of air service at LAX to best utilize the available gate facilities proposed for 2015 with Alternative D. Because LAX is the only existing or planned major international and hub airport serving Southern California and because Alternative D is designed to maintain the specialized and expansive infrastructure necessary

for LAX to accommodate long haul international service and higher volumes of commuter service, it is assumed that these types of air service will continue at LAX largely unencumbered. However, with implementation of Alternative D and its constrained aircraft gates, it is assumed that the airlines would respond by limiting the amount of domestic narrow body air carrier operations into and out of LAX and increasing the gauge resulting in a higher number of enplanements per departure. This is primarily due to the fact that this type of air service is more easily duplicated and absorbed by other airports within the Los Angeles region such as Burbank, Long Beach, Santa Ana and Ontario, airports that cannot accommodate long haul international service and do not operate as hubs nullifying their attractiveness to regional commuter carriers. Thus with a 3 percent increase in annual operations in 2015 with implementation of Alternative D a 36 percent increase in annual passengers is forecast. Alternative D was addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum.

PC00593-2

Comment:

2) The EIR places emphasis on "airport design capacity" which differs quite substantially from it's "maximum operating capacity"- which is not touched on at all in the EIR. Current LAX facilities were designed for 58 MAP (millions of annual passengers); yet today operates at 64 MAP (a 10 % increase) and maxes out at 79 MAP (a 36 % increase). This is due to "safety factors" built into the design capacity. So a design capacity of 89 MAP for Alt - C could potentially not max out until MAP = 121- using similar safety factors. The EIR does not base it's adverse affects on an MAP of 121; but instead bases it on the design capacity only of 89 MAP.

Response:

Currently LAX is operating at its maximum runway capacity (in terms of hourly operations) and activity above this level will escalate delays to an unacceptable level. Each of the Master Plan alternatives is considered constrained because none have sufficient runway capacity to meet forecast demand in 2015 without changes in the activity profiles. The aviation activity profiles were tailored to match the capacity of each alternative and are based on the anticipated air service adjustments that would occur over time in response to the capacity constraints. The Master Plan analysis assumed that the number of daily and hourly flights would remain within the limits of the airfield's practical capacity based on maximum tolerable average delays of 10 to 15 minutes. (See page V-3.183 of the Master Plan for an explanation of why this level of delay was chosen as the threshold.) These delay levels are higher than typical industry planning standards of what is considered acceptable and the airfield would be congested. See Chapter V, Section 3.3.2, Final Iteration Constrained Activity, of the Master Plan for more information. The most constraining component of an airport defines the capacity of the entire airport. With Alternative C, the most constraining component would be the airfield, not the terminal. Alternative C does provide increased terminal and landside capacity but it would have the same level of airside capacity as today. As a result, the airfield constraints would limit the amount of activity that can be served at LAX under this alternative. It is possible that the terminal facilities could serve more than the 89.6 MAP (at a lower level of service than is desired) if there were not other constraints at the airport. However, because the airfield will already be operating at high delays at 89.6 MAP, the ability of the terminal to serve beyond 89.6 MAP is not an issue.

Following the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA developed a new alternative that, consistent with public comments calling for a regional approach alternative, is designed to accommodate passenger and cargo activity at LAX that would approximate those of the No Action/No Project Alternative, has fewer environmental impacts, and improves airport safety and security. Alternative D, the LAWA staff-preferred alternative, would have a four runways system similar to that of Alternative C. However, contrary to Alternative C, the Alternative D airfield would not constrain the passenger activity at LAX. The passenger activity constraint at LAX with implementation of Alternative D would be the number of and design of the aircraft gate facilities. Alternative C includes a total of 222.2 NBEG gates while Alternative D includes 178.9. The passenger activity forecast for Alternative D assumes that the airlines would make adjustments in the type of air service at LAX to best utilize the available gate facilities proposed for 2015 with Alternative D. Beyond the forecast passenger active level for Alternative D in 2015 delay would begin to become a problem. However, in contrast to the other Alternatives, the delay would result from a lack of sufficient gate capacity to efficiently accommodate the volume of passenger traffic beyond 78.9 MAP. The four-runway airfield proposed in Alternative D would be able to efficiently accommodate the forecast volume of operations at LAX in 2015. Alternative D was addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00593-3

Comment:

3) Projected noise contour maps as affecting El Segundo indicates that Alt - C would not substantially increase current noise levels. The EIR spells out that a main contributing factor to this phenomena (despite an admitted doubling in number of jumbo jets expected) is the replacement of Stage 2 aircraft with quieter airplanes. However Stage 2 aircraft have already been banned from LAX since 12/31/99. Therefore where is further aircraft noise reduction really attributed to ?

Response:

Alternative C forecasts that by 2015 there will be a 38 percent increase in heavy jets using LAX instead of doubling as suggested in the comment. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR incorporates a substantial assessment of the noise level changes that might be expected for each alternative development action against Year 2000 conditions, after the phase out of large Stage 2 aircraft. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase and for noise modeling information see Topical Response TR-N-1.

PC00593-4

Comment:

4) The EIR does not touch at all on adverse affects of prolonged exposure time of residents to noise levels > 65 dB which obviously can be expected over an average day. There are supposedly (if one to take the data presented at face value) some additional 100 El Segundo residents that would be "newly exposed" to aircraft noise levels > 65 dB; however the scale of the contour maps provided within the EIR makes it very difficult, if not impossible, to tell which additional blocks of houses within the city would be further adversely affected by Alt - C.

Response:

Comparing the No Action/No Project Alternative to Alternative C, there would be newly exposed residents to 65 dB CNEL or higher noise levels. For Alternative C, there would be no areas within the City of El Segundo exposed to an increase of 1.5 dB CNEL or greater in 2005 or 2015. For Alternative D, as described and evaluated in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, there would be no El Segundo residents newly exposed to 65 dB CNEL or higher levels and areas exposed to an increase of 1.5 dB CNEL or greater in 2015.

PC00593-5

Comment:

5) The noise contour maps also are exclusive of "intermittent noise" that results from "early turns". Monthly there are still an average of about 100 complaints registered by El Segundo residents due to said "early turns". LAX has obviously not done enough on this subject of alleviating the practice of aircraft taking off towards the west (whether they be jumbo jets, smaller jets or turbo props) before crossing the coastline. What makes this problem seemingly unsurmountable is that the control tower itself provides the bogus excuses for the pilots who make the "early turns" that most of said violations are due to weather conditions over the ocean. Certainly a few may have the legitimate reason, but this "exemption" is being abused time and time again and undoubtedly there are videos in record that confirm the abuses in question. The EIR now promises (AGAIN) that the "coastline rule" will be enforced - but a lack of good effort now casts high doubts that the number of "early turns" would indeed not increase with Alt - C, which in actuality shifts about 20 % more turboprops to take off from the southernmost runway than current situation and turboprops have by far been the worst violators of the "coastline rule".

Response:

The contour maps for the environmental baseline condition incorporate early turns to both the north and south, as monitored by the airport's automated noise and operations monitoring system. This system evaluates the flight course of every aircraft departing or arriving at the airport and assigns it to the standard flight track most closely aligned to its course. Consequently, the early turn operations are captured in the noise contour evaluations. Because there are a limited number of early turns and most are conducted by light aircraft, the contours of average noise conditions are not substantially modified by their presence. The noise contours are reflections of the areas in which large volumes of noise energy are "piled up" over the course of an average annual day.

The proportion of turboprop operations would increase from 55 percent under environmental baseline conditions to 75 percent on the south runway pair with the implementation of Alternative C. However, reliance on the use of percentages alone can be misleading - the number of projected propeller operations is projected to decrease from 705 in the environmental baseline to 324 under Alternative C in 2015 and to 519 under Alternative D in 2015. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

PC00593-6

Comment:

6) Alt - C suggests that street traffic congestion along Sepulveda Blvd (within El Segundo boundaries) will actually improve somewhat versus the No Project Alternative. This is simply hard to believe. Surely some of the traffic signal synchronization and management for the natural increase in traffic (san an LAX Expansion) in 5 - 10 year time can be done notwithstanding the generous bone that the LAX offers that only an LAX Expansion would result in such mitigation.

Response:

Although continued traffic signal synchronization techniques may improve the flow of future traffic, it is unlikely that major capacity gains would be obtained with further traffic signal synchronization and management. While even the Master Plan mitigation would admittedly not provide enough improvements to allow Sepulveda Boulevard traffic to flow smoothly throughout the entire day (since the measures are intended to mitigate project impacts only, not existing traffic issues), the mitigation measures that were identified in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR are believed to be the best opportunity for improved conditions along this important artery.

PC00593-7

Comment:

7) There does not seem to be much detail provided within the EIR as to a road traffic analysis that captures adverse affects of extending the 105 freeway towards Pershing Drive. How would El Segundo residents be adversely affected should one or both entrances / egresses to the city at California Street or Main Street not be provided with an on / off ramp from the extended freeway?

Response:

There would be a grade separation from the Ring Road to Main Street. At this location, it is anticipated that the Ring Road would be below grade, with the extension of Main Street passing overhead. On the north side of the Ring Road, the Main Street extension would curve to the east to provide access to various ancillary facilities on the north side of the Ring Road. Freeway ramps would be provided to and from the east, accommodating westbound Ring Road traffic exiting to Main Street/ancillary facilities, and providing eastbound Ring Road access for Main Street/ancillary facilities. All new construction would take place north of the existing southern right-of-way boundary of Imperial Highway. Further design details will be provided during the design process for this project. California Street access would also continue to be provided, although its exact alignment could be altered by the Ring Road. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road, as was detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00594 Blanchard, Helen None Provided 7/6/2001

PC00594-1

Comment:

As a resident of El Segundo I would like to express my objections to the proposed expansion of LAX. While, as a frequent flyer, I am very much in favor of any changes that would increase safety on the ground, I do not understand how additional flights and passengers could accomplish this.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00594-2

Comment:

The traffic in the area is already atrocious with practically gridlock at times on both the Eastbound I-105 and Sepulveda Boulevard. Additional flights, as well as more truck traffic if cargo activity is increased, will only make matters worse.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the Congestion Management Program, and Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

PC00594-3

Comment:

Also, as a senior citizen, I am concerned about new emissions if the proposed increases are implemented.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects.

PC00595 Guerrero, Elyse None Provided 7/6/2001

PC00595-1

Comment:

My husband and I do not support the EIS/EIR.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00595-2

Comment:

Our house is situated 10 doors from The Centinela Adobe on the side of the 405 freeway. Not only is The Arbor Vitae Exchange of great importance to us because of the proximity of the land to be taken

from the Adobe but there is no mention of a sound wall to combat the extra noise from the 405, nor are we included in any soundproofing proposals.

Response:

Please see Section 5.6, Noise, and Appendix K, Supplemental Environmental Evaluation for LAX Expressway and State Route 1 Improvements, of the Draft EIS/EIR for a review of potential noise abatement measures. Also, the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR are "program-level" environmental documents, intended to analyze the impacts of a master plan. It is acknowledged that further documentation may be required in the future at the project-specific level to address certain environmental issues in a more specific manner, as necessary and appropriate. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway. Please see Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding impacts to the Centinela Adobe and Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement.

PC00595-3

Comment:

Every day there are new "For Sale" signs showing up in the neighborhood. People are refusing to stay in a neighborhood that keeps shrinking because more and more houses/businesses are being destroyed to expand an airport that is already at capacity.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00035-2 regarding residential acquisition; and Response to Comment PC00013-5 regarding business acquisition and relocation impacts, proposed collateral development at LAX Northside/Westchester Southside, and the proposed Preliminary Property Acquisition and Relocation Plan. Also see Response to Comment AL00018-1 regarding commercial property acquisition within the Westchester Business District. Additionally, please refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding the potential effects of the Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester.

PC00595-4

Comment:

How will the schools/teachers be supported if no new young people will move into this community?

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed impacts on schools in Section 4.27, Schools, with supporting technical data in Technical Report 17 of the Draft EIS/EIR.

Where the project would have direct impacts on public schools, rather than impacts through changes in enrollment, these effects were analyzed in other sections of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR which pertain to those impacts (e.g., Section 4.1, Noise; Section 4.2, Land Use; Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; Section 4.6, Air Quality, and Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment) and were summarized in Section 4.27, Schools. Technical Report 17 contains an analysis of schools outside of Los Angeles Unified School District.

PC00595-5

Comment:

Our quality of life is being jeopardized by declining property values, noise and pollution concerns. People cannot invest in upgrading their homes and communities due to this poor plan.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR

3. Comments and Responses

and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00595-6

Comment:

There needs to be a regional solution so our community doesn't have to be the only ones dealing with these issues.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00596 Quiring, Kathie None Provided 7/5/2001

PC00596-1

Comment:

Don't expand LAX!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00597 Thiessen, Mark and None Provided 7/7/2001
Mary

PC00597-1

Comment:

We are respectfully submitting a letter to voice our opposition to the expansion of Los Angeles International Airport. As residents of El Segundo, we are directly impacted by the current air and vehicle traffic in our community.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00597-2

Comment:

Our biggest concern is the environmental impact on increased air traffic at LAX. We are already worried about the long term effect of breathing in the air in our area and anticipate the pollution would worsen considerably with more airplanes, cars and trucks coming into and out of the airport.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses were provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4 and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-4 and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In general, the predicted air pollution impacts of any of the LAX Master Plan build alternatives will be lower than the predicted impacts of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC00597-3

Comment:

In addition, the noise of the airport would only become more distracting. We anticipated a noise problem when we moved to El Segundo and have dealt with it by installing double pane windows in our home. However, the noise of airplanes taking off in the middle of the night when our windows are open often disrupts our sleep. We expect this to only worsen with more traffic.

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of high single event noise levels that result in nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1. This area is defined by the 94 dBA SEL noise contour. The 94 dBA SEL contours for the 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions was shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Although the 94 dBA SEL contour includes the City of El Segundo, this contour has decreased under Year 2000 conditions compared to 1996 baseline conditions. As was described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6), the 94 dBA SEL contour within El Segundo under Alternatives A, B, C, and D was also reduced from 1996 baseline conditions in the City of El Segundo. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding significant noise levels and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC00597-4

Comment:

The quality of life in El Segundo is one of the reasons we moved to this small and lovely community. We know that quality will be damaged with the expansion of LAX. We strongly urge your committee to reconsider the proposal for expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00598

Polk, M.

None Provided

6/15/2001

PC00598-1

Comment:

How unfair it is for your expansion proposals to subject the City of El Segundo and the South Bay generally to the following horrors:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see responses to comments below. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00598-2

Comment:

Horror no. 1: A huge increase in cargo volume, meaning larger carriers, more off-peak, 24-hr. flights. Acute sleep deprivation will result.

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to nighttime awakenings in homes associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative and all four build alternatives in Section 4., Noise, and Section 4, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PC00598-3

Comment:

Horror no. 2: Ugly warehousing and shipping offices in surrounding areas, suggesting that planners of the project have had no training in proper land utilization. It is like putting an outhouse on the White House lawn.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00598-4

Comment:

Horror no. 3 . Huge heavy-duty trucks to feed the cargo planes--estimated over 50 thousand additional per year.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic. Alternative D, which was addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, would not increase cargo handling facilities at LAX. As indicated in Table S3-2 (page 3-23) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, cargo operations are projected to increase to about 3,120,000 tons/year at LAX by 2015 under the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative D. The traffic impacts of this level of cargo activity were described in Section 4.3.2.6.1 (beginning on page 4-293) of the Draft EIS/EIR Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00598-5

Comment:

Horror no. 4. Huge increase in emissions and pollutants (from increased flights and trucks, increased construction) on surrounding populations already afflicted by loss of hearing, asthma increase, etc. from being good-guy neighbors in the past. (The last time you expanded you said would be the last time that you would expand!)

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Response to Comment AL00017-246 regarding impacts on hearing. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build

alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00598-6

Comment:

Horror no. 5. Increased noise levels, increased oily deposits, forcing us to abandon outside, patio and garden, living. Children cannot play outside. Beach activities, sports, curtailed. Summer concerts in the bandstand in the park, and weddings, will be forfeited. The vibrant life of a whole, charming town is at issue here. Do you want to destroy all that? (Given the unacceptable noise levels to date, further increase cannot be tolerated-- cruel and unusual punishment .)

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollution deposition.

PC00598-7

Comment:

Horror no. 6. A proposed additional travel population each year equal to the entire population of our state!!!! Wouldn't most of them benefit from gateways closer to home?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00589-1.

PC00598-8

Comment:

Horror no.. 7. Many years of disruption and ugliness and pollution caused by construction in the revamping and extension of the airport, even before the other horrors are visited upon us.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed impacts related to community disruption, aesthetics, and air quality during construction in Section 4.20, Construction Impacts.

PC00598-9

Comment:

Horror no.8. The general destruction during construction of the the quality of lives of those east of the airport, uprooting many of them by displacement from homes and community (by eminent domain?)

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed impacts to air quality, noise, traffic, and other quality of life-related topics that would occur during construction in Section 4.20, Construction Impacts. In addition, the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed proposed acquisition and relocation of residences and/or businesses under each of the Master Plan alternatives in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses. Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00598-10

Comment:

Horror no. 9. The suggestion of noise impact insulation and moving people away from the area as a "solution." This is an affront to the American Way. I have made my choice to live here. You are the party who should move, who are coming in to disturb my peace.

Response:

As presented in Section 4.2.8 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, mitigation measure MM-LU-1 would expand and revise the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP) to convert incompatible uses to compatible uses through sound insulation of structures and acquisition and conversion of incompatible land use to compatible land use. This is a continuation of the current ANMP, and participation by the public is voluntary. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the current ANMP and proposed revisions under the LAX Master Plan.

PC00598-11

Comment:

Horror no. 10. Huge congestion impact on roads leading to expanded airport. Further fraying of nerves and unacceptable stress. Further adverse impact on police, fire, paramedic response. You are fudging your projected figures (under-estimated numbers), judging from our own experience.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed surface transportation impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Please also see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00598-12

Comment:

Horror no. 11. Depreciation of our property values goes without saying.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

PC00598-13

Comment:

Horror no. 12. Expanding LAX will establish a policy that will deprive outlying communities of more accessible gateways for decades to come. Such a policy of a giant LAX, once implemented, would not readily lend itself to change, if only because the huge amounts of taxpayer money . consumed would then be viewed as wasted. The region would be stuck with what you imposed on it. Imagine the continuing nightmare. It will be like trying to get out of a burning theater to leave the city. Too late, too late to open other exits.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00598-1.

PC00598-14

Comment:

Horror no. 12. Businesses have been buying property, etc. around regional airports, predicting you will have to finally select a regional plan as the smartest policy. Are you going to leave them high and dry?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00598-15

Comment:

As an ordinary citizen I resent the impact this process has already had on me. I have felt great stress on me to speak out and stop this injustice. But when one considers the tens of thousands of manhours consumed by the LA-LAX bureaucracy in selling their expansion plans, (not to mention the volumes of expensive campaign literature) I feel democracy itself is under threat. Ordinary people with ordinary lives, their time consumed by jobs and family, have no hope of being heard. The millions of words churned out for you by paid help, cannot be absorbed and handled by us average citizens.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00598-16

Comment:

We have reached saturation point. The airport has reached saturation point. Please move to a regional solution

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00598-17

Comment:

Please incorporate the attachment into the letter--it is part of my view.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment below.

PC00598-18

The attachment included as part of this comment letter is identical to an attachment to comment letter PC00599; please refer to Responses to Comments PC00599-3 through PC00599-24.

PC00599

Beale, Olga

None Provided

6/18/2001

PC00599-1

Comment:

The attachment expresses all my arguments. I have made it mine as part of this letter, and would appreciate your reading it.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00599-2

Comment:

Swallow your pride, fellahs, and admit you got stuck on a policy of staying put at LAX--the lazy line of least resistance-- before you even thought there might be alternatives. When other, more workable solutions were pointed out to you, you were so heavily invested in time and plans, it was hard to turn yourselves around. It is time to shake loose and start over from square one, and develop a truly regional plan. For everybody's sake save the dollars that going ahead with this dead duck will cost.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00599-3

Comment:

What Does the LAX Environmental Impact Report and Statement Say about Expansion?

General

- Though much of the public discussion is focused on passenger growth, LAX is focusing its expansion primarily to meet the projected cargo demand. This is the planning criterion in all 3 expansion scenarios. Of course, very significant increases in passenger activity is projected as well.
- Even in Alternative C (the Preferred Alternative/No Additional Runway scenario), LAX will be able to service a projected 2,275,236 tons (120%) increase in annual cargo volume in 2015.
- An increase in LAX annual cargo capacity would mean:
 - more and larger cargo aircraft
 - more off-peak and/or round-the-clock cargo flights
 - more heavy aircraft operations (an increase in heavy, or 747-class aircraft operation from 351 per day in 1996 to 587 in 2005, a 67% increase)
 - development of areas surrounding the airport for warehousing, distribution, and heavy shipping.
 - High truck and cargo traffic, which cannot be diverted to other forms of transport, such as buses, light rail or subway.

Response:

Comment noted. The new Enhanced Safety and Security Plan Alternative, Alternative D, analyzed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, was added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to the No Action/No Project Alternative. Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided extensive information on the formulation of this alternative and its consistency with the SCAG 2001 RTP. Please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand, Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.2 regarding the relationship between air traffic and noise and Subtopical Response TR-N-6.3, regarding the relationship between aircraft size and noise, and Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

PC00599-4

Comment:

- LAX cargo expansion is estimated to require an increase of 56,881 18-wheeler heavy duty trucks per year, an average of 156 trucks per day, or 6.5 trucks per hour, around the clock. This will significantly increase diesel emissions at LAX, a known toxic air contaminant.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC00599-5

Comment:

- Currently, the cumulative and additive impacts of emissions and pollutants on the population surrounding an airport are not fully documented. A comprehensive epidemiological study is needed to assess the risks to the affected population.

Response:

Please see Topical Responses TR-HRA-2 and TR-HRA-3 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects and human health impacts.

Potential health risks to populations in the vicinity of LAX were analyzed in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, of the Draft EIS/EIR, and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting information are provided in Technical Reports 14a and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided an evaluation of Alternative D and updated the risk assessment based on a reevaluation of baseline conditions. LAVA is not aware of any epidemiological studies (studies of people living near LAX) that have been conducted near LAX that establish any link between LAX operations and respiratory illness. Epidemiological studies have been performed at other airports. For example, the Illinois Department of Public Health (IDPH, 2001) examined actual cancer incidence observed in communities near Chicago's O'Hare and Midway airports between 1987 and 1997. Results of the study showed no elevation in cancer incidence for all cancers combined among whites, non-whites, males and females living near the airports. Trend analysis did not indicate a higher cancer burden for populations near the airports as compared to populations living farther away. This observation held true for all cancers combined as well as site-specific cancers. A study conducted by the Washington State Department of Health (1999) provided an examination of actual cancer cases near Washington State's SeaTac airport. Results of the study indicated that incidence of cancer was not statistically significantly higher for the SeaTac area compared to areas in the same county that are farther from the airport.

Epidemiological studies differ from risk assessments in that they describe actual incidence of cancer or other adverse health effects observed in real populations, and attempt to relate health effects to specific sources or causes. Risk assessments estimate potential health impacts using environmental data and exposure assumptions (e.g., lifetime exposure). Substantiating potential health risks estimated by risk assessment for an airport through epidemiological studies is very difficult because of the typical lack of exposure information about the study population. Further, understanding all of the factors that may lead to an adverse effect is necessary to related health effects to specific causes. The population evaluated in the epidemiological study may have lived in the area for many years or just a few years. They may have had exposure to chemicals from other sources, such as at work. They may have engaged in behavior such as smoking, drinking, overeating, or other lifestyle habits that increased their risk of adverse health effects. Simple observations of adverse effects cannot be used to establish a link between these effects and any source, including airport emissions. Given the inherent uncertainties associated with effects observed in epidemiological studies and the difficulties posed in trying to tie observed effects to a cause, use of approved risk assessment methodologies is the most appropriate way to evaluate potential health impacts associated with LAX emissions.

Illinois Department of Public Health. 2001. Cancer Incidence in Populations Living Near Chicago O'Hare and Midway Airports, Illinois. 1987 - 1997. Office of Epidemiology and Health Systems Development. November.

Washington State Department of Health. 1999. Cancer Rates in the Proximity of SeaTac International Airport (Questions 1 and 2 of the August 1998 Work Plan). Office of Epidemiology. February.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00599-6

Comment:

- The term "No Additional Runway" is misleading, as all four LAX runways will be relocated, reconstructed, and/or extended to make them into new runways under this scenario.

Response:

Although the existing runways would be relocated, reconfigured, and/or extended under Alternative C, this alternative would retain the current four-runway configuration, as compared to Alternatives A and B, under which a fifth runway would be added.

PC00599-7

Comment:

- Alternative C also contains the largest increase in total acreage devoted to cargo (280 acres vs. 197 acres in 1996, a 42% increase). It will displace 146 dwellings, 2 hotels, a public library, and a community college (vacant).

- If one accepts LAWA's projections, Alternative C represents an increase of 31.6 million annual passengers (54.5%) over current operations. This is equivalent to the entire population of California.

- LAWA says it represents an increase of only 44 take-offs and landings per day, or an average of 2 additional operations per hour. However, there is evidence that these projections are held artificially low by favorable assumptions about fleet mix.

Response:

Air cargo is an important element of LAX operations, as well as the LA Region's economy. The LA Region will generate increasing demand for cargo services in the future, as its role as a cargo gateway to the Pacific Rim increases with the integration and globalization of the world economies. One of the Master Plan goals is to continue to satisfy regional demands for global air transport of passengers and cargo by adding new facilities and optimizing existing facilities at LAX. To accommodate the unconstrained forecast cargo demand in 2015, 473 acres would be needed based on the facility planning requirements at a desired level of service. See Master Plan Chapter IV, Section 4.5 for an explanation of the development needed to meet the cargo facility requirements. Alternative C would provide additional cargo space by preserving all of the south airfield Imperial Cargo Complex, augmenting the existing Century Cargo Complex, and providing new facilities on newly acquired property south of Arbor Vitae and along both sides of Aviation Boulevard. A total of 473 acres would be devoted to accommodate increasing cargo demand in Alternative C to efficiently handle the cargo demand and provide the desired level of service. Alternatives A and B would also meet the 2015 demand for cargo but would have a less than a desirable level of service because they would do so on less land than provided in Alternative C.

The commentor is correct in asserting that Alternative C represents a 54.5 percent increase in annual passengers. This represents only a portion of the unconstrained market demand forecast for LAX due to the airfield constraints associated with the four-runway airfield system provided by Alternative C. The unconstrained forecast projects that passenger demand of 98 million annual passengers (MAP) would be expected for LAX in 2015. The unconstrained forecast is based on historical growth and industry accepted forecasting practices. The forecast was accepted by the Federal Aviation Administration and is considered reasonable. Alternative C is projected to serve 89.6 MAP and 797,200 annual operations in 2015.

The Master Plan has predicted that the airlines would adjust air service patterns in several ways in response to the capacity constraints associated with Alternative C and the other alternatives. The predicted air service changes include growth in international service, a focus on O&D passengers, a reduction in commuter service, and reduced service to short-haul markets with high levels of air service (or an increase in the size of the aircraft serving these markets). See Master Plan Chapter 5 3.3.2, Final Iteration Constrained Activity, page V-3.181, for more information on the predicted air service adjustments. One of the implications of the described air service changes would be an overall increase in the average size of the aircraft using the airport (while the number of flights would remain within the limits of the airfield's practical capacity based on maximum tolerable average delays of 10 to 15

3. Comments and Responses

minutes) in order to maximize the use of the limited airside capacity. As a result of the predicted air service changes, the Alternative C design day enplanements/departure ratio is projected to increase from 90.76 in 1996 to 145.09 in 2015 (a 60 percent increase). This is higher than the unconstrained forecast enplanements/departure ratio of 122.96 in 2015, which did not consider the constraints of the alternatives.

The higher enplanements/departure ratio with the Alternative C activity scenario reflects that under constrained conditions, the airlines will focus on the most profitable routes and attempt to serve as many passengers as possible, through the use of larger aircraft, within limits. In order to do so, a reduction in commuter operations is predicted. Therefore, while the enplanements/departure ratio was not permitted to increase beyond the unconstrained forecast ratio for any particular air service region (commuter, international, domestic) the overall enplanements/departure ratio would be higher with Alternative C than the unconstrained forecast because of the shift to domestic and international air carrier service over commuter service. See Chapter V, page V-3.195 of the Master Plan for a summary of the enplanements/departure ratios for each region. The increase in average aircraft size would not happen immediately and would more likely occur over time throughout the planning period.

The predicted air service changes are reasonable assumptions since they are based on the historical observation and aviation industry trends. The Master Plan acknowledges that these air service and activity levels are dependent on the collective decisions of the airlines and the predicted adjustments may not be fully realized. For example, if the airlines do not choose to reduce commuter service, the average aircraft size would be smaller and fewer passengers could be served with Alternative C than is predicted in the Master Plan (although operations levels would be similar). The environmental analyses in the Draft EIS/EIR, including noise and air quality, addressed the potential impacts under the most practical and most likely activity level for Alternative C. This fulfills the requirement of National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate reasonable alternatives.

PC00599-8

Comment:

- Even if no runways are added, the airport expansion plan still calls for a new terminal complex, a ring road, an LAX Expressway, additional midfield concourses, and a new air cargo handling complex. Planners for LAX expansion rejected off-site alternatives such as the use of other airports in the LA Basin, and alternate modes of transportation.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please note, Alternative D does not include the ring road or the LAX Expressway. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand.

PC00599-9

Comment:

- The EIR acknowledges that the projected futures for all alternatives increases in aviation activity at LAX would have a disproportionate impact on minority and low-income communities east of LAX under all the build alternatives (p. 4-395). The master plan relies on the commitments under the Residential and Business Relocation Program to cover environmental justice. No Master Plan Commitments for remedying or mitigating environmental justice are proposed. (p. 4-405 EIS/EIR)

Response:

Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, identified, discussed, and accounted for mitigation measures well beyond the referenced Master Plan commitment, as indicated in subsection 4.4.3.7. Other Master Plan commitments were not presented in Section 4.4.3, due to the proposed Environmental Justice Program. The final Environmental Justice

3. Comments and Responses

Program is presented in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of this Final EIS/EIR, with supporting information provided in Appendix F-A, of this Final EIS/EIR.

PC00599-10

Comment:

What Does the LAX Environmental Impact Statement and Report says about noise?

- If LAWA's assumptions about fleet mix prove overly optimistic, as we believe, the noise impacts from the LAX expansion will likely be much greater than the EIR/EIS acknowledges. That is, more people will be exposed to higher levels of noise than the EIR/EIS says.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report. Additionally, please see Topical Response TR-N-1, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-1.5 regarding the accuracy of forecast fleet mix. Please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for more information on and comparisons of noise and noise-related land use impacts under the baseline and Year 2000 conditions and the various Master Plan alternatives including new Alternative D.

PC00599-11

Comment:

- The 65 CNEL noise measures customarily used in assessing noise from airports does not fully capture the noise exposure likely to be experienced by the population. It represents a weighted daily average, and therefore discounts single noise events, that can be much higher in sound level.

Response:

Comment noted. Single event noise was extensively analyzed for nighttime awakenings and classroom disruption in sections 4.1, Noise and 4.2, Land Use of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report and Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report. Additionally, please see Response to Comment PC02605-29 regarding single event levels. Please see Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-2.1. Aircraft noise mitigation was described in Section 4.2.8 of the Draft EIS/EIR beginning on page 4-216. Mitigation measures for road traffic, construction equipment, and automated people mover noise were provided in Section 4.1.8 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR beginning on page 4-78. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR also provided mitigation measures for aircraft noise in Sections 4.1.8 and 4.2.8.

PC00599-12

Comment:

- Alternative C, the Preferred Alternative/No Additional Runway alternative, will expose an additional 7,150 people to the 65 CNEL noise level. 5,090 people will experience additional, significant noise impact (1.5 CNEL or more) over the 65 CNEL range, even if we accept LAX operations and fleet mix projections.

- The EIS/EIR concluded that the total population exposure, sensitive uses exposure (school & churches), and population/dwelling exposure to aircraft noise in 2015 under Alternative C scenario will be significant and unavoidable.

Response:

The comment states the conclusions for impacts under Alternative C that were presented in Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.6.1.4), and 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6), of the Draft EIS/EIR. However, total population exposure would not be considered significant and unavoidable. As stated in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.9.1), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, aircraft noise impacts would

remain significant and unavoidable under the following circumstances: where aircraft noise levels of 75 CNEL or greater affect residential properties with exterior habitable areas or other outdoor community areas; for interim impacts prior to sound insulation or acquisition; where properties do not qualify for sound insulation due to inconsistent zoning, land use, or substandard housing that is not feasible to insulate; and at schools newly exposed to high single event noise levels that would result in classroom disruption when classroom activities take place outdoors. Note that under LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative, Alternative D, the population newly exposed to 65 CNEL noise levels or an increase of 1.5 CNEL within the 65 CNEL would be reduced compared to Alternative C, as indicated on Table S4.1-30 and Table S4.1-31 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-1, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-1.5 regarding the accuracy of the forecast fleet mix.

PC00599-13

Comment:

- The keystone of the noise mitigation measures for the expansion is the LAWA sound insulation and property acquisition program, which will either force the population to remain indoors with their windows and doors closed, or force the population to move.

- Suggested measures for reducing noise impacts include accelerating or expanding sound insulation offered under existing LAX Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program and offering increased opportunities for residents to move out of the most heavily noise-impacted areas.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the ANMP and revisions to the ANMP under the LAX Master Plan. Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.14 provides a summary of impacts to noise-sensitive uses identified in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Although some residential uses would be newly exposed under the Master Plan alternatives, other residential uses would be removed from exposure to high noise levels. Based on information provided in Technical Report 1, Land Use Technical Report, pages 98 and 99, of the Draft EIS/EIR, approximately 71,556 residents are currently located within the ANMP boundaries. Based on current conditions, areas exposed to high noise levels are still heavily populated (the population has not moved). In addition, residential soundproofing would be provided as mitigation for those dwelling units within the ANMP contour, thereby reducing interior noise levels to meet California Airport Noise standards. As stated in Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.14 the ANMP would be revised to include noise-sensitive uses newly exposed to high noise levels. Furthermore, as indicated in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.9.1), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, even after incorporation of mitigation, noise impacts would remain significant where aircraft noise levels of 75 CNEL or greater affect residential properties with exterior habitable areas.

The primary intent of mitigation measure MM-LU-1, as presented in Section 4.2.8 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, would be to facilitate the conversion of incompatible uses to compatible uses through sound insulation of structures and acquisition and conversion of incompatible land use to compatible land use. MM-LU-1 includes several measures that would provide an increased opportunity for residents impacted by high noise levels to receive sound insulation in a more timely and efficient manner and allow more residents to qualify for soundproofing, but does not place an emphasis on increasing opportunities for residents to move out.

PC00599-14

Comment:

What does LAX's Environmental Impact Statement and Report Say about traffic congestion?

- Remarkably, the LAX Master Plan EIR says nothing whatever about traffic congestion impacts on the 405.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the

3. Comments and Responses

Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00599-15

Comment:

- The LAX Master Plan EIR says that airport peak hour, which differs from the normal commuter morning and evening peak hour, will experience an increase from 19,607 vehicle trips (in 1996) to 30,212 vehicle trips (in 2015). This represents a 54% increase in vehicle trips.

- The LAX Master Plan EIR says that the morning commuter peak hour will see an increase from 13,554 trips to 24,960 trips, an 84% increase. The evening peak hour will increase from 14,328 trips to 25,438 trips, a 78% increase.

- If, as we believe, the passenger projections for the LAX Master Plan are too low, then traffic increases will be much worse.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed surface transportation impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Please also see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00599-16

Comment:

- In addition, all of the expansion scenarios will result in significant traffic delays and problems during construction, however temporary (14 years) they may be. Construction traffic will add up to 25 truck trips per hour to the Central Terminal Area at peak-hour in 2004. This is another significant and unavoidable impact of the expansion.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-3 regarding construction traffic.

PC00599-17

Comment:

- Alternative C will increase traffic volumes on the northbound-to-westbound ramp from Sepulveda Blvd to the Central Terminal Area, resulting in a significant on-airport traffic impact.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00599-18

Comment:

What does LAX's Environmental Impact Statement and Report Say about air pollution?

3. Comments and Responses

- Air quality in the area surrounding LAX will decrease as emissions from the airport increase with the growth in activities. The EIS/EIR concluded that the only way to improve air quality and reduce emissions is to reduce airport activities.

Response:

Comment noted. Air quality would decrease in the future for all scenarios, including the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Response to Comment PC02585-6 regarding lower air quality impacts under the build alternatives as compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00599-19

Comment:

- The EIS/EIR concluded that increased traffic and activity levels will result in significant increased emissions of all five criteria pollutants (the five EPA-classified main air pollutant components) in all expansion scenarios. Diesel-engine construction equipment will also be a significant source of NOx and particulates during the construction period.

Response:

Both the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the impacts of air pollution in and around the airport in Section 4.6. In general, the predicted air pollution impacts of any of the LAX Master Plan build alternatives would be lower than the predicted impacts of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution.

PC00599-20

Comment:

- NOx and SO2 emissions increases for each scenario will reach level of significant impact. NOx is a main component of smog, and SO2 is a potent air pollutant. Both of these compounds will affect respiratory systems of children and the elderly.

- Due to increased traffic, total NOx emission from the airport will increase by 1,592 tons (31%) per year in 2015, or 4.4 tons (8,223 lbs.) per day. Total SO2 emissions will increase by 100 tons (55%) per year in 2015, or 548 pounds per day. If the projected operations, passengers, and cargo activity levels are too low, as we believe, then these impacts could be much more severe.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed health risk impacts in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment. Please see Response to Comment AF00001-25 regarding projected operations, and Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding cargo activity and demand. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase. Please note that air emission impacts have been updated since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for revised emissions for both on and off-airport sources.

PC00599-21

Comment:

- Construction activity will add 4,152 tons of NOx, (80% of current levels) and 582 tons of SO2 (318% of current levels), and 2,071 tons of particulates (1,302% or 13 times current levels) to emissions from airport activities in 2004.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase and Response to Comment PC00599-20 regarding increased air pollution.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00599-22

Comment:

- Minority, low-income populations and children may be more severely affected by any increase in ozone levels because they may be more susceptible to asthma and other chronic respiratory illnesses. They also have less access to adequate healthcare to help them deal with these problems

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase. Please also see Topical Response TR-EJ-1 regarding potential air quality and health risk impacts on low-income and minority communities.

PC00599-23

Comment:

What about Environmental Justice?

- LAX's EIS/EIR does not make any commitments to respond to environmental justice issues, even though it notes that low income and minority communities will bear a higher burden of the impacts of the airport expansion.

- Other than land acquisition, there is no solution for outdoor noise and air quality issues.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00599-9 above. Also see the measures summarized in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Final EIS/EIR that relate to noise and air quality issues.

PC00599-24

Comment:

- LAWA has formed an Environmental Justice Task Force but no actions have been carried out by this task force.

Response:

Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR indicated that the Environmental Justice Task Force is an element of the Environmental Justice Program. This program has continued since circulation of the Draft EIS/EIR. Actions taken under the program and how it has influenced development of mitigation measures and benefits under the Environmental Justice Program are described in Topical Response TR-EJ-2.

PC00599-25

Comment:

Coalition for a Truly Regional Airport Plan
Frequently Asked Questions about LAX and Regional Airports

1. How much expansion does LAX want?

3. Comments and Responses

- LAX currently services approximately 67 Million passengers per year (MAP) and 2.1 million tons of cargo per year. They propose to expand their capacity to service 89-98 million passengers per year and 4.2 million tons of cargo.

- These growth projections need to be treated skeptically. They are really public relations-driven numbers, not accurate capacity projections. When the last Master Plan was approved for the current LAX, it was supposed to be capable of handling merely 40 million passengers per year. LAX officials now say that LAX can handle almost 80 million passengers, double the original projections.

- LAX's projected 89 million passengers for the preferred alternative in the Master Plan is grossly understated. This estimate uses low load factors and other conservative assumptions in its calculations. It does not represent the airport's capacity at all, but rather more like the airport's preferred operating levels.

- Airports with similar runway systems and strategies for diverting smaller aircraft off their major runways, like Atlanta-Hartsfield, project growth to 121 million passengers.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels.

PC00599-26

Comment:

2. How many aircraft operations are expected at an expanded LAX?

- Currently, LAX handles over 2000 flights per day. We believe, if they expand as proposed, the airport could handle more than 2500 flights per day.

- LAX officials now say that over the next twenty years air carriers will change their fleet mix to rely upon larger aircraft that carry more passengers and that LAX intends to divert a large number of commuter and business jet activity to other nearby airports. They say doing so will allow LAX to serve more passengers and keep the number of operations to current levels.

- However, this fleet mix projection relies heavily upon unforeseeable and improbable developments. Projecting the fleet mix of air carriers twenty years from now is nothing short of "fleet-mix voodoo." In addition, LAX staff acknowledge they have no authority to divert any commuter flights to other airports.

Response:

In 1996, LAX accommodated 2,235 daily operations at about 10 minutes per operation of all weather annual average delay based on the 1996 baseline airside simulation analysis. Alternatives A and B could serve 2,719 daily operations and Alternative C could accommodate 2,319 daily operations. Alternative D would be capable of serving 2,279 daily operations. Aircraft operation levels assumed for all alternatives are based on the maximum tolerable average delays of 10 to 15 minutes. Please see Responses to Comments PC00599-7 above and PC00593-1 for a discussion on the fleet mix assumptions and operational levels. Please see Appendices E and F of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum for a discussion of the design day activity associated with Alternative D.

PC00599-27

Comment:

3. Why does the City of El Segundo and other communities near the airport oppose the expansion of LAX?

- The proposed expansion of LAX is the wrong answer to the right question. How should Southern California capture the growing opportunity in air commerce in the 21st Century? We believe that the best way to answer this question is by developing a regional plan to better use the eleven other commercial airports in Southern California. Many of these operate in the areas of Southern California expected to have the highest population and employment growth.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00599-28

Comment:

- The concerns of the cities near LAX, including El Segundo, are straightforward and reasonable. The proposed expansion of LAX will dramatically increase traffic congestion (especially with other nearby developments, such as Playa Vista), increase air pollution, increase airport noise, and increase air safety risks.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that cumulative impacts associated with development of the LAX Master Plan along with other projects in the area, including Playa Vista, are addressed in Chapter 4 for each environmental impact area.

PC00599-29

Comment:

- Projections of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) makes it clear that the region faces absolutely daunting congestion problems over the next twenty years. In the time frame of the expansion plan, stretches of the I-405 near LAX are expected to have an average congested speed of 16-23 mph reduced to 10 - 16 mph. It makes no sense to exacerbate this congestion by concentrating our air traffic at LAX when the growth in the region is in the Inland Empire, North Los Angeles and Orange Counties.

- Concentrating our airport facilities at LAX remote from where the greatest new growth in population and jobs will occur only ensures unnecessary congestion.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00599-30

Comment:

- The expansion will significantly increase air pollution and traffic congestion in communities around LAX. In addition to doubling automobile traffic, expanding LAX as proposed may more than double diesel truck traffic around the airport.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC00599-31

Comment:

- LAX is already the region's single largest source of NOx emissions, the primary precursor to ozone, greater than the next three largest sources combined, oil refineries and a power plant; 3 1/2 times the NOx generated by all MTA buses.

Sources	Nox Tons/Year
LAX	6,278
Mobil Oil Corp	2,731
Chevron USA	1,921
MTA	1,792
ARCO	1,712

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00014-4 regarding NOX emissions.

PC00599-32

Comment:

- LAX Master Plan will result in a significant increase in diesel exhaust. The California Air Resources Board has determined that diesel exhaust particulates are a toxic air contaminant, responsible for thousands of lung cancer cases among Californians.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health impacts in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment. This section contained a detailed human health analysis, including a Human Health Risk Assessment that showed that cancer risk would be below CEQA's approved threshold of significance for this environmental source category. It is important to note that human health impacts would occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative as well as under the design build options. Diesel exhaust particulates were included in each of these health risk assessments.

PC00599-33

Comment:

- Expanding LAX as proposed will dramatically increase the noise burdens on surrounding communities. For El Segundo this noise comes from takeoffs and from "fly arounds" that will increase substantially as the air space becomes more crowded.

Response:

It is not expected that the proposed alternatives would substantially increase the noise burden over communities north and south of the airport from environmental baseline conditions. The shifts of the runways, or construction of new runways north and south of the present runways, would result in commensurate shifts in the noise pattern over communities east of the airport and would shift noise patterns north and south of the airport northward or southward in accordance with the degree of lateral shift in the runway's locations. It is anticipated that the "fly around" (missed approach) pattern in the area would remain unchanged to assure safety of flight. For those alternatives with projected numbers of daily operations equivalent to baseline conditions (Alternatives No Action/No Project, C, and D) the numbers of missed approaches should not increase, and improved separation criteria and sequencing

3. Comments and Responses

of operations may reduce them. For those alternatives with substantially increased operations (Alternatives A and B) the average number of arrivals on the runway would be reduced because a third approach runway would be added. Consequently, the number of missed approaches should be reduced. For further information about turns over El Segundo, please see Topical Response TR-N-3, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3 and Subtopical Response TR-N-3.4

PC00599-34

Comment:

- Overcrowding in our air corridors reduces the margin of error in the air traffic system and increases the likelihood of air disasters.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00599-35

Comment:

4. You say that expanding LAX isn't safe, isn't fair, isn't prudent, and isn't necessary. What do you mean?

Is it safe? There are very significant concerns about air safety, congestion, air pollution and other environmental impacts that compromise the safety and public health of our communities.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-2, S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00599-36

Comment:

Is it fair? A disproportionate share of these burdens are born by a small number of communities in the "LAX impact zone." In addition to El Segundo and other South Bay communities, these impacts are born by several low-income and minority communities under the flight path of the airport.

Response:

Impacts on low-income and minority communities were evaluated in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting data and analyses provided in Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-EJ-1 regarding potential air quality and health risk impacts on low-income and minority communities and Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits.

PC00599-37

Comment:

Further, the proposed expansion of LAX will unfairly deny other communities in the region a full opportunity to develop their own airport and economic resources.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00599-27 above.

PC00599-38

Comment:

Is it prudent? El Segundo has concerns over the excessive costs of the proposed expansion of LAX. Other airport resources in the region can be developed at a far lower cost, since they will not require building new or "moving" runways as does LAX.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1, regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand that discusses the roles and responsibilities of LAWA, the City, SCAG, and SCRAA in meeting regional demand and the forecasts and capacities of the other regional airports.

PC00599-39

Comment:

Is it necessary? The capacity exists for capturing the anticipated growth in our regional air traffic at the multiple airports in Southern California that are suitable for commercial airport use. Properly using these airport resources, located in the high growth regions of Southern California, will make it unnecessary to expand LAX.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00599-27 above.

PC00599-40

Comment:

5. Assuming the increased environmental burdens you suggest, isn't the contribution to the local and regional economy too great to pass up?

- Comparable benefits can be had with a truly regional airport system, as demonstrated by the study done by CIC, Inc for the Southern California Association of Governments. Such a plan would more equitably spread the burdens of aviation by utilizing airports closer to where the new markets for air traffic will be developing, in the high growth regions of Southern California like Riverside, San Bernardino and Orange Counties as well as North Los Angeles County.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00599-27 above.

PC00599-41

Comment:

6. El Segundo is not under the take-off or landing flight paths. Why is it so concerned about LAX?

- The burdens of airport noise do not occur solely for communities under the flight path. El Segundo's noise problems come primarily from nearby takeoffs and "fly arounds" made while aircraft are queuing for landing.

Response:

Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00599-42

Comment:

- In addition, the impacts of traffic congestion and air pollution will be very severe for El Segundo.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00599-43

Comment:

7. Isn't this just a case of middle class NIMBYism? Won't communities elsewhere in the region experience lots of job benefits?

- No. Communities near LAX already bear extraordinary burdens. Adding to these environmental burdens is both unfair and unnecessary. It is simply good sense to use the regional resources that yield the fewest burdens, as well as the fairest distribution of benefits and burdens.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00599-27 above.

PC00599-44

Comment:

8. El Segundo is talking to other communities to gain their support. How is this effort going?

- Very well. As of today 88 cities and counties have joined us and adopted a version of our resolution calling for a regional airport plan and limiting growth at LAX - over 100 entities if you include transportation agencies and school districts, etc. Those include virtually all communities of the South Bay, Westside, and communities from the San Gabriel Valley, Southeast Los Angeles County, Orange County, Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. The list continues to grow.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00599-45

Comment:

9. Isn't some expansion of LAX justified? Do you oppose any expansion whatsoever?

- LAX officials have said in their original Notice of Preparation that if they were constrained to existing facilities they would expect to grow to 70 million passengers per year. (Now they say the capacity is 78 million passengers.) So, even if the Master Plan is not approved, activity at LAX would likely grow by 20-30%. Residents of El Segundo would not be happy with that and we do not support this growth. But if we choose to oppose this growth we would have to do so through the FAA, or some other means, since it is independent of the Master Plan that we are now opposing.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels.

PC00599-46

Comment:

10. Isn't the expansion of LAX necessary if we are to have a competitive economy in the 21st century?

- A case can be made that capturing all or a significant share of the potential growth in air commerce is important to the regional economy. However, this growth can and should be captured by making better use of the eleven other commercial airports in Southern California, rather than by expanding LAX.

- We believe that utilizing these other regional airports would provide comparable regional economic benefits, create far less environmental burdens, produce far less congestion, cost far less, and provide a much fairer distribution of burdens and benefits.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00599-27 above.

PC00599-47

Comment:

11. What makes you think that the development of a regional airport plan is possible?

- The system we envision continues LAX's role as the major hub airport in Southern California, but includes major connecting airports in the Inland Empire and in Orange County. Other airports in each of these three areas would serve the short and medium haul point-to-point markets much like Burbank does today. March, Norton and George are well suited to serve as primary cargo facilities in an era in which dedicated cargo aircraft will soon carry 80% of all air cargo. Such a system provides each county with a system that meets its own needs and reflects the growth distribution expected in Southern California over the next twenty years.

- Most of the eleven other commercial airports in Southern California are poised for significant growth and development. Many operate in communities expected to experience dramatic growth over the next two decades, growth that will ensure a strong market for local airport services. These airports have built appropriate local management capability and are marketing themselves to airline operators. All have existing runway systems and can avoid the enormous expense that expanding LAX would entail.

- These airports are ready to grow. However, consistently these airports hear the same refrain from potential operators: the operators want to see what will happen with the proposed expansion of LAX. As long as LAX is potentially expanding, the opportunity for other regional airports is limited.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00599-27 above.

PC00599-48

Comment:

12. Won't these other airports get tied-up by local political opposition, just as you're doing to LAX?

- Some airports have a history of local political resistance, especially those in built out urban environments, like LAX, Long Beach, Burbank, and John Wayne. However, other airports in the less built out areas, like the Inland Empire, can operate with little impact on residential areas. These communities can plan their airports and their overall development to avoid future collisions with neighbors. As a result, these airports now experience strong local community support because they are

3. Comments and Responses

seen by their communities as opportunities for economic development and a chance to become full partners in the regional economy.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00599-27 above.

PC00599-49

Comment:

13. The majority of the population and employment growth in the region is expected to occur in the Inland Empire and North Los Angeles County over the next twenty years. However, LAX officials say that the population with the "high propensity to fly" will grow mostly near LAX, and thus the proposed expansion is justified. How do you respond?

- LAX likes to say that 50% of all origins and destinations in Southern California are centered within a 20 mile radius of LAX and will still be so after the build out of the proposed Master Plan. We say, fine LAX can have that 50%; it is the other 50% that concerns us. A large share of those passengers can be served by other airports.

- The primary market of LAX (about a 20 mile radius) will experience about one-fourth of Southern California's population and job growth, yet LAX proposes to capture more than half the new growth in regional air commerce.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR only addressed the development of LAX. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. LAWA is currently updating the master plan for Ontario in order to develop adequate facilities to meet the projected demand that is based upon population growth in the Inland Empire.

Under Alternative D, the capacity of LAX would not be expanded beyond its current capacity. The constrained capacity of LAX would require that other airports in the region meet a higher percentage of the projected demand, or that demand will be lost to airports outside of the region. Please see also Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00599-50

Comment:

14. Some say that Palmdale Airport is the major alternative to expanding LAX. Others say Palmdale Airport simply cannot meet the needs of the 21st Century. What do you think about Palmdale Airport as an alternative?

- Palmdale Airport has an important role to play meeting the needs of a growing population and a growing economy in the North Los Angeles County and North San Fernando Valley region. However, Palmdale Airport is likely to play a role comparable to that played by Burbank Airport now, serving short and medium haul markets. It can be a contributor in an overall system, but it is not the major alternative to LAX.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale for a discussion of multi-airport markets, airline economics and passenger choice.

PC00599-51

Comment:

15. LAX officials say they are ready to support a regional plan that would include new airports at El Toro, expanding Ontario Airport, and perhaps building out Palmdale Airport. Nevertheless, they say, expanding LAX as proposed will be necessary. What do you say?

- Officials at LAX tend to reduce a regional plan to those airports they own and, recently, El Toro. Yet, there are eight other commercial airports in the region. We see no reason to deny these regional airports a role in the marketplace and the economic opportunity to the communities they serve. Rather, if we responsibly distribute the air traffic in the region, expansion of LAX would be unnecessary to capture projected regional demand.

- During the recent debate over the Regional Transportation Plan, the SCAG staff ran a computer model scenario that projected how air traffic would be distributed in the region if LAX is constrained to its current facilities. That scenario demonstrated that the projected growth in air travel demand can be distributed to other airports in the region with little or no loss of air commerce to the region. Thus, expanding LAX proved unnecessary.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00599-27 above.

PC00599-52

Comment:

16. There is strong opposition to El Toro Airport in Orange County. If El Toro is blocked, won't it be necessary to expand LAX?

- Measure F, recently approved by Orange County voters, does not send a clear signal about El Toro at all. The measure was crafted to include concerns about prisons, toxic dump sites, as well as airports. Previously, El Toro Airport has been approved by the Orange County Board of Supervisors three times and by Orange County voters twice. However, if El Toro is not built, it will mean little for the approval of LAX. Opposition to El Toro is no more committed and no more vigorous than opposition to the expansion of LAX. We see no reason why communities around LAX should bear the burden of Orange County need for air commerce.

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. The decision to develop an airport is the responsibility of local government. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR for LAX, Orange County, as the Local Redevelopment Authority for the former Marine Corps Air Station El Toro, discontinued pursuit of a civilian aviation reuse of the former installation as a result of the passage of the Orange County Measure W in March 2002. The decision to further develop LAX is the responsibility of the City Of Los Angeles. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00599-53

Comment:

17. What is the role of SCAG and the RTP in all of this?

- SCAG plays a very important role. Federal law has designated SCAG as the entity that must approve a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RTP identifies projects eligible for federal dollars. Since LAX is constrained in the RTP, it will be difficult for a larger project to be financed. In addition, the SCAG

3. Comments and Responses

Regional Council vote on the RTP is the closest thing we now have to a regional vote on LAX or a regional airport plan.

Response:

Comment noted. The comment provides background information and is not a comment on the Draft EIS/EIR. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00599-54

Comment:

18. LAX proponents say that air cargo is carried primarily in the belly of passenger aircraft rather than on cargo only air carriers. They say that the region's cargo facilities should therefore be located near to the centers of passenger activity, rather than in single purpose airports in the Inland Empire? How do you respond?

- SCAG has produced a recent study that indicates that more than 60% of the cargo in the region now arrives in dedicated cargo aircraft and that indicates that the direction of the air cargo industry is increasingly toward dedicated cargo aircraft. In twenty years, 80% of the cargo will arrive in dedicated freighters. This indicates that the proposed use of airports such as March and others as primarily cargo airports may work very well in the air commerce marketplace of the 21st century and that expanding LAX to accommodate a huge growth in air cargo is unnecessary.

Response:

The majority of cargo shipped via aircraft arrives at LAX as "belly cargo" in the cargo holds of passenger aircraft. While strictly cargo aircraft currently operate at LAX, they do not carry the majority of the goods shipped via air. Therefore, rerouting the cargo is a complex issue that is not easily solved by simply relocating all cargo aircraft.

Air cargo has become an increasingly important growth industry worldwide in response to the globalization of manufacturing and other business activity. This is particularly true in the Los Angeles region, which is one of the most industrialized areas in the world, with leadership in high technology and media industries. These industries export time-sensitive goods for which air shipment is essential. LAX today enjoys a dominant position in the world's air cargo market and is forecast to continue doing so in the future. First, LAX is the key U.S. gateway for air shipments to/from the Pacific Rim and Oceania from practically all of North America and Latin America. Other international air cargo also connects through LAX on its way to/from domestic destinations. Second, LAX is a trans-shipment and consolidation point for several major all-cargo airlines. Specifically, FedEx has a domestic hub at LAX and uses LAX as its main Pacific Rim gateway. The international cargo operations are forecast to increase more rapidly than domestic cargo operations, and these cargo activities would stay at LAX, since there is no other airport in the region that could provide the needed facilities to accommodate the growth.

The hub-and-spoke route system offers the most economically efficient system to move passengers and cargo throughout the country and throughout the day. Airlines establish hub-and-spoke route systems centered at geographically viable locations with direct services to markets where demand is high. The airlines provide connecting services to small markets where demand is not high enough to profitably provide direct services. By using small aircraft to low-demand markets, the hub-and-spoke operation enables airlines to provide air services to small markets that would otherwise not be served and to maintain lower operating costs. To relocate these aircraft operations to other airports by

3. Comments and Responses

providing direct services is not financially feasible for airline operations. On the other hand, airlines may choose to redistribute connecting passengers through their other hub airports when one hub airport is overly congested. The air service changes predicted by the Master Plan reflect this potential strategy.

PC00599-55

Comment:

19. How do you expect to win in your effort to propose a regional airport plan that constrains LAX and utilizes other airports?

- We believe that a regional coalition of communities and constituencies can be built among those who expect to be burdened by the proposed expansion, those who have airports they want to develop, and those who are simply fair minded. Such a coalition would be difficult for the City of Los Angeles to ignore. We believe that the members of the City Council of Los Angeles are responsible people, concerned about the environment, and concerned about fairness to their neighbors. We believe that a majority will prefer to be a regional leader among partners rather than isolated from its neighboring communities. Collaboration is the prudent course, and the course that will most benefit Los Angeles.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00599-56

Comment:

20. Is there reason to believe that the airlines are interested in utilizing other regional airports?

- So long as the proposed expansion of LAX is on the table, we expect the airlines to express reluctance to consider other airports, especially the five largest carriers who are accustomed to operating out of centralized hubs. However, were LAX constrained to the capacity of its existing facilities, we strongly believe that the airlines will follow the market to these other regional airports in the high growth areas of Southern California. They are experienced businesses that would not want their competitors to gain a foothold in these airports uncontested.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan, Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00600

Quintana, Teresa

**Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108**

7/9/2001

PC00600-1

Comment:

I SUPPORT MASTER PLAN ALTERNATIVE "C"

3. Comments and Responses

LAX is overburdened. There have been 13 near collisions at LAX from January 2000 through May 2001.

Master Plan Alternative "C" will address noise, pollution, gridlock, and safety problems.

A modernized airport will allow Los Angeles to handle rising passenger and cargo demands. Those demands will remain whether LAX is modernized or not but the conditions surrounding the airport will worsen.

A safer airport will benefit everyone.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00601 Wells, Tawama Los Angeles Sheet Metal 7/9/2001
Workers' Local 108

PC00601-1

Comment:

Grow or die!

I support Master Plan Alternative C.

I support a modernization plan that will give us a safer airport that will benefit all citizens of the City.

I support a plan that will ease the gridlock surrounding the airport.

I do not want to see our economy stagnate because LAX cannot handle the increase in passenger and cargo demand.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00602 Rooker, Bradley Los Angeles Sheet Metal 7/9/2001
Workers' Local 108

PC00602-1

Comment:

I support Master Plan Alternative "C"

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00603 Pelliccino, Michael Los Angeles Sheet Metal 7/9/2001
Workers' Local 108

PC00603-1

Comment:

I support Master Plan Alternative C.

Everyone who uses the airport will benefit from a more efficient LAX.

We need to ease gridlock on the San Diego Freeway.

The Green Line needs to directly connect to LAX.

We need to improve the taxiway system for a safer LAX.

Response:

Comment noted.

**PC00604 Ringwood, Roy Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108**

PC00604-1

Comment:

"If you build it, they will come."

"If you don't build it, they will come."

"They" are "us" and we are already here.

The noise that surrounds LAX, and the pollution and gridlock that is blamed on it will only get worse if LAX is not modernized.

Setting limits on the number of passengers the airport can handle a year won't stop people from visiting or moving here.

Not improving the cargo facilities will drive commerce out of State.

We deserve a safe airport that will benefit all citizens of the City.

I SUPPORT MASTER PLAN ALTERNATIVE "C"

Response:

Comment noted.

**PC00605 Rooker, Kenneth Los Angeles Sheet Metal 7/9/2001
Workers' Local 108**

PC00605-1

Comment:

WE CANNOT HIDE FROM THE AIRPORT PROBLEM!

LAX must be modernized. We need to do something about the gridlock that surrounds LAX. The fact that the Green Line doesn't connect to LAX is plain dumb. Ditto for the 105 freeway.

People who think that by stopping the modernization process the noise, pollution, and gridlock won't get worse. It will.

Those same people think they can force people into using Ontario or Palmdale. Wrong. They'll use LAX and wait longer, sit on the freeway longer, and complain louder. It will only get better if LAX is modernized. Who else is going to spend money to improve the conditions at LAX?

What's going to happen to the economy of the area if our cargo facilities remain the same? I don't want to see Los Angeles turn into Gary, Indiana.

Support Master Plan C - make LAX a safer place.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00606 Henderson, Chad Los Angeles Sheet Metal 7/9/2001
Workers' Local 108

PC00606-1

Comment:

California has the fifth largest "GNP" in the world. What will happen if we don't modernize LAX?

People will continue to come here. The City will continue to grow. If commerce is forced to go elsewhere we will tailspin into stagnation.

If Los Angeles is to remain a vital city, we must modernize LAX.

Please support Master Plan Alternative C.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00607 Fisher, Charles None Provided 7/7/2001

PC00607-1

Comment:

I am sending this letter to express my complete opposition to the expansion of LAX. It is almost unbelievable to me that there would be even a consideration of expansion in this particular area. I live in El Segundo and work in Westchester and the noise, traffic congestion and pollution from the existing airport facility is incredible.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, with supporting technical data and analyses in Appendices D and G, and Technical Reports 2, 3 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendices S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-2 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00607-2

Comment:

I can have my car washed at noon and park in a lot in Westchester and by 5pm, you can see pollution on the car.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC00607-3

Comment:

The I-405 freeway is already nearing the point of gridlock. With the addition of Playa Vista and the additional airport traffic, it will be the least viable freeway. The traffic already lines up on the I-105 at the Sepulveda South exit going in a westerly direction. Sepulveda Blvd is in no better condition when transiting through the tunnel and through Westchester.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the Congestion Management Program.

PC00607-4

Comment:

It is almost inconceivable, in an already highly residential and business area, that additional activity at the airport would be considered.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00607-5

Comment:

What is wrong with the Regional airport concept? It appears to be a logical situation in that it would distribute the aircraft traffic as well as enhance the economy of those local areas. To my knowledge, most of the cities in the affected areas, are more than anxious for a regional plan to develop.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00607-6

Comment:

Let's not belabor this issue further. Most of the political representatives are against this and the Mayor, L.A. County Supervisor, Congressional Representatives etc. have spoken out against it. It should be a dead issue, except for a small number of airport personnel who are trying to increase their fiefdom.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00608 Williamson, Kim Remax Beach Cities Realty 7/6/2001

PC00608-1

Comment:

I'm really concerned about the traffic. It now takes me 1/2 hour to travel from Sepulveda And 77th to El Segundo (past the airport) to Imperial Hwy. It should only be A few minets!! I'm forced at times to go through private Streets.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00608-2

Comment:

I'm also concerned about the polution. If the airplanes had emission controll from the government like cars, I might be OK. Why don't they??

Response:

The USEPA sets aircraft emission standards for all US-built aircraft engines. In addition, the international civil aviation organization (ICAO) maintains an additional set of aircraft emission standards for aircraft built in other countries. The standards are based on model years and type of aircraft and become more stringent with each future year's model. The standards apply to the following pollutants: hydrocarbons, oxides of nitrogen, and smoke.

Please see Appendix S-E of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a detailed aircraft emission analysis of LAX operations. For additional information, please see EPA's fact sheet for aircraft engines: <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/regs/nonroad/aviation/aircr-fr.pdf>.

PC00609 Beale, Rita None Provided 6/28/2001

PC00609-1

Comment:

I concur with all the letters that have dealt with pollutants, emissions, erosions of quality of life. The very fact your plans include offering sound insalation and help in moving to a less noisy location is ample demonstration that you intend to destroy our present enviroment.

Response:

Comment noted. Mitigation measures have been developed to reduce the impacts on the environment. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program, and Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00609-2

Comment:

We went along with you for the last increase in Airport size - You said then that was the end of it! Now look how you are breaking your word. Stop it, and go REGIONAL.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00609-3

Comment:

I have very bad azma, but why should I move to another location. Why should you come along and drive me out of my home. I'm a senior citizen, I'm too old to start over.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4 and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-4 and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PC00610

Hickman, Bonita

None Provided

6/11/2001

PC00610-1

Comment:

We are breathing enough bad air, now from the planes that go over, we do not need more planes flying over, we get black soot on our cars and houses, and the noise we don't need anymore.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC00610-2

Comment:

Give the work load to some of our neighbors, in the desert, like Lancaster, Palmdale they sure could use it, jobs for the people there.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale and a discussion of multi-airport markets, airline economics, and passenger choice.

PC00611

Prescott, Ardis

None Provided

6/30/2001

PC00611-1

Comment:

1. Why wasn't the date of the last EIS/EIR used as the base year instead of 1996?

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-1 regarding baseline issues.

PC00611-2

Comment:

2. Residents of Palos Verdes Peninsula and South Bay have been complaining about aircraft noise over these areas for the past 4 years. Why isn't the impact on these communities included in the report?

Response:

As shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the current ANMP boundaries that define areas exposed to high noise levels (based on the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL or greater noise contours) do not extend to the majority of the South Bay area, including the Palos Verdes Peninsula. As also shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the area within the 65 CNEL noise contour continues to decrease from 1992 conditions. As presented in Section 4.2.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the South Bay area would not be exposed to high noise levels under Alternatives A, B, and C. As shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the South Bay area is outside of areas exposed to high single event noise levels (as defined by the 94 dBA SEL noise contour) and would not be newly exposed to high single event noise levels under Alternatives A, B, C, and D. In addition, Section 4.2.6 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR concluded that development of Alternative D would not expose the South Bay area to the 65 CNEL contour. Therefore, based on the thresholds presented in Section 4.1.4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, no significant impact from aircraft noise has been identified for the South Bay area. Please see Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1, regarding South Bay overflights and Response to Comment PC01377-9 regarding noise impacts on the City of El Segundo.

PC00611-3

Comment:

3. Why weren't reverse thrust operations emissions considered?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AF00001-21 regarding the use of reverse thrust in air quality emissions estimates.

PC00611-4

Comment:

It appears the report is skewed to the advantage of the airport expansion and to the detriment of the surrounding communities with regard to noise, pollution, flight patterns/over flights, ground transportation, safety, quality of life and property values. It's as if to say the public be damned.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00612

**Christensen, V.
Lorene**

None Provided

7/4/2001

PC00612-1

Comment:

As the old saying goes, "Don't put all of your eggs in one basket." In addition to being more convenient & less expensive for airport travelers, the plan for a series of airports in outlying regions would be safer. In this age of terrorism, reality must be considered. Should LAX be targeted for such activity, the

3. Comments and Responses

problems would impact more than the immediate target. Let's mix a little Common Sense with the plans for airport expansion and develop the multi-site plan for strategically placed airports in Southern California.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comments AL00051-93 and PC02131-5.

PC00613

Kuntz, David

None Provided

7/6/2001

PC00613-1

Comment:

The Master Plan for the expansion of LAX solely represents the interest of the airlines and others that would benefit financially from the expansion. Ignoring the needs and input of the community assures that the proposal will meet heavy political opposition, and, if implemented, have disastrous consequences in terms of noise, pollution and traffic. Here are some suggestions for improving the Master Plan:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below. In addition, it should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00613-2

Comment:

1. The existing EIR for LAX is valid for 40 MAP, but LAX has been operating significantly over that limit for many years. There is no guarantee that if the proposed expansion is approved as recommended, LAX won't simply increase the traffic without concern for the limits set by the new EIR; that's exactly what's been done in the past. The new Master Plan must contain specific limits on the allowable number of flights and MAP that cannot be exceeded.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00928-3 regarding an airport operator's ability to limit activity at an airport. Also, please note that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

PC00613-3

Comment:

2. The Master Plan doesn't really explore the simplest alternative to increasing airport capacity -flying fewer planes with more people on them. Specifically, the large number of small turboprops flying short commutes should be replaced by a few, larger jets. The Plan assumes that the airlines will do this, but doesn't require them to. There needs to be specific measures included in the Plan to make it very attractive to the airlines to do this, so that they are virtually compelled to do so.

Response:

All alternatives assume that some commuter service is replaced by jet service. In addition, the Draft LAX Master Plan projected that 50 70-seat regional jets will serve LAX by 2015. The Draft LAX Master Plan forecasted the unconstrained design day enplanements per departure to increase from 90.76 in 1996 baseline to 122.98 in 2015. Due to the capacity constraints, the forecast enplanements per departure would be further increased to 145.09 in Alternative C by 2015 with predicted air service changes. Please see Chapter V, Section 3.3.2 of the Draft LAX Master Plan for a more detailed explanation of the predicted air service changes. The Draft LAX Master Plan acknowledges that these

3. Comments and Responses

air service and activity levels are dependent on the collective decisions of the airlines and the predicted adjustments may not be fully realized.

There is no federal law or regulation that would permit the Federal Aviation Administration or a local airport sponsor to prohibit the use of a public use airport. It is airlines' decision to schedule and operate flights with their choice of aircraft. It is the airport responsibility to provide suitable facilities to serve the airlines' needs.

Following the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA developed a new alternative that, consistent with public comments calling for a regional approach alternative, is designed to accommodate passenger and cargo activity at LAX that would approximate those of the No Action/No Project Alternative, has fewer environmental impacts, and improves airport safety and security. Assumptions about air service changes associated with Alternative D are described in the Draft Master Plan Addendum, Section 3.3.3, page 3-6. 2015 design day enplanements per departure are forecast to be 127.68 with implementation of Alternative D.

PC00613-4

Comment:

3. The Master Plan proposes extending the Metro Green Line directly into LAX. In 1994, the FAA released a report that stated, "the Green Line's path near runways could distract pilots with its lights, befuddle radar with electromagnetic emissions and stand in the way of low-flying aircraft in emergencies." Another FAA report said that, "construction of an airport metro station would cause major utility conflicts, disrupt air service during construction and potentially disturb two underground 'contamination' areas." These important safety issues are not addressed anywhere in the EIS/EIR.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00043-12.

PC00613-5

Comment:

4 . If LAX management truly wants a solution for the public, then get the public involved in the process. This process should include more than a few public meetings, which are transparently obvious political window dressing.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 for a listing of all public hearings.

PC00613-6

Comment:

I propose that LAWA management urge Mayor Hahn to put individuals from all parts of the community, including various citizens groups, on the Board of Airport Commissioners, to replace the group of "yes men" stooges that was installed by Mayor Riordan

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00614

Sanchez, Jesse

None Provided

7/9/2001

PC00614-1

Comment:

We are against any airport expansion to the north.

3. Comments and Responses

We are having too much noise and air pollution already. We cannot even open windows anymore.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00615 Dajani, Nabil None Provided 7/8/2001

PC00615-1

Comment:

YOUR MASTER PLAN IS IMPLIED TO BE ONLY A PART OF A LARGER REGIONAL AIRPORT-PLAN. SINCE SUCH A PLAN HAS NOT YET BEEN PUBLICLY PRESENTED AND DEBATED, TALKING ABOUT EXPANDING LAX IS AT A MINIMUM PREMATURE.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, including a discussion of the roles and responsibilities of LAWA, the City, SCAG, and SCRAA in meeting regional demand and the forecasts and capacities of the other regional airports.

PC00615-2

Comment:

ALSO, I HAVE NOT HEARD A SERIOUS DISCUSSION OF HIGH SPEED RAIL AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO MANY OF THE SHORT-HAUL FLIGHTS INTO AND OUT OF THE REGION.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand.

PC00616 Giles, Mary None Provided 7/7/2001

PC00616-1

Comment:

I have lived here in Westchester at the same location for 47 years and watched the changes take place.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC00616-2

Comment:

We have gone from a wonderful family community to an overcrowded bedroom community where "gridlock" exists when you leave your residential street -

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical

3. Comments and Responses

data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00616-3

Comment:

The smell of tires and fumes from the planes is prominent on the streets of downtown Westchester and extends to our homes through open windows.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding odors and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC00616-4

Comment:

Black droplets of soot defaces the yellow wooden siding of our home making it necessary to manually scrub it off!

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC00616-5

Comment:

Save what we have left! Do not expand the LAX Airport - use some of the other options elsewhere - bring growth to other areas we are all very much aware exist: Ontario, Palmdale as well as the abandoned Air bases!

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00617

Krueper, P.E., Harry

**Krueper Engineering &
Associates, Inc.**

3/31/2001

PC00617-1

Comment:

For well over six months, I have wanted to write this letter about the delays and "stackup" of aircraft at LAX virtually every day of operation, even on bright, sunny days, when you could not blame the

3. Comments and Responses

problems on the air traffic controllers, which is oftentimes done. You want to get more flights in and out of LAX at the sacrifice of the convenience of passengers, who are trying to maintain some type of reasonable schedule. You apparently have chosen to do this, rather than disperse your flights to other airports, such as Ontario, Burbank, Palmdale, Orange County, and Palm Springs, which can handle a greater influx of planes and could do so on time, without lengthy delays. The very selfish attitude of LAX is outrageous. I think that the "straw that broke the camel's back" was the fact that I had to fly from Ontario to LAX on March 30, 2001, but, according to the pilots, my flight could not take off in Ontario because of a stackup of aircraft at LAX that could not be handled. We sat for almost 45 minutes at the end of the runway in Ontario for a 10-minute flight to LAX. Then, once we pushed back on a United flight at LAX, it took 40 minutes to get to the end of the runway so that we could take off, because of the stackup of aircraft at your facility on a bright, sunny morning.

I try, whenever I can, to avoid LAX, as I know many other people do. LAX has developed the reputation that San Francisco has of flights never leaving on time unless the flight is at 3:00 a.m. I beg you to try to streamline your operation and disperse flights to other airports that can handle the load, rather than causing countless hours of passenger delays per day, which your operation is creating.

Response:

Comment noted. The region's secondary airports such as Ontario, Burbank, Palmdale, Orange County and Palm Springs, ability to supplement LAX connecting and gateway capacity is limited because the airports can not support flights to many other destinations at high frequencies. Please see Response to Comment PC00297-9 regarding dispersing LAX flights to secondary airports. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00618 Rotolo, Lenore None Provided 6/26/2001

PC00618-1

Comment:

There is no end to the expansion of LAX, if they keep on going the way they plan on going. When we moved here the airport was at mines field, then in the sixties (60's) they expanded by adding a north runway and taking 30% of the houses in Westchester and Playa del Rey. Then in the 1980's they expanded again to accomodate more passengers and cargo taking more homes. Now in the new millenium they want to take more homes and businesses which includes one half of the Westchester business district. If they continue this way, in 2020 they'll take everything south of Manchester!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that the Master Plan is considered separate from growth and expansion that has occurred at LAX in the past. As with past improvement projects at LAX, the Master Plan has been developed in response to increasing local, regional, and international demand for air transportation, in an effort to sustain and promote economic growth within the Los Angeles region. Please see Response to Comment PC00035-2 regarding residential acquisition; and Response to Comment PC00013-5 regarding business acquisition and relocation impacts, proposed collateral development at LAX Northside/Westchester Southside, and the proposed Preliminary Property Acquisition and Relocation Plan. Also see Response to Comment AL00018-1 regarding commercial property acquisition within the Westchester Business District. Additionally, refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding the potential effects of the Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester.

PC00618-2

Comment:

Now we read that LAX is one of the five unsafest airports in the country. What will it be with more expansion?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00618-3

Comment:

Isn't it time to send some of the cargo and passengers directly to their destinations instead of making the area around the airport off limits for the people who live here?

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00618-4

Comment:

Pollution will be unhealthy for everyone living in the area and cause cancer not only to the elderly but to the young families which live in the area, especially El Segundo which is a prime area for raising a family. We have three children living there with their young children, four of them.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase. Please also see Topical Response TR-EJ-1 regarding potential air quality and health risk impacts on low-income and minority communities.

PC00618-5

Comment:

No matter what you do traffic will be a problem and a hazard to locals and passengers going to and from the airport and be nerve racking.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00618-6

Comment:

We've had noise in the area for all the years we've lived here having to turn the sound louder on the television sets.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels, TR-LU-5 regarding thresholds used to identify significant noise levels, and Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program. Also see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

PC00618-7

Comment:

Even with soundproofing, which means we have to keep our doors and windows closed, and turn on the fan for air, which raises the price of our electric bill. Its impossible never to open them if want quiet and the noise will be even greater than its ever been.

Response:

Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Areas exposed to significant noise increase as a result of development of the Master Plan were identified in subsection 4.2.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program and Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels, including thresholds used to identify significant noise levels. Regarding increased electric bills, LAWA has not received such complaints from current ANMP participants. In addition, the use of acoustically-rated doors and windows prevents cooling loss and therefore increases the effectiveness of the air conditioning or ventilation system.

PC00618-8

Comment:

What are you doing to us!

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00619

Stragnell, Ben

None Provided

4/5/2001

PC00619-1

Comment:

As a resident of Playa del Rey, I am deeply troubled by the apparent assumption that the current level of noise emanating from LAX is acceptable, and hence that there is room at all for expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment PC00499-1 regarding noise impacts on Playa Del Rey. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00619-2

Comment:

Alternatives A and C are both somewhat misleadingly described as having the potential to reduce overall aircraft noise, but only because the figures associated with the federally mandated phase-out of noisier aircraft are included in the noise level predictions. Surely this is a separate issue that has little to do with the proposed runway relocations?

3. Comments and Responses

It is certainly possible that the phase-out will assist in bringing LAX noise closer to an acceptable level, but it is hard to see how any of the proposed north runway reconfigurations themselves will do anything other than worsen the already significant problems for residents in the Playa del Rey/Westchester area.

Response:

In spite of the proposed runway relocations of Alternatives A, C and D in which runways are aligned closer to the communities, this net effect would reduce overall aircraft noise exposure (i.e., increased noise exposure due to closer runways would be more than offset by the lower noise levels of quieter aircraft). Please see Topical Response TR-N-1 regarding the noise modeling approach. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00619-3

Comment:

As an experiment, I positioned a microphone outside our house, attached to a laptop computer, and wrote some custom software to take noise level readings every five seconds. The results of two approximately 2-hour periods are attached. Each flight is also isolated, and assigned a volume rating based on amplitude and duration. Flights with a rating over 130 are highlighted in red on the attached graphs. Typically (although this is a subjective judgement), these flights render outdoor conversation difficult. As the graphs show, not only are there a high frequency of these flights (sometimes 3 minutes or less between them!), but they also start at an exceptionally early hour. An increased number of flights can only make matters worse.

Response:

The graphs provided are not scaled, nor is a methodology for assessment provided. The information is therefore impossible to interpret. The commentator's residence in Playa Del Rey is located north of the departure path from the north runway complex. An increase in traffic associated with the growth patterns of Alternatives A and B would certainly result in increased number of flights in that area. However, the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative C and D would result in a lesser increase in the daily number of operations. For more information on noise related to Alternative D, please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and the related appendices, S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, and S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, for noise abatement and mitigation measures. Please see Topical Response TR-N-1 regarding the noise modeling approach and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC00619-4

Comment:

Sound-proofing of homes goes some way toward making the airport's presence more tolerable, but when residents are unable to enjoy the use of their gardens and outdoor spaces due to the near-constant screeching of aircraft overhead, it seems clear that we should be discussing ways to fix the current problems before we even consider the possibility of expansion.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program and Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

PC00619-5

Comment:

While I understand the necessity of finding methods whereby we can meet demand for air travel in Los Angeles, LAX has already expanded more than it should ever have done - it is presently a noisy, ugly

3. Comments and Responses

sprawl on an otherwise beautiful area of California coastal land. It makes no sense to continue to cram nearly all of Los Angeles' air traffic through one noisy, overcrowded airport, particularly when regional alternatives exist.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Neither the FAA nor LAWA have the authority to direct airlines to use one airport in favor of another airport. The Airline Deregulation Act of 1978, as amended, ended federal, state, and local governments role in determining the location for air service by airlines.

PC00620 Lincoln, Dale None Provided 6/19/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00586; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00586.

PC00621 O'Brien, Theresa None Provided 6/26/2001

PC00621-1

Comment:

The resent meeting that was held on LAX's expansion not only disturbed me to great length, but when I talked with your representatives I was informed a little more than usual. In fact, very frightening to say the least.

Response:

Comment noted. In addition, it should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00621-2

Comment:

I have had pictures, actually copies of the negatives that proposed all the configurations for that is being proposed for the expansion. In these films, but not printed out for the general public to see, were indications of "fuel storage tanks", were proposed to be on "Scatter Good" property, then piped underground to LAX to their storage tanks. The coastal commission saying fuel leaks could flow into the beach off Grand Avenue shot this plan down. New plans were proposed for a pipeline and new holding area.

Now at the latest meeting we hear the fuel tanks will be at the corner of Pershing and Imperial Avenues, under proposed a parking facility and future car rental establishments. The actual fuel lines will now go from Standard Oil Refinery through the Sewage Treatment plant, that's a Los Angeles Address onto LAX.

3. Comments and Responses

Here lies my problem; the proposed lines are way below standards, and cutting through the sewage plant seems to "exempt" any EIR's that are required and have been voided with other expansion plans. Of course everything is under "remodeling" to avoid any consequences that may arise from the real term, "expansion"

Response:

Comment noted. There are no plans for a fuel farm located at the corner of Pershing and Imperial Highway. The existing fuel farm would be relocated under Alternatives A and B. Under Alternative C, the fuel farm would remain in place and expanded to an area south of the existing facility. Under Alternative A, the fuel farm would be relocated to a 563,000 square foot area northwest of the intersection of Sepulveda Blvd and Imperial Highway. Under Alternative B, the fuel farm would be relocated to an off-site area south of the airport. As indicated on page 3-47 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the overall site footprint of the fuel farm under Alternative D would be reduced, but the fuel farm would retain its existing capacity and remain in its existing location.

Please see Section 4.24.3, Safety, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a more detailed discussion of the airport fuel farm.

PC00621-3

Comment:

In the proposed plan it will have to come through some of El Segundo's property. It was discovered with the Hyperon's expansion there were so many tunnels and underground wiring, their methane gas line plans had to be re-drawn. They had to admit there was no, zero, nothing in the archives to indicate what was done years ago. The discovery of piping that they had no knowledge to where it went, electrical wires that went here there and everywhere resulting in the original plans to be abandoned.

Response:

Of the four build alternatives, only Alternative B would involve Master Plan improvements extending through the City of El Segundo, specifically, pipelines associated with the option for an off-site fuel farm at the Chevron Refinery.

The implementation of any of the build alternatives would include implementation of Master Plan Commitment PU-1, Develop a Utility Relocation Program. In the event unknown underground utilities are discovered during project construction, coordination with the affected utility agency/company would occur as necessary and appropriate.

PC00621-4

Comment:

Then there's the plans from the "Green Line", to go underground at some point, but isn't that a bit too much. The consequences of a leak or explosion would be beyond comprehension. We know fuels lines already exist (4) that are going directly to the airport. But the addition of putting the Green Line doesn't exactly mix with the idea Electric or static electricity caused by these trains would be a good mixture. The underground proposal is in common sense terms are a bit ridiculous to say the least.

Response:

The proposed underground alignment for the Green Line along Imperial Highway (Alternatives A, B, and C) would be located to sufficiently avoid any fuel lines or fuel tanks. The fuel lines are designed to resist leakage and they are not susceptible to any static electricity that may be caused by nearby facilities. Finally, the concrete tunnel to be built for the Green Line would be designed to prevent leakage of fluids into the tunnel enclosure. Underground facilities that utilize electricity are often located in the vicinity of fuel lines. For example, electricity runs through gas station pumps and it does not present a hazard. Liquid fuel needs to have oxygen and be exposed to an ignition source in order to explode, and that will not occur inside a fuel pipe.

PC00621-5

Comment:

Now, what are your plans really? Tell us it won't happen, and do it anyway? Is there a song and dance it's all-safe, no worry or we're remodeling and this is part of The master plan. I hope my question and concern will be promptly answered.

Response:

Comment noted. The Master Plan will not be implemented until the Los Angeles City Council certifies the Final EIS/EIR and approves implementation of one of the alternatives, makes written findings, and adopts a statement of overriding considerations, if needed, and the FAA issues a Record of Decision.

PC00621-6

Comment:

Of course you have a wonderful opportunity to expand in Palmdale!

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00621-7

Comment:

Mass transporting people from there to the L.A. area via rail went with out a hitch after the earthquake. Passenger rail to and from there would be less traffic load to and from any airport. People that live in Apple Valley, or Oxnard would find this method of transportation a little more to their likings. But again no one is listening to common sense and practicality.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand.

PC00621-8

Comment:

You talk about the jobs that expanding LAX would create it! Daahh! Wake up; there would be jobs at the other airport as well. All the jobs this would create in one spot will only cause congestion that is focused in an already congested area.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00622

Murphy, Gary

None Provided

6/22/2001

PC00622-1

Comment:

I attended the recent presentation of the LAX master plan and found no justification for any increase in air traffic at LAX. The recent news that LAX leads all U.S. airports in near runway incidents makes it even clearer that LAX has reached its capacity.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

A forecast of aviation demand was prepared that projected future traffic levels based on historical trends and predictions of economic variables. This is an accepted methodology to project future aviation activity. The improvements depicted for all alternatives (in particular, providing a taxiway between each set of parallel runways) are proposed to reduce the potential for runway incursions. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. Also, please note that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

PC00622-2

Comment:

The study, which attempted to justify expansion, failed to address in any meaningful manner the problems of freeway traffic in the area. Local residents have long recognized the limited use that we can now make of the 405 and 105 freeways. Almost all future growth in the Los Angeles area will be in Orange County and inland areas. Adding this traffic to the freeways around LAX will bring them to a grinding halt for a large part of every day.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00622-3

Comment:

Even at current LAX passenger levels there is unnecessary pollution, wasted petroleum resources and a huge loss of passengers time in driving 60 to 80 miles due to lack of a regional approach to transportation. I hope the FAA can consider the quality of life for people in the area and block further growth at LAX. Only this will finally force a regional approach to air transportation.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00623

Bray, Sandra

None Provided

6/21/2001

PC00623-1

Comment:

LAX should "be constrained to operate safely within the capacity of its existing facilities" and other airports in the region must be developed to handle future air traffic increases.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00623-2

Comment:

LAX must not be allowed to continue carving up Westchester with property takeovers under the guise of environmental justice. This has happened just one time too many.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC00035-2 regarding residential acquisition, Response to Comment PC00013-5 regarding business acquisition and relocation impacts, and Response to Comment AL00018-1 regarding commercial property acquisition within the Westchester Business District. Issues relating to environmental justice were addressed in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Environmental justice concerns do not serve as justification for impacting a particular community instead of another, but rather relate to whether adverse human health or environmental impacts would disproportionately affect minority and/or low-income populations and the extent to which the economic benefits of the project would offset such impacts. Please also refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding the potential effects of the Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester.

PC00623-3

Comment:

I am sure that none of the LAWA bureaucracy will suffer any ill effects of their so called "modernization - reconfiguration - expansion plan" because they do not live in the areas of our community that they are targeting again!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00623-4

Comment:

I implore you to push for a regional solution to air traffic including the development of El Toro as an International Airport to help serve the region.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate

3. Comments and Responses

future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00624 **Heath, Mr. & Mrs.** **None Provided** **6/19/2001**
Charles

PC00624-1

Comment:

Some would defend airport expansion by saying there would be no significant increase in traffic on the 405 freeway which is now at maximum capacity.

May I suggest:

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC00624-2

Comment:

The health of adults and children under the flight path is already in jeopardy.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC00624-3

Comment:

The San Fernando valley and Orange County residents should not converge on us in the South Bay area.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please

3. Comments and Responses

see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00624-4

Comment:

You don't care about our history? It's preserved now in the Centinela Adobe, until you put that elevated expressway over our complex.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding impacts to the Centinela Adobe.

PC00624-5

Comment:

We beseech you to consider carefully our future, and the future of our children.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00625

**Clark, Alan B. &
Ruth A.**

None Provided

6/19/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00530; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC00530.

PC00626

Winters, Nancy

None Provided

6/18/2001

PC00626-1

Comment:

I am against LAX expansion even though I fly frequently for business & work in El Segundo.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00626-2

Comment:

I live in Hermosa Beach, & for 3 years I've experienced increased jet noise over my house.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00552-2.

PC00626-3

Comment:

I complain to the LAX NOISE hotline - usually at 12:05 AM, & the usual international flight between 2 & 3 AM that rattles my windows.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00552-3.

PC00626-4

Comment:

I would rather take light rail & bus to Burbank & fly from there than have more jet noise & pollution at my home. Please do not expand LAX - put more flights in San Bernardino, Riverside, & Orange Counties instead. Reduce congestion - don't make it worse!

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan, Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendices D and G and Technical Reports 2, 3 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendices S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-2 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00626-5

Comment:

The traffic to LAX is bad enough as is!

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PC00627

Ikemura, Bonnie

**Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108**

6/18/2001

PC00627-1

Comment:

Los Angeles Sheet Metal Workers' Local 108 supports the Master Plan alternative "C" for Los Angeles International Airport. LAX has long needed modernization notably direct access from the Green Line and 405 and 105 freeways.

Everyone who uses the airport will appreciate and benefit from a ring road to ease gridlock.

3. Comments and Responses

Adding a western terminal and new customs facilities will help to carry the passenger demand that is estimated to double over the next twenty years.

Our economy will be limited unless we improve the cargo facility to handle increased trade.

The Master Plan will create 50,000 jobs at LAX alone. The Master Plan will put 86,000 construction men and women to work. Improving and modernizing LAX will indirectly create many more jobs. These jobs will translate into active economic growth in the region across all sectors.

We need the Master Plan to retain our status as an economically viable city in the twenty-first century.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00628 Lindner, Dorothy None Provided 6/16/2001

PC00628-1

Comment:

Some years back, I became involved in attending airport commission, hearings due to LAX purchases (via inverse condemnation) in the Emerson Manor area of Westchester. Back then at the meetings, I witnessed my submitted questions for the commission being hand shredded and pitched in the nearby round file. (By color coding the papers it became very easy to observe the destruction of my proposed questions.)

At that time, Clifton Moore was the LAX general manager, and he often referred to LAX being "a good neighbor" (unheard of now!) and about LAX staying at 40 million annual passengers. (Are you laughing yet? Some people believed Moore, but I was not among the trusting.)

Our Emerson Manor home was purchased by LAX after at least one insultingly low offer. We waived the condition that LAX had air rights as part of the sale. (Picture, if you will, a helicopter crash or otherwise during the escrow period. What then?)

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00628-2

Comment:

The airport continues its disregard for surrounding areas of LAX and they continue to feel unanswerable to anyone or any government or civic/public agency. With more power, money, attorneys and time, LAX will continue its expansion and use any property, anytime, any way it sees fit for its own purposes.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00628-3

Comment:

As a result, the so called "Palmdale Airport" is more of an urban legend than anything else. Forewarned is forearmed. -This "touch of history" goes into the record as notice/warning about Los Angeles "World" Airports ruthless approach to ruining any neighborhood.

It reads: their way at any cost.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00628-4

Comment:

I really miss my former auto license plate,BAH LAX. It was appropriate while registering for a commission meeting in "the tower." (I signed in with Red Ink for very good reasons!) Good luck and keep excellent conversations, dates, places (visited or proposed for destruction, er, re-use), persons--as the courts require accurate information.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00628-5

Comment:

Delay delay delay may just eventually read: delete delete delete expansion plans, so other outlying areas will be forced into sharing the greed and added "MAP's as well. About time too! "BAH LAX"

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00629

Austin, Brenda

None Provided

6/13/2001

PC00629-1

Comment:

I object to the expansion in any form or plan. Currently the air and surface travel has increased to unliveable levels along with the pollution(dirt, dumped gasoline from airplanes, other debris from airplanes and exhaust from the cars in my residential area of 6th avenue and surrounding areas) in addition, the noise is deafing. There are over 1500 flights including every airline coming and leaving Los Angeles International Airport. I do not favor this expansion in any way.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00629-2

Comment:

I have developed breathing and hearing problems as a result of the increased traffic as outlined above.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-246 regarding the fact that existing and future noise levels at and around LAX are projected to be well below the OSHA and CalOSHA standards that serve to protect against hearing loss. Please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PC00629-3

Comment:

Structural problems such as window cracks, shaking and noise making adds to the unbearable living conditions.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration.

PC00629-4

Comment:

The property values is constantly be reduced and the possibility of selling is more decreased in the negative probability than positive as it was years ago and this is because of the airport increased traffic and this proposed plan of expansion.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00629-5

Comment:

The frequency of flights of airlines blocks out television and telephone capability to the level of possible peril when trying to call out in cases of normal communication and emergencies (911).

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels and Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program. Also see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. As presented in Tables S16, S17, S18, and S19 in Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, periodic high noise levels that would result in telephone interference noise are of limited duration. The noise levels that might interfere with speech cognition while using the telephone are on the order of 85 or more decibels. Only a limited number of residential uses near the airport are exposed to this noise level, and then for relatively short intervals of time during the day.

PC00630

Hyra, J.

None Provided

6/13/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00153; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00153.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00631 Hardin, Christine None Provided 6/12/2001

PC00631-1

Comment:

I am writing to you regarding the expansion of the LAX Airport. I was not able to attend the public hearing that was held on this subject this past Saturday. I just wanted to share my opinions with you because it is my understanding that you have some authority over this matter. So here are my concerns and comments. Thank you in advance for giving me the opportunity to be heard.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC00631-2

Comment:

First, I live in Venice and therefore my thoughts are not influenced by any concerns for my property value one way or the other. I do hear the airplanes from both the LAX and the Santa Monica Airport that has started to allow small jets. This is not healthy to have to hear these jets taking off and landing at all hours. I don't know how to explain it. There are other noises that we can't control, such as cars with their radios blasting, neighbors with their problems, etc...but these huge jets are more unsettling than other typical urban sounds. It just seems to me that people should have some peace in their homes at night and more airplanes landing at LAX is not going to facilitate that goal.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC00631-3

Comment:

Secondly, I understand that the population continues to grow and the needs change but would you agree that there will be a point when the LAX Airport has met it's limit for expansion? If there is a finite limit to the expansion, why not consider it to be at it's capacity now. Regardless of whether the expansion goes forward, there will be another group of people in 10 years that claim to need further expansion. So if at some point we are going to say that we have met capacity, no more expansion, then why not say it now while we still have a chance to preserve the little bit of peace and sanity here.

Response:

Comment noted. Chapter 2, Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action, of the Draft EIS/EIR explained the underlying purpose, objectives, and need for the Master Plan. The purpose and objectives of the Master Plan proposed expansion are to provide, in an environmentally sound manner that is compatible with surrounding land uses, sufficient airport capacity for passengers and freight in the Los Angeles region to sustain and advance the economic growth and vitality of the Los Angeles region. Please see Response to Comment PC00287-3 regarding future expansion plans beyond 2015. Also, please note that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

PC00631-4

Comment:

There is so much at stake for so many people. I think that the surrounding community is very much against any expansion of the airport. I am not writing on their behalf, I really believe that the money could better be spent at another airport to spread some of the noise and pollution around equally. There is Burbank Airport and Ontario Airport that might need expanding.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendices D and G and Technical Reports 2, 3 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendices S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-2 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00631-5

Comment:

The worst case scenario for not expanding, which is the best case scenario for the surrounding community, is that less planes get to land here, maybe the price of the tickets go up. If the airport were to expand, wouldn't that mean more people, more planes,

Response:

The number of aircraft arriving and departing at the airport daily will increase by about forty operations with Alternative C. The forty additional operations would consist of cargo operations scheduled at off-peak hours. The increase in people (passengers and employees) would follow as improvements are made to existing facilities, new facilities are developed, and the size of the fleet mix increases. Please see Chapter V, Section 3.3.2 of the Draft LAX Master Plan for a description of the activity levels associated with the alternatives. Also, please note that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

PC00631-6

Comment:

more people driving to and from the airport dropping people off and picking them up, more workers driving to and from their jobs at the airport? Well this means more traffic on Lincoln Blvd. and on the 405 Freeway. I don't know how familiar you are with these roads but they are, and have been for many years, used beyond their intended design.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding

3. Comments and Responses

proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PC00631-7

Comment:

What about the environmental impact of the place?

Response:

The environmental impacts associated with the proposed LAX Master Plan alternatives were addressed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00631-8

Comment:

Why should the airport officials' desire to have more people move specifically through LAX be more or even equal in importance to the businesses that would be displaced when the land (over 250 acres) they occupy is questioned? If the statistics said that we should plan for 150 million passengers in the year 2015 instead of the 98 million they now project, would that mean we should rationalize the acquisition of 500 acres for an airport expansion? Basically what I am saying is that if there will be a limit to the expansion of the LAX Airport then please do what I believe to be the right thing and call it a day right now.

Response:

Comment noted. If the forecast predicted 150 million annual passengers (MAP), LAWA would have to determine how much of that demand it was willing to accommodate at LAX. The amount of property necessary to accommodate 150 million passengers could be more or less than 500 acres. The acquisition of the 250 acres the commentor references would be needed for Alternative C to accommodate 89.6 MAP. The airfield capacity of Alternative C would limit this alternative to 89.6 MAP. Please see Response to Comment PC00013-5 regarding business acquisition and relocation impacts. Also, it should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

PC00631-9

Comment:

Just while typing this letter (inside my house) at 11:00 P.M. I have heard at least eight major jets taking off at LAX. There is so much noise pollution living here, we need some relief wherever we can get it.

Response:

Aircraft noise during the nighttime hours is perceived to be more intense due to the reduction of ambient noise levels. The number of operations that are projected to occur during the night hours will increase, and with that increase will come a commensurate increase in aircraft noise. To institute restrictions on nighttime operations would require approval of such measures by the FAA. To gain that approval, the benefits of the measure are required to outweigh its costs. The heavily loaded flights to Asia have an enormous economic benefit to the region, and they need to leave during the night hours to meet the most efficient window of time for delivery in Asian markets. The costs of stopping these operations would equal the economic benefit to the community derived from them, and the benefits from their cessation would not justify the action under Part 161 of the Federal Aviation Regulations. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration and Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

PC00631-10

Comment:

If the city also is partly in the Valley, then why can't they share some of the burden with an expansion of the Burbank Airport?

Response:

The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00631-11

Comment:

Thank you for your consideration. I hope you will consider the above comments when making decisions regarding this very important urban planning issue.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC00631-1 through PC00631-10 above.

PC00632

Gare, Helen

None Provided

6/12/2001

PC00632-1

Comment:

I am in favor of airport expansion to regional airports instead of placing all The burden on Those who live in LAX's vicinity, For example, Denver and Kansas City have airports out of Town, Taking pressure off The city dwellers

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00633 Halpern, Sam None Provided 6/12/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00140; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC00140.

**PC00634 Montgomerie, MD,
John None Provided 6/11/2001**

PC00634-1

Comment:

I am firmly of the opinion that the LAX expansion is a bad idea for West Los Angeles.

1. It is bad for the Environment
2. It is a major problem for road traffic which is already beyond capacity.

Response:

Comment noted. Environmental impacts of each alternative were addressed in Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00634-2

Comment:

There are a number of areas in Southern California where another airport could be constructed or enlarged especially expanding areas like Ontario that would welcome such expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00635 Marx, Michelle None Provided 6/11/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00084; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC00084.

PC00636 Playford, Michelle None Provided 6/10/2001

PC00636-1

Comment:

My personal opinion is - "I'm against any airport expansion." - That is my stance. However, I believe that further airport expansion is inevitable either sooner or later, no matter how sad it is or how many people oppose it.

My only suggestion is that when you do expand the airport, you do so with care and concern for the surrounding community, and you do not rule out expanding the other area airports or building new ones - an idea that has been advanced and does make sense.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00637 Michetti, Jo Ann None Provided 6/10/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00093; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00093.

PC00638 Dickens, Mr. & Mrs. None Provided 6/9/2001
Richard

PC00638-1

Comment:

WE ARE WESTCHESTER HOME OWNERS FOR OVER 50 YEARS. WE HAVE SEEN PREVIOUS LAX EXPANSIONS AND ENDURED THE NOISE, THE INCREASED TRAFFIC AND PROPERTY GRAB. WE DON'T WANT TO SEE WESTCHESTER DISTURBED FURTHER.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses is provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00638-2

Comment:

WE BELIEVE THAT IF SOME EXPANSION IS INEVITABLE IT CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED BY THE TOTAL REMOVAL OF ALL AIR FREIGHT AT LAX. MOVE AIR FREIGHT TO PALMDALE OR ONTARIO, THUS OPENING ACRES OF TERMINAL SPACE AT LAX, REDUCING CROWDED AIR SPACE FOR PASSENGER TRAVEL ONLY, AND ELIMINATING CROWDED FREEWAY ACCESSSES BY TRUCKS THAT DELIVER AND PICK UP AIR FREIGHT AT LAX. IT SEEMS TO US THAT THE SUBJECT OF AIR FREIGHT HAS NOT BEEN UNDER DISCUSSION SO FAR. WE BELIEVE IT SHOULD RECIEVE CONSIDERABLE INTEREST AS A MEANS TO SAVING WESTCHESTER FOR

3. Comments and Responses

RIGHTFUL PROPERTY OWNERS AND RESIDENTS. PLEASE DO NOT DISTURB WESTCHESTER ANY FURTHER BY EXPANDING LAX.

Response:

Air cargo has become an increasingly important growth industry worldwide in response to the globalization of manufacturing and other business activity. This is particularly true in the LA region, which is one of the most industrialized areas in the world, with leadership in high technology and media industries. These industries export time-sensitive goods for which air shipment is essential. LAX today enjoys a dominant position in the world's air cargo market and is forecast to continue doing so in the future. First, LAX is the key U.S. gateway for air shipments to/from the Pacific Rim and Oceania from practically all of North America and Latin America. Other international air cargo also connects through LAX on its way to/from domestic destinations. Second, LAX is a trans-shipment and consolidation point for several major all-cargo airlines. Specifically, FedEx has a domestic hub at LAX and uses LAX as its main Pacific Rim gateway. The international cargo operations are forecast to increase more rapidly than domestic cargo operations and these cargo activities would stay at LAX since there is no other airport in the region that could provide the needed facilities to accommodate the growth.

The hub and spoke route system offers the most economically efficient system to move passengers and cargo throughout the country and throughout the day. Airlines establish hub and spoke route systems centered at geographical viable locations with direct services to markets where demand is high. The airlines provide connecting services to small markets where demand is not high enough to provide direct services in a profitable manner. By using small aircraft to low demand markets, the hub and spoke operation enables airlines provide air services to small markets that would not be served otherwise and maintain lower operating costs. To relocate these aircraft operations to other airports by providing direct services is not financially feasible for airline operations. On the other hand, airlines may choose to redistribute connecting passengers through their other hub airports when one hub airport is overly congested. The air service changes predicted by the Master Plan reflect this potential strategy.

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00640 Wong, Aida None Provided 6/9/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00098; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00098.

PC00641 Komoc, Dr. Bashar None Provided 6/8/2001

PC00641-1

Comment:

I am taking the time to express my utmost concern regarding the LAX- Expansion.

As a resident of Westchester I am very opposed to any expansion plan of LAX.

Any expansion of this airport would mean definitely more pollution, more congestion, tremendous noise and suffocating traffic.

We owe it to our families, our kids, as well as our selves, to try to create a clean, comfortable, relaxing environment.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, and human health and safety in 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-

3. Comments and Responses

LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase, and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00642 Hessler, Gerhard & None Provided 6/7/2001
Marta

PC00642-1

Comment:

We have lived at this address for almost 50 years, we are very upset by what the politicians are doing to our precious area. We raised two sons here & now are watching with great pride as two of our grandchildren attend Loyola - Marymount U. The greedy developers are doing their best to destroy our town bit by bit, if they keep this up, very soon this area won't be fit to live in. Why can't these creatures go out to the desert and use up some of that space, that won't be missed by any one. They should feel ashamed at what they are doing to so many of us who put down their roots at what was once a lovely community.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00643 Margolin, Mitchell None Provided 6/7/2001

PC00643-1

Comment:

I OPPOSE ANY & ALL LAX EXPANSION AND A LAX EXPRESSWAY THAT WOULD DISRUPT AIRPORT BLVD. I HAVE BEEN A HOMEOWNER IN WESTCHESTER FOR 8 1/2 YEARS. I LOVE THIS COMMUNITY. THIS LAX EXPANSION ISSUE HAS BEEN AND IS A NIGHTMARE FOR MY FAMILY AND I.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway.

PC00643-2

Comment:

LAX HAS BORE THE BRUNDT OF THIS BIG CITY'S AIR TRAFFIC. IN NYC, THERE ARE 3 BIG AIRPORTS TO SERVE THE REGION; KENNEDY LA GUARDIA & NEWARK. HERE IN LA, THE LA WORLD AIRPORTS & OTHERS WANT LAX TO CARRY THE LOAD OF THE WHOLE CITY. USE NYC AS THE MODEL & DEVELOP IN LONG BCH, PALMDALE, ONTARIO OR EL TORO. THE LAX ISSUES ARE UNFAIRLY FORCING MY FAMILY AND MANY OTHERS TO LEAVE THIS AREA BECAUSE OF THE UNSTABLENESS OF OUR WELL BEING. LEAVE US ALONE AND TAKE THE AIR TRAFFIC & GO ELSEWHERE

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed

3. Comments and Responses

pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00644 Sexton, L. None Provided 6/7/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00158; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC00158.

PC00645 Adkins, Kathii None Provided 6/6/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00104; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00104.

PC00646 Ramos, Gloria None Provided 6/6/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00101; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00101.

PC00647 Bettencourt, Patricia None Provided

PC00647-1

Comment:

I received this letter from the executive director, Lydia H. Kennard regarding the LAX Master Plan, because I work at LAX, however I and so many others work at LAX live in Westchester.

There plan takes away our homes.

Our home or gridlock!

Find another way.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed residential relocation in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

PC00647-2

Comment:

El Toro is a step in the right direction, no homes, schools, etc, in the way. No more people, no more cars, no more pollution. Im not ready to give up my home to add to the gridlock and pollution at LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00648

Ragus, Nicholas

None Provided

6/6/2001

PC00648-1

Comment:

LAWA has progressively doomed my community over the past five years with aircraft on approach to LAX. The Draft Master Plan & Draft EIS/EIR does not address the negative impact LAX has on my community 20 miles away from the airport. As I write this form aircraft have been passing overhead every 60 - 90 seconds at different altitudes and noise levels. Why do you allow these flights over residential areas? Two miles south of here is nothing but factories. Please review the enclosed letter.

Response:

Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also, please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

PC00648-2

The attachment included as part of this comment letter is identical to the attachment to comment letter PC00105; please refer to Responses to Comments PC00105-2 through PC00105-10.

PC00649

Bettencourt, P

None Provided

PC00649-1

Comment:

ABOUT TWO YEARS AGO, THE AIRPORT SAID OK WE ARE NOT TAKING ANY MORE HOMES, WE ARE GOING TO SOUNDPROOF YOUR HOME IF THE DECIMALS ARE OVER 63 TO 65 OR SO. WE THOUGHT GREAT, THEY WOULDN'T SPEND ALL THAT MONEY ON SOUNDPROOFING IF THEY WERE GOING TO TAKE OUR HOMES. WRONG, LAWA LIED AS USUAL THEY NOW WANT TO TAKE MY HOME AND 56 OTHERS PLUS 263 BUSINESSES FROM THE WESTCHESTER COMMUNITY, THAT THEY PROMISED THEY WOULD NOT TAKE. WHEN IS A LINE GOING TO BE DRAWN TO STOP THEM FROM DESTROYING A COMMUNITY AND CAUSING MORE POLLUTION,

3. Comments and Responses

NOISE, CONJESTION AND A GREATER HEALTH HAZARD TO THOSE THAT ARE LEFT IF THEY ARE ALLOWED TO EXPAND.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed land acquisition for each of the alternatives in Chapter 3 and Section 4.2, Land Use. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 concerning impacts within the Community of Westchester. Also note, as described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6.5), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, in contrast to the other build alternatives, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative), does not propose any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester Business District. As was described in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences and Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA's programs for the acquisition of residences and business properties would conform to governing federal and State requirements for the payment of just compensation for the purchase of any needed property and applicable relocation assistance and payments would be provided to any person displaced from their home or business. Please also see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation. For the effects of the Master Plan alternatives on Noise, Congestion, Air Quality, and Human health, please see Sections 4.1, Noise, 4.3, Surface Transportation, 4.6, Air Quality, and 4.24, Human Health and Safety, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00649-2

Comment:

MOST OF THE HOMES THEY ARE GOING TO TAKE ARE OWNED BY SENIOR CITIZENS, WHO ARE RETIRED OR ARE GETTING READY TO RETIRE IN A COUPLE OF YEARS OR SO. THINKING WE WORKED ALL OUR LIFES LIKE MOST, NOW WE CAN ENJOY WHAT WE LOOKED FORWARD TO AND WORKED TOWARD ALL THOSE YEARS. THEN LAWA COMES ALONG AND SAYS TOO BAD, WE WANT IT, WE'RE TAKING IT. FIND SOMETHING ELSE. WELL WE DON'T WANT TO, THIS IS OUR HOME, WE ARE NOT AT AN AGE WHERE WE CAN START OVER AND WE SHOULD'T HAVE TO, JUST BECAUSE LAWA WANTS TO CAUSE MORE POLLUTION, NOISE, CONJESTION AND HEALTH HAZARDS.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00040-46. Please also see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation issues.

PC00649-3

Comment:

REGARDLESS OF WHAT THEY SAY OR THE NUMBERS THEY PUT IN THEIR EIR REPORTS, THEY ARE EXPERTS AT LYING AND HIDING THE TRUTH.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00649-4

Comment:

LOS ANGELES OWNS 4 OTHER AIRPORTS THAT THEY CAN BUILD UP, WITH NO HOMES, SCHOOLS OR BUSINESSES TAKEN. PALMDALE ALONE HAS 17,500 ACRES OF LAND. PLEASE DON'T LET THE ENVIRONMENT SUFFER ANYMORE THEN IT IS ALREADY AT LAX AND SO MANY SURROUNDING AREAS IF THEY ARE ALLOWED TO EXPAND BEYOND WHAT THEY ARE AT NOW. SCAG HAS ALREADY COME OUT IN THEIR REPORT THAT LAX IS ALREADY AT THEIR CAPACITY AND THEN SOME, SHOULD NOT GO BEYOND. THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO READ THIS.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00650 Cloroly, Eileen None Provided

PC00650-1

Comment:

I JUST WANT TO BRING TO YOUR ATTENTION THE POLLUTION OF THE JET FUEL BURNOFF LAX IS EMITTING ON THE PEOPLE AND PROPERTY OF THE WESTCHESTER COMMUNITY AND BEYOND. YOU WASH YOUR CAR AND A DAY OR TWO LATER IT HAS THIS LAYER OF BLACK SOOT ALL OVER IT. THE OUTSIDE OF OUR HOMES HAVE TO PAINTED SOONER THEN SHOULD BE BECAUSE OF IT.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC00650-2

Comment:

WE ALL HAVE TO BREATHE THAT. IT IS A SERIOUS HEALTH PROBLEM.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC00650-3

Comment:

NOW THEY WANT TO INCREASE THE CAPACITY AND EXPAND EVEN MORE. I REALLY HOPE THE EIR TAKES A SERIOUS LOOK AT WHAT THE SITUATION IS NOW, AND THAT IT CAN ONLY GET WORSE, IF THEY ARE ALLOWED TO EXPAND THE WAY THEY WANT TO. PLEASE THINK OF ALL THE MEN, WOMEN AND CHILDREN WHO WILL BE AFFECTED. WHO COMES FIRST, THE ENVIRONMENT, PEOPLE OR LAX? THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO READ THIS. I JUST WANT TO STAY HEALTHY, KEEP MY HEARING AND ENJOY THE TREES, GRASS AND FLOWERS. RESIDENT OF WESTCHESTER AND FOR ALL THOSE PEOPLE IN THE SURROUNDING AREA'S OF THE AIRPORT. THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00651 Cloroly, Eileen None Provided

PC00651-1

Comment:

WILL YOU PLEASE LISTEN TO THE PEOPLE OF THE WESTCHESTER COMMUNITY, WHILE THERE IS STILL A COMMUNITY. BECAUSE IF ITS' UP TO LAWA, IT WILL SOON BE A NON EXISTENT COMMUNITY. WITH THE POLLUTION, CONJESTION, NOISE AND HEALTH HAZARDS WE HAVE NOW, LAWA WANTS TO ADD TO IT BY TAKING YET MORE HOMES AND BUSINESSES IN ORDER TO EXPAND LAX. THINK OF THE ADDED BURDEN THIS PUTS ON WESTCHESTER AND THE SURROUNDING CITIES ON ALL SIDES. PLEASE STOP AND THINK OF THE MEN, WOMEN, CHILDREN AND ANIMALS BREATHING IN THE ADDED JET FUEL BURNOFF. DESTROYING TREES, GRASS, FLOWERS AND MOST IMPORTANT THE PEOPLES HEALTH. PLEASE TRY TO THINK OF THE PEOPLE FOR A CHANGE AND WHAT IS BEST FOR THEM AND THE ENVIRONMENT THEY LIVE IN. DON'T LET LAWA ADD TO THE POLLUTION, NOISE, CONJESTION AND HEALTH HAZARDS WE ALREADY HAVE, WHEN IT IS NOT NECESSARY.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, human health and safety in 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, and impacts to trees, grass, and flowers in Section 4.10, Biotic Communities, Section 4.11, Endangered Species, and Section 4.17.2, Natural Resources. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester and Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00651-2

Comment:

HELP STOP THE MONOPOLY OF LAWA. LET THEM USE THE MONEY TO BUILD UP THE OTHER FOUR AIRPORTS THAT LOS ANGELES OWNS. LIKE ONTARIO AND PALMDALE. THE ACRES OF LAND THAT HAS NO HOMES OR SCHOOLS IN THE WAY. THEREFORE NO HEALTH HAZARD TO THE PEOPLE AS IN WESTCHESTER AND THE SURROUNDING CITIES. I THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO READ THIS AND THINK ABOUT IT.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale, and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. Human health impacts were addressed in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PC00652 Kojima, Mary None Provided 6/4/2001

PC00652-1

Comment:

I am unable to attend a public hearing to be held on June 9, 2001; therefore, I wish to express my concern and opposition to the Draft EIS/EIR proposal, particularly as it affects the Centinela Adobe facility located at 7634 Midfield Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90045,

This historical landmark must be preserved. It is an educational opportunity for visitors, young and old alike, to learn the background of the Centinela Valley, the buildings and furnishings cannot be duplicated, the site is used for invaluable community events, etc.

It is my hope that the proposed construction plans will in no way disturb the Centinela Adobe Complex.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding impacts to the Centinela Adobe.

PC00653 Bettencourt, P. None Provided 6/3/2001

PC00653-1

Comment:

CAN YOU PLEASE EXPLAIN TO ME, HOW, WITH THE NOISE, POLLUTION AND CONJESTION THE AIRPORT IS PUTTING US THROUGH NOW WITH IT'S CAPACITY AND THEY WANT TO INCREASE THAT AMOUNT, THAT IT WON'T HAVE A MUCH WORSE IMPACT ON THE WESTCHESTER COMMUNITY AND ALL THE SURROUNDING AREAS.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses in Appendices D and G, and Technical Reports 2, 3 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR, and Appendices S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-2 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase, and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00653-2

Comment:

THEY ARE GETTING LIKE A MONOPOLY. LOS ANGELES OWNS 4 OTHER AIRPORTS THAT THEY CAN IMPROVE ON AND BUILD UP, AND NOT TAKE HOMES AND BUSINESSES AWAY FROM A COMMUNITY.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00653-3

Comment:

LAWA WILL NOT BE HAPPY UNTIL THEY TURN WESTCHESTER INTO ONE VAST AIRPORT. THINK OF THE EIR ON THAT AND THE FACT THEY ARE DESTROYING A COMMUNITY AND NO ONE SEEMS TO CARE EXCEPT WESTCHESTER AND THE SURROUNDING CITIES OF THE AIRPORT. PLEASE THINK HARD ABOUT THE HEALTH, SAFETY AND LIFE OF A FAMILY COMMUNITY, WHOSE WAY OF LIFE AND WELL BEING IS SLOWLY BEING DRAINED AWAY AND FOR WHAT REASON OTHER THEN LAWLA WANTS TO GROW BEYOND IT'S CAPACITY, TO CREATE MORE POLLUTION, NOISE, CONJESTION AND HEALTH HAZARDS. PLEASE THINK VERY HARD ABOUT THIS. THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO READ THIS.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, and traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00654

Hetz, Matthew

None Provided

6/1/2001

PC00654-1

Comment:

I write regarding the proposed expansion of Los Angeles International Airport. I live in Westchester, approximately one-and-one-half miles north of the airport, and I oppose the expansion plans currently put forward by the City of Los Angeles for the following reasons.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below. In addition, it should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00654-2

Comment:

- The airport already is a tremendous source of neighborhood noise from jets. These sources of noise range from jets landing and taking off; jets idling on the runways; jets flying over my residence in their flight path after they have made a turn over the Pacific Ocean and are then headed Northeast; planes that don't make touchdown, and then have to rev their engines to regain altitude to then make a turnaround and attempt the landing again; to jets engines that are being serviced at all hours and are run at what seems like full bore for lengthy periods of time until they are in sync (I hear their oscillations and at times the revving engines create two pitches at an interval of a major-second). In essence, the jet noise is nearly continuous until late into the night. And when it is foggy, the noise from idling jets is quite loud. This constant noise is very irritating, and there are times when I need to leave the neighborhood (my home) to seek some relief. My only conclusion from the proposed massive expansion is that the noise will increase in loudness and frequency.

Response:

Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the

Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC00654-3

Comment:

While the city does have a soundproofing policy for area homes, I like to keep my windows to experience the wonderful sea breeze. Furthermore, if the house is closed tight to keep out the airport noise, some type of circulation device would be needed, and why add another air condition unit to take more power from the energy grid?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program and Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels. Features of residential soundproofing under the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP) typically include alterations to existing ventilation systems or a new system to maintain fresh air circulation, and acoustically-rated doors and windows. The use of these doors and windows prevents cooling loss and therefore increases the effectiveness of the air conditioning or ventilation system. Regarding taking power from the energy grid, during the electricity shortage experienced in 2000-2001 the City of Los Angeles did not experience any supply shortfalls, and sold surplus electricity to meet the shortfalls experienced by other utilities.

PC00654-4

Comment:

- Westchester is already impacted by the current levels of ground traffic, and the proposed massive expansion will only acerbate the matter. I live near Sepulveda and over the past years I have noted a marked increase of traffic on that boulevard, and all surrounding streets. Much of this is airport traffic gauging from the number of buses, limousines, and cars with multiple passengers and luggage in the seats.

Response:

The Master Plan would help to separate regional airport traffic from local traffic, and satisfy future airport traffic demand while mitigating impacts to the surrounding street system. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00654-5

Comment:

Additionally, the proposed Playa Vista development is situated about a mile from my residence, making it about three miles to the airport. This development (admitted to I believe by the developers and the City of Los Angeles) will have a gross, negative impact on the traffic in the local area. I think the airport should be included in this term of an area local to the development, and will make the traffic situation for the airport and on local streets much, much worse. Playa Vista will also negatively affect the San Diego Freeway, the main traffic artery serving the airport.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment PC00148-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00148-2.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00654-6

Comment:

While I take it that the FAA does not hold jurisdiction over traffic matters for ground transportation, traffic does impact passengers and freight drivers who use the airport, and these increases to the traffic will increase travel times for airport ground traffic.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00654-7

Comment:

- Currently LAX handles a large volume of commercial air freight, and the impact of the increased truck traffic from the proposed expansion would again greatly impact the area in a negative manner. There should be alternatives to handling air freight other than having LAX as the primary destination.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts of cargo activity in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation (subsection 4.3.2.6.1). In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic and Response to Comment PC00638-2 regarding LAX as a primary destination for air freight. Alternative D, which is addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, would not increase cargo handling facilities at LAX. As indicated in Table S3-2 (Section 3.3, Description of Alternatives) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, cargo operations are projected to increase to about 3,120,000 tons/year at LAX by 2015 under the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative D.

PC00654-8

Comment:

- I feel other airports in the Southern California region should be expanded to handle the strain that LAX currently bears, and to handle the projected increases in air travel for passengers and freight. The other airports of which I am aware of are the El Torro Marine Base in Orange County, Long Beach, Ontario, and Palmdale/Lancaster.

LAX is busy enough, and crowded enough today. While there will be an inevitable increase in air traffic, other areas in the region need to be utilized to absorb some, if not most, of future increases in air travel.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

3. Comments and Responses

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00655 **Cullen, Doris** **None Provided** **5/29/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00521; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC00521.

PC00656 **Heath, Mildred** **None Provided** **5/29/2001**

PC00656-1

Comment:

Please consider the danger of adding more cars to 405 at Arbor Vitae Ave. (road rage and gridlock) (pollution).

Response:

The assumptions regarding the Arbor Vitae interchange are summarized in Topical Response TR-ST-2. FHWA has withdrawn its support for a half interchange at Arbor Vitae, and the half interchange is not part of the LAX Master Plan. FHWA policy is to only consider full proposed interchanges, not partial ones. This interchange is not proposed as a mitigation for any airport impacts. The comment should be addressed to Caltrans, the Southern California Association of Governments, and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority as the agencies responsible for regional transportation planning.

PC00656-2

Comment:

There is only so much air space for the airplanes above us.

Response:

Airspace capacity is considered for any proposed runway expansion project. The analysis for LAX found that there is sufficient airspace capacity to serve the activity generated by the runway systems in each alternative. As discussed in the Draft LAX Master Plan (Chapter II, Existing Conditions, Section 2.1), an Airside Working Group was formed to review the assumptions, approach, and results of the airside analysis, including the assessment of airspace capacity. The Airside Working Group included participation from LAWA, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), and the LAX carriers. All airspace assumptions, including those for triple independent approaches (necessary for Alternatives A and B), were reviewed with the Airside Working Group. The FAA will not approve an alternative that is not safe, and prior to conducting any operations at LAX with any modified airfield, the FAA would develop air traffic control procedures that ensure the continued safety of flight operations at LAX.

PC00656-3

Comment:

Why should people travel from San Fernando Valley and Orange County to LAX for flights, in increasing numbers, when other airports can be developed.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements

3. Comments and Responses

and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00658 Ghilardi, Adelina None Provided 5/27/2001

PC00658-1

Comment:

I have been a resident of Westchester for over 50 years and have been very proud to live in this neighborhood. I was here before the jewel of LAX Airport was built and before the 405 Freeway existed. I have seen the increased congestion, pollution, noise, etc. go from bad to worse.

I want to go on record as being completely opposed to your LAX Master Plan Alternatives A, B, and C. My friends and neighbors all feel the same way.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendices D and G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00659 Haskell, Walter Historical Society of Centinela Valley 5/25/2001

PC00659-1

Comment:

The Centinela Adobe, a 150 year old structure, adjacent to the 405 Freeway in Westchester is threatened by the proposed elevated expressway to LAX!

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding impacts to the Centinela Adobe.

PC00659-2

Comment:

The venerable structure has withstood earthquakes and fires down through years, but it now faces its greatest challenge - the LAX expressway!

The Centinela Adobe, La Casa de la Centinela was built by Ygnacio Machado in 1834 on land which was known as the Centinela Rancho. It was the first major structure in the entire Centinela Valley. It passed through a succession of owners until it was acquired by Sir Robert Burnett, a Scotch nobleman, who expanded it to 25,000 acres. Burnett sold the property to Daniel Freeman who farmed it and later established the town of Inglewood

The Centinela Adobe was placed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1937

The structure was to be demolished for tract homes, when in 1950 the Native Daughters led a public subscription to save it. \$20,000 was raised, and the property given to the City of Inglewood, which annexed it to that city. Since that time, it has been lovingly administered and shown to the public by the Historical Society of Centinela Valley

The Adobe is open to the public on Wednesdays and Sunday afternoons, where it is shown and interpreted by docents. Through the years, thousands of school children have passed through its portals. Special tours are offered to groups. There are no paid employees - all are volunteers!

On the Adobe property are two other significant buildings: the 1889 Daniel Freeman Land Office, now a museum of Inglewood business, and the Walter Haskell Heritage Center, containing artifacts from the 1889 Freeman residence, historical photos and books. These buildings comprise the Centinela Adobe complex.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding impacts to the Centinela Adobe.

PC00659-3

Comment:

La Casa de la Centinela is the historical center piece of the Centinela Valley! IT MUST BE SAVED FROM ENCROACHMENT OR DESTRUCTION

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding impacts to the Centinela Adobe.

PC00660

Ehret, John

None Provided

PC00660-1

Comment:

This is a suggestion to construct a Taxiway on the north side of the existing North North Runway and not move the runway nor add a Taxiway in between them. This is for plan C proposal.

For the following reasons:

1. You will not be increasing the NOISE . A taxing airplane could not be heard over the existing noise.
2. It would a less costly than moving a Runway and still adding a Taxiway down the middle which is unsafe as wing spans increase with the new jumbo jets.
3. Any interruption to existing air traffic would be minimized during construction when comparing to your Plan C, which could be years to complete while traffic is increasing.
4. The Cargo planes could taxi to the new easterly cargo facilities uninhibited by the passenger planes going to the terminals as they do now.
5. The suggested Taxiway would more compatible with the large draining ditch on the north side as the wing could stick out over it while taxing.

[The following are handwritten comments on attachments]

Revision to Plan C Add taxiway rather than moving existing runway or adding a taxiway in between

Plan C Problems Higher noise for neighbors. High blds on Sepulveda & Parkway caution & higher costs and traffic interruption

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The content of this comment is essentially the same as comment AL00015-1; please see Response to Comment AL00015-1.

PC00661 Brown, Matthew None Provided 2/20/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00005; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC00005.

PC00662 Gabriel, Anna None Provided 3/29/2001

PC00662-1

Comment:

1. I oppose Alternative C - please look for a Regional Solution that would not place all the burden and environmental injustices on our communities.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed potential disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and low-income populations in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix F and Appendix S-D.

PC00662-2

Comment:

2. I am opposed because I am entitled to not have the quality of my life, neighborhood, and family atmosphere negatively impacted by additional pollution, traffic, vibration and noise.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00662-3

Comment:

3. How can the EIR/EIS possibly justify the traffic impacts and noise impacts. This can not possibly be justified by officials without looking at the negative impacts, to residents, with a blind eye. Officials need to be held accountable and honest when reviewing the noise, air, pollution, vibration, and traffic impacts to our

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. In addition, please see Response to Comment PC00662-2 above.

PC00662-4

Comment:

4. I understand that the method used to determine acceptable noise levels is outdated and may not be an accurate way to determine the true noise impact to residents. Accurate and reliable base line data and standards should be demanded when making such an important decision that will affect our community.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-1 regarding the noise modeling approach and Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences.

PC00662-5

Comment:

5. I am entitled to environmental justice. I am concerned about my breathing and my hearing that will be negatively impacted by the LAX Expansion.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-190. Also, please see Response to Comment AL00017-246 regarding the existing and future noise levels at and around LAX that are projected to be well below the OSHA and CalOSHA standards that serve to protect against hearing loss. Finally, please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

PC00663

Cayette, Claretta

None Provided

4/16/2001

PC00663-1

Comment:

The expansion of LAX Airport - I am totally against for the following reasons:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below. In addition, it should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00663-2

Comment:

1. More pollutions will increase -

Response:

Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In general, the predicted air pollution impacts of any of the LAX Master Plan build alternatives will be lower than the predicted impacts of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution.

PC00663-3

Comment:

2. More plants will be sick and die -

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed potential impacts to sensitive biotic communities and sensitive floral species in Section 4.10, Biotic Communities, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix J and Technical Report 7 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-H of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00663-4

Comment:

3. Too much noise (now)

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PC00663-5

Comment:

4. No privacy

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00663-6

Comment:

5. More people will have sinus problems

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

Health risk assessment cannot be used to link individual illnesses such as sinus problems to past chemical exposures, nor can health risk assessments and epidemiological studies prove that a specific toxic substance causes an individual's illness (California EPA, 2001). As described in the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR health risks (cancer, non-cancer chronic and non-cancer acute) for the majority of nearby residents would be lower for Alternative D than for 1996 baseline, Year 2000 conditions and the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternative D provides for airfield improvements that would enable aircraft to move more efficiently, thereby reducing air pollutant emissions from aircraft operating in taxi/idle mode, and provides substantial improvements to the on-airport and off-airport surface transportation systems, thereby reducing air pollutant emissions from motor vehicles. Additionally, Alternative D, unlike the No Action/No Project Alternative, includes Master Plan commitments and mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions.

California EPA. 2001. A Guide to Health Risk Assessment. Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment.

PC00663-7

Comment:

6. More greed increase with big businesses expansion

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00663-8

Comment:

7. More planes can be unsafe -

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00664

Hurd, Geraldine

None Provided

4/19/2001

PC00664-1

Comment:

I AM AGAINST THE EXPANSION OF LAX, for the following reasons:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below. In addition, it should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00664-2

Comment:

The excessive noise the planes create.

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00664-3

Comment:

- The dirt, oil and grease emitted as the planes fly over the community.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding soot and deposition.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00664-4

Comment:

- Our home windows are sticky from airplane oil emissions. Plants and trees also suffer from oil pollution.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC00664-5

Comment:

- For health reasons. The emissions from the planes are inhaled by children and adults.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts

PC00664-6

Comment:

- Our television and radio reception are bad.

Response:

Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program and Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing noise levels.

PC00664-7

Comment:

The community is sleep deprived from the constant roar of aircraft, all day and especially after 11:30 P.M. until daybreak.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC00664-8

Comment:

The structures of our homes have been weakened (windows, doors, and foundations).

Response: Please see Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration.

PC00664-9

Comment: - If this plan is approved, the acquisition of property in Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Inglewood, Playa Del Rey, and South Central will displace countless children, adults, and especially seniors.

HOMEOWNERS CANNOT REPLACE THEIR PROPERTIES FOR WHAT THEY WILL PROBABLY BE OFFERED. NEW HOMES START AT \$200,000 AND UP.

Response: Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation issues. The Master Plan would not require residential acquisition within El Segundo, Hawthorne, Inglewood, Playa Del Rey, or South Central Los Angeles.

PC00664-10

Comment: AGAIN, I AM AGAINST THE LAX EXPANSION PLAN. Please, consider some of the alternative areas, such as El Toro or Burbank.

Response: Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00665 Bridge, Yanique None Provided 4/11/2001

PC00665-1

Comment: 1. How will my allergies be affected with your added solution? (LAX Expansion)

Response: Please see Response to Comment PC00663-6.

PC00665-2

Comment: (2) With your expansion plan of LAX will the property value of the Homes in Playa Del Rey go up or down?

Response: Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00666 Ross, Oadie None Provided 4/10/2001

PC00666-1

Comment:

I live over the airplane highway, at one time the planes did not come over my house late at night an early morning. But now they come all day and night and I can hardly sleep nor hear my T.V. and I do not want to hear more noise and the black smoke has ruined my curtains.

I do not want an expansion

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

**PC00667 Palmquist, DVM,
Richard None Provided 4/8/2001**

PC00667-1

Comment:

I am writing in response to the plan to expand Los Angeles World Airport. As you can see from the above address, I live in an area that is affected by the present plan. I also own a business in the Inglewood area.

LAX carries a large amount of traffic. Such volumes of traffic do create environmental effects on the people living in communities surrounding an airport. I do not favor any plan that would greatly increase traffic at LAX. The plan to expand to the 405 Freeway would bring planes in even lower over Inglewood.

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. There is no relation between increasing capacity of I-405 and the approach path of aircraft into LAX. The proposed extension of Runway 6R/24L (the inboard runway on the north complex) will be done such that the landing threshold will be retained at its current location. Therefore, the extension of the runway to the east will not cause aircraft to be lower over Inglewood as they approach to land at LAX. Further, Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or the Ring Road that is proposed in Alternatives A, B, and C.

PC00667-2

Comment:

Many of my clients have expressed concern over their personal health and that of their pets. I do feel that I see increased allergic problems in pets in our area. One postulated reason for this is the quantity of combustion products deposited on our areas by jets using the airport.

The environment can and does do great things to cleanse itself, but living systems (people included) are overwhelmed by toxic products of industry. Jets burn fuel and combustion products are toxic to the environment. Toxins damage respiratory membranes and sensitize individuals to other antigenic loads present in the environment such as pollens and molds. One need only examine the windows and awnings of homes on the flight path to observe the quantity of material present from these sources.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC00667-3

Comment:

It simply makes better sense to expand the air traffic to other airports in our region. Plans using Palmdale and other airports would allow for toxic products to be spread over a wider area. This dispersion would provide a better model for natural elimination of toxins produced by the industry. Besides being better for the environment such a plan would allow for communities to benefit financially, too. Using other airports to handle increasing traffic also spreads out the traffic and reduces congestion, both qualities that improve the community.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00667-4

Comment:

Please send me detailed information about medical studies involving the disease rates of persons living on flight paths and landing paths of major airports. Has your agency examined any such studies? Have such studies been done? Are any planned?

Response:

The content of this comment is essentially the same as comment PC00599-5; please refer to Response to Comment PC00599-5. Also, please see Topical Responses TR-HRA-2 and TR-HRA-3 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects and human health impacts.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00668 Bush, C. None Provided 4/7/2001

PC00668-1

Comment:

We have lived in the Westchester community for 24 yrs. Now slowly the airport has expanded. We need to keep this community as a community not open air space land.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00668-2

Comment:

El Toro is definitely an alternative as even Lancaster.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00668-3

Comment:

The airport should contain, there is no more room to expand in this area. It will hurt business etc that are now strong. We are proud to be Westchester residents & have put alot of time & money to develop our houses raise out children etc. We are defenitley against LAX expansion. "Enough is enough"

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 5 in the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-3 in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00669 Payne, Barbara None Provided 4/5/2001

PC00669-1

Comment:

We have lived with airplane noise for 47 years, each year more and more noise & more and more planes.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-121 and Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding opportunities to alleviate impacts associated with past or present airport activities at LAX. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix

3. Comments and Responses

D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00669-2

Comment:

They land so close to my home, that I have to wash my front door & windows every week because of the residue from the planes.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC00670 Mitchell, Janine None Provided 4/1/2001

PC00670-1

Comment:

This is not humanly right. I feel we should be more compassionate towards each other. If facts are facts (the truth) this life is more about love than the (\$dollar) bill. I feel we (as a mass consciousness) need to wake up & do something about what is really important. Helping each other, giving, caring & make the highest choice possible for all Beings to be their Best.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00671 Cotton, Bruce & Debra None Provided 3/26/2001

PC00671-1

Comment:

We live at the above address and are right below the airplanes path to airport. I can not keep pictures on my living room walls because the vibration continuously knocks them off. I have an oil painting of my husband & I that was destroyed because of the strong vibrations,

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration.

PC00671-2

Comment:

Also, the exhaust comes right through my windows, so, dusting is a "MUST".

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC00671-3

Comment:

If Expansion goes through - I'm sure I will lose more valuable items in my home.(crystal, glass, etc.)

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00672 Cook, Claudine None Provided 3/24/2001

PC00672-1

Comment:

The LAX expansion must be stopped. The noise, pollution, and traffic will harm the people directly in the flight path. As well as being an inconvenience to the city.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00672-2

Comment:

Why not use the other airports in Palmdale, El Toro, and Ontario?

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00672-3

Comment:

I HAVE BEEN TRYING TO GET SOUND PROOFING FOR MY HOME FOR OVER A YEAR NOW. I HAVE WRITTEN MANY LETTERS AND MADE NUMEROUS TELEPHONE CALLS WHICH HAVE BEEN IGNORED.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program. As stated in Topical Response TR-LU-3, residential sound insulation that qualifies under the ANMP is prioritized within the highest CNEL measurement band above 65 CNEL first and the qualifying property owner is contacted to participate in the current program band. Although the subject property appears to be located within the ANMP boundary, it is outside the 1996 baseline and Year 2000 65 CNEL contour and therefore would receive a lower priority for sound insulation than those residences currently exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures to address existing high aircraft noise levels in residential areas.

PC00672-4

Comment:

The noise has a tremendous affect, especially at night. There are a lot more planes now. Imagine what it will be like with additional noise and traffic due to the expansion. Please help!!!

Response:

The number of operations that are projected to occur will increase during both day and night hours, and with that increase will come a commensurate increase in aircraft noise events. LAWA will be pursuing Federal approval of a restriction to alleviate that situation by making over-ocean procedures mandatory when they are in effect between midnight and 6:30 a.m. If approved, these measures would restrict the number of operations that overfly your area during the late night hours to those necessary for weather or wind conditions. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC00673 Wimberley, Fred None Provided 3/24/2001

PC00673-1

Comment:

Ms. Waters, I plan to do all that I can to fight the LAX Expansion. It's unhealthy for our community & our school children. Please keep me informed on all future Town Hall Meetings about this subject.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 14a and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00673-2

Comment:

I met you 2 yrs. over at 1st Church of God at Crenshaw & Hardy in Inglewood. I would like your endorsement, support & vote as I run as L.A.'s Black District Attorney for the County of Los Angeles in 2008. Please respond to this most important letter of mine as soon as possible. Thanks Ms. Waters!

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00674 McKey, Dorothy None Provided 3/24/2001

PC00674-1

Comment:

I am against the LAX expansion

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00674-2

Comment:

We have enough noise Already my house shakes when plane are passing over

Response:

Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration.

PC00674-3

Comment:

To much traffic

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00674-4

Comment:

Also there are children in my neighborhood that have medical problems such as asthma so bad that they miss a lot of school

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC00674-5

Comment:

Plus the airport has lied about the number of people

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels.

PC00675

Martinez, Maria

None Provided

3/23/2001

PC00675-1

Comment:

Emissions of sulfur oxide will increase by 100 tons (55)% per year in 2015, or 548 pounds per day. We already face enough in pollutants in our air and don't need even more from an expanded L.A.X.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Section 4.6.8.3, Regional Traffic Emissions, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding traffic emissions for the current LAWA Staff-Preferred alternative, Alternative D. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00675-2

Comment:

Increase in traffic will add to the total nitrogen oxide emissions from the airport by 1592 tons (31%) per year in 2015, or 4.4 tons (8.223 lbs) per day. The additional pollution to our communities air is why I cannot support LAX's expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Section 4.6.8.3, Regional Traffic Emissions, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding traffic emissions for the current LAWA Staff-Preferred alternative, Alternative D. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00675-3

Comment:

The EIS/EIR states that negative impacts of expansion will fall disproportionately on minority communities. I found this unacceptable and oppose any expansion of LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed environmental justice in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice. Supporting technical reports and analyses are provided in Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00675-4

Comment:

The 120% increase in annual cargo volume will add an additional 156 "18-wheelers". Everyday our communities find this unacceptable to our quality of life.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic, which was addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, would not increase cargo handling facilities at LAX. As indicated in Table S3-2 (page 3-23) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, cargo operations are projected to increase to about 3,120,000 tons/year at LAX by 2015 under the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative D. The traffic impacts of this level of cargo activity were described in Section 4.3.2.6.1 (beginning on page 4-293) of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00676 Russell, Stephen None Provided

PC00676-1

Comment:

I oppose any plans to EIR for LA World Airport. I do favor such EIR plans for: Ontario Intl Airport and IF EVER FUNDED, Palmdale Intl Airport. LAX is too crowded & air traffic must be split tween:

Ontario
Palmdale If ever built, funded

3. Comments and Responses

San Berd
John Wayne OC Airport
Palm Springs Airport
alone.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00676-2

Comment:

I do urge High speed RR to Palmdale Airport IF funded from Dwtn LA, Burbank, Pasadena, Van Nuys, Encino, 1000 Oaks, Union Station, Northridge.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand.

PC00676-3

Comment:

I call for more VertPorts to serve LA Area: Van Nuys, 1000 Oaks, Pasadena, Ontario, Pt Mugu, Malibu, Long Bch, Irvine, Buena Park to be served by civilianized Osprey tiltplanes or jetcopters alone. Combined the above can CUT LAX AIR TRAFFIC. Besides the VertPorts would create new jobs.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00677

**Etheredge, Joe &
Beverly**

None Provided

4/30/2001

PC00677-1

Comment:

We oppose LAX expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00677-2

Comment:

We are living in the air path as it is. The air planes come over our home 24 hrs. a day due to this I can't enjoy my back or front yard due the to noise.

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PC00677-3

Comment:

Our garden is not doing good because we see the fule from air plains let out over our street 83st off Western

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC00677-4

Comment:

I can't hear well & breathing is bad

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-246 regarding the fact that existing and future noise levels at and around LAX are projected to be well below the OSHA and CalOSHA standards that serve to protect against hearing loss. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PC00677-5

Comment:

I oppose expanitian and all air lines over our home & neighborhood

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

PC00678

Tobelman, Charles

None Provided

4/25/2001

PC00678-1

Comment:

The noise Don't Bother me Except when they have to take off Toward the East of Freeway & Air Port

If they do this the Poor People will be hurt more then the Big Hotels & other Large Barons as they will Have Lawyers to Protect them.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use, and in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and F and Technical Reports 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-D and Technical Reports S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures. Also see mitigation measure MM-N-5, in Section 4.1, Noise, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, which seeks federal approval of a locally-imposed restrictions on departures to and approaches from the east when over-ocean procedures are in effect.

PC00679 Glennon, Ruth & None Provided 4/20/2001
Don

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00059; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC00059.

PC00680 Adams, Jim Los Angeles Building &
Construction Trades Council

PC00680-1

Comment:

My name is Jim Adams and I am Council Representative of the Los Angeles/Orange Counties Building Trades Council. I'm here today to provide a very simple message for an issue that I acknowledge is very complex. It is clear to me, and to the tens of thousands of men and women in the construction trades, that LAX needs to be modernized. It needs to be modernized for a number of reasons. This airport is a critical economic engine for our city, our region, our state and for the country. Over 400,000 jobs in our region are attributable to the economic impact of LAX. Los Angeles County benefits from \$50 billion in economic output related to the airport. The airport is a fundamental part of our public infrastructure that has been left to deteriorate, has been surpassed by growth in population and is no longer capable of adequately dealing with the advances in transportation technology that have taken place over the last decade.

Thousands of construction related jobs will be created by the modernization program. Those jobs will provide livelihoods for families, will help send children to college and will bring consumer dollars into every city in this region. But the modernization of LAX is not a jobs program. The modernization of LAX is critical because it will make our airport safer. It will preserve its role as the gateway to Asia and make it a critical gateway to growing economies in South America, Central America and Mexico. And it will serve as a test-case for how a complex society deals with the long term infrastructure planning that is essential to prepare for the demographic and social changes that are part of the future of this whole region.

The people of Los Angeles have a choice to make about LAX. If we do nothing, delays will increase, the runways will become less safe, airline traffic will continue to increase and we will lose jobs to other regions who are more willing and ready to act. These are indisputable facts of our situation and these facts will not be altered by fantasizing about quick-fix solutions or pie in the sky ideas about how we will unilaterally demand that air carriers fly to other airports.

We can't control all of the economic decisions of our airline industry. But, we can control our planning, our creativity in solving problems and our vision as to what LAX can be. It can become a top level airport for this new century. Right now it is not. We can have a "regional" solution to increasing demand for air travel and cargo. But that solution will not occur without LAX taking its fair share of that increase.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00681 Honda, David Asian Business Association 6/9/2001

PC00681-1

Comment:

Good afternoon, my name is David Honda, President of the Asian Business Association of Los Angeles. I come before you today on behalf of our 500-member organization in Los Angeles representing Small and medium size businesses. We have a statement traded within Our organization that . . . "diverse talents inspire unlimited prosperity.. ." All Asians, whether Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Filipino, Indonesian, Vietnamese or Indian are "bottom line orientated" Our member profile covers owners of International trade, Construction- Architectural trades, Restaurateurs and Services Companies.

Our focus today, is to support the Modernization of LAX to accommodate the increase of cargo and passengers anticipated for the future growth of Los Angeles.

Our members have two reasons for this modernization. One, our members will benefit from the increase in construction and engineering business opportunities and two the increase in the production of cargo facilities (i.e. perishable foods) that pass thru the terminals for food service Restaurateurs and international traders. Remember, perishable items are flown in not shipped by sea. As one can see, we are . . ."bottom line oriented". Los Angeles has a vast expanding population of Asians and increasing daily, necessitating future passengers from Asia. Our leaders at LAX demonstrate Wisdom, Will and Vision and should be encouraged to move forward. . . carefully & thoughtfully but post haste, for a 21 century facility.

Thank you for this opportunity to convey our message.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00682 Chan Wong, Ada Chinese Chamber of Commerce 6/9/2001

PC00682-1

Comment:

My name is Ada Chan Wong, and I am the President of the Chinese Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles. We are one of the oldest Chinese American business organizations in Los Angeles, established in 1955. We have 30 Board of Directors, which consists of many prominent business people in our community. We have almost 500 members and over 3000 individuals and corporations on our current mailing list. They represent the owners of every type and every size business imaginable, from high-tech to restaurants, from manufacturing to the service industry.

We support the LAX Master Plan because we understand modernization of the airport and the availability of aviation services are a necessary part of being able to continue in business for hundreds of our members and thousands of companies in the Los Angeles area.

LAX is nearly dysfunctional. It hasn't been modernized in nearly twenty years. Anyone who uses the airport, whether for a short trip to San Francisco or a journey overseas to Asia or Europe, knows how troublesome and difficult overcrowding has made our airport. The terminals are sometimes filled with thousands of people waiting to board their planes. People stand or sit on the floor for hours because there aren't enough seats and there are so many long delays.

We have carefully reviewed the proposed Master Plan. In addition to improving the experience for travelers in the airport, it will vastly improve transportation and traffic to and from the airport. It includes mitigation steps like extending the Green Line and an express lane from the 405 Freeway directly to the airport.

3. Comments and Responses

The Recommended Master Plan does not call to include any additional runways. Airport officials have come up with a modernization plan that is efficient and includes a very small number of increased flights.

We urge you to recommend approval of the LAX Master Plan.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00683 Verduzco, Maria Lennox Coordinating Council

PC00683-1

Comment:

I am here on behalf of the Lennox Coordinating Council (LCC), the informal governing board of the unincorporated area of Lennox. The LAX expansion will have a significant impact on the communities, like Lennox, surrounding the airport. Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) in an effort to address the concerns of the communities on the periphery of the airport has hired a consulting group (URS) to convene public forums to inform residents about the impact of the airport expansion plans.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00683-2

Comment:

Our concern is that these public forums, which are being billed as Environmental Justice meetings, will not present information to the community in an unbiased and objective manner. As you know, the proposed expansion has significant implications for the public health and safety for the surrounding communities, such as Lennox. As a result, there is a great deal of community concern and interest in this proposal. It is therefore vital that every effort be made to inform and provide local residents with accurate and objective information, so that they in turn may fully participate in the decision making process.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00178-2.

PC00683-3

Comment:

We believe that the manner in which the Environmental Justice group is doing their community outreach is inconsistent with the requirements for community outreach spelled out in the LAWA Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The EIR states that "the environmental justice community outreach process will involve an interactive and ongoing program to assure an effective dialogue with minority and low-income communities affected by LAX. To initiate this process, members of LAWA's Environmental Justice Task Force and other LAWA representatives will meet with elected officials and other community representatives, and community workshops will be held." The Environmental Justice Meeting on May 19 at Inglewood High School did not allow residents to share their concerns and questions publicly. Instead, the format of the meeting only allowed residents to voice their concerns or ask questions individually to the various consultants staffing a booth. We believe this format is not conducive to creating an effective dialogue with the community (instead it fosters individual dialogue without allowing other residents a chance to hear comments or questions that might be of importance to them). We have met with the Environmental Justice group convened by LAWA in a good faith effort to request that certain conditions be met in order to present the workshops in an unbiased manner. Some of these requests were met, while others were refused. LAWA's refusal to engage the community in an Interactive manner, makes the EIR goal of "forming advisory and other types of working groups" implausible.

Response:

As noted above in Response to Comment PC00178-2, LAWA has engaged the community in an interactive manner and the format of the workshops was changed to include group orientation and question and answer sessions. From the beginning, every effort was made to design and conduct the workshops in a manner that would foster the fullest possible input from the community.

PC00683-4

Comment:

We believe that the process being proposed for community outreach by the Environmental Justice Task Force is not in the best interest of the community. Ultimately, we want to ensure that the public receives unbiased, objective information about the impact of the expansion on their communities and that they are clear on the distinction between the workshops being offered by the Environmental Justice Task Force and the formal public hearings on the LAX masterplan, EIR.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC00178-2 and PC00178-3. EJ workshop notices, materials, and presentations were clear regarding the objectives of the workshops. Comment forms for both the Draft EIS/EIR and more specific EJ comments were made available at the workshops. While the Draft EIS/EIR public hearings were more broadly focused, all comments received through both public input processes have been considered and addressed by LAWA and the FAA.

PC00684

Jeffe, Jerry

**Los Angeles Area Chamber of
Commerce**

6/9/2001

PC00684-1

Comment:

The Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce compliments Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) on their initiative in developing various enhancement plans for LAX. This shows progression toward a solution that will keep our region economically competitive in the new millennium.

Los Angeles is the main entryway for goods sent from the Pacific Rim nations. Without a strong aviation infrastructure here, the entire nation suffers.

Southern California is the home to nearly six thousand export and import businesses, which export nearly 110 billion dollars in manufactured goods. The majority of those exporters and importers are small businesses - the heart blood of our economy. Without world-class airports in the Los Angeles region, many of these small businesses will not be able to compete on a world-class level.

The Chamber pioneered aviation improvement efforts throughout the 20th Century. In fact, the Chamber championed Palmdale as a site for aerospace and aviation immediately after World War II. Fox Field in the Antelope Valley is named after the Chamber member who lead the effort to open up Palmdale to aviation.

We look forward to Los Angeles World Airport's future Master Plan Studies for Ontario and Palmdale Airports to create a regional, 21st Century solution to Southern California's air transportation deficiencies. But we also recognize that LAX is the crown jewel of airports in Southern California. It must be modernized to reflect real growth in population and economic activity.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00686 Carpio, Cecil None Provided

PC00686-1

Comment:

WHERE IN THE EIR/EIS ARE THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ADDRESSED:

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC00686-2 through PC00686-15 below.

PC00686-2

Comment:

WHAT WILL HAPPEN WITH THE INTRODUCTION OF THE NEW LARGE-BODY AIRPLANE? WHAT WILL BE THE EFFECTS OF WIDER TURNS?

Response:

There is no data yet available relative to the anticipated noise characteristics of the New Large Aircraft (NLA), other than the requirement that to operate in the United States, it must meet the requirement of Federal Aviation Regulation, Part 36, which sets noise level limits for all commercial aircraft. All aircraft weighing more than 850,000 pounds, including the NLA and the 747-400 are subject to the same noise level requirements. For noise modeling purposes, the NLA is considered to be equivalent to the 747-400. Consequently, its effect in turns will be equivalent to that of the substitution aircraft.

The airport is being developed using Airplane Design Group V standards while being able to accommodate the Airplane Design Group VI aircraft such as the Airbus A380. Please see FAA Advisory Circular 150/5300-13, Airport Design for FAA Airport Design Standards. Please see Figures V-J.51 through V-J.53 in the Draft LAX Master Plan, Chapter V, Appendix J, for taxiways able to accommodate Group VI standards.

Following the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA developed a new alternative that is designed to accommodate passenger and cargo activity at LAX that would approximate those of the No Action/No Project Alternative, has fewer environmental impacts, and improves airport safety and security. Alternative D, the LAWA staff preferred alternative, would also have the ability to accommodate the Group VI aircraft. For the taxiways able to accommodate Group VI standards in Alternative D, please see Figure E-11 of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum Appendix E.

PC00686-3

Comment:

WHAT NEW TECHNOLOGY WILL PREVENT THE NEED FOR GREATER SEPARATION?

Response:

Technology applications are not moving toward greater separations, but reduced separations. Use of navigation global positioning satellites and upgraded flight management systems on-board aircraft are planned to provide a reduction in separation between aircraft during the en route phase of flight. The installation of Precision Parallel Monitoring (PRM) high update radars at some airports will allow aircraft to conduct simultaneous landings on closely spaced parallel runways down to 3,000 feet vice the current 4,300 feet. The Center/Terminal Automation system (CTAS) will assist pilots and controllers to establish approach and landing sequencing at greater distances from the airport providing greater airspace efficiency. The FAA and industry are continuing to develop technology such as Cockpit Display of Traffic Indicator (CDTI), which will assist flight crews in seeing other aircraft in their vicinity. The ultimate goal of CDTI is to allow operation of aircraft under visual conditions in instrument weather.

PC00686-4

Comment:

WHAT WILL PREVENT THE PRACTICE OF ALLOWING MORE EARLY MORNING AND LATE NIGHT OPERATIONS TO OCCUR IN ORDER TO COMPENSATE FOR A REDUCED ARRIVAL RATE?

Response:

Comment noted. Scheduling of flights is the responsibility of the individual airlines. Neither the airport operator nor the FAA has the ability to require airlines to operate during specific hours; however, LAWA Air Traffic Control converts to an over-ocean operations mode by limiting the runways that can be used between the hours of midnight to 6:30 a.m. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC00686-5

Comment:

WHERE IN THE EIR/EIS ARE THE IMPACTS OF THE AIRBUS CONSIDERED FOR THE FOLLOWING ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS: TRAFFIC, AIR QUALITY AND NOISE?

Response:

The Integrated Noise Model 6.0C, which is the FAA approved computer model used to predict noise impacts from aircraft operations, does not contain noise data for the New Large Aircraft (NLA) Airbus 380 since the aircraft has not yet been developed. However, all alternatives in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR include NLA operations through the use of a "substitute" aircraft, the Boeing 747-400. Additional noise information can be found in Section 4.1, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Similarly, the peak hour air passenger characteristics resulting from use of the NLA formed the basis of the trip generation characteristics used in the traffic impacts analysis. The results of that analysis were provided in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analysis provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Regarding air quality, similar to above, NLAs were classified as "747-X" and were included in the air quality analyses contained in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also refer to Table 1 in Appendix G of the Draft EIS/EIR and Table S1 in Appendix S-E of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00686-6

Comment:

AT THE PRESENT MOMENT, REGULAR OPERATIONS ARE OCCURRING DURING NIGHT CURFEW HOURS (MIDNIGHT TO 6:30 AM). DURING THE CONSTRUCTION OF RECONFIGURED OR ADDITIONAL RUNWAYS, WHAT WILL PREVENT REGULAR OPERATIONS FROM OCCURRING AT NIGHT?

Response:

As to the comment regarding curfew hours, LAX has no curfew. It does have special operating procedures for late night hours, however. See Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-5.1.

The noise contour patterns presented in the body of the Draft EIS/EIR in Section 4.2, Land Use, and referenced in Section 4.1, Noise, indicate the expected pattern of aircraft noise dispersion during the years 2005 and 2015. During the period between those target years, various construction projects will result in temporary modifications to the noise patterns of each build alternative, including increases and decreases of the use of certain runways at night. This section provides an overview of the expected pattern changes that might be expected during these periods of construction, including the night period.

3. Comments and Responses

Alternative A, Aircraft Noise Pattern Between 2005 and 2015.

The north airfield construction projects would be completed without substantial disruption to airfield operations by conducting construction activity at night and closing the active runways for only short periods. During such closures, the nighttime operations that would use the runway would be reassigned to the most efficiently used adjacent runway, or to the south runways (Runway 7L/25R). When construction in the north runways is completed, the focus of development would turn to the relocation of Runway 25L to the south, with construction at night. During that period, any activity that would normally use the runway at night would be assigned elsewhere (to Runway 25R for all departures and part of the arrivals, and to Runway 24L for the remainder of the arrivals). Figure 12 (located in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report), Interim Aircraft Noise Contours Between Construction Projects-Alternative A, which indicates the expected noise exposure pattern of this condition, would last for several months toward the end of the planning period. The noise pattern would differ from the 2015 pattern by only a northward shift of the noise pattern to reflect the closure of the outboard runway in the south complex at night during construction. The level of exposure within the area of the noise contours would not differ appreciably from the Alternative A condition for 2015, owing to the similarity of the contours.

Alternative B, Aircraft Noise Pattern Between 2005 and 2015.

During implementation of Alternative B, the airfield would undergo a series of modifications that would result in different noise exposure patterns. Noise contours were computed to represent the projected exposure pattern for a period between different phases of the construction, representing the period between the completion of new Runway 25L and the relocation of the other runways in the south airfield complex.

Figure 13 (located in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report), Interim Aircraft Noise Contours Between Construction Projects - Alternative B, represents the noise exposure pattern expected when Runway 7R/25L is in place but the new Runway 7C/25C is not yet in its ultimate location. The south airfield construction projects may be completed without substantial disruption of airfield operations by conducting construction activity at night and closing the active runways for only short periods. Runway 25L is sufficiently separated from the existing runways in the south airfield that construction may take place unimpeded by airfield activity. Immediately following the construction of Runway 25L, Runway 25R is relocated to the north without affecting the operation of the airfield except during the construction of taxiways. The noise pattern would be virtually identical to the later 2015 contour around and leading to the north airfield complex, while differences between the construction and 2015 alternative contours are noticeable east of the south runways. The principal differences between the two conditions in this area are during construction, the approach noise leading to the south runways would be centered on an alignment to Runway 25C that is 500 feet south of its alternative alignment, and along the existing approach to the runway. The level of noise exposure associated with this scenario is comparable to the exposure for 2015.

Runway 25C would be relocated to the north after completion of the other two runways in the south airfield complex. The noise pattern at that time would approximate the final build out 2015 pattern for the south runways; but would be slightly offset from the contour pattern for the north airfield. In the north airfield, Runway 6L/24R would be reconstructed first, requiring nighttime activity on that runway to be relocated to Runway 6R/24L in both east and west flow. The level of exposure within the area of the noise contours is not expected to differ significantly from the 2015 alternative condition, owing to the similarity of the areas included within the contours.

Alternative C, Aircraft Noise Pattern Between 2005 and 2015 During Construction

After the completion of the north airfield reconstruction, the airfield would operate for a period with the new north airfield and the existing south airfield, as represented by the 2005 condition. At some time near the end of the planning period, Runway 25L would be reconstructed with an alignment 50 feet south of its present position. Construction would be accomplished in six months during the night hours and the runway would need to be closed only during that time. Any traffic that is projected to operate on the runway during the night would need to be reassigned to another runway at night. In this case, such traffic would be assigned to Runway 25R.

Figure 14 (located in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report), Interim Aircraft Noise Contours Between Construction Projects - Alternative C, indicates the pattern of noise that might be expected during the six-month construction period. The notable difference between the construction pattern and

the later 2015 noise exposure pattern is a slightly wider approach noise pattern leading to the south runways, reflecting the reassignment of night approaches to the inboard runway.

Evaluations conducted for the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided information related to the anticipated noise exposure pattern during the construction of the modifications required for Alternative D. It is assumed that Runway 25L would be closed for a period of approximately one year, during which time aircraft would be redirected to the remaining three runways. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR contained a section that disclosed the impacts of this condition. A projected schedule of operations that would occur during the construction period indicates that a portion of the flights that could normally occur during the day-evening period would be delayed into the nighttime hours. Reconstruction of the north airfield proposed by Alternative D would be accomplished without substantive effect on the operation of the airport. Relocated Runway 24L would be constructed prior to the closing of current Runway 24L, and any construction activity that may affect the utility of Runway 24R would be accomplished during the night hours when that runway is not used as part of the noise abatement program of the airport. In contrast, the reconstruction of Runway 25L, planned for the 2005 time frame, would require substantial changes to the way the airport is operated. It is anticipated that Runway 25L would be closed for a period of approximately one year while it is being shifted 50 feet to the south to accommodate a center taxiway between the two runways in the south airfield complex. During the period of closure, the airport would have only three serviceable runways. It is expected that the flight schedule for the construction period would be reduced to a level at or near the VFR capacity of the airport, and that most of the flights eliminated would be propeller and private jet aircraft. Runway 25R is expected to accommodate both landings and takeoffs, while the runways in the north airfield would continue to operate as they are now used - the outboard runway would predominantly serve landings and the inboard runway would predominantly serve takeoffs. Most heavy aircraft would be assigned Runway 25R for landings because the 5 mile separation requirements between heavy jet landings would allow controllers to launch westerly departures in between the heavy arrivals. The runway utilization proportions anticipated during the relocation of Runway 7R/24L is provided in Table S11, Alternative D 2015 94 SEL Part 161 Mitigation Contour vs. Unmitigation Alternative D 2015 94 SEL. Figure S5, Alternative D Noise Exposure During Relocation of Runway 7R/25L, indicates the pattern of noise that might be expected during the construction period. The notable difference between the construction pattern and the later 2015 noise exposure pattern is a northward shift and slight lengthening of the noise pattern leading to the south runways, reflecting the reassignment of approaches to the inboard runway. East of the north runways, the contour is slightly longer than is anticipated in 2015. Additionally, the contours north and south of the airport, in areas principally exposed to noise associated with takeoffs or the use of thrust reversal during landing, the contours are shifted slightly to the north as takeoffs are reassigned to the north from the south runway complex. For additional noise related information on Alternative D, please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00686-7

Comment:

IS THERE SOME PLACE IN THE EIR/EIS THAT SHOWS HOW REGULAR OPERATIONS DURING THE NIGHT CURFEW ARE FACTORED INTO THE CNEL? WHICH OPERATIONS ARE FACTORED IN--THOSE RELATED TO INCLEMENT WEATHER, NIGHT MAINTENANCE, CONSTRUCTION, HIGH DEMAND?

Response:

While there is no curfew at LAX, there are special late-night operating procedures. For modeling purposes, all operating conditions present at the airport were considered, including deviations from the preferred over-ocean procedures during the late-night hours. The Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts of night operations in Section 4.1 Noise, with supporting technical data and analyses in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report. Subsection 4.1.2.1.1, Noise Exposure Contours, in Section 4.1, Noise, explains the CNEL metric and aircraft operating conditions. Please see Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences and Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement. Additionally, please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Technical Noise Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a detailed description of nighttime awakenings.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00686-8

Comment:

WHY DID LAWA INTRODUCE THE NEW MASTER PLAN ALTERNATIVE "C" AFTER THE SCOPING PROCESS HAD ENDED? THE PURPOSE OF THE SCOPING PROCESS IS TO GET PUBLIC INPUT BEFORE AN ALTERNATIVE IS INCLUDED FOR PROJECT ANALYSIS. PROPER SCOPING IS AN ESSENTIAL PART OF THE EIS REVIEW PROCESS.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00022-17 regarding the public notice pertaining to Alternative C. Please also see Response to Comment AL00022-63 regarding the purpose of the scoping process.

PC00686-9

Comment:

ALL THREE MASTER PLAN ALTERNATIVES CONTAIN THE EXTENSION AND/OR ADDITION OF RUNWAYS THAT WOULD SHIFT AIRPORT ACTIVITIES EAST AND INCREASE THE IMPACT OF EMISSIONS ON AIR QUALITY IN OFF-AIRPORT AREAS. WITHOUT MITIGATION, INCREMENTAL HEALTH RISKS (CANCER) AND HEALTH HAZARDS WILL EXCEED THE CEQA THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE. WHAT MITIGATION OPTIONS WILL REDUCE HEALTH RISKS AND HAZARDS TO LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HRA-4 regarding human health mitigation strategies. All post-mitigation analyses have been revised and were presented in Section 4.24.1.9, Level of Significance after Mitigation, in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

Mitigation measures currently proposed differ from those under consideration during the preparation of the Draft EIS/EIR. Recommended mitigation measures were identified in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR to reduce impacts from airport operations and construction as well as from regional vehicular traffic under Alternatives A, B, C, and D. These recommended mitigation measures would also reduce impacts to human health associated with exposure to toxic air pollutants (TAPs). Mitigation measures considered in the analysis include: continued conversion of GSE to alternative fuel, multiple construction-related measures including use of alternative fuels and add-on emission control devices on construction equipment, and expansion of flyaway bus service between LAX and other locations in the South Coast Air Basin using alternative-fueled buses. These mitigation measures, in combination with other proposed mitigation measures, would reduce emissions of TAPs during LAX operations and construction primarily by reducing exhaust emissions from mobile sources and reducing traffic congestion near the airport, thereby reducing VOC and PM emissions. As discussed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, mitigation measures are expected to reduce operational emissions of VOCs, such as benzene, for on-airport sources by 8 percent in the Interim Year and by 54 percent in the Horizon Year. These recommended mitigation measures would also reduce impacts to human health associated with exposure to TAPs.

PC00686-10

Comment:

CURRENTLY, LAX HAS THE CAPACITY TO SERVE 78.7 MILLION ANNUAL PASSENGERS AND 3,120,000 ANNUAL CARGO TONS. THE MASTER PLAN FORECASTS INDICATE THAT THERE IS A NEED FOR LAX TO SERVE 97.9 MAP AND 4,172,000 ANNUAL CARGO TONS. WHY IS LAWA READY TO SPEND \$12 BILLION TO \$15 BILLION TO ACCOMMODATE 19.2 MILLION MORE ANNUAL PASSENGERS AND 1,052,000 AIR CARGO TONS?

Response:

The purpose and need for the proposed action were presented in Chapter 2 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00686-11

Comment:

WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE MASTER PLAN'S PROPOSED PROJECTS PHASE-IN? CARGO CAPACITY, PROPERTY ACQUISITION, AIRFIELD EXPANSION, RUNWAY EXTENSION, AND TERMINAL EXPANSION AND IMPROVEMENT TAKE PRECEDENCE OVER THE MITIGATION OF IMPACTS THE SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES ARE ALREADY EXPERIENCING. THE HISTORIC RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LAX AND ITS NEIGHBORS HAS ALREADY PROVEN THAT MITIGATION OF THE EFFECTS OF LAX'S EXPANDED OPERATIONS TAKES LOW PRIORITY. LAWA HAS BEEN PROMOTING THE MASTER PLAN AS THE ONLY VIABLE WAY TO ADDRESS TODAY'S TRAFFIC, NOISE AND AIR QUALITY IMPACTS. THE PROPOSED PHASE-IN WILL ONLY EXACERBATE THOSE IMPACTS.

Response:

The proposed LAX Master Plan identifies a number of major improvement projects that, together, are designed to enable LAX to better accommodate current and projected activity levels. Chapter 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR identified the construction phasing programs associated with each of the build alternatives, providing for a systematic logical sequence for the proposed improvements to occur. In so doing, better coordination of construction activities can occur and serve to reduce potential construction-related impacts as well as provide for certain improvements to be in-place as future growth in activity occurs.

PC00686-12

Comment:

GIVEN THE 2015 PLANNING HORIZON, WHY WAS THE HIGH-END POTENTIAL AT PALMDALE EXTRAPOLATED TO 2010? WHAT DID THE HAGLER BAILLY STUDY DETERMINE PALMDALE'S 2015 MILLION ANNUAL PASSENGERS COULD BE?

Response:

The Hagler Bailly study was prepared to answer the question: "What is the maximum theoretical long-term potential of Palmdale Airport without regard to costs to improve access or develop airport facilities?" The study concluded that the high-end potential was 4 million annual passengers (MAP) in 2010 and 7.3 MAP in 2020. The 2015 forecast would be interpolated to be 5.4 MAP. The study noted: "The projections presented in this report are not, therefore, most likely estimates of potential demand at Palmdale." The actual results will almost certainly be lower, potentially significantly lower. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00686-13

Comment:

AS STATED IN THE EIR/EIS, THE PURPOSE OF THE LAX MASTER PLAN IS TO SUPPORT THE FUTURE ECONOMIC GROWTH AND VITALITY OF THE FIVE-COUNTY LOS ANGELES REGION. WHY, THEN, WERE THE COUNTIES OF SAN BERNARDINO, RIVERSIDE, VENTURA AND ORANGE LEFT OUT OF THE SCOPING PROCESS?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00007-1 regarding the scoping undertaken for the LAX Master Plan.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00686-14

Comment:

AS STATED IN THE EIR/EIS, AN OVERARCHING CONSIDERATION DURING THE PLANNING PROCESS HAS BEEN TO ACHIEVE THE PROJECT OBJECTIVES IN A ENVIRONMENTALLY SOUND MANNER. WHY, THEN, WAS ALTERNATIVE C INTRODUCED AS THE PREFERRED PROJECT? ALTERNATIVE C HAS JUST AS MANY SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE EFFECTS AS ALTERNATIVES A OR B.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00022-3 regarding the number and severity of impacts associated with Alternative C compared to Alternatives A and B. It should be noted that, subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and would make the airport safer and more secure, convenient and efficient. Alternative D has replaced Alternative C as the LAWA staff-preferred alternative.

PC00686-15

Comment:

IN THE SUMMERY COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FROM ALTERNATIVES A, B, AND C, WHY WASN'T "NO ACTION/NO PROJECT" INCLUDED FOR COMPARISON?

Response:

The summary table in the Executive Summary identifies Master Plan commitments and mitigation measures related to each individual impact as well as the level of significance of the impact following the implementation of these measures. Pursuant to Section 15126.2(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, the identification of significant impacts only applies to the proposed project, in this case, the build alternatives. Accordingly, the consideration of mitigation measures also applies only to the proposed project. Were the No Action/No Project Alternative to have been included in this table, no information would have been able to be provided. Note that a comparison to the No Action/No Project Alternative was provided for each environmental discipline in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00687

**Douroux, Ph.D.,
Marilyn**

None Provided

PC00687-1

Comment:

Create wider options to mitigate impact of noise and pollution on communities most impacted.

Examples: 1) In addition to insulation/air conditioning, finance property improvement caused by airplane emissions: discoloration of homes & wooden fences; destruction of vegetation; insulation/soundproofing of schools.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition and Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program. Proposed measures, including sound insulation, to mitigate impacts to schools significantly affected by aircraft noise were included in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.8), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, which provided the basis for the mitigation measures presented in this Final EIS/EIR.

PC00687-2

Comment:

2) Afford a significant tax deduction based on property depreciation due to airport activity and a yearly monetary compensation for the former. AN ANNOYANCE FEE!

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

PC00687-3

Comment:

This note is an analogy nor an in-kind request. It is meant to indicate who creates the problem thus who is responsible for its mitigation: The building of a reservoir at Hemet created so much dust/destruction from dynamiting, its builder (probably the state) paid for weekly home and neighborhood maintenance including car washing.

WHO WILL PAY FOR DAMAGE TO MY HOME EXTERIOR STUCCOED AND PAINTED 4 YEARS AGO - MAUVE TURNED GREY!!

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC00688 No Author Identified, None Provided 8/14/2001

PC00688-1

Comment:

The noise boundy should be winden to cover more area

Response:

The noise impact area which determines residential uses eligible for sound insulation is described in Topical Response TR-LU-3. Noise-sensitive uses exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour under the 1996 baseline were described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3), and shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Noise-sensitive uses exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour under Year 2000 conditions are described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3), and shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As shown on these respective figures, under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions, the area within the 65 CNEL noise contour has decreased compared to the ANMP contour. This defines the area of eligibility for sound insulation. Although this is a comment on existing noise levels and conditions, the general focus of the document, pursuant to NEPA and CEQA, is to evaluate the potential future environmental effects of the project and to provide feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

PC00689 Dorsey, Louversa None Provided 7/14/2001

PC00689-1

Comment:

I have soundproofing in my home my concern is the flight traffic of planes between the early morning hours - What can the M/P do to reduce the coming in & going out of planes.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The difficulty in implementing a nighttime curfew or other means of reducing night activity is addressed in Section 7.1.2, Airport Regulation Changes, and Section 7.1.2.1, Curfews, in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report. Implementation of a curfew is incompatible with a major international hub and will not be pursued at LAX. However, LAWA will be pursuing Federal approval of a restriction to alleviate that situation by making over-ocean procedures mandatory when they are in effect between midnight and 6:30 a.m. During a recent 18 month period, 82 jets departed to the east when over-ocean procedures were in effect, an average of about one per week. As noted by the noise abatement procedures delineated in Topical Response TR-N-7, exceptions to the over-ocean procedures are available when weather or wind conditions require east traffic flow. An analysis of nighttime awakenings associated with single event noise is provided in Section 4.1, Noise, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Mitigation Measures MM-N-4 regarding updating the Aircraft Noise Abatement Program for future airfield configurations regarding LAWA efforts to restrict eastern departures and arrivals during over-ocean operational procedures, will provide mitigation for nighttime aircraft noise.

In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC00689-2

Comment:

It is my recommendation that the control of the Plan is not being followed and more planes are flying early morning between 12 midnight to 4, 5, 6 A.M.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC00690

Parker,

None Provided

7/14/2001

PC00690-1

Comment:

Master Plan noise mitigation program needs to expand to include East of Normandie past Central or Century Blvd.

Response:

The noise impact area which determines residential uses eligible for sound insulation is described in Topical Response TR-LU-3. Noise-sensitive uses exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour under the 1996 baseline were described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3), and shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Noise-sensitive uses exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour under Year 2000 conditions were described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3), and shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As shown on these respective figures, under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions, the area within the 65 CNEL noise contour has decreased compared to the ANMP contour. This defines the area of eligibility for sound insulation. Although this is a comment on existing noise levels and conditions, the general focus of the document, pursuant to NEPA and CEQA, is to evaluate the potential future environmental effects of the project and to provide feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

PC00690-2

Comment:

Monitors need to be placed on Century Bl & Central Avenue.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:
Comment noted.

PC00691 Holden, Fred None Provided 6/14/2001

PC00691-1

Comment:
The soundproofing windows need to be looked at regarding to street location. We live at 105th Street and the soundproofing renovation is cut off at 104th St. The Federal Government must take consideration of noise the affect all people in the neighborhood.

Response:
The noise impact area which determines residential uses eligible for sound insulation is described in Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4, and is based on the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL noise contour. Noise-sensitive uses exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour under the 1996 baseline were described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3), and shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Noise-sensitive uses exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour under Year 2000 conditions were described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3), and shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As shown on these respective figures, under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions the area within the 65 CNEL noise contour has decreased compared to the ANMP contour, which continues to define the area of eligibility for sound insulation. Although this is a comment on existing noise levels and conditions, the general focus of the document, pursuant to NEPA and CEQA, is to evaluate the potential future environmental effects of the project and to provide feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts. See Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.14 for a description of how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP and Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

PC00692 Griffin, William None Provided 7/14/2001

PC00692-1

Comment:
I wought like to no more about the Draft Plan because I am in direct Path of air traffic

Response:
Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review. Chapter 3, Alternatives (Including Proposed Action), of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the build alternatives, whereas Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed impacts associated with each respective alternative evaluated.

PC00693 Turner, Patricia None Provided 7/14/2001

PC00693-1

Comment:
I would like to comment about the noise of the airplanes on 10601 S. Manhattan PI you can't hear the TV or on the phone. So I figure if they soundproof to 104 St they should do 106 St because it only two streets over and we hear the same noise.

Response:
The noise impact area which determines residential uses eligible for sound insulation is described in Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4, and is based on the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL noise contour. Noise-sensitive uses exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour under the 1996 baseline were described in

3. Comments and Responses

Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3), and shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Noise-sensitive uses exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour under Year 2000 conditions were described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3), and shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As was shown on these respective figures, under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions the area within the 65 CNEL noise contour has decreased compared to the ANMP contour, which continues to define the area of eligibility for sound insulation. Although this is a comment on existing noise levels and conditions, the general focus of the document, pursuant to NEPA and CEQA, is to evaluate the potential future environmental effects of the project and to provide feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts. See Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.14 for a description of how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

PC00694 Parker, Joann None Provided 7/14/2001

PC00694-1

Comment:

Contine to have public meetings on the weekend to allow those who work during the week day to attend.

The forum was well organized & are questions were answered completely.

The literature that was provided is very informative, especially in the job opportunity area.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00695 Gaddis, Jessie None Provided 7/14/2001

PC00695-1

Comment:

I am Very much Conserved about the Nois and how soon can we expect some Improvemt, And About What Year?

Response:

Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, describe the anticipated effects and changes in aircraft noise patterns anticipated in future years at LAX. The degree of change on any one area is dependent upon the alternative selected for final implementation at the airport. Please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for more information on and comparisons of noise and noise-related land use impacts under the baseline and Year 2000 conditions and the various Master Plan alternatives including new Alternative D. In addition, Please see Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PC00696 Stanford, L. None Provided 7/14/2001

PC00696-1

Comment:

The area in which I live needs to be included in sound proofing. We get noise from both flight patterns and the planes do not always stay within the boundaries you have drawn.

Response:

The noise impact area which determines residential uses eligible for sound insulation is described in Topical Response TR-LU-3. Noise-sensitive uses exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour under the

3. Comments and Responses

1996 baseline were described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3), and were shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Noise-sensitive uses exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour under Year 2000 conditions were described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3), and were shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As was shown on these respective figures, under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions, the area within the 65 CNEL noise contour has decreased compared to the ANMP contour, which continues to define the area of eligibility for sound insulation. Although this is a comment on existing noise levels and conditions, the general focus of the document, pursuant to NEPA and CEQA, is to evaluate the potential future environmental effects of the project and to provide feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

PC00696-2

Comment:

Also, the planes do fly over between midnight and 6 AM. All of these homes should be included. The computer is not a human being. Sound Proof. Please!

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences, and Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

PC00697 Gonzales, Chris None Provided 7/10/2001

PC00697-1

Comment:

I support Master Plan Alternative "C", for a better L.A.X.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00698 Chavez, Samuel None Provided 7/10/2001

PC00698-1

Comment:

I support Master Plan "C"!

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00699 Leal, Lila None Provided 7/9/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00601; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00601.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00700 Sandoval, Ana None Provided 7/9/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00604; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00604.

PC00701 Frederick, Kenneth None Provided 7/10/2001

PC00701-1

Comment:

I SUPPORT MASTER PLAN ALTERNATIVE "C"

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00702 Ikegami, John None Provided 7/13/2001

PC00702-1

Comment:

- Fully support the Master Plan. Be sure to provide DIRECT ACCESS from terminals to Green Line.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

PC00702-2

Comment:

- Add dedicated access from the freeway to the terminal area without merging into Sepulveda tunnel.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00702-3

Comment:

- Large Hotel in the center of loop may be a desirable improvement. Be sure to cap the rate with profit control.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00702-4

Comment:

- A good plan and must move forward.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00703 **Ramirez, Alexander** **Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108** **7/12/2001**

PC00703-1

Comment:

I support Master Plan "C" for a better LAX

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00704 **Skorheim, Norman** **Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108** **7/12/2001**

PC00704-1

Comment:

I support Master-Plan-C

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00705 **McQuown, Norm** **Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108** **7/12/2001**

PC00705-1

Comment:

I support Master plan "C"

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00706 **Luna, Benjamin** **Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108** **7/12/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00705; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00705.

PC00707 **Fraser, Jim** **Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108** **7/12/2001**

PC00707-1

Comment:

Master Plan C

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

**PC00708 Rodriguez, Danie Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108 7/12/2001**

PC00708-1

Comment:

I support Master Plan C

Response:

Comment noted.

**PC00709 Vargas, A. Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108 7/12/2001**

PC00709-1

Comment:

Support Support

Response:

Comment noted.

**PC00710 Hernandez,
Anastacio Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108 7/12/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00705; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00705.

**PC00711 Jimenez, Robert Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108 7/12/2001**

PC00711-1

Comment:

[No text in comment]

Response:

No comments were included in this letter.

**PC00712 Duckwald, Sr.,
Lawrence Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108 7/12/2001**

PC00712-1

Comment:

I support the Master Plan Alternative "C" for a better & safer LAX.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00713 Martinez, Hector None Provided 7/12/2001

PC00713-1

Comment:

I SUPPORT MASTER PLAN "C" FOR A BETTER LAX

Response:

Comment noted.

**PC00714 Martinez, Jr., Alfred Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108 7/12/2001**

PC00714-1

Comment:

"C"

Response:

Comment noted.

**PC00715 Ochoa, Richard Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108 7/12/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00708; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00708.

**PC00716 Short, Edgar Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108 7/12/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00705; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00705.

**PC00717 Olmedo, Richard Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108 7/12/2001**

PC00717-1

Comment:

"C" for a safer L.A.X

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00718 **Pastor, Frank** **Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108** **7/12/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00705; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00705.

PC00719 **Kapko, Michael** **Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108** **7/12/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00705; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00705.

PC00720 **Martinez, Ruben** **Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108** **7/12/2001**

PC00720-1

Comment:

I support Master Plan C"

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00721 **Salisbury, Jerry** **Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108** **7/12/2001**

PC00721-1

Comment:

I support Master Plan "C" for a better L.A.X.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00722 **Cardoza, Charles** **Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108** **7/12/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00708; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00708.

PC00723 **McCarthy, Dan** **Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108** **7/12/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00705; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00705.

**PC00724 Kemmer, Kenny Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108 7/12/2001**

PC00724-1

Comment:

I support Measure "C", the Master Plan

Response:

Comment noted.

**PC00725 Carrilli, Opiar Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108 7/12/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00705; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00705.

**PC00726 Green, Ronald Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108 7/12/2001**

PC00726-1

Comment:

I would like to see the Airport Expansion, to make things easier.

Response:

Comment noted.

**PC00727 Jessie, Ayala Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108 7/10/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00701; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00701.

**PC00728 Campos, Joseph Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108 7/9/2001**

PC00728-1

Comment:

I support Plan C for a safer airport

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00729 **Witt, Kenneth** **Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108** **7/10/2001**

PC00729-1

Comment:
I support Master Plan Alternative "C"

Response:
Comment noted.

PC00730 **Ige, Mabel** **Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108** **7/9/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00605; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00605.

PC00731 **Teran, Bob** **Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108** **7/9/2001**

PC00731-1

Comment:
I support plan C

Response:
Comment noted.

PC00732 **Ortega, Estela** **None Provided** **6/10/2001**

PC00732-1

Comment:
I support Plan "C" for a more efficient Airport.

Response:
Comment noted.

PC00733 **[unreadable], Ben** **None Provided** **7/9/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00600; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00600.

PC00734 Demchak, Juanita Los Angeles Sheet Metal 7/10/2001
Workers' Local 108

PC00734-1

Comment:
I support plan "C" for a safer airport.

Response:
Comment noted.

PC00735 Medina, Luther Los Angeles Sheet Metal 7/9/2001
Workers' Local 108

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00603; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00603.

PC00736 Ward, Charles Los Angeles Sheet Metal 7/10/2001
Workers' Local 108

PC00736-1

Comment:
The airport can be a better place if it were modernized.

Please do something about the gridlock.

Please make it a safer place.

PLEASE

Response:
Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

Also, please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00737 Odom, James Los Angeles Sheet Metal 7/9/2001
Workers' Local 108

PC00737-1

Comment:
I DO SUPPORT THE LAX MASTER PLAN, ALTERNATIVE "C"

Response:
Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

**PC00738 Natividad, Jaime Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108 7/10/2001**

PC00738-1

Comment:

I support Master Plan Alternative "C"

Response:

Comment noted.

**PC00739 Amador, Coy Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108 7/12/2001**

PC00739-1

Comment:

I support the Master Plan "C" (LAX)

Response:

Comment noted.

**PC00740 Berrard, Sydney Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108 7/9/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00601; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00601.

PC00741 Sandoval, Alfonso None Provided 7/9/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00603; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00603.

**PC00742 Huckabee, Joseph Los Angeles Sheet Metal
Workers' Local 108 7/9/2001**

PC00742-1

Comment:

I am in full support of Master Plan "C".

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00743 Teran, Mario Los Angeles Sheet Metal 7/9/2001
Workers' Local 108

PC00743-1

Comment:

I support Master Plan C I use it all of the time and it needs help.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00744 Mahony, Paul None Provided 7/14/2001

PC00744-1

Comment:

We would like to know what will be done about the increased traffic on Sepulveda Blvd. Our back yard backs up to Sepulveda and our concern is with noise from vehicles as well as aircraft. We noticed on Aviation blvd. south of Marine in Manhattan Beach that a block wall was built by the city because of traffic & we know that the traffic here is worse than that. Does the city of L.A. have any such plans for Sepulveda blvd. between Manchester & Howard Hughes parkway?

Response:

Protecting neighborhoods is one of the four principles guiding the development of the Ground Access Plan. Protection from traffic-generated noise will be addressed in the neighborhood protection program that will be implemented following adoption of the LAX Master Plan. The Neighborhood Protection program is summarized in Topical Response TR-ST-2, (subsection 7.3.4).

PC00745 Wolf, Frank None Provided 6/25/2001

PC00745-1

Comment:

Why is LAWA expanding LAX creating new problems for the surrounding communities when it fails to correct existing problems?

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-121 regarding opportunities to alleviate impacts associated with past or present airport activities at LAX. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00745-2

Comment:

All too frequently the local media reports of an incident involving aircraft maneuvering within the confines of the airport. What is currently being done to minimize accidents on the ground between behemoths aircraft at the gates and on the taxiways.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00746 Sterner, Rick None Provided 7/14/2001

PC00746-1

Comment:

I have been a home owner in Playa del Rey for 15 years and live 1 mile from the airport at LAX. The jets take over the water near my house I am an airport employee.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00746-2

Comment:

(1) My family doesn't like the noise. Its the worst problem in my area.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for more information on and comparisons of noise and noise-related land use impacts under the baseline and Year 2000 conditions and the various Master Plan alternatives including new Alternative D. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PC00746-3

Comment:

(2) A fine black ash dust falls on my property and I suspect it is jet exhaust. I have two toddlers. Will this dust hurt them?

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition, Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PC00746-4

Comment:

(3) Im concerned about the 1,302% increase in smog expected with the expansion of LAX.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC00746-5

Comment:

Will the jets have smog control standards like automobiles

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00608-2 regarding aircraft emission standards.

PC00747 Mashburn, Lucille None Provided 7/13/2001

PC00747-1

Comment:

The comments of the City of Inglewood on the Draft LAX Master Plan, and Draft-Environmental Impact Statement / Environmental Impact Report, allege that the studies were flawed, due to use of improper baseline statistics.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-1 regarding baseline issues.

PC00747-2

Comment:

The above documents also appear to be out of compliance with many state and federal applicable laws.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00747-3

Comment:

LAWA owes the surrounding communities replies and explanations to each allegation.

Response:

In accordance with the provisions of NEPA and CEQA, FAA and LAWA have prepared written responses to all comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. These responses are provided herein as part of this Final EIS/EIR.

PC00748 Orriss, Bruce None Provided 7/13/2001

PC00748-1

Comment:

Mr. Ritchie: I support the effort to reorg/expand the airport within its boundaries and make it more efficient to allow some additional capacity.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00748-2

Comment:

I am against a ring road that will destroy our new downtown Westchester that has been just finished within the last few years. There must be another way to feed traffic into the airport.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the Ring Road. Also, the alternatives were planned to satisfy the future airport demand while also mitigating any impacts on the surrounding street system, including in Westchester. The analysis revealed that the plan would help to separate regional airport traffic from local traffic, which is a goal of a well-planned roadway/freeway system. This would help to

3. Comments and Responses

alleviate airport-related traffic in Westchester. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road, as was detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00748-3

Comment:

Also another issue that I've yet to hear voiced is this. I am an aircraft engineer at Northrop Aircraft for the last 30 years. I have lived in Inglewood/Westchester since 1966. I have watched your air traffic increase tremendously during that time. This airport cannot support too much more air traffic. The air space and your air traffic control system will not allow it. Your looking at an accident waiting to happen! Remember Cerritos

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00749 Sawall, Ruth None Provided 7/12/2001

PC00749-1

Comment:

I am the grandmother of Ethan Corgrove who resides at 77th. and Kenwood. I plead with you to hold back any expansion of LAX due to the pollution you already have here in Los Angeles. Citizens here in Westchester does not need anymore. Please think of our grandchildren's future. Thank you.

Response:

Comment noted. Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00750 Sawall, Eugene None Provided 7/13/2001

PC00750-1

Comment:

Expansion of LAX is the least desirable of the options to improve airline service to L.A. and the adjoining area.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00750-2

Comment:

Our children live in Westchester, and are particularly ill served by the expansion proposal. LAX as presently provided creates a level of pollution which can only be considered as stressing the limit of acceptability and safety, as well as reasonable convenience for air travelers.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4 and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-4 and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00751 Shimada, Loraine None Provided 7/13/2001

PC00751-1

Comment:

I am against the LAX Expansion for the following reasons:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below. In addition, it should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00751-2

Comment:

1) Increase in air pollution

Response:

Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In general, the predicted air pollution impacts of any of the LAX Master Plan build alternatives will be lower than the predicted impacts of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution.

PC00751-3

Comment:

2) Increase traffic congestion

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00751-4

Comment:

3) Negative impact on the Westchester shopping district on Sepulveda Blvd

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided additional discussion beyond that presented in the Draft EIS/EIR of potential acquisition effects on the Westchester Business District. As was described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsections 4.2.6.2 through 4.2.6.4), acquisition within the Westchester Business District would be about 16 acres or 31 percent of the District under Alternative A, about 11 acres or 21 percent under Alternative B, or approximately 13 acres or 26 percent of the District under Alternative C. No shopping centers are proposed for acquisition and Ralph's Supermarket is not proposed for acquisition under any of the build alternatives. Alternative A would include acquisition of Longs Drugstore and Office Depot. Office Depot would also be acquired under Alternative C. Longs Drugstore would not be acquired under Alternatives B or C. Alternative A would also acquire the Mayfair Square Shopping area. Under Alternatives A through C, relocation opportunities would be available for some uses nearby within Westchester Southside. Also, many of the uses being acquired are airport related and a number of the community related uses that would be acquired (a bank, an office supply store, a bar and beauty shop) would remain available through other similar businesses located in close proximity within the Westchester Business District.

Also, as was described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6.5), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA Staff's new preferred Alternative, Alternative D does not include any acquisition within the Westchester Business District. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00751-5

Comment:

4) Overall negative impact on surrounding neighborhoods.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00751-6

Comment:

I also believe a major airport should be built in Orange County to reduce traffic congestion on the 405 FWY between Orange County & LAX & all other negative impacts caused by Orange County passengers driving to LAX.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC00752

**Guindon, Ray &
Elaine**

None Provided

7/12/2001

PC00752-1

Comment:

We sincerely hope that you will not abandon the safety and well being of our Westchester community by expansion of LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00752-2

Comment:

We know about the significant increase in traffic, noise, pollution and airport havoc that airport expansion will produce.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00752-3

Comment:

It is only logical that airports should expand in other areas of Calif., like Palmdale & Ontario.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00754

**Weldon, Cynthia &
Lyle**

None Provided

7/12/2001

PC00754-1

Comment:

As homeowners in the Westchester area, we oppose the expansion of LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00754-2

Comment:

We feel it would be in the better interests of all L.A. citizens to explore the expansions of existing smaller airports in the Los Angeles area, including Palmdale, Ontario & Burbank. Los Angeles is a city too big for one major airport.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No

3. Comments and Responses

Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00754-3

Comment:

Please consider this suggestion - - don't harm our wonderful neighborhood.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00755

**Watson, Russ and
Maureen**

None Provided

7/12/2001

PC00755-1

Comment:

I feel that the community surrounding LAX already has enough traffic, noise and pollution without expanding the airport.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00755-2

Comment:

I feel strongly that Palmdale, Ontario and John Wayne airports need to be expanded instead especially for cargo flights.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale, and Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand.

PC00756 Hoskins, Barbara None Provided 7/12/2001

PC00756-1

Comment:

The 405 freeway is full - a virtual parking lot. The 105 freeway is much the same. Our surface streets are full. Sepulveda doesn't move at 9 AM and 5:00 PM.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00756-2

Comment:

Please consider alternative places. Cargo certainly should go elsewhere.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan, Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, and Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand.

PC00757 Clever, DeLoris None Provided 7/12/2001

PC00757-1

Comment:

I am 80 yrs. old. Have lived in this area for 70 yrs First on Fairview Bld. Went to Inglewood High. I use to ride my horse on the area where I now live. It has changed too much.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00757-2

Comment:

The traffic on Sepulveda now is terrible. The time it takes to get from the tunnel to 77th Street, you have to sit on the signals wasting gasoline and all the fumes it creates.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00757-3

Comment:

I can wash off my side walks every day & the dirt is unbelievable - Even the outside lids of our trash barrels are covered w/ dust & the window sills, etc -

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC00757-4

Comment:

Wish it could be like it was. When my husband was alive his business was almost ruined & he had to start all over again the houses that where taken away - Not again.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. No residential relocation is proposed under Alternative D.

PC00757-5

Comment:

Move out to the desert with your airport

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00758

Cavallaro, Deborah

None Provided

7/13/2001

PC00758-1

Comment:

LAX Master Plan is ludicrous! It's a colossal waste of tax payer' money!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that construction of the improvements proposed by the LAX Master Plan would be funded by airport-related revenues, not through taxpayer funds.

PC00758-2

Comment:

It's outdated before you begin and you know it but want to proceed anyway???

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00758-3

Comment:

Airports need to be away from densely populated areas! Develop Palmdale with all of the infrastructure required. In the long run it's the cheapest and best solution.

Stop the short sighted thinking!

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00759

Benke, Genevieve

None Provided

7/13/2001

PC00759-1

Comment:

Why ruin one of the nicer middle income communities when there are other saner options! Most major cities have located their airports an hour or more from city center. Train and bus service connecting airport to city center needs to be developed. Ontario, Palmdale, El Toro are far more logical locations for the increase in air commerce.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00759-2

Comment:

The thousands of people who would be adversely affected need to have a voice in determining what is best for the community.

Response:

Comment noted. The FAA and LAWA are committed to extensive public outreach and input. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00759-3

Comment:

Enough of high-handedness by the bureaucrats and those whose interests are antithetical to the communities: I.E. profit versus quality of life.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00760

Koda, Kimi

None Provided

7/12/2001

PC00760-1

Comment:

Please do not expand/enlarge the volume of traffic to LAX. We loved Westchester as it used to be.

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00760-2

Comment:

Traffic has increased to unacceptable levels, noise has increased with the large number of flights.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00760-3

Comment:

We would like you to leave it alone and move your plans to other airports - Orange Co. & Ontario.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00760-4

Comment:

Please do not tear Westchester up to increase air traffic at LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00761 Dumalski, Gunther None Provided 7/14/2001

PC00761-1

Comment:

This is to add my voice of PROTEST as regards the planned EPANSION of the AIRPORT.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00761-2

Comment:

For many decades the airport has been growing incrementally. Some time such expansion must stop. The time is NOW to actually enhance the usefulness of the other airports in your system. The development of PALMDALE, for instance will come eventually. But you should work diligently toward that end right now.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00761-3

Comment:

The safety and welfare of our community is at stake.

I have lived in Los Angeles since 1924 and in Westchester since 1950.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00762 Cooper, Kim None Provided 7/13/2001

PC00762-1

Comment:

Just wanted to register my opinion on the expansion of LAX. As a Westchester resident I am strongly opposed to any proposition expanding the airport. Westchester is perfect as it is now and we don't need any more noise, smog or traffic. Development of other airports around the Southland should definitely be undertaken before any expansion of LAX is even considered.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendices D and G and Technical Reports 2, 3 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendices S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-2 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00763 Ring, Marion None Provided 7/13/2001

PC00763-1

Comment:

The airport expansion will bring more traffic, pollution and more noise to our area.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00763-2

Comment:

I have seen houses torn down, a High School gone and a once quiet area turn into a nosy, dirty neighborhood.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00763-3

Comment:

The airport expansion needs to go elsewhere. Westchester residents don't need to take the blast of additional air demand.

Take a look and see what other cities and countries have done. Their airports are mainly out of residential areas.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00763-4

Comment:

Soundproofing is not the answer. A quality of life is to be able to go outdoors and enjoy the environment.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program and Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00764

**Barnaba, John &
Frances**

None Provided

7/13/2001

PC00764-1

Comment:

As I'm writing a white jet flew off course & over our house check 7-13-01 9:30 AM. This happens quite often - I call in but it still continues.

Response:

For additional information on why these deviations from the centerline departures occur, please see Topical Response TR-N-3. LAX does keep records of the noise complaint and complainer. In the event that a complainant does request a written response and includes a mailing address, LAWA's Noise Management staff policy is to provide them with written response. However, no more than five noise events will be investigated on a monthly basis. LAWA has also recently incorporated a policy to place the complainant on a monthly mailing list where all incoming identified noise complaint calls are put on a monthly log and addressed by LAWA Noise Management staff. Then the responses (broken down by date, time and block address) are sent to the requesting community members. LAWA has recently installed a PASSUR system to assist the community in tracking aircraft operations. By going to the LAWA website www.lawa.org and entering the Noise Management section, community members can specifically identify LAX operations that cross their community.

PC00764-2

Comment:

Living here since 1956 & watching the people & area being PROSTITUED by POLITICIONS it's a sham.-

An area with the ambiance of places like Torrey Pine's or even like Carmel -

3. Comments and Responses

As spoiled -

As for traffic - !#/ .e.-

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00765 Gabelman, Brian None Provided 7/14/2001

PC00765-1

Comment:

I am strongly opposed to expansion of LAX.

This, combined with the Playa Vista Project will unfairly & significantly degrade the quality of life in Westchester, creating massive traffic & air pollution problems.

Please respect our rights!

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Response to Comment AL00018-19 regarding cumulative impacts.

PC00766 Hodges, Laura None Provided 7/12/2001

PC00766-1

Comment:

We urge you to please expand the air traffic in the Los Angeles area by developing and expanding Palmdale, Ontario and El Toro.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00767 Sommer, Mark None Provided 7/14/2001

PC00767-1

Comment:

We feel that the airport noise is high already and do not support LAX Expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PC00767-2

Comment:

We think that outerlying communities should share the burden/responsibility of airport traffic noise. LAX already is overcrowded. We support the regionalization of airport traffic.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00768 Considine, Anne None Provided 7/9/2001

PC00768-1

Comment:

It is my opinion that LAX should not be expanded. We have lived in our home in Westchester since 1962. We have seen in prior expansion, many homes were torn down, large expanses of land left idle, long after the people were asked to move.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-121 and Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding the mitigation of impacts to the community from activities at LAX. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00768-2

Comment:

The traffic on Sepulveda & Lincoln has been on the increase for many years. Further expansion will only result in more noise, traffic on our surface streets & freeways.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00768-3

Comment:

The demand for larger cargo aircraft, more flights, & heavy aircraft operations & overcrowding of air corridors may lead to air disasters.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00768-4

Comment:

Ontario & Palmdale not LAX, should be expanded. El Toro should also be developed as well.

Response:

Comment noted. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00768-5

Comment:

I pray you will give my request some consideration. Thank you.

Response:

Responses to individual comments included in this comment letter are provided above.

PC00769 Breese, Kristine None Provided

PC00769-1

Comment:

You've got to be kidding me. We're going to allow our airport, our community and our children shoulder the burden of the region's air traffic needs and let Orange County get by with their 10 million - passenger, no-planes-after-10:00 p.m. airport at John Wayne and no development at El Toro? NO WAY!

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build

3. Comments and Responses

alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00769-2

Comment:

My two kids are already breathing the dirty air from planes and cars stuck in traffic.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-3.

PC00769-3

Comment:

We're already awakened by planes overhead.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding areas exposed to high aircraft noise levels under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions and current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. See also Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program, Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels, and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC00769-4

Comment:

Please, please seek a regional solution to this huge issue. We love our community and only want LAX to be a good neighbor.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00770

Komoc, Bashar

None Provided

7/13/2001

PC00770-1

Comment:

Unfortunately only when people die as a result of negligence or greed, then things get corrected. This is exactly the case of LAX expansion of any kind.

Mr. Jim Ritchie's name, as well as others, should, and will be linked directly to any tragic death in the future resulting from an air-collision, or cancer related cases due to pollution as a direct result of expanding LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety impacts in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety and Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please note that LAX

3. Comments and Responses

is not run as a for-profit organization. It is a public service and the fees collected are used to pay for the maintenance and upkeep. As required by Federal law, any funds generated at the airport must be expended at the airport.

PC00771 **Weinberg, Stan** **None Provided** **7/14/2001**

PC00771-1

Comment:

I believe that the proposed LAX expansion is a very bad idea for the reasons indicated below. The LAX expansion will add more noise, air pollution and traffic to the surrounding communities which are already under siege from the airport.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00771-2

Comment:

The plan poses major health hazards to people living and working in the surrounding communities.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC00771-3

Comment:

The surface streets in Westchester cannot handle any more traffic that would result from expanding LAX. We do not need the LAX airport expansion to dump more traffic on the surface streets in the area and on the already overburdened I-405 freeway

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PC00771-4**Comment:**

The proposed LAX expansion plan will remove an estimated 250 small businesses, decimating what remains of the Westchester business district and will adversely effect the employment of many employees forcing business to relocate or close. Also, the LAX expansion will remove many homes and force its residents to relocate elsewhere. Westchester's business district and residences still have not recovered from the last LAX airport expansion.

Response:

The Master Plan is considered separate from growth and expansion that has occurred at LAX in the past. Please see Response to Comment PC00035-2 regarding residential acquisition; Response to Comment AL00018-1 regarding commercial property acquisition within the Westchester Business District; and Response to Comment PC00013-5 regarding business acquisition and relocation impacts, proposed collateral development at LAX Northside/Westchester Southside, and the proposed Preliminary Property Acquisition and Relocation Plan. As discussed therein, LAX Northside/Westchester Southside will serve as a community commercial "village" intended to benefit Westchester residents and accommodate displaced uses. While significant business relocation impacts would occur under each of the build Alternatives for certain types of land uses, the long-term economic benefits occurring over the life of the Master Plan (through 2015) would include increases in employment opportunities, annual property taxes, and business tax revenues. Refer to Response to Comment PC01679-20 regarding the increased employment and economic output expected to result from Master Plan implementation. It should be noted that Alternative D would involve the acquisition of far fewer businesses than the other build alternatives, would involve the least amount of potential acquisition-related employment loss, would not require acquisition within the Westchester Business District, and does not propose residential acquisition. As with past improvement projects at LAX, the Master Plan has been developed in response to increasing local, regional, and international demand for air transportation, in an effort to sustain and promote economic growth throughout the Los Angeles region. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-120 and Response to Comment PC01879-11 regarding mitigation of potential acquisition and relocation impacts. Additionally, refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding the potential effects of the Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester.

PC00771-5**Comment:**

In the 1960's, the residents were promised that LAX airport would never be expanded again when many fine homes and businesses were destroyed.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-121 and Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding the mitigation of impacts to the community from activities at LAX.

PC00771-6**Comment:**

There are more airports in the Southern California region than in any other region in the world. The City of Los Angeles owns four of them: Van Nuys, Ontario, Palmdale and LAX. The City of Los Angeles must do its part to create an efficient regional airport system so that people and goods can move through the region in a safe and timely manner. By expanding the airports regionally we can minimize the safety risks associated with overcrowding LAX airport, reduce traffic congestion, spread the impact of noise and air pollution, thus reducing the impact on any one area and airport. This will result in implementing a comprehensive air transportation system to take us through the year 2025, and beyond. Growth projections point inland, so it is logical that airports should be expanded where there will be the greatest need, such as at Van Nuys, Ontario and Palmdale. It is not fair to decimate the business

3. Comments and Responses

district of Westchester and take more homes just to accommodate more air traffic that can be handled by development and expansion at other regional airports.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Please also see Response to Comment PC00599-49 and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00771-7

Comment:

I have lived in Westchester for 29 years since 1972 and I have developed allergies as an adult living in Westchester that I attribute to air pollution from all of the airplanes flying in and out of LAX.

Response:

Please refer to Topical Responses TR-HRA-2 and TR-HRA-3 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects and human health impacts.

PC00771-8

Comment:

Westchester is a fine, stable and family neighborhood community. It deserves to be preserved and protected.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00772

Reilly, Ronald

None Provided

7/13/2001

PC00772-1

Comment:

Sensible cities do not attempt to locate massive airports in heavily populated areas - check out Denver or Washington, D.C. Although it may be inconvenient for business and travelers (including me) to travel to an expansive airport in Ontario or Palmdale it would not only solve expansion at this time, but also ten years from now when further expansion will be needed.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided

3. Comments and Responses

in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00773 Frank, Alice None Provided 7/14/2001

PC00773-1

Comment:

Don't take homes in Westchester. No on Lax Expressway.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation. Also see Response to Comment PC00418-1 and Topical Response TR-APPK-2 regarding the LAX Expressway.

PC00773-2

Comment:

and part of Historic Centifinela adobe no

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding impacts to the Centinela Adobe.

PC00774 Reyes, Victoria None Provided 7/15/2001

PC00774-1

Comment:

Over population & pollution is not what this city needs to flourish.

It's a bad plan!

I love my home, I love this town. Westchester provides good quality of life.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00775 Indgin Family, None Provided

PC00775-1

Comment:

[We just received this in July!]

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process. There has been extensive opportunity to provide input.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00775-2

Comment:

Please don't add an extra 2000+ flights a day - that's almost 2 per minute extra. The noise would be ceaseless, pollution unbearable, and traffic gridlocked even worse than it is now!!

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00775-3

Comment:

You know what must be done - Other regional airports expanded. LAX expansion is shortsighted.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00775-4

Comment:

Do not dare take any extra Westchester property for 'cargo space'. This is a community, not a storage facility.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00776

Brennan, Karen

None Provided

7/13/2001

PC00776-1

Comment:

In order to build LAX Expressway & the Ring Road, the LAWA will have to acquire one-third of the Central Business District on Sepulveda Blvd, homes near Nielsen Fields and part of historic Centinela Adobe.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00018-1 regarding commercial property acquisition within the Westchester Business District and Response to Comment PC00035-2 regarding residential acquisition. A fourth Master Plan build alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was proposed following publication of the Draft EIS/EIR and would not require acquisition within the Westchester Business District nor any residential acquisition (refer to the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for analysis of Alternative D). Alternative D also would not involve development of the LAX Expressway or the ring road, thereby precluding any of the associated impacts.

3. Comments and Responses

The Centinela Adobe would not be acquired under any of the Master Plan build alternatives. Impacts to the historic significance of this property were addressed in Section 4.9.1, Historic/Architectural and Archaeological/Cultural Resources, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Impacts attributable to development of the LAX Expressway (under Alternatives A, B, and C) are discussed in Appendix K, Supplemental Environmental Evaluation for LAX Expressway and State Route 1 Improvements, of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00776-2

Comment:

What happens when this Expansion isn't enough? Whose homes will be the next target?

Response:

Acquisition was addressed in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition.

PC00776-3

Comment:

Overcrowding of the air corridors may lead to air disasters.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00777

Gare, Helen

None Provided

7/14/2001

PC00777-1

Comment:

I am opposed to present plan for expansion of Los Angeles Airport (LAX) because it will increase air pollution, noise & traffic congestion. These elements are just marginally acceptable at this time.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00777-2

Comment:

Master plan is only a short Term solution to congestion at airport. Other key airports should be utilized.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate

3. Comments and Responses

future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00778 Migliore, Barbara None Provided 7/12/2001

PC00778-1

Comment:

As a thirty year resident of Westchester, I am extremely concerned about the proposed LAX expansion for a number of reasons.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below. In addition, it should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00778-2

Comment:

Removal of one third of the Central Business District on Sepulveda Boulevard will further erode the number of viable and accessible local businesses. Removal of homes near Nielson Field and part of historic Centinela Adobe will diminish our existing community.

Response:

This comment is similar in content to Comment PC00776-1; please refer to Response to Comment PC00776-1. Also see Response to Comment AL00018-1 regarding commercial property acquisition within the Westchester Business District and Response to Comment PC00035-2 regarding residential acquisition.

PC00778-3

Comment:

Increased traffic from cargo carrying trucks and from passenger vehicles will add more congestion to already overcrowded streets and freeways. Traffic on the 405 freeway is currently at a crawl that extends 25 miles both north and south of LAX.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the Congestion Management Program, and Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

PC00778-4

Comment:

An increase in surface and air traffic will certainly increase noise and pollutants to the community.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00778-5**Comment:**

Recent reports indicate the number of near collisions on the ground has increased. More planes can only increase that number both on the ground and in the air.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00778-6**Comment:**

The basis for expansion, the ability to handle more air traffic, can only lead to a decrease in the quality of life not only for Westchester, but for all of the City of Los Angeles.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00778-7**Comment:**

Why must Los Angeles bear the brunt of being the single major airport serving three counties, Los Angeles, Bakersfield and Orange? Why must so many planes come to LAX? Why should passengers, visitors, cargo, shuttles and busses travel so far to reach an airport? The obvious solution is to develop Ontario and Palmdale airports that are also owned by the City of Los Angeles and to encourage the development of El Toro.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00778-8**Comment:**

I most strongly urge the LAWA Commissioners to vote against the expansion of LAX.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00779

Migliore, John

None Provided

7/7/2001

PC00779-1

Comment:

As a thirty year resident of Westchester, I am extremely concerned about the proposed LAX expansion for a number of reasons.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below. In addition, it should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00779-2

Comment:

Removal of one third of the Central Business District on Sepulveda Boulevard will further erode the number of viable and accessible local businesses. Removal of homes near Nielson Field and part of historic Centinela Adobe will diminish our existing community.

Response:

This comment is similar in content to Comment PC00776-1; please refer to Response to Comment PC00776-1. Also see Response to Comment AL00018-1 regarding commercial property acquisition within the Westchester Business District and Response to Comment PC00035-2 regarding residential acquisition.

PC00779-3

Comment:

Increased traffic from cargo carrying trucks and from passenger vehicles will add more congestion to already overcrowded streets and freeways. Traffic on the 405 freeway is currently at a crawl that extends 25 miles both north and south of LAX.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the Congestion Management Program, and Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

PC00779-4

Comment:

An increase in surface and air traffic will certainly increase noise and pollutants to the community.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00779-5**Comment:**

Recent reports indicate the number of near collisions on the ground has increased. More planes can only increase that number both on the ground and in the air.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00779-6**Comment:**

The basis for expansion, the ability to handle more air traffic, can only lead to a decrease in the quality of life not only for Westchester, but for all of the City of Los Angeles.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester.

PC00779-7**Comment:**

Why must Los Angeles bear the brunt of being the single major airport serving three counties, Los Angeles, Bakersfield and Orange? Why must so many planes come to LAX? Why should passengers, visitors, cargo, shuttles and busses travel so far to reach an airport? The obvious solution is to develop Ontario and Palmdale airports that are also owned by the City of Los Angeles and to encourage the development of El Toro.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00779-8**Comment:**

I most strongly urge the LAWA Commissioners to vote against the expansion of LAX.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00780

Reed, Nancy

None Provided

7/13/2001

PC00780-1

Comment:

I have no desire to have more airport fallout in my lungs.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC00780-2

Comment:

Since moving here in 1973 - The airport has put people, North of this LAX & displaced people, Families & lovely homes & gardens.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00780-3

Comment:

It appears to me as a student pilot - that Palmdale should be the optimum choice - room to expand and lots more air to assist in healthy lungs & good life in takeoffs & landing - its a real Win/Win.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00781

**Rouseyrol, Andre &
Barbara**

None Provided

7/12/2001

PC00781-1

Comment:

We as residents of Westchester for the past 36 years are opposed to the expansion planned for LAX for the following reasons:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00781-2**Comment:**

1) SAFETY from overcrowding of the air corridors. We witnessed a Qantas aircraft approaching LAX on the wrong landing strip with their landing gears down and will never forget how close the plane was to our home.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00781-3**Comment:**

2) TRAFFIC is a night-mare for the residents now in trying to get to business; our area cannot handle any more cars with the LAX expansion

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PC00781-4**Comment:**

3) CARGO demands should be handled from other areas, i.e. Ontario, Palmdale and El Toro Develop these airports to take the pressure off LAX.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00599-54.

PC00781-5**Comment:**

4) LOSS of the Central Business District on Sepulveda Blvd and homes. LAX continues to take homes from the area.

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided additional discussion beyond that presented in the Draft EIS/EIR of potential acquisition effects on the Westchester Business District. As described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsections 4.2.6.2 through 4.2.6.4), acquisition within the Westchester Business District would be about 16 acres or 31 percent of the District under Alternative A, about 11 acres or 21 percent under Alternative B, or approximately 13 acres or 26 percent of the district under Alternative C. Under Alternatives A, B, and C, relocation opportunities would be available for some uses nearby within Westchester Southside. Also, many of the uses being acquired are airport related and a number of the community related uses that would be acquired (a bank, an office supply store, a bar and beauty shop) would still remain available through similar businesses that are located in close proximity within the Westchester Business District.

Regarding residential acquisition, please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1, and note that Master Plan Commitment RBR-1 ensures that LAWA will implement a relocation plan for affected properties in compliance with the Uniform Relocation Act, state and local regulations, and FAA Advisory Circular 150/5100-17.

3. Comments and Responses

Also, as described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6.5), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, in contrast to the other build alternatives, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative), does not include any acquisition within the Westchester Business District or residential acquisition. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00781-6

Comment:

5) NOISE and AIR POLLUTION keeps increasing which destroys the family life. The residue in our bird-baths in the yard are proof of the increase in air pollution over the past years.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC00781-7

Comment:

At the present time there are so many large developments in the immediate area of LAX and not enough allowance for the increase of cars and people to handle these developments.

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00018-19 regarding the evaluation of cumulative impacts in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00781-8

Comment:

This Plan is only a short-term quick fix approach and should not be allowed to go forward for all of the above reasons. The development of the City of Los Angeles owned airports in Ontario and Palmdale should be where the expansion is done. Please leave LAX as is and go elsewhere..

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00782 **Warren, Bianca & Michael** **None Provided** **7/12/2001**

PC00782-1

Comment:

We are a very concerned about the plans for the LAX expansion. We recently just had a little baby and she is the reason why we oppose to the expansion. Air quality will suffer, noise pollution will increase, the traffic will unbarable.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00782-2

Comment:

Its hard for us to understand why in LA. when the expansion can be done in Palmdale or even El Toro, where not so many residences would be affected.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00782-3

Comment:

We also invested a lot of hard earned money in our new home. We believe property value will drop, hurting us tremendously. When we moved to Westchester, we had the plan to make Westchester our permanent and long lasting home. And we still want to.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00782-4

Comment:

The LAX expansion will not be a healthy development for Westchester because it will destroy home, shut down businesses

Response:

Comment noted. The acquisition and relocation impacts associated with the various Master Plan Alternatives were addressed in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses (subsection 4.4.2.6), of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment PC00035-2 regarding residential acquisition; and Response to Comment PC00013-5 regarding business acquisition and relocation impacts, proposed collateral development at LAX Northside/Westchester Southside, and the proposed Preliminary Property Acquisition and Relocation Plan. Also refer to Response to Comment PC01679-20 regarding the economic benefits, including increased employment and economic output, expected to result from Master Plan implementation. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-120 and Response to Comment PC01879-11 regarding mitigation of potential acquisition and relocation impacts. Additionally, refer to Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding the potential effects of the Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester.

PC00782-5

Comment:

and compromise safety - will air disaster be avoided. We don't believe so.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00782-6

Comment:

We've been hearing about the expansion for years. We truly hope that it never happens, for the sake of us and our children.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00784

Forbes, Mary

None Provided

7/13/2001

PC00784-1

Comment:

Am against any & all expansion of the LAX Airport -
Go to where there is open land & open another.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00784-2

Comment:

It will create more noise, pollution, traffic more mess & take from taxpayers. What about the safety of this community! This goes for my son who is at same add.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; safety impacts in Section 4.24.3, Safety; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that construction of the improvements proposed by the LAX Master Plan would be funded by airport-related revenues, not through taxpayer funds.

PC00785

Miller, Janet

None Provided

7/14/2001

PC00785-1

Comment:

As a concerned citizen of Westchester I am very opposed to the LAX Expansion regarding the Master Plan with special concerns about Environmental Impact Statement and Report. Keeping the Central Business District whole and not increasing Noise and air pollution are my biggest concerns.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. As indicated in TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not include acquisition within the Westchester business district.

PC00785-2

Comment:

I am hoping for alternative solutions to the need for increased need for cargo aircraft operations. Why not use Palmdale/Ontario or El Toro possibilities? Please help keep our neighbor whole.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00786 Phelps, Ruth None Provided 7/14/2001

PC00786-1

Comment:

I was born in Los Angeles and eventually graduated from El Segundo High School. Often with an apple and book I would sit under the eucalyptus trees about where the Douglass Mortuary now occupies and watch the small private planes use the airleions to do circle flights out in Mines Field airport. It was looking like toy planes and all the beautiful meadow and hills surrounded it. What has happened since then because of WW II and the aircraft factories in El Segundo is pretty horrible to view. I still have lived in Westchester since 1950 - saw the houses being built - and torn down. Westchester has been torn apart more than once - isn't it some other airport's turn? Please spare us!!

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-121 and Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding the mitigation of impacts to the community from activities at LAX. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00787 Cody, Anna None Provided

PC00787-1

Comment:

We've made our home in Westchester for the past 18 years. We are extremely concerned with the additional traffic and pollution resulting from further airport expansion at LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00787-2

Comment:

The Westchester/Playa del Rey community is daily impacted by the taxis, limos, shuttle buses and airport traffic.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the approach used to mitigate traffic impacts associated with the proposed build alternatives, including means to reduce impacts to local streets and communities. Also, the alternatives would be designed to limit west terminal access from the north on Pershing Drive. That is, while access would be provided from Playa del Rey to and from the east on the Ring Road, direct access to and from the west terminal would not be allowed. This is designed to restrict airport cut-through traffic in Playa del Rey. This should help the airport traffic issues in that community. Alternative D does not include a new west terminal.

PC00787-3**Comment:**

We are daily impacted by the noise and pollutants, and our beaches are covered with tar.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and coastal resources such as beaches in Section 4.14, Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC00787-4**Comment:**

We are a community bordered on three sides by major freeways. We are also in the midst of several large expansion projects in our community, all of which will result in additional traffic, over-crowding, and pollution in our neighborhoods.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00018-19 regarding the evaluation of cumulative impacts in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00787-5**Comment:**

Why should an area already severely impacted by airport expansion be subjected to it again? Surely other airports have available area for expansion, surrounded by communities who have not been subjected to the burden absorbed by Westchester/PDR.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00787-6**Comment:**

Previous airport expansions have had a negative impact on Westchester and Playa del Rey residential communities and business districts. The ghostly remains of Playa del Rey beachside neighborhoods is a daily reminder of prior expansion.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-121 and Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding the opportunities to alleviate impacts associated with past or present airport activities at LAX. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00787-7

Comment:

While growth is unavoidable and increased commerce is something we all can appreciate, Westchester/PDR has sacrificed enough. PLEASE assist us in a NO EXPANSION stance.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00788

Nachman, Martin

None Provided

7/13/2001

PC00788-1

Comment:

This is to inform you that my wife and I are very much opposed to the expansion of LAX. We have lived in this house for 18 years and have seen LAX steadily increase in size and traffic volume. Our main reasons for opposing any further increases are:

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC00788-2

Comment:

1. Greater number of flights & noise

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PC00788-3

Comment:

2. Impact on traffic which, as you know is already terrible (e.g. 405 "Parking Lot", Sepulveda jams, and even the [NEW] 105 is overcrowded.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00788-4

Comment:

3. It is time for a long-term solution re Ontario, Palmdale and/or El Toro.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00789

**Goldstein, Tim &
Maria**

None Provided

PC00789-1

Comment:

Please don't tear down the homes in Westchester. It will cost millions of dollars to accommodate & purchase homes for those who are asked to move out.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation issues, including affordable housing.

PC00789-2

Comment:

It would be a better solution to expand the Palmdale and Ontario airports. Why don't we start there?

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00790

Gladstone, Larry

None Provided

7/14/2001

PC00790-1

Comment:

NO MORE EXPANSION OF L.A.X.!

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00791 Vandexar, Shirley None Provided 7/9/2001

PC00791-1

Comment:

We reside near Manchester and Airport. I don't want to be directly next door to the airport.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00791-2

Comment:

The Nielsen Field & Centinela Adobe are very near my home.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding impacts to the Centinela Adobe.

PC00791-3

Comment:

Enough is Enough! Let another Airport do its share of transport!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00791-4

Comment:

PS. We moved to Westchester for peace & Quiet

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00792 No Author Identified, None Provided

PC00792-1

Comment:

??? STOP!
Expansion?! i,e,a,u,*.

3. Comments and Responses

Go to Ontario or Palmdale. Future plans should be aimed in that direction. Just think the money L.A. City could make by new business, rapid transit etc, etc, etc
Leave Westchester ALONE!!!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale, and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00793 Soelter, Undine None Provided 7/14/2001

PC00793-1

Comment:

I strongly object to the planned expansion of LAX for several reason.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments below. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00793-2

Comment:

For one, I am, very selfishly, concerned about the increase in the noise level for homes close and even not so close to the airport. Noise pollution is already very high, and in general is a great stress for everyone involved.

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-5 for a description of existing measures to address high noise levels and mitigation measures that would be implemented under the LAX Master Plan. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00017-52, regarding health effects of aircraft noise.

PC00793-3

Comment:

*My greatest concern, however, centers on increased air pollution. In recent years we have had a great influx of families with young children here in Westchester. The lung and airway tissues of young children, are especially susceptible to damages from inhalants. - I am an asthma sufferer myself. -

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00793-4

Comment:

With all the increased development around Westchester we already suffer an increase in traffic and air pollution, not to mention road congestion.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00018-19 regarding the evaluation of cumulative impacts in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00793-5

Comment:

I strongly urge you to not permit an expansion of LAX, but to, instead, expand inland airports, such as Ontario and Palmdale.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00793-6

Comment:

We have only so much land and real estate close to the ocean, why do you want to expand the airport here and reduce everyone's quality of life and cause negative effects for everyone's health?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and TR-HRA-4 regarding human health mitigation strategies. Also, Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00793-7

Comment:

Ideally speaking, all of LAX should be removed from this ocean shore area so that more people can have the opportunity to enjoy the clean air and cool temperatures associated with living here! So why expand here of all places?

The seemingly "easy" way out is most of the time not the right solution with a long range futuristic vision in mind.

Response:

Comment noted. The development of other alternative locations for the airport was discussed in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft

3. Comments and Responses

EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00794 Salk, Jean & Darin None Provided 7/13/2001

PC00794-1

Comment:

As residents of Westchester, we are very concerned about the airports proposed expansion plans. We feel our community already suffers from airport noise & traffic congestion. The proposed expansion of LAX would only exacerbate these conditions.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00794-2

Comment:

We would like to see the city focus on expanding existing airports that serve outlying communities.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00794-3

Comment:

Please keep us informed of the airports plans.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process.

PC00795 Hoskins, Vera None Provided 7/14/2001

PC00795-1

Comment:

I am happy the way things are.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00796 Hoffman, Walter None Provided 9/13/2001

PC00796-1

Comment:

The present passenger and cargo landings need to be reduced, not increased. Transfer the excess to Ontario & Palmdale now and develop other regional facilities. The cost of the LAX Master Plan would be better spent on other units.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00796-2

Comment:

Mitigation of current problems here need to be developed before any increase is allowed.

Response:

Comment noted. The 1996 environmental baseline accounts for the incremental increases in activity at LAX that have occurred up to that point, including airport-related traffic, noise, air pollutant emissions, and other environmental factors that affect the surrounding community. The impacts analysis contained within the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the environmental effects projected to occur with ongoing increases in activity projected to occur by 2015. The mitigation measures presented in the subject documents provide for both on-airport and off-airport improvements to reduce LAX's impacts to the local community, improvements that would not otherwise occur outside of the Master Plan and EIS/EIR processes. It should be noted that mitigation measures adopted as part of project approval are subject to the monitoring and reporting requirements of CEQA. Similarly, mitigation measures set forth as part of the Record of Decision (ROD) are also monitored.

PC00797 Oakes, R.N., B.S.N., None Provided 7/12/2001
E.M., E

PC00797-1

Comment:

Nothing is needed more than to move LAX to Palmdale as was planned 30 years ago -

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build

3. Comments and Responses

alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00797-2

Comment:

and build a fast train from LAX to Palmdale airport, as planned then.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand.

PC00797-3

Comment:

I have been through one destruction of Westchester. An airport for 50 million passengers was planned. You have been pushing it ever since. 89 million!

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding projected versus actual capacity levels at LAX and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding the potential effects of the Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester.

PC00797-4

Comment:

You are only interested in making your self & friends rich. How rich do you have to be???

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00797-5

Comment:

You should be caring about all the kids with asthma in this area & all the old folks dying from Airport Pollution, heart & Lung disease.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase. Please also see Topical Response TR-EJ-1 regarding potential air quality and health risk impacts on low-income and minority communities.

PC00797-6

Comment:

We have gridlock now on every freeway and street.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00797-7

Comment:

Playa Vista will block Lincoln totally.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment PC00148-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00148-2.

PC00797-8

Comment:

As our former allergist wrote in his newsletter every jet taking off puts as much pollution in the air as 10,000 cars running for 24 hours

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding increased air pollution. Please note, using FAA and EPA approved methodology, it can be shown that one Boeing 747-400 with four PW4056 engines emits 42 pounds of nitrogen oxides and roughly 1 pound each of carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, and sulfur oxides during takeoff mode. In 75 degree F weather, ten thousand vehicles traveling for one mile at 55 mph collectively emit roughly 2,900 pounds of carbon monoxide, 500 pounds of hydrocarbons, 70 pounds of nitrogen oxides, and 3 pounds of sulfur oxides.

PC00797-9

Comment:

To say nothing of the deafening noise -

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00797-10

Comment:

If you doubt that put out a pan of water and in one day see the film of jet fuel covering it. So empty the bird bath, the fountains, and the water under your potted plants.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC00797-11

Comment:

Everything - is toxic with pollution from Jim Ritchie - LAWA - and he's planning more. I say No! No! No!

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4 and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-4 and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects.

PC00797-12

Comment:

The explosion of population is North - East & South of L.A. So take the airports to those fast populated areas - and relieve the bumper to bumper traffic on the 405, 5, 10, 91, 105, 110, 101, 605, and the rest of our streets & freeways. If we have regional airports all the traffic will disperse and a lot of pollution of planes & cars & trucks too.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00798

Klocki, Beverly

None Provided

7/12/2001

PC00798-1

Comment:

We have lived at the above address for 29 years. We raised 2 children and more than doubled the size of our home in the past 29 years. The airport noise is tolerable at this point, but LAX expansion will drive us out of our home. The Westchester neighborhood will become a ghost town if LAX expansion continues.

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also note that overall, for the community of Westchester, the number of dwelling units that would be exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels in 2015 would decrease under all of the build alternatives when compared to the 1996 baseline or Year 2000 conditions. The greatest reduction in dwelling units exposed would occur under Alternative D, LAWA Staff's preferred alternative, with 4,431 fewer units exposed compared to the 1996 baseline and 2,589 fewer units exposed compared to Year 2000 conditions. Similarly, new analysis of single event noise levels presented in Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.6), and Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR shows that the number of residential units in Westchester exposed to 94 SEL or greater noise levels would be reduced in 2015 under all of the alternatives when compared to 1996 and Year 2000 conditions. The greatest reduction in 94 SEL exposure or nighttime awakenings would occur under Alternative D with 5,957 fewer units exposed compared to the 1996

3. Comments and Responses

baseline and 1,753 fewer units exposed compared to Year 2000 conditions. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00798-2

Comment:

Stop LAX expansion!!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00799

Chandler, Keith

None Provided

7/12/2001

PC00799-1

Comment:

Expansion of Lax will be the worse thing that ever happen to Los Angeles.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00799-2

Comment:

Increased traffic will result in poorer air quality, not only because of traffic, but the increased flights to L.A.

Response:

Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In general, the predicted air pollution impacts of any of the LAX Master Plan build alternatives will be lower than the predicted impacts of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution.

PC00799-3

Comment:

The people of Los Angeles are Against Expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00800 **Chaine, Randie** **None Provided** **7/13/2001**

PC00800-1

Comment:

I am very opposed to LAX expansion plan. My concerns are related to the impact LAX would have on my community of Westchester. LAX is already too busy.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00800-2

Comment:

More air traffic needs to be placed at Palmdale or Ontario. Ontario has plenty of space for expansion!

Please do not expand LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00801 **Devine, Trudi** **None Provided** **7/12/2001**

PC00801-1

Comment:

NO.
No LAX expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00801-2

Comment:

The plan would CREATE: Intolerable levels of SMOG. Thousands of acres of CONCRETE to accommodate endless snarls of POLLUTING Auto and Air TRAFFIC.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses were provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In general, the predicted air pollution impacts of any of the LAX Master Plan build alternatives will be lower than the

3. Comments and Responses

predicted impacts of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution.

PC00801-3

Comment:

The plan would DESTROY: A pleasant, safe, middle class and affordable (by Westside standards) NIEGHBORHOOD.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00801-4

Comment:

A thriving small business COMMUNITY.

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided additional discussion beyond that presented in the Draft EIS/EIR of potential acquisition effects on the Westchester Business District. As described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsections 4.2.6.2 through 4.2.6.4), acquisition within the Westchester Business District would be about 16 acres or 31 percent of the District under Alternative A, about 11 acres or 21 percent under Alternative B, or approximately 13 acres or 26 percent of the District under Alternative C. Under Alternatives A through C, relocation opportunities would be available for some uses nearby within Westchester Southside. Also, many of the uses that would be acquired are airport related and a number of the community related uses that would be acquired (a bank, an office supply store, a bar and beauty shop) would still remain available through similar businesses that are located in close proximity within the Westchester Business District.

Also, as described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6.5), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, in contrast to the other build alternatives, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative), does not include any acquisition within the Westchester Business District. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00801-5

Comment:

The historic treasure of the CENTINELLA ABOBE.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding impacts to the Centinela Adobe.

PC00801-6

Comment:

All of the above generally impoverishing the entire City of Los Angeles.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socioeconomics, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and in Technical Report S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00801-7

Comment:

Time for ORANGE COUNTY to pull their weight. They benefit greatly by much of the freight tonnage that arrives at LAX. They enjoy the vast passenger schedules at LAX. We Westchester Angelenos have co-operated and compromised over and over again with the LAX Department of Airports, While Orange County John Wayne won't allow air traffic after 10:00pm and conspire to authorized 2500 new homes to be built under the flight path of El Toro to thwart airport development there. ENOUGH!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC00802

Winkler, Emily

None Provided

7/12/2001

PC00802-1

Comment:

PLEASE RECONSIDER EXPANSION. WESTCHESTER IS A DESIRABLE COMMUNITY TO LIVE IN AND SAID EXPANSION WOULD DESTROY THE TRANQUILITY.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00802-2

Comment:

PALMDALE IS A GREAT ALTERNATIVE AND WOULD POSSIBLY BE EASIER & LESS COSTLY TO CONSTRUCT PLUS IT WOULD SOLVE CONSTRUCTION & TRAFFIC PROBLEMS IN THIS AREA - NOT TO MENTION LESS POLLUTION.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00803

Zilian, Carl

None Provided

7/12/2001

PC00803-1

Comment:

The LAX area is already heavily polluted from surface traffic as well as air traffic.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-3.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00803-2

Comment:

Soot on our windowsills is an everyday reality.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC00803-3

Comment:

I walk for fitness every day and I have learned to avoid Sepulveda Blvd in the early morning and after 3:00 PM because of the heavy traffic congestion with much idling due to the stop and go environment.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00803-4

Comment:

Further increases in traffic volume can only worsen an already bad situation.

Response:

Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In general, the predicted air pollution impacts of any of the LAX Master Plan build alternatives will be lower than the predicted impacts of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution.

PC00803-5

Comment:

Westchester residents are in large measure senior citizens who are particularly vulnerable to respiratory and cardiac problems.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase. Please also see Topical Response TR-EJ-1 regarding potential air quality and health risk impacts on low-income and minority communities.

PC00804 **Albert, Frank & Carolina** **None Provided** **7/13/2001**

PC00804-1

Comment:

We oppose the LAX Expansion. Long term planning is needed. The other key LA airports should be developed as opposed to LAX. We should not bear the burden of other County's need for air commerce.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00804-2

Comment:

We do not want our neighborhood ruined. We will fight this expansion & vote for those who share our views.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00805 **Haist, Robin** **None Provided** **7/13/2001**

PC00805-1

Comment:

Where exactly are the boundaries that the airport is planning to expand. How about a map.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review. Also, please refer to Chapter 3, Alternatives (Including Proposed Action), of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding extent of the build alternatives.

PC00805-2

Comment:

How about more news with details in the newspaper or a info packet sent to all area residents.

Response:

LAWA submits regular press releases to the media. Further, there is the LAX web site for information, www.laxmasterplan.org. Also, please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public outreach program associated with the LAX Master Plan.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00805-3

Comment:

We don't want this expansion/does it affect your house?

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00806

Hilton, Mike

None Provided

7/11/2001

PC00806-1

Comment:

THE TRAFFIC IS ALREADY INTOLERABLE ANY INCREASE COUPLED WITH THE HOWARD HUGHES PROJECT AND PLAYA VISTA WILL CREATE ONE OF THE MOST CONGESTED AREAS IN W.L.A.!

Response:

For details on how the future traffic demand from the Howard Hughes and Playa Vista developments were incorporated in the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, please see Topical Response TR-ST-2. Regarding existing traffic concerns surrounding LAX please see Topical Response TR-ST-4.

PC00806-2

Comment:

WE LIVE ON REALITIVELY QUITE STREETS, THE NOISE, POLLUTION, & TRAFFIC CONGESTION WOULD BE FAR TOO MUCH.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00806-3

Comment:

THE REGIONAL SOLUTION IS THE ANSWER. SOUTHERN CAL. NEEDS MORE THAN ONE MAJOR AIRPORT. WE ARE GROWING SO FAST, ANY EXPANSION OF LAX WILL BE FRUITLESS.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate

3. Comments and Responses

future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00807 **Nasman, Stig** **None Provided** **7/15/2001**

PC00807-1

Comment:

I urge you to block the L.A. Expansion! I will loose the home I have only owned for a short 10 months, I have put so much work, love and money into improving it.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

PC00807-2

Comment:

Please support keeping Westchester as a community with a small town atmosphere as it is today. This will be destroyed by:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00807-3

Comment:

- Increased traffic for construction, expansion and operations on local streets and the freeways.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-3 regarding construction traffic.

PC00807-4

Comment:

- More noise. It's already horrible. The soundproofing only partial helps - indoors.

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program, Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels, and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00807-5

Comment:

- Safety - More planes, flights, cargo and people. The increase in the size and volume of these factors increases the chance of disaster.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00807-6

Comment:

- Air Pollution - When planes take off they spew a large amount of all S GPA classified major air pollutants.

Response:

Comment noted. Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-2 regarding toxic air pollutants.

PC00807-7

Comment:

It can cause deadly health problems for all of us.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC00807-8

Comment:

The only intelligent approach is to spread operations out with a regional solution, other So. Cal areas need to absorb the impact of their own air traffic.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00808 **O'Connor, George** **None Provided** **7/12/2001**

PC00808-1

Comment:

Prior to getting into specifics I want you to know that I am a 60 year resident of the South Bay and I knew LAX first as Mines Field and the only things that flew off of it were airplanes built either by Douglas or North American.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00808-2

Comment:

Nothing I have seen, read, or heard of your Master Plan says anything about shifting any load to either Palmdale or Ontario. Ontario being centrally in Los Angeles County would be excellent for cargo and Palmdale to a lesser degree.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00808-3

Comment:

The increase in cargo traffic on the South side of LAX has already caused excess surface truck traffic with an attendant rise of Diesel emissions which have been hazardous to myself and my neighbors

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health impacts in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment. These risk assessments include the impact from diesel particulate emissions.

PC00808-4

Comment:

I look forward to your answer.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments PC00808-2 and PC00808-3 above.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00809 Klocker, B & JM None Provided

PC00809-1

Comment:

No airport expansion! Use PALMDALE, ONTARIO & ORANGE COUNTY Airports

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00809-2

Comment:

APPROVE of STATE building a Fast Hi speed RAIL FROM PALMDALE TO Los Angeles Not WESTCHESTER!

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand.

PC00809-3

Comment:

REASONS: TRAFFIC - NOISE - AIR POLLUTION - SAFETY - CARGO DEMANDS & KEEP WESTCHESTER AS A COMMUNITY!

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts to quality of life, and Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00810 Liberman, Pearl None Provided 7/13/2001

PC00810-1

Comment:

Please No LAX Expansion

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00811 Wofford, Susan, Ron None Provided 7/12/2001
& Kristen

PC00811-1

Comment:

As a resident of Westchester (and home owner), I have to deal with the noise from airplanes over my house on a daily basis. I certainly do not want any more noise than already exists - how much is too much I wonder?

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1.

PC00811-2

Comment:

How does this impact resident's emotional & stress levels?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise.

PC00811-3

Comment:

Why should we have to deal with more when other areas such as Ontario would not have This impact & 25% of all traffic to LAX is from Orange County?

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please

3. Comments and Responses

see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC00811-4

Comment:

Why is it OK for my family including a pregnancy in process have to be further exposed to more air pollutants which will affect our respiratory system & possibly cause cancer. My husband & I are both in health care & work with patients with cancer on a daily basis. We certainly do NOT want our health & especially our children's health affected any more - enough is enough as far as what we already have to live with.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC00811-5

Comment:

It is time for Palmdale & Ontario to pick up the slack not LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00811-6

Comment:

The 405 Freeway is already a nightmare & The thought of expansion needs to be stopped. Thank you for your time.

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00812

Phillips, Patricia

None Provided

7/12/2001

PC00812-1

Comment:

In 1973, the airport took my home on Earhart. Now, certain officials have decided to invade the other side of Westchester. Lining pockets and leaving a "legacy" of the "we'll-do-what-we-please" power is, of

3. Comments and Responses

course, more important than long-time residents and businesses of our community. This is one time that the power-hungry few should NOT be allowed to overcome the will of the majority.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00812-2

Comment:

Let other airports share responsibility. Leave our community alone!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00813

Rosenfeld, Niki

None Provided

7/12/2001

PC00813-1

Comment:

No more traffic please! No more congestion - no LAX Expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00813-2

Comment:

Let them expand Ontario & El Toro.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00814 Meagher, Robert None Provided

PC00814-1

Comment:

Westchester has paid dearly (loss of over 3500 homes) which caused a loss of business & homes. Now the airport wants to cause more havoc, rip out more homes and disrupe things again. Cause more traffic, noise, and smog.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester and Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

PC00814-2

Comment:

THEY ALLREADY MADE A MESS OUT OF ARBOR VITEA, AND SEPULVEDA IS NOW A RACE TRACK, ISN'T WORTH YOUR LIFE TO CROSS AS A PEDESTRIAN.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, in particular Subtopical Response TR-ST-4.1.

PC00814-3

Comment:

TO ENLARGE THE AIRPORT WILL ONLY MAKE WESTCHESTER A TOWN NOT WORTH LIVING IN

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00814-4

Comment:

you must leave the airport at its currant size and enlarge Oterrio & Palmdale they need it, we don't.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please

3. Comments and Responses

see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00814-5

Comment:

ENLARGEING ROADS IS A WASTE, TAKE A FOUR LANE TRAFFIC JAM, ADD TWO LANES, & HAVE A SIX LANE TRAFFIC JAM IMMEDIATELY.

Response:

Additional capacity often does induce additional traffic. If additional capacity is provided on a highway, for example, it will often fill shortly after opening. However, adjacent arterial streets will typically experience an improved service level as a result of the traffic shift. The traffic modeling work that was performed for this Master Plan accounted for this phenomenon. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PC00814-6

Comment:

The airport is maxed out, another plan is needed.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, is designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport capacity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. Alternative D will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient, and will have the fewest negative impacts to local communities and the region. Analysis of Alternative D is contained in the Draft Master Plan addendum and in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The No Action/No Project Alternative examined the capacity of all of the airport components and defined the maximum level of activity (approximately 78.9 MAP) that could be accommodated at LAX without improvements. See Chapter V, Concept Development, Section 3.3.2 of the Draft LAX Master Plan and Chapter 3, Alternative D Constrained Activity, Section 3.1 of the Draft Master Plan Addendum for more information on the activity and constraints associated with each alternative.

PC00815

Holt, Joycelee

None Provided

7/10/2001

PC00815-1

Comment:

Stop LAX airport expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00815-2

Comment:

Noise is already intolerable, both from traffic congestion and from LAX.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1.

PC00815-3

Comment:

Smog is also intolerable from traffic and airport. We don't need more.

Response:

Comment noted. Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC00815-4

Comment:

Why isn't Ontario (or Palmdale) more suitable for additional air traffic? Why are Westchester and surrounding areas being torn up and the quality of our lives being so disrupted when a regional balance is so apparent? Why aren't the needs of other areas, who want regional participation, considered?

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00816

Reesing, Harlan

None Provided

7/12/2001

PC00816-1

Comment:

I suggest the most positive solution to the L.A. Airport problem is to activate the Palmdale Airport. Expanding LAX is only a short term solution and will leave Westchester and surrounding communities badly damaged. Most other large cities have an outlying airport where the needed expansion of runways and cargo facilities can be built. With the rapid growth of air traffic LAX will be overcrowded before the program can be completed and then we will have to go to Palmdale. Lets put our effort in the best long term solution now. We should give the welfare of our citizens top priority and not favor airlines or other business interests.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00817 Courville, John None Provided 7/17/2001

PC00817-1

Comment:

(The walk signs to get from parking to terminal are too low cant see because busses block view)

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00817-2

Comment:

I was at airport post office at July 11 at 9:30 as I sat waiting for the wife I counted 11 aircraft going directly over the post office with 1 ½ minute & 2 minute intervals. Too close. Also why put the post office here where it will be right at end of runway when expanded. What a waist. 2 min is very little time for plane to get to taxi way before next plane passes it!! Consider that next time you fly.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00818 Diaz, Karen None Provided 7/11/2001

PC00818-1

Comment:

The air traffic issue for Southern California needs a REGIONAL solution. Having larger airports in Palmdale, Ontario, El Toro and even John Wayne airports would spread car traffic, reduce air pollution, reduce delays due to traffic congestion and increase the profit of companies relying on timely delivery of cargo delivered by air.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00818-2

Comment:

Westchester was built over 50 years ago. We were here first. We have accepted the current size airport. WE HAVE DONE OUR SHARE!!!

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00819 McNay, Dan None Provided 7/12/2001

PC00819-1

Comment:

We do not want any expansion of LAX under any circumstances, so all and any plans open to public comment are unacceptable to our household. We do not wish to scapafice our quality of life, to enable the commercial concerns invested in these expansion plans to make more money.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00820 Candler, Trevor None Provided 7/13/2001

PC00820-1

Comment:

PLEASE ADVISE WHY IS NOT THE PALMDALE AIRPORT BEING DEVELOPED TO TAKE THE INTERNATIONAL AIR TRAFFIC LOAD OFF LAX. I AM FROM NEW ZEALAND ORIGANLY AND KNOW FIRST HAND A LOT OF TRAVEL THROUGH LAX IS ACTUALY GOING ON TO OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTRY BUT IS FORCED TO CHANGE PLANES AT LAX. PALMDALE HAS SPACE AND PLENTY OF PEOPLE IN THE AREA WHO NEED THE WORK. BUILDING A MEGA AIRPORT IN A HIGHLY POPULATED CITY AREA WITH THE EXISTING TRAFFIC AND POLUTION PROBLEMS MAKES NO SCENCE. MAINTAIN LAX AS IS AND BUILD PALMDALE.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00821 Yucknat, Savannah None Provided 7/13/2001

PC00821-1

Comment:

Keeping our community whole

Much more traffic

To much noise

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00822

Free, Dana

None Provided

7/13/2001

PC00822-1

Comment:

My family and I are extremely concerned with the proposed expansion of LAX. As long time residents of El Segundo, we are well aware of how the airport already negatively affects quality of life for the residents here. Expansion of LAX can only worsen that quality in many respects. Additionally, the EIR does not properly address some of the areas that are of utmost concern to me.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. In addition, please see Responses to Comments below.

PC00822-2

Comment:

Commute times in the general area of LAX are horrendous currently. For example a drive that can take 12 minutes in a non-peak time (Manchester/Sepulveda to Manhattan Beach Blvd/Sepulveda) takes up to 30 minutes during peak travel times. LAX expansion will only worsen that scenario. These are roads that we use and depend upon everyday.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PC00822-3

Comment:

The 405 will also be adversely affected. This is an area that is largely overlooked in the EIR. Using this freeway anywhere in the vicinity of LAX is already a burden. With the expansion of LAX, the freeway will be unusable, thereby dumping much of the traffic from the freeway onto the surrounding streets as people look for alternative routes. The degree of difficulty of commuting for El Segundo residents will also greatly rise.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Subtopical Response TR-ST-4.1 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00822-4

Comment:

My family resides in a "quiet" part of El Segundo. Yet I can hear the airplanes all day and all night. There are nights when the jet engines wake up my family and my neighborhood. Expansion will surely increase the noise level in El Segundo to an unbearable level.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01377-9 regarding existing noise levels and future noise impacts resulting from development of the Master Plan Alternatives on the City of El Segundo. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00822-5

Comment:

Additionally, the air pollution from the diesel fuel is already disgusting. I hate to open my windows because I know that I will have to clean black jet fuel off the furniture of the house the next day. Cars left on the street or in the driveway overnight get a similar coating of black dirt on them by morning. Any of my children's toys left out overnight need to be cleaned the next morning because they get so dirty just in the span of a few hours.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC00822-6

Comment:

And if this is what is happening to the cars, windowsills, furniture and toys, what is it doing to our children's lungs? That is perhaps the most frightening aspect of all. You see, we breathe this air, every minute of every day. As our children run play and breathe, what is this air doing to their little lungs? I don't even want a glimpse of the future to answer that question. The answer will be too frightening.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition, Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC00822-7

Comment:

Please protect the residents of El Segundo and their children. Do not move to expand LAX in any way. Our lives and the quality of them depend upon this.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts to quality of life.

PC00823

Wilder, Virginia

None Provided

7/13/2001

PC00823-1

Comment:

I am against LAX Expansion

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00823-2

Comment:

I believe a Regional Solution should be the approach. The other airports should be expanded to handle air commerce for Orange County and the Inland Empire namely, El Toro, Ontario, Palmdale and such places as George, Norton and March AFB. If I live in those areas I would be happy, if I did not have to drive 50-60 miles to catch a plane.

Response:

The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00823-3

Comment:

LAX Expansion would greatly impact my life with more noise pollution & Traffic. Be kind. Give us relief.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00824 **Burns, Bruce** **None Provided** **7/12/2001**

PC00824-1

Comment:

There should be NO EXPANSION of the LAX airport. Its present location in the Westchester area of the city of Los Angeles cannot endure any increase of the aircraft traffic, surface street congestion, air pollution, and noise damage which is now destroying the health, safety and quality of life of hundreds of thousands of residents.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00824-2

Comment:

Rather than an expansion, the volume of traffic at LAX should be reduced. LAWA should not be permitted to build more cargo facilities and seek more cargo flights. Cargo should be brought into airports closer to the center of the county; the harbor to downtown rail/truck corridor would be a practical location.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic. Alternative D, which was addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, would not increase cargo handling facilities at LAX. As indicated in Table S3-2 (page 3-23) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, cargo operations are projected to increase to about 3,120,000 tons/year at LAX by 2015 under the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative D. The traffic impacts of this level of cargo activity were described in Section 4.3.2.6.1 (beginning on page 4-293) of the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

PC00824-3

Comment:

LAX was originally designed to handle 40 million annual passengers but has grown to 65 MAP. The referenced plan proposes to increase that volume to 89 MAP. Projections for the region see 157 million over the next 20 years. It is imperative that a multi-county, multi-airport regional plan be developed now, rather than endorse cancerous, out-of-control growth at LAX. The Draft Master Plan and Draft EIR/EIS are impractical; they will not result in a solution, but rather cause more problems.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided

3. Comments and Responses

in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00824-4

Comment:

Right now, it is not safe to fly into or out of LAX. The airline pilots association has rated LAX as the most unsafe airport in the United States. It is reported that LAX management has shortened the distance between planes in the sky in order to cram more jets in the landing patterns. How can safety be maintained when planes flying 600 miles an hour are only three miles apart, instead of five miles? This reduces the distance in real time to just thirty seconds.

There have been collisions in the air and on the ground that have resulted in fatalities. Aircraft traffic is so dense that there have been frequent near misses of crossing traffic and take-off traffic. There have been major landing accidents. There are frequent near-collisions in the immediate air space and the approaches. In 1988 LAX own spokespersons admitted that at 65 million passengers -today's volume -- LAX will have reached its airspace capacity. Adding more runways will not increase the airspace; it will only increase the number of flights and increase the safety hazards.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00824-5

Comment:

LAX expansion will cause a 64% increase in rush hour car traffic, from 14,000 to 23,000 vehicles.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed surface transportation impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00824-6

Comment:

The airport management admits they will not be able to mitigate the traffic jams at 6 key intersections: 2 on La Cienega Blvd., 3 on Lincoln Blvd., plus the one at Sepulveda & La Tijera Blvds.

Response:

Nine intersections would remain impacted and unmitigated in Alternative C, six would remain unmitigated in Alternatives A and B, and three would remain unmitigated in Alternative D.

PC00824-7

Comment:

The La Tijera on-ramps to the 405 Freeway will go from a D rating to F rating, to over 100% of their designed capacity. Most LAX traffic funnels back into the 405 freeway, which is often clogged for ten miles in either direction of the airport.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. As shown in Technical Report 3b, Attachment C, the La Tijera ramps would operate at LOS C or better in all future year scenarios.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00824-8

Comment:

The Los Angeles City Council representative from the LAX neighborhood reports that expansion of LAX will produce a 1,302% increase in smog. This is an unacceptable health risk.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 concerning air pollution.

PC00824-9

Comment:

Wise planning would not increase air traffic at LAX but disperse the volume among various locations in a wider region.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00824-10

Comment:

Approximately 50,000 people are subjected day and night to noise levels over 65 decibels. Expansion would bring up to 50% more people into the zone of unsafe noise levels. This is cruel and inhumane.

Response:

The comment mixes different comparisons of data presented in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6), of the Draft EIS/EIR to arrive at a 50 percent increase in population exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour as described below.

As shown in Table 13 of Technical Report 1, *Land Use Technical Report*, of the Draft EIS/EIR, under 1996 baseline conditions approximately 48,990 residents are exposed to the 65 CNEL or greater noise contour. As presented in subsection 4.2.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, a change in population compared to 1996 baseline conditions is identified in terms of overall net change, population removed that was previously exposed to high noise levels, and population newly exposed that previously was not exposed to high noise levels under Alternatives A, B, C, and D. These comparisons are presented in Table 1, below.

Table 1
No Action/No Project, Alternatives A, B, C, and D Population Change
(Compared to 1996 Baseline Conditions)

Scenario	Compared to 1996 Baseline		Overall Change
	Population Removed	Newly Exposed	
No Action/No Project 2105	9,390	4,720	-4,670
Alternative A 2015	14,930	10,310	-4,620
Alternative B 2015	12,540	24,370	11,830
Alternative C 2015	11,570	7,150	-4,420
Alternative D 2015	11,120	5,090	-6,020

Source: PCR, Landrum & Brown, 2003.

As shown in Table 1, the greatest increase in population exposed to the 65 CNEL or greater noise contour would occur under Alternative B, in which 24,370 residents would be newly exposed compared to 1996 baseline conditions. Although this would represent an increase of approximately 50 percent compared to the 1996 baseline population of 48,990; this does not consider population removed from high noise levels due to a shift in noise contours under Alternative B. A more accurate comparison is represented by the overall change and population removed under Alternative B compared to 1996 conditions. Based on these comparisons, the overall change (or increase of 11,830 residents) represents a 24 percent increase compared to 1996 baseline conditions and the population removed (12,540) represents a 26 percent decrease compared to 1996 baseline conditions. Note that Alternative B is the worst case scenario. A reduced impact would occur under Alternatives A, C, and D. As shown on Table 1, under Alternative D there would be a 9 percent decrease (or 6,020 fewer people) exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour compared to 1996 baseline conditions.

As was stated in subsection 4.2.8 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, approval of the LAX Master Plan would trigger implementation of mitigation measure MM-LU-1, which would include the residential sound insulation program under the ANMP land uses that would be newly exposed to the 65 CNEL contour that are currently outside of the ANMP boundaries.

PC00824-11

Comment:

The airport management mitigation is to keep its neighbors caged in marginally sound-dampening houses, unable to enjoy their patios and gardens. This unhealthful situation would be increased if LAX were permitted to expand.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program, Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels, and Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding thresholds used to identify significant noise impacts that would result from development of the build alternatives and mitigation measures that would reduce exposure of noise-sensitive uses to high noise levels. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00825 **Moore, Viola** **None Provided** **7/12/2001**

PC00825-1

Comment:

The proposals and plans for LAX expansion, including construction of a complicated web of new access roads, will do nothing to relieve overcrowded air and ground traffic in and around LAX. It will only make a manageable annoyance into a nightmare.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00825-2

Comment:

It will result in the destruction of Westchester and Playa del Rey as thriving and desirable communities.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester/Playa del Rey.

PC00825-3

Comment:

The solution is plainly to develop the regional airports at Ontario and Palmdale, while making those changes at LAX that will improve efficiency and safety, and move traffic through the area as quickly as possible.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00825-4

Comment:

It may even be possible for visitors to stop and shop along the way if they are not caught in the whirlwind of expanded traffic, noise, and air pollution.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00826 Buchman, M None Provided 7/12/2001

PC00826-1

Comment:

THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES OWNS TWO OTHER AIRPORTS, BESIDES LAX WHICH SHOULD BE DEVELOPED. IN ADDITION, EL TORO SHOULD ALSO BE DEVELOPED. I AM AGAINST YOUR NEW MASTER PLAN FOR EXPANSION OF LAX. THE TRAVELORS AND AIR CARGO CUSTOMERS WOULD BE BETTER SERVED BY SOME EXPANSION OF FACILITIES IN THE ONTARIO AND PALMDALE SITES.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00826-2

Comment:

DEVELOPMENT OF THESE TWO SITES ALSO WOULD RESULT IN FEWER "NEAR MISSES BETWEEN AIRPLANES.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 concerning transferring operations to other airports, Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety, and Response to Comment AL00051-26 regarding safety of increased operations at LAX.

PC00827 Weisberg, David None Provided 7/13/2001

PC00827-1

Comment:

I AM CONCERNED ABOUT LAX EXPANSION BECAUSE:

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below. In addition, it should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00827-2

Comment:

- Air pollution from jet fuel/additional car & bus traffic

Response:

Comment noted. Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC00827-3

Comment:

- NOISE POLLUTION FROM ADDITIONAL FLIGHTS

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PC00827-4

Comment:

- TRAFFIC - INCREASED CAPACITY

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00827-5

Comment:

- SAFETY - LAX ALREADY HAS TOO MANY "NEAR MISSES"

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00827-6

Comment:

- CONGESTION - FLIGHTS ALREADY DELAYED TOO OFTEN, ADDITIONAL CAPACITY & STREET TRAFFIC WILL MAKE THINGS WORSE

Response:

Comment noted. The airfield modifications proposed under any of the Master Plan build alternatives would reduce flight delays.

PC00827-7

Comment:

- Value - Areas around airport have more security problems - Effects property values

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

PC00827-8

Comment:

- DE CENTRALIZATION - THIS IS THE PATTERN OF EXPANSION IN LA METRO. UNLIKE OTHER CITIES, EVERYTHING IS SPREAD OUT. WHY NOT THE OTHER AIRPORTS?

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00828

Gateman, Sandra

None Provided

7/13/2001

PC00828-1

Comment:

How can anyone think this is reasonable?

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00828-2

The remainder of this comment letter is identical to form letter PFG; please refer to the responses to form letter PFG.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00829 Mazzola, Emma None Provided 7/11/2001

PC00829-1

Comment:

Expanding LAX appears to be a very expensive temporary fix for the air traffic problems in the Los Angeles area. There just is not enough room! Our city needs to do some long term planning. El Toro, Palmdale and Ontario truly have more space, and with proper attention, could be developed to properly handle air traffic well into the future.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00829-2

Comment:

I hope this comment will receive your consideration.

Response:

Responses to individual comments included in this comment letter are provided above.

PC00830 Chartier, Jean None Provided 7/13/2001

PC00830-1

Comment:

Comments: I oppose the expansion of LAX and urge you to adopt a Regional Airport Strategy to address the continued growth and spread of the population across So. California.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00830-2

Comment:

The communities of Westchester, Inglewood and El Segundo have been and continue to be negatively impacted by the operations of the airport for the reasons outlined below.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC00830-3 through PC00830-11 below for responses to each of the concerns outlined by the commentator.

PC00830-3

Comment:

- Traffic will increase substantially more if the expansion goes through. Increased cargo volumes means more personnel adding more vehicle trips through Westchester and surrounding areas. Construction to support expansion will add more heavy-duty trucks as well as more trucks to move cargo.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic. Alternative D, which was addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, would not increase cargo handling facilities at LAX. As indicated in Table S3-2 (page 3-23) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, cargo operations are projected to increase to about 3,120,000 tons/year at LAX by 2015 under the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative D. The traffic impacts of this level of cargo activity were described in Section 4.3.2.6.1 (beginning on page 4-293) of the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Section 4.20 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding construction impacts.

PC00830-4

Comment:

Where is the plan and accountability to mitigate the freeways, especially the 405 that funnels this traffic to LAX?

Response:

The plan and accountability for improving the freeways in Los Angeles County are found in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and in the Congestion Management Program (CMP) for Los Angeles County. Also, see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00830-5

Comment:

- Noise is already a big problem. The closer you get to the airport, the louder it is of course. By expanding the airport and building an Expressway and Ring Road it will add to the noise substantially.

Response:

Please see Section 5.6, Noise, Appendix K, Supplemental Environmental Evaluation for LAX Expressway and State Route 1 Improvements, of the Draft EIS/EIR for a review of potential noise abatement measures. Please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for more information on and comparisons of noise and noise-related land use impacts under the baseline and Year 2000 conditions and the various Master Plan alternatives including new Alternative D.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00830-6

Comment:

Noise creates stress and everyone knows how unhealthy this is.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise.

PC00830-7

Comment:

- Air Pollution levels are already dangerous. The increased emissions of the five EPA classified major air pollutants are a serious danger to everyone working and living in the area.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00043-6 regarding LAX as a source of air pollution.

PC00830-8

Comment:

Where are the mitigation plans for increased pollution from the planes and automobile/truck traffic?

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality mitigation measures in Section 4.6.8, Mitigation Measures, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation.

PC00830-9

Comment:

Is there an Air Pollution Study for the EIR/EIS? Please include it in your study for public consumption.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality impacts in and around the airport in Section 4.6, Appendix G, and Technical Report 4, and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality impacts in and around the airport in Section 4.6, Appendix S-E, and Technical Report S-4.

PC00830-10

Comment:

- Overcrowding of the airways. LAX is already considered to be one of the most dangerous airports by pilots. Any addition of traffic increases the likelihood of more frequent and serious disastrous crashes.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00830-11

Comment:

- Southern California continues to expand and the population continues to look for affordable housing farther and farther away. Developing a regional series of airports makes more sense for the citizens and

3. Comments and Responses

businesses that can be better served by having local airports close to them. This will mitigate traffic, driving time, air pollution, etc; the benefits are too numerous to list.

A long-term plan strategic plan needs to be developed now incorporating a regional approach including keeping LAX at its current configuration. The other areas and counties should be sharing/participating in this air traffic expansion since they use the resources. Why should it just be our problem? El Toro needs to be developed along with the other regional airports.

The opportunity should be taken advantage of now. The El Toro area, as an example, could readily be made commercial airport now but the local government is trying to make sure it can't be done. WE MAY NEVER HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY again. This is a problem that will not be solved by expanding LAX in the next 25 years. Southern California is going to have the population and commerce explosion for the next 100 years. I urge you to scrap the expansion plan and focus on a regional airport solution that will better serve Southern California.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00831 Matthes, Ruth None Provided

PC00831-1

Comment:

Please reconsider any more expansion at L.A.X. The increased traffic (I thought it couldn't get any worse) the smog & general congestion will be unbearable, as seniors we can't take anymore bad air!

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00832 Beattie, Helen None Provided 7/12/2001

PC00832-1

Comment:

I am against the expansion of LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00832-2

Comment:

The traffic created by the airport now is a problem. There are hours when I try to leave Kentwood and find traffic on Sepulveda piled up! The effect on local communities would be disastrous.

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00832-3

Comment:

Is it their idea of doing away with Westchester, El Segundo and east of the airport?

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding overall impacts on surrounding communities.

PC00832-4

Comment:

I feel it is high time we developed Palmdale and further expand Ontario. I see problems expanding John Wayne and opening an airport for commercial flights at El Toro. Or is it their idea to destroy those local communities too?

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00832-5

Comment:

For safety reasons, I feel heavy cargo operations should be separated from a passenger airport.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. All flight operations at LAX operate under the same strict safety guidelines and procedures regardless if they are cargo or passenger flights.

PC00832-6

Comment:

I am a long-time resident of Kentwood. I can remember when the air was much fresher than it is now. I had never had breathing problems until about 1991 when I developed asthma.

Response:

Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and the link with adverse health effects and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increases. In addition, please see Response to Comment PC00070-1.

PC00833 Domjanovich, Nancy None Provided

7/12/2001

PC00833-1

Comment:

Westchester is a community of people & businesses, not an open land area.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00833-2

Comment:

I would like to see an airport such as Palmdale be further developed, since there are more wide open spaces around there.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00833-3

Comment:

Expanding LAX would impact our community too much - noise, traffic, pollution.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00833-4

Comment:

Think of long term and go further out! Cities that build new airports always build them way out of town.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00834

Bowie, Wendy

None Provided

7/12/2001

PC00834-1

Comment:

My family is against expansion. We just moved to Westchester with the hope of raising a family her.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00834-2

Comment:

If the expansion goes ahead our property value will drop, we will be forced to move because of the ridiculous noise, traffic & pollution.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00834-3

Comment:

Westchester is one of the last little communities in this big city. Please help it stay that way.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00835 **McAdam, Jennifer & Kevin** **None Provided**

7/13/2001

PC00835-1

Comment:

We recently moved into this neighborhood to raise our son Michael who is 15 mo. & our new baby who is due in November. We moved here because it is a safe & quiet neighborhood. If this expansion goes through, our neighborhood & home will not be safe or quiet any longer.

Response:

Safety impacts were addressed in Section 4.24.3, Safety, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As further described in this section, airport improvements would be designed in compliance with FAA standards and strict adherence to FAA rules and regulations pertaining to aircraft safety would ensure that no compromise in aviation safety occurs. For a summary of improvements proposed for increased safety see Topical Response TR-SAF-1.

Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. When compared to the 1996 baseline or Year 2000, conditions some residential properties within Westchester would be newly exposed to high noise levels and other properties would be removed from exposure to high noise levels. Overall, for the community of Westchester, the number of dwelling units that would be exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels in 2015 would decrease under all of the build alternatives when compared to the 1996 baseline or Year 2000 conditions. The greatest reduction in dwelling units exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels would occur under Alternative D, with 4,431 fewer units exposed compared to the 1996 baseline and 2,589 fewer units exposed compared to Year 2000 conditions. Similarly, new analysis of single event noise levels presented in Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.6) and Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR showed that the number of residential units in Westchester exposed to 94 SEL or greater noise levels would be reduced in 2015 under all of the alternatives when compared to 1996 and Year 2000 conditions. The greatest reduction in 94 SEL exposure or nighttime awakenings would occur under Alternative D, with 5,957 fewer units exposed compared to the 1996 baseline and 1,753 fewer units exposed compared to Year 2000 conditions. Also, for a summary of effects on the community of Westchester see Topical Response TR-LU-2.

PC00835-2

Comment:

There are other airports that are very underused! (Ontario, for example) there is much more space there.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00835-3

Comment:

Westchester has no more room for any industrial expansion. It is one of the very few quality neighborhoods left in the L.A. area. Please don't destroy it!

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00835-4

Comment:

As an environmental scientist - the air pollution alone the expansion would cause is enough for many families to move - lowering house values & destroy the neighborhood!

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00836 Packiz, Joe None Provided 7/12/2001

PC00836-1

Comment:

Comparing LAX to other airports we have recently been to, I think we are over crowded now and should reduce rather than expand LAX

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

PC00837 Obeda, Suzanne None Provided 7/12/2001

PC00837-1

Comment:

Westchester should not be expected to bear the burden of an ever increasing airport. Ontario & Palmdale want the airport & more & more people live near those areas & need airports near them.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale, and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00837-2

Comment:

Westchester already suffers from too much traffic, noise & pollution from LAX. We have a large enough airport. We don't need an expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C,

Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00837-3

Comment:

Keep our community whole & safe. Any politician or elected official that does not support our community will not be voted for or re-elected. I have lived in Westchester for 30 years - & I cannot imagine a more wonderful place to raise my children - Please don't ruin our special community!

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00838 Boucher, Patricia None Provided

PC00838-1

Comment:

I want to voice my concern and disapproval of any and all plans to expand LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00838-2

Comment:

I live in the northern part of Westchester where the density of traffic and noise has grown immensely since the Howard Hughes development. Things will get even worse when Playa Vista goes in since it is an explosion of population in the area.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment PC00148-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00148-2.

PC00838-3

Comment:

Any plans to expand LAX are unconscionable. The entire area surrounding the airport is jammed and expansion will make the situation untenable. We are faced with air pollution, noise pollution and gridlock now. Amplification of these problems is criminal.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00838-4

Comment:

If expansion of cargo capacity is needed why not use Ontario or build something new in Eastern Orange County? A master, long term plan of the airport needs of Los Angeles, Orange and San Bernardino counties is needed. Please, please don't let this go through. It makes no sense when other solutions are possible. Thank you.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand.

PC00839

Ferrandino, Nancy

None Provided

7/12/2001

PC00839-1

Comment:

PLEASE GO AWAY! Can't you build a new airport out in Riverside or someplace where it won't affect so many people?

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government.

PC00839-2

Comment:

The traffic is already bad here.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00839-3

Comment:

We're just regular people, trying to raise our children in this nice community. Haven't we put up with enough change?

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00840 Murphy, Phyllis None Provided 7/12/2001

PC00840-1

Comment:

1. Explain plans for mitigating traffic and noise.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The traffic mitigation plans are summarized in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR subsection 4.3.2.9, Mitigation Measures, while the noise mitigation plan is summarized in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.1.8, Mitigation Measures.

PC00840-2

Comment:

2. If LAX, in order to build the LAX Expressway & the Ring, must acquire 1/3 of the CBD on Sepulveda, thereby negatively impacting the home values on our street, does LAX plan to remunerate those of us who live relatively close to Manchester? Although home prices have maintained their high prices this year, several deals have fallen through because of the above plan. Does LAX plan to buy our homes?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values and Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D would not involve property acquisition within the Westchester Business District, nor does it propose residential acquisition.

PC00840-3

Comment:

3. What efforts are being made by LAX to persuade Orange County to develop El Toro?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 that discusses the El Toro conversion. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00840-4

Comment:

If not, can Orange County residents be charged additional fees for using LAX? (Fees which be used for noise, traffic, & pollution mitigation).

Response:

LAX is a public facility and is supported by grants from the FAA. It is illegal to charge different fees to users of the same facility and thus discriminate among users.

PC00841

Keltie, Janette

None Provided

7/14/2001

PC00841-1

Comment:

DEVELOP EL TORO AND PALMDALE.

Response:

In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00841-2

Comment:

SEPULVEDA BLVD. IS ALREADY A NIGHTMARE AS FAR AS TRAFFIC IS CONCERNED.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Subtopical Response TR-ST-4.1 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00841-3

Comment:

I would like my grandchildren to smell air instead of gasoline fumes.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-4 odors and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC00841-4

Comment:

THESE SHORT TERM SOLUTIONS DO NOT ANSWER THE LONG TERM QUESTIONS.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00841-5

Comment:

THE NOISE IS DREADFUL NOW HATE TO THINK WHAT IT WILL BE IN THE FUTURE.

Response:

Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1.

PC00842

Levine, Joan

None Provided

7/13/2001

PC00842-1

Comment:

Expansion of Airport (LAX.)
Airports such as Burbank, and surrounding Airports should divide Air Traffic among all of them!

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00842-2

Comment:

LAX is already an unsafe Airport Why add to the problems?

Response:

Comment noted. The FAA has determined through its statutory responsibility, that Los Angeles International Airport is safe to use by the flying public. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00843 Raftery, Mary None Provided 7/12/2001

PC00843-1

Comment:

In 1950 when we chose our lot on which to build our home, we researched the Airport plans so as to live north of it and avoid, the noise and traffic.

Yes, Westchester has grown and grown a lot since then. We have become a real community and are proud of our homes and keep them up.

Please do not ruin all of this by encroaching north with expansion. There are many better and suitable solutions.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00844 Torch, Fred None Provided 7/13/2001

PC00844-1

Comment:

Los Angeles is the only city in the world trying to expand their airport within city limits.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00844-2

Comment:

Just spend a day in our neighborhood navigating Sepulveda Blvd. Every taxi-airfreight & limo driver is on it.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Subtopical Response TR-ST-4.1 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00844-3

Comment:

We have to shut windows due to the plane noise at night.

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of high single event aircraft noise levels that result in nighttime awakening in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical

3. Comments and Responses

Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC00844-4

Comment:

Thanks to you, we're moving. You're so out of touch with the community. Thanks for destroying Westchester.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00845 Eidsmoe, Martha None Provided 7/12/2001

PC00845-1

Comment:

I don't believe a new road along the existing freeway makes sense.

Why not locate a new entrest on the East South side (on property you allready own) between the two freeways with a more direct path. by using people movers and rethinking the design of the terminal & landing fields, you could not need more land. The west entrest is not a good secolection - because of the roads & hill pluss the Mernia - no direct entrest As far as trafic solve it with the freeway! 105 and 405

Response:

Comment noted. This suggested concept is very similar to Alternative D - the Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, which is analyzed in detail in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00845-2

Comment:

Could not get some of the web sites on my computer.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00846 Greer, Joanne & Phil None Provided 7/12/2001

PC00846-1

Comment:

No LAX Airport Expansion. We LIVE here.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00846-2

Comment:

The regional solution is the way to go. It would benefit the entire County & surrounding counties.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00847

Romero, Rylee-Ann None Provided

7/11/2001

PC00847-1

Comment:

Current expansion plan is a short-term quick fix approach. Think long term!
What about Palmdale & Ontario? Long Beach? El Toro?

Response:

It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00847-2

Comment:

I am directly affected by the hideous traffic & construction noise & nuisance. I already keep 100% of my windows closed to block the noise. 100%

Response:

Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1.

PC00847-3

Comment:

This plan will only add to the problem and lower property values & quality of life.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding the impacts on residential property values and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC00848 Nichols, David None Provided 7/12/2001

PC00848-1

Comment:

I live at above address and suffer from LAX noise. The noise has increased over the years and is at this point unacceptable. They have sound-proofed the school across the street, Loyola Village Grammer School, but have made no effort to help the surrounding neighborhood -- on Villanova St. or Ave. If expansion is allowed the noise will get worst. I know the whole neighborhood feels the same way.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase and Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

PC00848-2

Comment:

How can "EIS/EIR", in good conscious, approve such an expansion, knowingly know that the noise abatement will get worst among other things, etc traffic, air pollution.

Response:

The purpose of an EIS/EIR is to disclose the potential impacts of a proposed project to decision-makers so that such impacts will be taken into account during the decision-making process. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00848-3

Comment:

Please do the moral and right thing -

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00849 Jeffers, Frank None Provided 7/13/2001

PC00849-1

Comment:

Westchester - The planned changes will be a mortal blow to the area ambiance

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00849-2

Comment:

Surface traffic - Already quite heavy, will be much more congested, and noisier. The roads are already needing rebuilding.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00849-3

Comment:

Air Traffic - Too heavy now, expansion will make it worse. Send cargo and certain passengers to Palmdale, Ontario & El Toro.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00849-4

Comment:

Air Pollution - Bad now on some days, will be worse with L.A.X. expansion.

Response:

Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In general, the predicted air pollution impacts of any of the LAX Master Plan build alternatives will be lower than the predicted impacts of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution.

PC00849-5

Comment:

Noise - Do you think those 11:00 - 12:00 PM engine runs are not heard?! Engines for the new Airbus from France will be louder! Hiding the loud noises in that CNEL of 65 is not honest!

Response:

There is no data yet available relative to the anticipated noise characteristics of the New Large Aircraft (NLA), other than the requirement that to operate in the United States, it must meet the requirement of Federal Aviation Regulation, Part 36, which sets noise level limits for all commercial aircraft. All aircraft weighing more than 850,000 pounds, including the NLA and the 747-400 are subject to the same noise level requirements. For noise modeling purposes, the NLA is considered to be equivalent to the 747-400. Nighttime single event noise impacts and mitigation were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting information in Appendix

3. Comments and Responses

S-C and Technical Report S-1. For additional information on modeling and night single event noise, please see Topical Response TR-N-1 and Topical Response TR-N-2. Topical Response TR-N-7 addresses the airport rules related to nighttime engine run-ups, which under each project development alternative will be mitigated in a Ground Run-up Enclosure - a facility that substantially reduces the levels of noise heard from these events in the community. Additionally, new aircraft, such as the new Airbus, must comply with stage 3 noise standards to operate in the United States.

PC00850 Lenz, Margery None Provided 7/12/2001

PC00850-1

Comment:

The proposed expansion of LAX will destroy Westchester! The "downtown" business district has just started looking good again with the revitalization. This is a prime area to live and many people including myself have made major improvements to their homes.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00850-2

Comment:

Property values will be destroyed and we will never be able to relocate.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

PC00850-3

Comment:

I moved from Playa Del Rey in 1975 because of the noise there. Since moving to Westchester the noise has increased here to say nothing of the dirty film from air pollution. The traffic has become unbearable at times. I can't imagine how bad it will be with more plane & car traffic.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC00850-4

Comment:

It's ridiculous to try to squeeze more airport into the space. Build away from populated areas in the interest of safety. Other cities such as Denver have started from scratch and have "state of the art" airports. Certainly safer than trying to "patchwork" the existing LAX. There is land available and owned by the Dept. of Airports. Airports should be where there is space available - not crammed into a heavily populated area. That's an accident waiting to happen.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 for further discussion regarding aviation safety.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00850-5

Comment:

I'm not anti airline... I just retired after 40 years with the largest carrier at LAX. I love the convenience of LAX but my home, air quality and safety are my first concern. Expansion of LAX and the increase in air traffic will certainly have a destructive impact on this area and it's people.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00851

Pryme, Lillian

None Provided

7/12/2001

PC00851-1

Comment:

I was an original owner of this property which was purchased 1/5/1945. We had good clean air. We no longer have that. If it gets any worse no one will be able to breath it.

Response:

Comment noted. Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution.

PC00851-2

Comment:

Therefore, I object to any more expansion of the airport.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC00851-1 above. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00852

Lins, Marianne

None Provided

PC00852-1

Comment:

The news is already full of stories about near-misses in the air. Why don't we cut back on the number of flights rather than expand the airport?

Response:

Comment noted. Market forces and the regulatory structure of the commercial air transportation industry favors and promotes the continued use of primary airports such as LAX. The airlines, not government, dictate where air service will be provided and the airlines tend to select airports convenient

3. Comments and Responses

to their customers. As a result of the Airline Deregulation Act of 1978, the federal government does not have the authority to direct where commercial air transportation will occur. Please see TR-SAF-1 for a further discussion on aviation safety. Also, please note that Alternative D-the Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, has been added since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR in light of the events of September 11, 2001, and is specifically designed to protect airport users and crucial airport infrastructure, and to incorporate federal security recommendations as they are developed to the greatest extent possible.

PC00852-2

Comment:

Why don't you build an airport near palmdale to increase commerce and population and property values out that way?

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00852-3

Comment:

(or expand those airports further away - why must we all cram into certain areas?)

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00853

Jahn, Frank

None Provided

7/12/2001

PC00853-1

Comment:

EXPANSION - WILL ADD MORE TRAFFIC FROM CARS & TRUCKS THIS WE DO NOT WANT

NO EXPANSION

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00853-2

Comment:

There R 3 - major Hi schools in the area just think of them EIR dos not think o this

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed impacts on schools in Section 4.27, Schools. The schools analysis study area included high schools within Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). Where the project would have direct impacts on public high schools, rather than impacts through changes in enrollment, these effects are analyzed in other sections of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR which pertain to those impacts (e.g., 4.1, Noise; 4.2, Land Use; 4.3, Surface Transportation; 4.6, Air Quality and 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment) and are summarized in Section 4.27. In addition, the Draft EIS/EIR addresses impacts on high schools outside of LAUSD in Technical Report 17 of the Draft EIS/EIR.

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding mitigation measures for noise impacts on schools.

PC00853-3

Comment:

Res over 50 yers

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00854

Rotolo, Paula

None Provided

PC00854-1

Comment:

There is no end to the expansion of LAX if they keep on going the way they plan on going. When my parents and we moved here the airport was at Mines Field, then in the sixties they expanded by by adding a north runway and taking 30% of the homes in Westchester and Playa del Rey. Then in the 1980's they expanded again to accommodate more passengers and cargo taking more homes.

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for LAX Master Plan. This new option - Alternative D, Enhanced Safety and Security Plan - provides enhanced security and is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 Regional Transportation Plan, which proposes no expansion of LAX, no relocation of residences and, instead, shifts the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive analysis of Alternative D.

PC00854-2

Comment:

Now in the new millenium they want to take more houses and businesses which includes 1/2 of the Westchester business district. If they continue this way in 2020 they'll take everything south of Manchester!

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided additional discussion beyond that presented in the Draft EIS/EIR of potential acquisition effects on the Westchester Business District. As described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsections 4.2.6.2 through 4.2.6.4), acquisition within the Westchester Business

District would be about 16 acres or 31 percent of the district under Alternative A, about 11 acres or 21 percent under Alternative B, or approximately 13 acres or 26 percent of the District under Alternative C. Under Alternatives A through C, relocation opportunities would be available for some uses nearby within Westchester Southside. Also, many of the uses that would be acquired are airport related and a number of the community related uses that would be acquired (a bank, an office supply store, a bar and beauty shop) would still remain available through similar businesses that are located in close proximity within the Westchester Business District.

See Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

Also, as described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6.5) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative) does not include any acquisition within the Westchester Business District or residential acquisition, in contrast to the other build alternatives. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 for further discussion of effects on the community of Westchester.

PC00854-3

Comment:

We now read that LAX is one of the unsafest airports in the country. What will it be with more expansion?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00854-4

Comment:

Isn't it time to send some of the cargo and passengers directly to their destinations instead of making the area around the airport off limits for the people who live here?

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00854-5

Comment:

Pollution will be unhealthy for everyone living in the area and cause cancer not only to the elderly but to the young families which live in the area, especially El Segundo which is the prime area for raising young families.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase. Please also see Topical Response TR-EJ-1 regarding potential air quality and health risk impacts on low-income and minority communities.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00854-6

Comment:

My brother has 2 children 4 ½ and 2 ½ and my sister has two littler girls ages 6 and 11. If any children get cancer I'll be another Erin Brocovich, and sue the airport out of business. There will be other Erin Brocovich'es to help me.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D was added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. As stated in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment (subsection 4.24.1.7.3) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAX emissions under Alternative D would reduce cumulative cancer risks for all areas near the airport relative to the other future year alternatives, including the No Action/No Project Alternative.

In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC00854-7

Comment:

No matter what you do traffic will be a problem and a hazard to locals and passengers going to and from the airport and be nerve wracking.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00854-8

Comment:

Not discounting the pollution it will cause.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC00854-9

Comment:

We've had noise in the area all these years we've lived here 43 yrs. and my parents have paid taxes to bear all of it. We've had to turn the TV louder to drown out the plane noise.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels, including thresholds used to identify significant noise levels and Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program. Also see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

PC00854-10**Comment:**

Even with soundproofing, which means we have to keep our doors and windows closed and turn on the fan which raises our electric bill, because the manger of soundproofing wouldn't put in a vent system. and the air from the vents or fan still give us polluted air to breathe.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00088-2.

PC00854-11**Comment:**

You're killing us!

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 14a and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00855**Tun, Mra & Mary****None Provided****7/12/2001****PC00855-1****Comment:**

We are very concerned about over expansion in Westchester and Playa del Rey as we are already witnessing the conjection in Playa del Rey and Marina del Rey.

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00855-2**Comment:**

The quick fix master plan approach is not the answer and we must seriously look at other alternatives in Ontario and Palmdale as well as El Toro in Orange County.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please

3. Comments and Responses

see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00855-3

Comment:

We have lived in Westchester for the past 27 years and the survival of the community does not depend on further expansion of the area. More traffic, more pollution and over crowding can only mean more trouble; the end to good peaceful neighborhood.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00856 Repaich, Margaret None Provided 7/19/2001

PC00856-1

Comment:

I came to Los Angeles in 1973, and I loved it, but after we got some very greedy people running our City, we have had to fight for our rights, "not that we win" because if they can't get it one way they get it another way, where they can get it without our vote, now its the airport fiasco, I am saying no to expanding it - will anyone listen?

Response:

Comment noted. The public hearing process is set up to allow public input for decisionmakers to hear community concerns. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00856-2

Comment:

You can send the excess out to Palmdale with no problem, so do let your conscience be your guide, and do the right thing.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00857 **Merritt, Sr., John** **None Provided** **7/12/2001**

PC00857-1

Comment:

To many hardships, heartbreaks - to much longevity memories - heart-break. Im for advancement but this is a quick fix.

The state plan for highspeed rail from Palmdale will solve long term & future problems, better our city will soon be there - and then what about Mohave!

PS My eye are so bad I can hardly write but I had to give my opinion. I'm 86 at this age it wont effect me one way or the other. Im just thinking of my friends LA & Westchester.

PS Local Since 1949

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC00858 **Caravello, Dorothy** **None Provided** **7/11/2001**

PC00858-1

Comment:

The LAX expansion will impact our house, a home where we have lived for 38 years and where our children still consider home.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00858-2

Comment:

Traffic is already ten fold and expansion will cause our front room windows to face a busy fast moving highway.

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

3. Comments and Responses

PC00858-3

Comment:

We are very concerned about the the added air pollution already high in emissions.

Response:

Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In general, the predicted air pollution impacts of any of the LAX Master Plan build alternatives will be lower than the predicted impacts of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution.

PC00858-4

Comment:

Our noise impact is so high now that homes are eligible for soundproofing. I would like to be able to open my windows!

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program, Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels, and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1.

PC00858-5

Comment:

We should not be expected to bear any more of the burden when so many other places - El Toro, Orange County Palmdale, Ontario and others are doing nothing. People in these areas should be able to travel and not have to go all the way to L.A.X.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC00859 Rigney, Eric & Leslie None Provided

7/12/2001

PC00859-1

Comment:

TRAFFIC - As homeowners in Westchester, we are very concerned about the increase of cargo & possibly passenger traffic to this already extremely busy airport.

Response:

Cargo traffic was included in the traffic analysis, and mitigation plans were developed for any significant impacts that would result from the project. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00859-2

Comment:

The 405 freeway is heavily congested as it is.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Subtopical Response TR-ST-4.1 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC00859-3

Comment:

And the air traffic is already becoming unsafe with too many planes arriving and departing.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00859-4

Comment:

BUSINESS DISTRICT - We are very concerned about losing the fragile Westchester business district that has been rejuvenated in the last 5 - 8 years.

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided additional discussion beyond that presented in the Draft EIS/EIR of potential acquisition effects on the Westchester Business District. As described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsections 4.2.6.2 through 4.2.6.4), acquisition within the Westchester Business District would be about 16 acres or 31 percent of the District under Alternative A, about 11 acres or 21 percent under Alternative B, or approximately 13 acres or 26 percent of the District under Alternative C. Under Alternatives A through C, relocation opportunities would be available for some uses nearby within Westchester Southside. Also, many of the uses that would be acquired are airport related and a number of the community related uses that would be acquired (a bank, an office supply store, a bar and

3. Comments and Responses

beauty shop) would still remain available through similar businesses that are located in close proximity within the Westchester Business District.

Also, as described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6.5), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, in contrast to the other build alternatives, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative), does not include any acquisition within the Westchester Business District. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC00859-5

Comment:

REGIONAL SOLUTION - Los Angeles needs to work on a solution where all areas bear the burden including Orange County, not just the Westside of Los Angeles. The burden being more air & noise pollution, increased traffic & land confiscation.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Business, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendices D and G and Technical Reports 2, 3 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendices S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-2 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00860

Histed, Laura

None Provided

7/12/2001

PC00860-1

Comment:

Traffic is bad enough now - without any additions. Our air in Westchester is good now - but with more aircraft it will not be for long.

There is also the risk of accidents. We do not need more accidents, traffic noise and bad air.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC00861 **Heiser, Dick & Loretta** **None Provided** **7/10/2001**

PC00861-1

Comment:

A. Increasing ground and air emissions unacceptable

Response:

Comment noted. Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In general, the predicted air pollution impacts of any of the LAX Master Plan build alternatives will be lower than the predicted impacts of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution.

PC00861-2

Comment:

1) Why use LAX for cargo planes? - there are other places to land!

Response:

Comment noted. There is a perception among many observers and respondents that air cargo and passenger aircraft can be easily split between or among airports in a multi-airport market. While in some cases and for select airlines this may be feasible, there are several significant barriers including but not limited to: Combination Service - Many foreign flag carriers and at least one U.S. carrier (Northwest Airlines) provide both passenger and all-cargo flights at LAX. Typically, the local management and operations (i.e., ground handling/warehousing) of this combination of passenger and cargo service is inseparable and economically undesirable. U.S. Postal Service - The U.S. Postal Service (USPS) is a major contractor with both U.S. passenger airlines, more recently FedEx. Splitting all-cargo flights between or among airports would likely degrade air mail service as it has been structured. Promise to Deliver - The express all-cargo carriers, mostly notably FedEx and United Parcel Service (UPS), state that relative proximity to population/commercial density is critical to achieve the overnight promise to deliver, the hallmark service of express carriers. For these reasons, among others, it is not feasible to eliminate cargo traffic from LAX. Please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC00861-3

Comment:

2) Trucks clogging 405 & I105 are making commuters crazy

Response:

Please see Subtopical Response TR-ST-4.1 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

PC00861-4

Comment:

B. Safety - overcrowding on streets, in skies and runways!

1) We need a better system for existing conditions - not just adding more complexity as if that will solve the problem - it only postpones it.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC00861-5

Comment:

2) Look at larger picture - other existing air landing spaces that won't ruin neighborhoods, congest and create hazardous possibilities.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Also, please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC00861-6

Comment:

C. New windows to stop noise is NOT a viable solution. This is a living community of churches, schools, etc. We do not want to be made prisoners behind thick windows.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program. To achieve full benefits of this program, windows need to be closed. See also Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels.