

**PC00862      Warren, Chris      None Provided      7/13/2001**

**PC00862-1**

**Comment:**

We've lived in Westchester for 50 years. We've seen many changes.

The airport expansion is not a change for the better.

**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.

**PC00862-2**

**Comment:**

There is already too much traffic - the expansion would bring more.

**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.

**PC00862-3**

**Comment:**

There is already too much noise - the expansion would cause more.

**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.

**PC00862-4**

**Comment:**

We believe Palmdale should be used to alleviate the crowded LAX.

**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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC00863      Gordon, Arnold      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC00863-1**

**Comment:**

I will not waste my time reading even one of the 12,000 pages of the master plan. Nothing in it will change my opinion about the idea of airport expansion.

IT SHOULD NOT BE DONE.

Over the years Westchester has lost homes and business to airport expansion. The minimum proposal is going too far!

The major backers of expansion are not residents of Westchester and have nothing to lose. They don't care what happens in the future to one of the finest residential areas in Los Angeles.

**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.

**PC00863-2**

**Comment:**

Palmdale should be developed as quickly as possible to the greatest extent possible, particularly for air freight.

**Response:**

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

**PC00863-3**

**Comment:**

Developing El Toro would also eliminate the need for more passenger capacity at LAX.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

**PC00864      Reed, Mary Lou &      None Provided**  
**Walter**

**PC00864-1**

**Comment:**

We have lived in Westchester since 1966. The airport bought our first home on 9388 Colegio Dr. in 1975 (when we purchased our present home.) We think it would be entirely unfair to have to give up our home again!

**Response:**

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

**PC00864-2****Comment:**

Also, we don't need more traffic, pollution, noise etc. etc. Leave things as they are - please!

**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.

**PC00865****Foster, Melanie****None Provided****7/12/2001****PC00865-1****Comment:**

I do not want the airport expanded. I believe the airport is old and outdated and I would like it to be updated. I would like the surrounding areas airports to be enlarged to serve the ever-growing population of air travel. LAX should not be the main airport for a city the size of Los Angeles.

**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.

**PC00865-2****Comment:**

I am concerned about the increased 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.

**PC00865-3****Comment:**

Westchester is our home and does not need to become the hub for all air travel.

### 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-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC00866      Lange, Madeline      None Provided      7/13/2001**

**PC00866-1**

**Comment:**

I have lived in Westchester since 1947 long before LAX or the 405 Freeway were built. I've endured the noise & dirt these many years.

**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.

**PC00866-2**

**Comment:**

Now that I am a widow and 81 years old I don't want to face losing my property or have it devalued in price. It's not fair. We've given enough for progress.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00040-46. Also, please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values and Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

**PC00866-3**

**Comment:**

Why not develop the Palmdale airport?

**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.

**PC00867      Ghilardi, Adelina      None Provided      7/6/2001**

**PC00867-1**

**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 ANY LAX EXPANSION OR THE PROPOSED RING ROAD. Westchester was a wonderful neighborhood and can continue to be if the LAX Airport wasn't so greedy. I have seen some of our wonderful schools close, lovely neighbors being forced to move, congestion, pollution, noise, etc. increasingly getting worse.

**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, air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and school impacts in Section 4.27, Schools. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendices D and G, and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4 and 17 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. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. Please note that LAX 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.

**PC00867-2****Comment:**

It is time for Orange County to assume their share of transportation problems.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

**PC00867-3****Comment:**

Also LAX Airport needs to spend their effort in making use of the other airports they own.

**Response:**

The City of Los Angeles owns and LAWA controls the operation and potential expansion of four airports: LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys. An update of the Master Plan for Ontario is currently underway. The Ontario Master Plan will recommend the needed improvements to meet the projected demand of 17.6 MAP in 2015. LAWA is also promoting the expanded use of Palmdale. However, Palmdale's remote location and limited local passenger market have made it difficult for airlines to maintain air service at the airport despite past subsidies by LAWA. Palmdale's only air service in the past consisted of commuter operations into LAX. About 19,000 passengers used the airport in 1997. In early 1998, the sole airline providing service at Palmdale ceased operations. Currently, Palmdale has no scheduled air service. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in a regional approach to meeting demand.

**PC00868****Schultz, William****None Provided****7/12/2001****PC00868-1****Comment:**

I urge you to consider the negative impact on our local community regarding LAX Expansion.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC00868-2

**Comment:**

Environmentally, this proposed expansion will be disastrous! Increased noise, traffic, pollution will degrade our local 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; 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.

#### PC00868-3

**Comment:**

A regional solution is the only true option!

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC00869**

**Essen, William**

**None Provided**

**7/12/2001**

#### PC00869-1

**Comment:**

As a resident in Westchester since 1962, I know what it was like the 1st time the LAX expanded. Many people (some friends) were forced to leave the ocean bluffs and the area north to LA - Tijera Blvd. Those remaining near the border suffered from noise pollution. Even though barriers were built, people couldn't enjoy their backyards and I'm sure lived like hermits indoors.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

#### PC00869-2

**Comment:**

More expansion can only mean loss of major portions of downtown Westchester business district,

**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, note that 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. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC00869-3**

**Comment:**

more smog, more noise and increased traffic in the region.

**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.

**PC00869-4**

**Comment:**

Has anyone noticed what Sepulveda Blvd traffic is now like, to say the least about Lincoln Blvd North.

**Response:**

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

**PC00869-5**

**Comment:**

The construction in Playa Vista cannot accommodate traffic now.

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00148-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00148-2.

**PC00869-6**

**Comment:**

Having travelled many places in the world, I still claim the Westchester area to have the best balance of climate and living conditions but this will disappear if there is not a limit to the LAX 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC00869-7**

**Comment:**

The Palmdale airport is the best answer since the State of Calif. already has plans to build high speed rail direct-link between LA and Palmdale.

**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.

**PC00870      Egan, Kenneth      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC00870-1**

**Comment:**

I am against LAX Expansion. I believe the physical capacity is maxxed-out and a Regional solution is required.

**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.

**PC00870-2**

**Comment:**

At current levels, we in the Westchester area already suffer enough from the 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.

**PC00871      Avikian, Toros & Sonja      None Provided      7/15/2001**

**PC00871-1**

**Comment:**

Westchester is for 36 years our home and we belived that is a great place to live out our life. Now wit on expansion planed it is for us and our neighbors a threat to our health and well being. We have more than enough noise and air polution. Anyone thinking its good for on expansion does not life in our area. We are being killed with airplain emission slowly alredy.



**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. 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.

**PC00871-2**

**Comment:**

There are other places for an airport not an other expansion like the north runway and what about crime?

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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 crime in Section 4.26.2, Law Enforcement, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 16 of the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC00871-3**

**Comment:**

Forget the plan and let us live out our life in peace if you can call this.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC00872**

**Paul, Marc**

**None Provided**

**7/12/2001**

**PC00872-1**

**Comment:**

My wife and I moved to Westchester from Santa Monica last year. We fell in love with the quiet streets and family atmosphere of our neighborhood. We plan to stay, live and raise a family in Westchester. However, we have grave concerns about LAX Expansion plans. We do not want our neighborhood to become polluted with increased traffic, noise, air pollution and air traffic. We have invested a great deal of money in our home, and for this we feel extremely concern about LAX plans to expand into our neighborhoods and destroy the fabric of our communities.

**Response:**

Impacts associated with traffic, noise, and air pollution were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use, Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. See Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residents or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding acquisition. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC00872-2

**Comment:**

WE URGE YOU TO ENCOURAGE THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES TO USE ITS OTHER TWO AIRPORTS TO FUFILL THE DEMAND FOR INCREASED AIR TRAVEL AND CARGO. THERE IS NO REASON FOR OUR COMMUNITIES TO BEAR THE BURDEN FOR THE REST OF THE CITY AND ORANGE COUNTY'S NEED FOR 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.

#### PC00872-3

**Comment:**

PLEASE HELP PUT A STOP AND AN END TO ANY FURTHER PLANS FOR AN 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.

**PC00873**

**Krause, Gary &  
Sharon**

**None Provided**

**7/11/2001**

#### PC00873-1

**Comment:**

WE SUPPORT THE EXPANSION OF ONTARIO AND PALMDALE. ALSO THE BUILDING OF EL TORO WHICH WOULD CUT DOWN ON ORANGE COUNTY TRAFFIC TO LAX. LAX IS ALREADY OVER CROWDED. THERE IS NOT ENOUGH LAND TO EXPAND LAX WITHOUT INFRINGING ON OUR SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES. THERE IS MUCH MORE LAND IN ORANGE COUNTY TO DEVELOP A AIRPORT THAT WILL SERVE THE COMMUNITY WITHOUT DISTURBING NEIGHBORHOODS.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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. Following the passage of local Measure W in March 2002, Orange County, the Local Redevelopment Authority for the former Marine Corps Air Station El Toro, discontinued pursuit of the base for a civilian aviation reuse. The Department of the Navy has decided to dispose of the base for non-aviation uses. The City of Los Angeles does not have the authority to develop a civilian airport at the former MCAS El Toro.

<b>PC00874</b>	<b>Ginoza, Lynn &amp; Wayne</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/13/2001</b>
----------------	---------------------------------	----------------------	------------------

**PC00874-1**

**Comment:**

We are very concerned about 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.

**PC00874-2**

**Comment:**

There is an increase in noise level and frequency of overhead planes. An increase & expansion will add to this problem.

**Response:**

Aircraft on final for Runway 24R may appear to be overflying the commentor's residence due to the size of aircraft. However, aircraft are already on short final and are in line with the center of the runway thus would not likely be overflying the commentor's residence. 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-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement. In addition, please see Alternative-Specific Abatement Opportunities in Section 7.2. of Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, in particular Section 7.2.2, Alternative A. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

**PC00874-3**

**Comment:**

We have had to spend our money in trying to alleviate this problem with some soundproofing solutions.

**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.

**PC00874-4**

**Comment:**

Traffic into LAX is already excessive and with the expansion it will only get worse. It is quite a sight seeing a dozen or more planes positioning in the sky all in a line preparing to land. To date I think we must count ourselves lucky that a fatal air collision disaster has not occurred over our Westchester neighborhood.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC00874-5

**Comment:**

Please STOP & expand in areas that are less populated (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. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

**PC00875**

**Turner, James**

**None Provided**

**7/13/2001**

#### PC00875-1

**Comment:**

No L.A.X. expansion! Move it 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. 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.

#### PC00875-2

**Comment:**

Have you tried to drive through the business district of Westchester and North on Sepulveda? Bumper to bumper most of the day now.

**Response:**

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

#### PC00875-3

**Comment:**

The expansion idea is absolutely crazy! We have entirely too much noise pollution and air pollution plus all of the other problems.

**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.

**PC00876      Gernert, Mr. & Mrs.      None Provided      7/14/2001**  
**Lynn**

**PC00876-1**

**Comment:**

We are 40 year residents of Westchester. The airport expansion would cause more traffic, noise, pollution. Please, we do not want this.

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

**PC00876-2**

**Comment:**

Right now our roads are such a mess on Sepulveda Blvd.

**Response:**

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

**PC00876-3**

**Comment:**

Fix what you have and maintain the airport. Do not 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.

**PC00877      Hislar, Patricia      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC00877-1**

**Comment:**

We have too much air and street traffic in this area now. I don't think we can have anymore. If there is anymore cargo coming in the area the streets will be clogged by even more trucks, fumes, exhaust etc.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety and Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding impacts from cargo truck traffic.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC00878      Carignan, Heidi      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC00878-1**

**Comment:**

Please NO LAX expansion!

For the safety & health of my family!

Please don't!

**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 for the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-9 for 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.

**PC00879      Marshall, Thomas      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC00879-1**

**Comment:**

We have a Southern California Problem, not a Los Angeles Problem. Other airports should be expanded or added to service this region all the way to San Diego. It's understandable why the airlines would like one airport instead of four or six, but this does not help the traveling public or LAX. Does anyone really believe you can expand LAX to an additional fifty percent in passenger traffic? At certain hours of the day, you can hardly navigate the airport as 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.

**PC00879-2**

**Comment:**

Even if the airport is not expanded, a ring around the airport should be constructed with proper entrances and exits.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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.

**PC00879-3****Comment:**

Also, some terminals should move to the Pershing Drive area with additional parking.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00562-3 regarding new terminal locations.

**PC00879-4****Comment:**

There should be a Southern California solution to this problem. Let's not make a bad situation 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 and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

**PC00880****Moore, Thos.****None Provided****PC00880-1****Comment:**

LAX razed our homes 30 yrs ago. How much is enough?

Power corrupts & absolute power corrupts absolutely. Never in my life have I experienced such a demonstration of this old saw. Rationality and reasonability be damned, we (LAX) will do what we please.

Have you no conscience?

Have you no morals?

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC00881****Gaston, Mary****None Provided****7/13/2001****PC00881-1****Comment:**

I am 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.

**PC00881-2**

**Comment:**

I think cargo expansion should be done at Palmdale & passenger expansion at Ontario 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. Following the passage of local Measure W in March 2002, Orange County, the Local Redevelopment Authority for the former Marine Corps Air Station El Toro, discontinued pursuit of the base for a civilian aviation reuse. The Department of the Navy decided to dispose of the base for non-aviation uses. The city of Los Angeles does not have the authority to develop a civilian airport at the former MCAS El Toro.

**PC00881-3**

**Comment:**

I have lived in Westchester since 1942 & I do not think this area needs more noise, traffic and 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC00882**

**Burr, Rebecca**

**None Provided**

**7/13/2001**

**PC00882-1**

**Comment:**

I have lived here all my life. I was born in Los Angeles, California, attended schools in Los Angeles and now I teach for LAUSD at 98th Street Elementary School in Manchester Square. I also live in Kentwood, Westchester.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC00882-2**

**Comment:**

If LA Airport expansion takes place, more than an elementary school and a community will be destroyed. The quality of all surrounding communities will be adversely affected. Even though more money might be brought into our communities as a result of the expansion, the quality of our lives here will never be the same again!

**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. Please see Sections 4.2, Land Use, and Section 4.27, Schools (CEQA), of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.



**PC00882-3****Comment:**

In Kentwood, we can hear the roar of jets that come and go at LAX, way into the night. But, if/when LAX expands, it will place us under these jets, in their very flight path. This will directly depreciate the value of our beautiful neighborhood, and my house.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

**PC00882-4****Comment:**

If LAX expands, I will lose my job at 98th Street Elementary school, and will eventually have to lose my home and peaceful way of life due to the impact of more traffic, noise, congested highways, freeways and jet fuel.

I am only one individual who will be so greatly impacted. There are hundreds and hundreds of people living here whose lives will be changed in much the same way, or worse.

**Response:**

Impacts on schools were addressed in Section 4.27 of the Draft EIS/EIR. As was further described in subsection 4.27.6.1, 98th Street School is within the boundaries of a current voluntary acquisition program. This program was established by LAWA based on a high level of interest from homeowners and residents in the Manchester Square and Belford neighborhoods in having their properties acquired in-lieu of receiving sound insulation. Acquisition of these properties is well underway. With approximately 85 percent of the enrollment for 98th Street School in the Year 2000 estimated as coming from these properties, its continued operation will in time no longer be feasible. As set forth in the Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Manchester Square and Airport/Belford Area Voluntary Acquisition Project, LAWA in consultation with LAUSD shall either: offer to purchase the property at market value; expand facilities at schools identified by LAUSD and LAWA as Program-impacted schools by providing modular classrooms; or, implement other mitigation which reduces Program impacts to a level of insignificant as mutually acceptable to LAUSD and LAWA. Accordingly, effects on 98th Street school are not related to the proposed LAX Master Plan and will occur with or without approval of the proposed project.

Impacts associated with traffic, noise, and air pollution were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise; Section 4.2, Land Use; Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; and Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC00882-5****Comment:**

What is more important, money, or the lives of hundreds of thousands of families living in the communities surrounding this airport?! Furthermore, just because LAWA has the money to expand - or do anything else they want to - does it make it good, right or moral??? I say NO!

I will predict that there will be those of us who will go out of our way to avoid supporting the Los Angeles Airport in the future. If all of the above damage to my life becomes a reality, I know my family and I will have nothing to do with 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

---

**PC00882-6**

**Comment:**

PS: Thank you for this opportunity!

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC00883      Hamilton, Patricia      None Provided**

**PC00883-1**

**Comment:**

LAX is in need of upgrading not expansion. The plans that have been submitted would be inadequate on completion. There is not enough ground space to cover the projected Air Traffic in the future.

**Response:**

An upgrade of existing facilities is incorporated into each of the build alternatives. 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. 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 four build alternatives demonstrate how various levels of activity can be served with the existing land area and minimal expansion. Please refer to Response to Comment PC00539-6 for more information on the land acquisition required for each 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.

**PC00883-2**

**Comment:**

A suggestion: Build a new Airport in Palmdale with a Metro Rail placed through the mountains directly to downtown Los Angeles. The City owns all that land and this would be a solution for our Metropolitan City. Every large City in the nation has more than one Airport.

**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.

**PC00883-3**

**Comment:**

We have the solution in the County of Los Angeles, our area needs better access roads for transportation. Outlying areas continue to grow, the growth is not here there is no more room. Design your plans for the Regional Solution and come up the Large Picture.

**Response:**

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

**PC00884****Thomas, Emilia****None Provided****7/13/2001****PC00884-1****Comment:**

We like this house, we live here since 1978 we do not want to lose it. Also we could not afford to pay for another house. I am on social security, retired & disable

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00040-46. Also see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values and Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation, including affordable housing.

**PC00885****Ratzlaff, Gertrude****None Provided****PC00885-1****Comment:**

I have lived in Westchester since 1941 and have been so proud of our beautiful community. My late husband and I were saddened when many stores were made to close due to their landlord trippingly their leases. However, with new businesses opening up, Westchester is again, a great place to live.

I am very much against LAX expansion. We do not need the additional traffic, noise, air pollution etc.

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

**PC00885-2****Comment:**

Ontario and Palmdale should be developed as opposed to 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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC00886      Arce, Katherine      None Provided      7/13/2001**

**PC00886-1**

**Comment:**

Expanding LAWA will lead to increased Traffic congestion, Noise, and air pollution in our Westchester 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. 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.

**PC00886-2**

**Comment:**

This will lead to increased rates of disease such as Asthma, heart disease, COPD, and hearing defects

**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-3 regarding air pollution increase, Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding land use and noise mitigation and Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

**PC00886-3**

**Comment:**

It will also lead to decrease in quality of life and subsequently, our property values.

**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.

**PC00886-4**

**Comment:**

A better solution is to expand outlying Airports such as Ontario and Palmdale and 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. Following the passage of local Measure W in March 2002, Orange County, the Local Redevelopment Authority for the former Marine Corps Air Station El Toro, discontinued pursuit of the base for a civilian aviation reuse. The Department of the Navy decided to

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

dispose of the base for non-aviation uses. The City of Los Angeles does not have the authority to develop a civilian airport at the former MCAS El Toro.

**PC00886-5**

**Comment:**

Please consider my comments seriously.

**Response:**

Please see Responses to Comments PC00886-1 through PC00886-4 above.

<b>PC00887</b>	<b>Conklin, Dale</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/13/2001</b>
----------------	----------------------	----------------------	------------------

**PC00887-1**

**Comment:**

I am very concerned about the proposed expansion of the LA Airport. The current traffic load already adversely impacts our neighborhood. The proposed plan will lead to thousands more trucks and trucks going to and from the airport, leading to additional pollution and congestion.

**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 the proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Please also see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Section 4.1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for information regarding noise.

**PC00887-2**

**Comment:**

There are no mitigation measures for handling the traffic on the freeways.

**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. Freeway impacts are addressed in the Congestion Management Program analysis, which is contained in Technical Reports 3b and S-2b, section 6.

**PC00887-3**

**Comment:**

This plan is not well considered. It proposes that additional traffic route though the LA airport when it would be closer for many people and products to fly in and out of expanded 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

### 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.

#### PC00887-4

**Comment:**

Flights into and out of the airport are already very dense, adding even more will increase the safety risk for passengers and the surrounding community.

**Response:**

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

#### PC00887-5

**Comment:**

The EIR/EIS shows that pollution will be increased beyond it's current level which could lead to serious respiratory problems for residence or even 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.

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. The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR evaluated the potential risk of adverse health effects for each of the Master Plan Alternatives based on the emissions associated with each of the alternatives. The No Project/No Action Alternative assumes that no substantial changes are made to current LAX facilities, and is based on projections of growth in airport activity between 1996 and horizon year 2015. Airport congestion during this time is expected to grow worse without additional capital improvement. In all cases, build alternatives are expected to relieve current and predicted future congestion by making airport operations, particularly aircraft operations, more efficient.

After implementation of mitigation measures, the build alternatives would reduce predicted impacts to human health compared with the No Project/No Action Alternative. Implementation of any of the build alternatives is therefore anticipated to reduce future health impacts for most people living, working or going to school near the airport. However, as was indicated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, predicted chronic non-cancer human health impacts for maximally exposed residents under Alternatives B and C are slightly higher for some areas than those predicted with the No Project/No Action Alternative.

#### PC00887-6

**Comment:**

I believe LAX should not be expanded. Regional airports could be developed 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

### 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.

**PC00888      Homeyer, Steve      None Provided      7/13/2001**

**PC00888-1**

**Comment:**

THE LAX MASTER PLAN WILL TURN PERSHING DRIVE INTO A REFLECTION OF TRAFFIC CONGESTED SEPULVEDA BLVD. ACCESS TO THE SOUTH BAY IS LIMITED TO THREE THOROUGHFARES AROUND LAX, BARELY PASSABLE DURING RUSH HOUR! PLEASE DON'T OVER STRESS THE WEST SIDE ROADWAYS BY EXPANSION OF EXTRA TERMINALS OFF PERSHING.

**Response:**

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

**PC00889      Haskell, Walter      None Provided      7/14/2001**

**PC00889-1**

**Comment:**

In all the swirling controversy about the LAX Expansion Plans, little mention or concern has been expressed about the fate of the Centinela Adobe, the prime historical jewel and landmark of the entire Centinela Valley. This venerable structure, built in 1834 by Ignacio Machado, is the first significant building in the Valley.

The Centinela Adobe was recognized in 1937 by being placed on the National Register of Historic Places.

The Centinela Adobe has withstood earthquakes, fires, and demolition by developers. It was saved in 1950 when the Native Daughters began a campaign to preserve it. A public subscription raised \$20,000, and the landmark was deeded to the City of Inglewood, a gesture thought to preserve it forever. La Casa de la Centinela Association was formed open it to the public. Later, the Historical Society of Centinela Valley was incorporated to take over this obligation. This entity is a volunteer service group; no person receives any compensation for services.

It is considered to be one of the best preserved smaller adobe structures in Los Angeles County.

Over the years thousands of school children have visited the premises. Docents are on duty two days a week to guide people through the structure, and interpret its history.

On the same premises is the Daniel Freeman 1889 Land Office from which were sold lots in the new town of Inglewood. Formerly located adjacent to the old Santa Fe Station, it was moved to the Freeman residence property on Grace Avenue, then moved to the Centinela Adobe property. It serves as a museum of early Inglewood business. Also, on this property is the Walter Haskell Heritage Center, built by the Historical Society of Centinela Valley in 1980 by funds raised in the community.

These buildings, called the Centinela Adobe Complex, are important to the history and culture of the entire Centinela Valley and must not be impacted, disturbed or destroyed by a planned massive elevated expressway connection to the airport!

Ladies and gentlemen, consider your heritage and abandon these plans, Preserve the Centinel Adobe fix future generations!

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**Response:**

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

**PC00890**

**Pappas, Kim**

**None Provided**

**7/12/2001**

**PC00890-1**

**Comment:**

NO LAX EXPANSION

My concerns are:

air pollution  
cargo demand  
keeping our community whole  
noise  
safety  
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 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-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.

**PC00890-2**

**Comment:**

Develope Ontario and Palmdale airports instead.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC00890-3**

**Comment:**

NO LAX 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.



**PC00891      Klippel, Stephen      None Provided      7/10/2001**

**PC00891-1**

**Comment:**

This airport has already outgrown our community. Too much noise & traffic to a small community like Westchester. Stop the expansion now.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 2 and 3. 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.

**PC00891-2**

**Comment:**

Look for regional solutions to spread the burden. Save Westchester now.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC00891-3**

**Comment:**

Air safety will be compromised if more air traffic is allowed.

**Response:**

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

**PC00892      Franz, Anne      None Provided      7/13/2001**

**PC00892-1**

**Comment:**

Having lived and owned our home in Westchester we have lived thru many of the Airports changes and heard many outright lies. NO MORE EXPANSION! ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!

**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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC00892-2

**Comment:**

This is irresponsible doings by people who don't even live in this area and or have not seen & experienced the bad changes that have come about because of the expansion.

Like a chinese torture = it just does not stop.

**Response:**

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

#### PC00892-3

**Comment:**

My health has certainly been affected - constant noise, polution, horrible traffic or sep. - bad street conditions because of the volume.

**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 in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment. Supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, and 14a of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, and S-9a 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.

#### PC00892-4

**Comment:**

L.A. made a mistake when first planning this Airport - DON'T MAKE ANOTHER THIS TIME

**Response:**

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

#### PC00893

**Arius, Linda**

**None Provided**

**7/12/2001**

#### PC00893-1

**Comment:**

I oppose the LAX expansion. Im a 20 year resident of Westchester and only just purchased my first home, here, in 1998 - it's a great area and I am against the expansion that will lead to more noise, air & cars, the traffic, the pollution and the whole idea --

**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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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

**PC00894**      **Holland, Bernard S.      None Provided**      **7/11/2001**  
                    **& Jennie F.**

**PC00894-1**

**Comment:**

THERE ARE MANY OBJECTIONS TO THE LAX EXPANSION PLANS IN THE EIR/EIS. THESE INCLUDE: DESTRUCTION OF BUSINESSES & HOMES, INCREASED TRAFFIC ON STREETS & HIGHWAYS, NOISE AND AIR 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; relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses; and air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendices D and G, and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendices S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-2, S-3, 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.

**PC00894-2**

**Comment:**

BUT THE MOST IMPORTANT THING IS THAT ANY EXPANSION OF LAX IS NOT NECESSARY. IT IS FAR BETTER TO EXPAND OTHER AIRPORTS IN THE REGION SUCH AS - ONTARIO, PALMDALE AND EL TORO AS WELL AS OTHERS.

**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-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, for information on El Toro, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario International Airport, 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.

**PC00895**      **Jamner, Lisa**      **None Provided**      **7/15/2001**

**PC00895-1**

**Comment:**

TO EXPAND THE AIRPORT IS DISGUSTING. THERE IS ALREADY TOO MUCH NOISE, TRAFFIC, SAFETY ISSUES ETC. WE DON'T NEED MORE.

### 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, traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, 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. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

**PC00895-2**

**Comment:**

EXPAND VAN NUYS, EL TORO, BURBANK AND KEEP LAX THE SAME SIZE

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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. Van Nuys Airport serves a critical role as a general aviation reliever airport for LAX. Following the passage of local Measure W in March 2002, Orange County, the Local Redevelopment Authority for the former Marine Corps Air Station El Toro, discontinued pursuit of the base for a civilian aviation reuse. The Department of the Navy decided to dispose of the base for non-aviation uses. The City of Los Angeles does not have the authority to develop a civilian airport at the former MCAS El Toro.

**PC00895-3**

**Comment:**

FEEL FREE TO CALL IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO HEAR AN EARFUL!

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC00896**

**Yurga, Pauline**

**None Provided**

**7/14/2001**

**PC00896-1**

**Comment:**

Do not enlarge LAX. Let orange county provide for their people. They have lots of room at El Toro.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

**PC00896-2**

**Comment:**

You are courting disaster by crowding LAX. I hope I never see it happen.

**Response:**

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

**PC00897      Yurga, Pauline      None Provided      7/14/2001**

**PC00897-1**

**Comment:**

Please add my name to the list of people who object to enlarging L.A.X. Its just not fair to let greed put us all in jeopardy. You can only get so much "blood out of a stone" and no more.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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 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.

**PC00897-2**

**Comment:**

Make LAX more efficient - not larger.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC00897-3**

**Comment:**

Im a resident of Westchester for 48 years and I hate what is happening to the community.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC00898      Goldstein, Michael      None Provided      7/15/2001**

**PC00898-1**

**Comment:**

My wife and I are against LAX expansion. It will destroy our neighborhood, increase noise & air pollution, and the increase in car & truck traffic would be catastrophic.

**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. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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

---

#### PC00898-2

**Comment:**

Why not look to Ontario, Palmdale, & 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. Following the passage of local Measure W in March 2002, Orange County, the Local Redevelopment Authority for the former Marine Corps Air Station El Toro, discontinued pursuit of the base for a civilian aviation reuse. The Department of the Navy decided to dispose of the base for non-aviation uses. The city of Los Angeles does not have the authority to develop a civilian airport at the former MCAS El Toro.

**PC00899**

**Cairns, Cliff**

**None Provided**

**7/13/2001**

#### PC00899-1

**Comment:**

Please - no expansion, only improvements on current sites. Improve Parking, People movers such as Trains, etc. Cut # of hotel & car rental buses. "Freeze" # of flights by all airlines, enforce traffic infractions & push for off airport premises parking.

**Response:**

Alternative D addresses many of the concerns mentioned. Alternative D has been added to 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.

#### PC00899-2

**Comment:**

Force Orange County to make El Toro a major airport as well as Ontario & 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.

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, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

#### PC00899-3

**Comment:**

I'm 73 year Calif. native!

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**Response:**  
Comment noted.

**PC00900      Lawson, Mary      None Provided      7/14/2001**

**PC00900-1**

**Comment:**  
I do not want to lose my home. My husband passed away 1986. My home was paid for at that time. I am over 75 yrs old and do not want to move in my late years. There are four (4) widows on my one block. Two are disable.

**Response:**  
Please see Response to Comment AL00040-46. Also see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values and Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation, including affordable housing.

**PC00900-2**

**Comment:**  
Taking our homes will only add to traffic at the airport and in Westchester. You have done enough damage to Westchester.

**Response:**  
See Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residents or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding acquisition and Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, concerning impacts associated with traffic. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. Also note that Alternative D, LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative, does not propose residential acquisition.

**PC00901      Aasved, Ken      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC00901-1**

**Comment:**  
I am opposed to expanding the Los Angeles International Airport in Westchester 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.

**PC00901-2**

**Comment:**  
1. The airport is already overused and is ranked by pilots as one of the country's most dangerous.

**Response:**  
Please see Response to Comment PC00543-1.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

#### **PC00901-3**

**Comment:**

2. Enough of Westchester has been taken by Eminent Domain for airport use.

**Response:**

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 regarding impacts to 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 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 will be provided to any person displaced from their home or business. Also please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

#### **PC00901-4**

**Comment:**

3. Soot, or dirt pollution from jet fuel is already a problem in Westchester

**Response:**

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

#### **PC00901-5**

**Comment:**

4. Noise from airplanes, and helicopters flying over Sepulveda Blvd.

**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.

#### **PC00901-6**

**Comment:**

5. Traffic in and around the airport is a nightmare.

**Response:**

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

#### **PC00901-7**

**Comment:**

6. Air pollution is a problem and would only increase.



**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, Air Quality. 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.

**PC00901-8**

**Comment:**

7. Airport space is available at John Wayne Airport and El Toro in Orange County, as well as in Ontario 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. 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.

**PC00902**

**Midstokke, Merlyn**

**None Provided**

**7/14/2001**

**PC00902-1**

**Comment:**

The idea of expanding LAX any more is ridiculous, since it is already too large for our 405 freeway, especially to the north, to accommodate the current traffic.

**Response:**

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

**PC00902-2**

**Comment:**

The newly purposed circle airport access roads promise to gut out an enormous part of Westchester, El Segundo, Inglewood, Hawthorne, Playa Del Rey, and other communities.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology. Also, the alternatives were planned to satisfy the future airport demand while also mitigating any impacts on the surrounding street system, including in Westchester. Land would not be required for the Ring Road from El Segundo, Inglewood, Hawthorne, or Playa Del Rey. 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 alleviate airport-related traffic in the communities mentioned by the commentor. 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.

**PC00902-3**

**Comment:**

The gridlock of traffic from the beach communities of Manhattan Beach, El Segundo, and Redondo Beach can hardly get out of or into their cities now; it is beyond my imagination to picture what their situation would be with further airport expansion.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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

**PC00902-4**

**Comment:**

Any further airport expansion requires completely disregarding the legal rights and the welfare of the citizens who live anywhere near 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.

**PC00902-5**

**Comment:**

Also, since the airport commission has not chosen to enlarge hardly any other airports in the Los Angeles area they are in part responsible for extra traffic on all of our freeways, with people traveling even over 100 miles by automobile because LAX is the only airport they have to 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.

**PC00903**

**Smith, Peggy & Jeff**

**None Provided**

**7/12/2001**

**PC00903-1**

**Comment:**

Massive traffic congestion.  
& air & noise pollution that will be unbearable!  
Ontario would be a good location or El Torro.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendices D, G, S-C, and S-E and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4, S-2, and S-4. In addition, 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 City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. 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.

<b>PC00904</b>	<b>Jacobs, John &amp; Jennifer</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/12/2001</b>
----------------	------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------

**PC00904-1**

**Comment:**

It is completely unfair to the residents surrounding LAX to bear the total burden of the Southland's air travel needs. It makes logical sense to spread the burden to the regional airports & to require O.C. to provide for their own 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.

**PC00904-2**

**Comment:**

Expansion of LAX will ruin the wonderful Westcher area, which includes 9,000 homes.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The comment does not raise any specific issues with the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC00904-3**

**Comment:**

Traffic on Sepulveda is already so overwhelming that my elementary school daughter cannot walk home from school by herself simply because it is too dangerous to cross Sepulveda.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC00904-4**

**Comment:**

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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

<b>PC00905</b>	<b>Cram, Jayne &amp; Gregory</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/13/2001</b>
----------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	------------------

#### **PC00905-1**

**Comment:**

First Playa Vista, now this! Please stop destroying our community for the sake of more \$\$ to developers, airlines, everyone but the residents of Westchester. I am a 36 year Westchester resident and oh how I've seen the changes over the years. Now it is time to stop!

**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.

#### **PC00905-2**

**Comment:**

One community cannot bear the brunt of "progress." Spread the "wealth" to Ontario, Palmdale, Orange Co.... anywhere but here.

**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.

#### **PC00905-3**

**Comment:**

This community has so little land/open space for it's residents. We do not want a total cement jungle. We might as well be in NYC!

**Response:**

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. However, it should be noted that based on the analysis presented in Section 4.26.3, Parks and Recreation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR that development of the Master Plan alternatives would expand, rather than reduce, the amount of park and recreation space in the vicinity of LAX.

#### **PC00905-4**

**Comment:**

The traffic is getting worse and

**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 the proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

**PC00905-5**

**Comment:**

Playa Vista isn't even close to completion.

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00148-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00148-2.

**PC00905-6**

**Comment:**

Leave our air, our streets, our ears..... our community alone. Enough is enough!

**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. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC00906**

**Migliore, Jr., John**

**None Provided**

**7/12/2001**

**PC00906-1**

**Comment:**

As a lifetime 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.

**PC00906-2**

**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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC00906-3

**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 surface transportation analysis methodology, and Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

#### PC00906-4

**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.

#### PC00906-5

**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.

#### PC00906-6

**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. In addition, 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.

#### PC00906-7

**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.

**PC00906-8****Comment:**

I most strongly urge the LAWA Commissioners to vote 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.

**PC00907****Nuzzo, Ruth****None Provided****7/13/2001****PC00907-1****Comment:**

Long term planning is absolutely necessary. Ontario and Palmdale must be developed along with El Toro, to help with the problems of increased airport flights. Westchester and the surrounding communities have put up with LAX expansion long enough. Other areas must start to share in the expansion problems projected volume of activity indicates.

**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-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, for information on El Toro, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario International Airport, 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

---

#### PC00907-2

**Comment:**

I have lived at this address since April of 1949 so I do know how the community has changed. 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.

<b>PC00908</b>	<b>Kelly, Coleman L &amp; Cindy A.</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/14/2001</b>
----------------	--	----------------------	------------------

#### PC00908-1

**Comment:**

The following comments, though they are not mine originally - I take as my own; as they express my opinion so well.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

#### PC00908-2

**Comment:**

KEEPING OUR COMMUNITY WHOLE - In order to build LAX Expressway and the Ring Road - the LAWA will have to acquire one-third of the Central Business District on Sepulveda Blvd., homes near Nielsen Field and part of historic Centinela Adobe. What happens when this Expansion isn't enough - Whose home will be the next target?

**Response:**

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. Potential impacts to cultural resources were discussed in Section 4.9.1, Historic Architecture and Archeological/Cultural Resources of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 concerning impacts within the Community of Westchester and Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding the Centinela Adobe. 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. Further, it does not include the LAX Expressway and therefore there it has no potential for impacts on the Centinela Adobe. 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. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

#### PC00908-3

**Comment:**

TRAFFIC - Increase in cargo volume will lead to thousands more trucks.



**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.

**PC00908-4**

**Comment:**

Construction will bring more traffic, though it may be temporary.

**Response:**

Sections 4.3.1.6.2 and 4.3.2.6.2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 7 of 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 address the concern raised in this comment.

**PC00908-5**

**Comment:**

Expansion would add numerous cars to our surface streets and 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.

**PC00908-6**

**Comment:**

There are no mitigation measures for handling the traffic on the freeways.

**Response:**

This comment is similar to Comment PC00887-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00887-2.

**PC00908-7**

**Comment:**

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

**Response:**

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC00148-7; please refer to Response to Comment PC00148-7.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC00908-8

**Comment:**

Homes in the 65 CNEL are eligible for soundproofing. More noise and soundproofing may mean that people will have to remain indoors with their doors and windows closed!

**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.

#### PC00908-9

**Comment:**

CARGO DEMAND - The LAWA is focusing its expansion to meet projected cargo demand. Areas of concern include larger cargo aircraft, more flights, and heavy aircraft operations.

**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 information on the formulation of this alternative and its consistency with the SCAG 2001 RTP. Please also see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increases related to larger aircraft, additional flights, and heavy aircraft operations.

#### PC00908-10

**Comment:**

AIR POLLUTION - Auto emission, emissions from idling planes and jet fuel emissions. LAX is already one of the region's single largest source of NOx emissions - the primary precursor to ozone. The EIR/EIS predicts that the increased ground and air traffic will result in increased emissions of all five EPA classified major air pollutants.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00043-6 regarding LAX as a source of air pollution.

#### PC00908-11

**Comment:**

This could affect the respiratory systems of some people and may cause 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. 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.

**PC00908-12****Comment:**

SAFETY - Overcrowding of the air corridors may lead to likelihood of air disasters.

**Response:**

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

**PC00908-13****Comment:**

REGIONAL SOLUTION - The Master Plan is a short-term quick fix approach. Long term planning is needed. The City of Los Angeles owns two key airports - Ontario and Palmdale - which should be developed as opposed 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.

**PC00908-14****Comment:**

El Toro (Orange County) should also be developed. Why should the communities around LAX bear the burden of Orange County's need for air commerce?

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

**PC00908-15****Comment:**

The State of California has plans to build high-speed rail that would provide a direct link between Palmdale and Los Angeles.

**Response:**

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

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

**PC00908-16**

**Comment:**

If the City of Los Angeles wants to set an example of true leadership & sensible long range vision . . . Now is the time. If the New Mayor truly is a man of his word - let him appoint a City Council & LAWA Commissioners with the same "NO-EXPANSION" view as he has pledged during Campaign.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00578-1 regarding the development of Alternative D-Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, which was developed at the direction of Mayor James Hahn.

**PC00909      Berg, Eric & Louise      None Provided      7/13/2001**

**PC00909-1**

**Comment:**

Please listen to the voices of the people of Westchester & Playa Del Rey. I have been a resident of Westchester for 23 years and have watched it become more & more congested, noisy and polluted. The LAX airport expansion will be a horrible & devastating impact on this and the surrounding communities.

**Response:**

Impacts associated with traffic, noise, and air pollution were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use, Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional discussion of environmental effects on the Westchester community, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2.

**PC00909-2**

**Comment:**

There are other more realistic options. Please stop the expansion of LAX and help save our homes & lives of the children & people of Westchester & Playa Del Rey.  
Thank you.

**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.

**PC00910      Cunningham, Nancy      None Provided**

**PC00910-1**

**Comment:**

LAX is surrounded on three sides by very nice residential areas which have been bearing the brunt of the dirty air, jet engine exhaust residue, loud noise and heavy traffic for many, many years. We don't have any expectations for a decrease in these problems, but its certainly time to look elsewhere for future increases in air traffic. The increase in population in L.A., Orange, and Riverside counties is moving farther east and north so this is where the increased air traffic should be concentrated.

**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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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.

**PC00911      Alling, Clyde R. &      None Provided      7/12/2001**  
**Pilar C.**

**PC00911-1**

**Comment:**

The expansion of LAX is unthinkable when you can expand the Ontario & Palmdale airports. Doing so would alleviate noise & air pollution, noise from traffic congestion on Sepulveda Blvd.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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. 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.

**PC00911-2**

**Comment:**

The loss of businesses and uprooting long time residents from their homes shows lack of consideration. WHAT NEXT? TOTAL PHASE OUT WESTCHESTER RESIDENTIAL AREA? Respectfully request your kind consideration.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see 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 or any acquisition within the Westchester Business District.

**PC00912      Geiss, Patricia &      None Provided      7/12/2001**  
**Harvey F.**

**PC00912-1**

**Comment:**

Once upon a time, downtown Westchester & the community surrounding the then LAX expansion (about 30 yrs ago) was DEVASTATED, decimated or any other word you may choose. Recovery has been slow & now it looks like more trauma to the area.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC00912-2

**Comment:**

I see no reason why Palmdale, with thousands of acres of available land, & a citizenry that wants an airport shouldn't get their wish.

**Response:**

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

#### PC00912-3

**Comment:**

Soundproofing is unacceptable - I'm not going to be a prisoner in my own home (closed doors & windows).

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program. To achieve the full benefits of this program, windows need to be closed. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

#### PC00912-4

**Comment:**

The airlines may not like it but they will get use to their "new" hub in the high desert.

**Response:**

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

**PC00913**

**Hyra, Joan**

**None Provided**

**7/12/2001**

#### PC00913-1

**Comment:**

Already the traffic in our community is too heavy. When I drive I try to be extra careful in Westchester because taxis and cars are trying to get to LAX as fast as they can.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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 the proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

#### PC00913-2

**Comment:**

Even walking can be dangerous because people run red lights and don't even look for anyone crossing the street. They are all in a hurry to catch a plane.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC00913-3****Comment:**

And we residents have to breathe all that polluted air.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00088-2.

**PC00913-4****Comment:**

Regional airports are the only fair and logical solution. They will relieve LAX congestion.

**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.

**PC00914**

**Pepping, John &  
Dolly**

**None Provided**

**7/13/2001**

**PC00914-1****Comment:**

There is absolutely no need to destroy Westchester for the purpose of expanding Los Angeles International Airport. Almost all those who land there are not going anywhere nearby.

**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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

**PC00914-2****Comment:**

They are going to cities scattered all over So. Calif. They would be just as well served landing at the Palmdale or Ontario airports. As a matter of fact many of them would be closer to their final destinations.

**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.

#### PC00914-3

**Comment:**

This plan to destroy Westchester appears to be a power play by the General Manager of the Los Angeles airport.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC00915**

**Kanoff, Edy**

**None Provided**

**7/12/2001**

#### PC00915-1

**Comment:**

I moved to Westchester because of the solitude, no traffic congestion, and minimal air traffic affording a relatively clean and quiet air environment. None of this is prevalent now.

**Response:**

Sections 4.6, 4.1, and 4.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed impacts related to air quality, noise, and traffic, respectively. 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.

#### PC00915-2

**Comment:**

The filth spewed out by airplanes flying overhead is revolting.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

#### PC00915-3

**Comment:**

The traffic congestion along the Sepulveda corridor is nerve-racking.

**Response:**

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

#### PC00915-4

**Comment:**

What was once a lovely staid community now is being threatened even more by the possible expansion of LAX.



**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC00915-5****Comment:**

Who needs it? We don't, and we don't want it!

With all due respect to our outgoing Mayor Riordan, it is time for him to consider our community and take his plans to Palmdale or Ontario and let us enjoy that for which we pay taxes.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC00915-6****Comment:**

Take away the fall-out and let us have our clean air again. (I used to enjoy hanging laundry in my backyard - no more.)

**Response:**

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

**PC00915-7****Comment:**

I am hopeful if enough Westchester inhabitants UNITE and PROTEST - if only by letter - we may ultimately prevail in our search for control of what we hold dear.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC00916      Figueroa, Mr. & Mrs.      None Provided**  
**Harold**

**7/13/2001**

**PC00916-1****Comment:**

IN MY HOME AREA SOOT AND NOISE JET AIRCRAFT

**Response:**

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-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC00916-2**

**Comment:**

EXCESSIVE TRUCK AND AUTO TRAFFIC TO & FROM AIRPORT

**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 the proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

**PC00916-3**

**Comment:**

405 FREEWAY  
NOISE

**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.

**PC00916-4**

**Comment:**

EXHAUST EMISSION  
DIRT FROM TIRE WEAR

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC00917**

**Moore, Susan**

**None Provided**

**7/11/2001**

**PC00917-1**

**Comment:**

I am opposed to LAX expansion. Increased cargo planes would increase noise and air pollution which affect my health and quality 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, 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-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand and 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.

**PC00917-2****Comment:**

I urge airport expansion to take place at Ontario or Palmdale 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.

**PC00918      Dinsmoor, Lawrence      None Provided**

**7/12/2001**

**PC00918-1****Comment:**

I AM VERY CONCERNED ABOUT ALL THE TOXIC FUMES THAT ARE CURRENTLY RELEASED INTO OUR AIR AND ALL THE ADDITIONAL TOXIC GASSES & AIR POLLUTION THAT WILL BE IN OUR AIR AROUND LAX! FROM AUTOS, TRUCKS & PLANES.

**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 and addressed the human health risk impacts in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of each document.

**PC00918-2****Comment:**

I HATE TO SEE WESTCHESTER BUSSINESS AREA DESTROYED ALONG WITH ALL THE ADDITIONAL NOISE!

**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, note that 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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

Impacts associated with noise were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

#### **PC00918-3**

**Comment:**

TRAFFIC IS TERRABLE AND GETTING WORSE! FREEWAYS ARE PARKING LOTS AT TIMES AND WITH LAX EXPANSION ALONG WITH MAR VISTA, TRAFFIC WILL BE UNBEARABLE!

**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 the proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

**PC00919**

**Rattin, E.**

**None Provided**

**7/12/2001**

#### **PC00919-1**

**Comment:**

Westchester is already heavily impacted by the increased traffic caused by the airport. We have reached the limit and don't want anymore!!

**Response:**

The Draft LAX 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-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC00920**

**Flynn, Virginia**

**None Provided**

#### **PC00920-1**

**Comment:**

I am writing to you to please Stop the LAX expansion. I have lived here in the same home for 43 yrs. and to watch how our beautiful Westchester has been torn apart over the years is so discouraging.

**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.

#### **PC00920-2**

**Comment:**

I can't understand why Ontario & Palmdale & Orange County airports aren't expected to enlarge to share this burden.

**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.

**PC00920-3****Comment:**

This expansion will take homes and businesses away in great numbers.

**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. 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.

**PC00921****Rigoli, Carl****None Provided****7/12/2001****PC00921-1****Comment:**

I have been a resident of Westchester since 1972 and Love living here. I am very upset to learn about the proposed expansion by the LAX 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.

**PC00921-2****Comment:**

I live near the Historic Centinela Adobe and I am very concerned that my neighborhood is in jeopardy of being destroyed by the proposed expansion.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding impacts to the Centinela Adobe. Effects on the Centinela Adobe and adjacent areas are evaluated in Appendix K, Supplemental Environmental Evaluation for LAX Expressway and State Route 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR. As was described and evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAVA Staff's new preferred alternative, Alternative D, would not include the LAX Expressway or the ring road. Therefore any neighborhood impacts resulting from the development of the LAX Expressway, as analyzed in Appendix K would not occur under Alternative D. See also Topical Response TR-LU-1 for a discussion of overall community effects associated with the Master Plan alternatives.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

<b>PC00922</b>	<b>Macfarlane, Mary &amp; Bill</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/12/2001</b>
----------------	------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------

#### **PC00922-1**

##### **Comment:**

We do not want the airport to expand, Palmdale & Ontario must be utilized. Send the cargo there. There are millions of people in those areas the "cargo" will eventually be sent to anyway.

##### **Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. It is important to note that 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 particular 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 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 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.

#### **PC00922-2**

##### **Comment:**

We have lived here over 30 yrs. We don't want any more changes!

##### **Response:**

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

**PC00923      Lee, James      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC00923-1**

**Comment:**

Did the people who want to expand LAX know the reality of traffic congestion on the 405 FW between Westwood and Airport? Do they know how many tall office buildings have built in recent years between Westwood and Airport. During the rush hours, the cars do not move on 405FW between Century Blvd and Westwood Blvd.

**Response:**

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

**PC00923-2**

**Comment:**

In New York Areas, instead of expanding Kennedy Airport, New York people created La Guardia Airport and New Wark Airport to sove the traffic congestion.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC00923-3**

**Comment:**

New York Planners are smart. How come Los Angeles Planners are not smart? To their brains, \$\$\$\$ sign only! They do not have pictures in their brains that many people will be on the 405 FW with anger because the cars do not move. At that time, who have to get blaim for those anger? The City Planners who are short-sighted will be responsible.

**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.

**PC00924      Fisher, Joy      None Provided      7/13/2001**

**PC00924-1**

**Comment:**

Recently my husband arrived at LAX. The plane sat in on the tarmac for over a half an hour waiting for terminal space so they could unload the passengers and cargo. Until problems such as this can be solved, there should be a cut-back on the number of flights allowed per hour. Any expansion plans should be contingent on a resolution of the current overcrowding problems.

**Response:**

Improving the current conditions for travelers by relieving traffic congestion on and off the airport and reducing flight delays by enhancing operational efficiency of the LAX airfield and flight paths was one of the guiding principles in developing the Master Plan alternatives. Please see Response to Comment PC00928-3 regarding the ability of airport operators 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)

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

**PC00925      Lee, Family the,      None Provided      7/17/2001**

**PC00925-1**

**Comment:**

Thank you for the opportunity to reply to the Expansion of the Los Angeles Airport.

We have been living in this neighborhood for quite sometime and have seen the growing changes at the airport.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

**PC00925-2**

**Comment:**

Since the using of the north runway was approved many years ago and the additional new lane just added last year, the noise and smell of the fumes are terrible. We have to keep our window close most of the time.

**Response:**

Although the focus of the EIS/EIR is on the potential future environmental effects of the project, existing conditions relative to noise and air quality were described in Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.3.1), Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3), and Section 4.6, Air Quality (subsection 4.6.3), of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC00925-3**

**Comment:**

The airplane noise is especially loud after 10 p.m. The thrust and reviving up of the engine must be coming from a very large plane.

**Response:**

Each development alternative incorporates the construction of one or more Ground Run-up Enclosures (GRE) within which all run-up activity would be conducted. These facilities, when properly designed, achieve a reduction of approximately 20 decibels over run-ups conducted without enclosure. See Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-5.3 regarding night run-up activity. 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 S-C and Technical Report S-1.

**PC00925-4**

**Comment:**

There are many young children and elderly in our neighborhood and it is very unhealthy for them to breath in this great fresh air into their 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



### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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.

#### **PC00925-5**

**Comment:**

It is our strong opinion that we have given our fair share to the Los Angeles Airport Expansion in the past few decades. Now it is time for other areas to take on the new load.

**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.

#### **PC00925-6**

**Comment:**

We do not need anymore of the EXPANSION at the Los Angeles Airport near 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.

**PC00926**

**Nelson, Pam**

**None Provided**

**7/12/2001**

#### **PC00926-1**

**Comment:**

I find it hard to believe that anyone would seriously consider expanding the capacity of LAX without first considering the ramifications of traffic, especially on the 405.

**Response:**

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

#### **PC00926-2**

**Comment:**

Also, I know countless people who live in Orange County who trudge up to LAX for flights. Can't they / shouldn't they be convinced of the importance of an Orange County airport?

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC00927      Schlarmann, Erika      None Provided      7/13/2001**

**PC00927-1**

**Comment:**

Our regional airports should be developed, not LAX. Palmdale and Ontario want the development. We already have too much traffic, too much pollution, and too much noise from LAX. Absolutely do not expand this already monstrous 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. 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.

**PC00928      No Author Identified,      Peninsula Aircraft Noise/Safety      7/9/2001**  
**Information Committee**

**PC00928-1**

**Comment:**

The Peninsula Aircraft Noise/Safety Information Committee has worked for the past four years to mitigate aircraft noise in the Palos Verdes Peninsula. Our input to the Master Plan is as follows:

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

**PC00928-2**

**Comment:**

1. Nowhere in the existing Master Plan document or EIS/EIR do we see any mention of how the proposed expansion will specifically affect our community. We would like to see projections on how the proposed expansion will increase or change air traffic in our area, and if there are any planned changes to our local airspace.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Turbo-prop aircraft departing LAX destined for San Diego are routed at least one mile off-shore. Turbo-jet traffic is routed five miles west of the Palos Verdes Peninsula. There is no anticipated change to these routes. Turbo-prop aircraft destined for Ontario and Palm Springs cross on-shore south of the Palos Verdes Peninsula. 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.

#### PC00928-3

**Comment:**

2. LAX has operated at a level far beyond its existing EIR (40 MAP) for many years. The Master Plan should contain specific provisions to keep LAX from expanding beyond whatever new level is approved.

**Response:**

Airport operators and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) do not have the authority to limit future activity at airports. Airlines choose to provide additional flights. The Master Plan analyzed the capacity offered by each alternative and the future delays that would result at LAX in determining the level of activity that will likely occur at LAX by 2015. The activity levels for each alternative were developed by considering the airlines' likely reaction to increasing congestion. 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 provided in the Draft LAX 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 LAX 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.

#### PC00928-4

**Comment:**

3. The Master plan should contain very strong incentives for the airlines to pursue the simplest alternative to increasing airport capacity, specifically, flying fewer, larger aircraft. This will minimize the number of takeoffs and landings necessary to move a given number of people. The use of small capacity (turboprop) aircraft should be heavily discouraged through economic means

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00222-4 regarding the ability of LAWA to limit turboprop operations at LAX. As discussed in this response, LAWA has no authority to force the airlines to use or not use certain aircraft. LAWA has limited indirect influence as well; operational costs for airlines that are within LAWA's purview, the landing fees and apron fees, are a very small component of an airline's costs. Airlines choose "equipment" (aircraft type) to economically serve the market demand.

#### PC00928-5

**Comment:**

4. The FAA reported in 1994 that extending the Metro Green Line directly into LAX would be unsafe. The Master Plan does not address the safety issues raised by the FAA.

**Response:**

The FAA finding was made with respect to a different alignment to the airport. The proposed alignment in the Master Plan alternatives skirts around the southern edge of the airfield. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC00928-6**

**Comment:**

5. LAWA management should get more segments of the community involved in the planning process.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC00928-7**

**Comment:**

Mayor Hahn should be encouraged to draft a diverse group of new Airport Commissioners, rather than just those who will economically benefit from LAX expansion.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC00929**

**Baron, Lena**

**None Provided**

**7/13/2001**

**PC00929-1**

**Comment:**

Also own 7 unit Bldg at 7761 St Bernard St. Playa del Rey Ca 90293

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC00929-2**

**Comment:**

I am very pleased with the soundproofing finished in Dec 2000. However my residence is a problem -

1. Noise
2. Nearer to my house it seems the airplanes are nearer.

**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.

**PC00929-3**

**Comment:**

Black dust on all windows & stucco

**Response:**

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

**PC00929-4****Comment:**

I cannot understand why Orange city cannot use an airport as most of their population comes to LAX to board. Same w/ L. Beach. Why not!!  
Palmdale for cargo makes more sense then leaving it vacant.  
I realize LA Airport would bring in more money but in the long run - it makes more sense to not more abuse!  
LAX = It's doing fine my new entrance plans etc  
Org city ->?? So redicule not to -  
Palmdale  
Cargo planes good for all of us  
Ontario = I just don't understand WHY NOT

**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 Response to Comment PC00922-1 for information regarding air cargo.

**PC00929-5****Comment:**

Sorry for messy report but I want to make my deadline -  
I'm writing as I feel -  
God bless us all to achieve the best available.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC00930****Lutz, Charlene****None Provided****7/12/2001****PC00930-1****Comment:**

The airport noise and pollution is already UNBEARABLE. The traffic congestion is even worse!! I am adamantly opposed to any further LAX expansion, as it has already gone too far.

**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

---

#### PC00930-2

**Comment:**

Take all LAX cargo to another location - Palmdale? Ontario? March Airforce Base? LAX is smack in the middle of an urban area. People live and work there. LAX should accommodate commuter traffic only. Expand the regional airports, not LAX.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00599-54.

#### PC00930-3

**Comment:**

Can the city absorb the potential litigation that could develop over trespass and public nuisance that leads to the many personal injuries that result? THINK!!

**Response:**

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

<b>PC00931</b>	<b>Gonzalez, Jerry</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/13/2001</b>
----------------	------------------------	----------------------	------------------

#### PC00931-1

**Comment:**

No expansion!!  
Keep our community safe and quiet.

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

#### PC00931-2

**Comment:**

At least no more noise than what we currently "enjoy"

**Response:**

Section 4.1, Noise and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided detailed 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, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1.

#### PC00931-3

**Comment:**

Traffic bad now guess what happens if this goes through. No amount of planning will fix it either!!

**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 the proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

**PC00932      Yucknat, Savannah      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC00932-1****Comment:**

Air pollution is bad now if airport expanse it will be worse.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00070-1 regarding existing air quality. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

**PC00932-2****Comment:**

Traffic will increase,

**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 the proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

**PC00932-3****Comment:**

and so will noise.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 regarding too much noise now and in the future. Section 4.1, Noise and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided detailed 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.

**PC00933      Gilmore, Jewel      None Provided**

**PC00933-1****Comment:**

Any one with any sense of compassion would know that LAX is big enough now. The Palmdale airport would service those in the growing suburbs to the Northeast.

**Response:**

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

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

#### **PC00933-2**

**Comment:**

Sepulveda pass is dangerous now. It would ease traffic to go the other way and save time for air traveler too.

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00933-1. Please see Response to Comment PC00933-1.

#### **PC00933-3**

**Comment:**

Westchester has been a secure family community and needs the businesses already in place.

**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. The Westchester Southside proposal, as well as the LAX Northside proposed under Alternative D, includes a community commercial "village" which would provide a pedestrian oriented environment for the residents of Westchester as well as an opportunity for relocation of displaced retail, office and educational uses. 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, note that 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.

#### **PC00933-4**

**Comment:**

The air pollution now is too much.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-3.

#### **PC00933-5**

**Comment:**

Heavy planes could land in the Palmdale area more safely and service the Valley easily.

**Response:**

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



**PC00933-6****Comment:**

The noise, even with double glazed windows is frightening.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 regarding existing and future noise levels. Also, please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

**PC00933-7****Comment:**

Wasting money on those unsightly pillars is an example of the inane thinking of the Master Plan.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC00934****Batton, Judy****None Provided****7/12/2001****PC00934-1****Comment:**

I am a lifelong resident of the airport area and I am writing this letter to express how much I oppose 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.

**PC00934-2****Comment:**

I think the LAX Master Plan would mean the demise of the community of Westchester due to the destruction of homes and businesses. The increased traffic and pollution that would result from the expansion would hurt the quality of life for the entire area.

**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 stated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the new LAWA Staff preferred alternative, Alternative D, does not propose residential acquisition.

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. Under Alternatives A through C, relocation opportunities would be available for some uses nearby within Westchester Southside. The Westchester Southside proposal, as well as the LAX

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

Northside proposed under Alternative D, includes a community commercial "village" which would provide a pedestrian oriented environment for the residents of Westchester as well as an opportunity for relocation of displaced retail, office and educational uses. 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, note that in contrast to the other build alternatives, Alternative D does not include any acquisition within the Westchester Business District.

Traffic effects were described in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As was further described in this section, the alternatives have been designed to separate regional airport traffic from local traffic, and to improve the functioning of the roadway systems in the vicinity of LAX. As a result, the quality of life in the neighborhoods surrounding LAX is not expected to be significantly affected by traffic. Pollution, in terms of air quality impacts, were described in Sections 4.6, Air Quality, and 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, 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.

#### PC00934-3

**Comment:**

I have lived in Westchester for forty-three years and for the past two years in El Segundo (right next to the airport). Some nights I am kept awake by the continuous noise from the jets. I can't even imagine what the noise might be like in ten to fifteen years from now!

**Response:**

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. However, please see Response to Comments AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels and PC01377-9 regarding noise impacts to the City of El Segundo. Sections 4.1.6 and 4.2.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR addressed projected noise increases for Alternatives A, B, and C through 2015 and provided a comparison against 1996 baseline conditions. Sections 4.1.6 and 4.2.6 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included discussion of a new LAWA Staff preferred Alternative D, comparison of projected noise increases for Alternatives A, B, C, and D in 2015 against Year 2000 conditions (and against 1996 baseline conditions for Alternative D), and analysis of significant single event noise levels that result in nighttime awakening or classroom disruption.

See also Topical Responses TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels, TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, and TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

#### PC00934-4

**Comment:**

When I drive through the tunnel on Sepulveda Blvd. during rush hour, the traffic is backed up at least 1/2 mile in both directions from the airport entrance.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00236-1 regarding the Sepulveda Tunnel.

#### PC00934-5

**Comment:**

I notice that I cough a lot more now than ever before and each year my sinuses bother me worse than the year before. My husband and I worry about the effects the pollution might be having on our 3 teenage sons.

**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.

**PC00934-6****Comment:**

My parents have lived in Westchester for over fifty years. They are both eighty-five years old and live on Airport Blvd. If Airport Blvd. is turned into an expressway from the 405 freeway, it would be nearly impossible to enter and exit the driveway to/from their home. The 405 freeway always slows down to a crawl near the airport area. Are expressways really going to improve these conditions?

**Response:**

This comment does not raise any specific environmental issue. However, the project would not convert Airport Boulevard to an expressway, as was described in detail in Draft EIS/EIR Chapter 3, Alternatives. The benefits and impacts of the proposed LAX Expressway, which would not use the Airport Boulevard alignment, were discussed in Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.3.2.6.2, Alternatives A, B, and C, and in Appendix K.

**PC00934-7****Comment:**

There are already too many cargo planes and trucks in the area, why should their number increase? I think most of the cargo transportation should be diverted to another nearby airport and leave LAX just a passenger airport!

**Response:**

Please see Responses to Comments PC00599-54 and PC00922-1.

**PC00934-8****Comment:**

Please HELP US! keep the quality of our cities noise and pollution safe!

**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.

**PC00935****Diaz, David****None Provided****7/12/2001****PC00935-1****Comment:**

I have lived in Westchester for over 15 years. I am a small business owner. Profits are important to any company and profits will DECREASE for businesses forced to use LAX as the ONLY airport for cargo and employees. Profits will INCREASE across all of So. Calif. if they have access to expanded airports close to their place of business.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC00935-2**

**Comment:**

The noise levels will only increase with expansion. Mitigation is a fantasy.

**Response:**

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 a discussion of noise impacts and related mitigation measures under each of the Master Plan alternatives. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels, Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program, and Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding noise mitigation.

**PC00936**

**Mascaro-Merola,  
Marta**

**None Provided**

**7/11/2001**

**PC00936-1**

**Comment:**

My husband and I moved to Westchester eight years ago. Westchester is a refuge in a big city, a place akin to the kind of safe, family-friendly neighborhoods we grew up in. We bought our home and started our family here. It is home.

However, we object to the possible expansion of LAX. It is ridiculous to believe that in this day and age, airport expansion is even being considered along our California coastline. No other city would consider this type of expansion along environmentally sensitive areas such as the coast, and high priced real estate such as our beaches. All other airports are built & expanded in surrounding areas, not within the city itself (Note Dulles in Wash. DC area & Newark for Tri State area.)

Please stop this expansion now. Westchester is already burdened with enough air pollution (jet fuel), noise pollution & traffic. Please keep Westchester what it is. a wonderful place for families to raise their children in a safe, healthy 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. 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, air quality impacts 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 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 and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

**PC00937**

**Comerford, Donna**

**None Provided**

**PC00937-1**

**Comment:**

Re: Westchester and the impact on it by LAX - all I can think is that the public officials are trying to wipe Westchester off the face of the earth. It is a lovely unique community in Los Angeles and should receive more consideration than it has from the start.

**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.

**PC00937-2****Comment:**

Please go out to Palmdale! The signs all point in that direction. It only makes good sense which hasn't been utilized since the very beginning.

**Response:**

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

**PC00937-3****Comment:**

I feel like one voice crying in the wilderness.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC00938****Erland, F.****None Provided****7/12/2001****PC00938-1****Comment:**

LEAVE L.A.X ALONE EXPAND EL TORO PALMDALE ONTARIO THEY NEED THE EMPLOYMENT

**Response:**

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.

**PC00939****Pons, Wangei****None Provided****PC00939-1****Comment:**

LAX NO - Expansion!!!  
For  
= 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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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

#### PC00939-2

##### Comment:

Please save us - please!!!  
Do humans ever count? Do you guys have 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. 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.

**PC00940      Young, Stephanie      None Provided      7/13/2001**

#### PC00940-1

##### Comment:

I am strongly opposed to LAX expansion, as a recent homeowner in Westchester. I do not want anymore noise, traffic, or air 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. 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.

**PC00941      Pedenko, Rose      None Provided      7/11/2001**

#### PC00941-1

##### Comment:

This, in addition to Playa Vista, will be just too much traffic and noise.

##### 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 noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

#### PC00941-2

##### Comment:

I would propose that passengers (and cargo) be limited to a 30 mile radius to where they can initiate their travel. For example, most of the Valley residents must fly out of Palmdale and anyone east of Monrovia must fly out of Ontario. Once these restrictions are in place, the airlines will be forced to

create new hubs. It is the airlines that must comply with new proposed regulations. Cargo should also be re-directed according to destination.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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. Further, the procedure to enforce the commentor's proposal would likely violate the fourth amendment to the U.S. Constitution in order to determine and further enforce how or where a traveler initiated their trip. The increased efficiency of airlines to serve the demand for air transportation services is the primary reason that the Airline Deregulation Act of 1978 was enacted by the U.S. Congress. It is important to understand that 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. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-2 regarding the role of deregulation in aviation planning.

**PC00942      Albini, Jacqueln      None Provided**

**PC00942-1**

**Comment:**

LAX EXPANSION  
Please stop the expansion---  
Keep our community together. We finally started improving Westchester. --- "then it is time to rip it apart again?

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC00942-2**

**Comment:**

The traffic in the area is already too crowded.

**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 the proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

**PC00942-3**

**Comment:**

Now is the time to utilize the Ontario & Palmdale Airports to ease the problem at LAX. Also Orange County needs to do their part and take care of their residents.

**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.

**PC00942-4**

**Comment:**

It can only get worse --- not better.

### 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.

**PC00943      Call, Karen      None Provided**

**PC00943-1**

**Comment:**

We have noise and pollution from the current 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 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.

**PC00943-2**

**Comment:**

In the summer when we open windows, we must turn up the volume of our T.V.

**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.

**PC00943-3**

**Comment:**

Our windows, cars & houses are covered with grime from jets fuel.

**Response:**

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

**PC00943-4**

**Comment:**

Please NO more 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 S-C of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

**PC00943-5**

**Comment:**

What is the Master plan? Why aren't other solutions being considered like the expansion of other airports? (Ontario - Palmdale - or 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-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, for information on El Toro, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario International Airport, 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.

**PC00943-6****Comment:**

We don't want to lose our Central business district on Sepulveda - It has taken years to build a new one like Ralphs - Longs Drugstore and now the airport wants to destroy it.

DO NOT DESTROY OUR CITY (90045)

**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, note that 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. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. Please see Response to Comment PHF00025-2.

**PC00943-7****Comment:**

DO NOT INCREASE TRAFFIC ON SEPULVEDA. IT IS BAD AS IT IS.

**Response:**

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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC00943-8**

**Comment:**

THINK LONG TERM

**Response:**

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

**PC00944**

**Woodling, Bill &  
Marlene**

**None Provided**

**7/16/2001**

**PC00944-1**

**Comment:**

We are extremely opposed to all LAX expansion or increase of air traffic.

Since 1963 - 1996 we lived on Waterview St. Playa del Rey and were burdened by noise, pollution, etc and eventually forced to sell our home at a reduced price. We won't let it happen again. We already have too much airplane noise. We will fight LAX with every possible legal means.

**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.

**PC00945**

**McGregor, Louise**

**None Provided**

**7/14/2001**

**PC00945-1**

**Comment:**

I am a long time resident of Westchester, 50 yrs. And I am opposed to any LAX expansion.

It will be the end to our great community

**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.

**PC00946**

**Keren, Ronald**

**None Provided**

**7/13/2001**

**PC00946-1**

**Comment:**

I am completely Appauled at your desire to Increase Traffic Noise Pollution and SAFETY 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, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and Safety in 4.24.3, Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 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, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D, added subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, was specifically designed with an emphasis on enhancing the safety and security of LAX.

**PC00946-2****Comment:**

NO LAX EXPANSION! Without cargo planes you could increase passengers Send the cargo to Palmdale!

**Response:**

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

<b>PC00947</b>	<b>Francis, Hugo</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/16/2001</b>
----------------	----------------------	----------------------	------------------

**PC00947-1****Comment:**

I strongly the position taken by the Westchester/LAX Marina del Chamber of commerce and that of Supervisor Ruth Galanter.

**Response:**

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

<b>PC00948</b>	<b>Presti, Anne</b>	<b>None Provided</b>
----------------	---------------------	----------------------

**PC00948-1****Comment:**

Too much noise and pollution from idling aircraft.

**Response:**

The Draft EIS/EIR addressed the impacts from noise in and around the airport in Section 4.1, Noise, and the impacts from air quality in and around the airport in Section 4.6, Air Quality.

**PC00948-2****Comment:**

Can't believe that the city would even think of expanding LAX. Next, they will be building ramps going out over the ocean! Drive the fish crazy with the noise...then what next!

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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

---

#### PC00948-3

**Comment:**

Ontario and Palmdale have much more room to expand than LAX, and also including El Toro. These places should be considered. All kinds of room for all the expansion you want!

**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. 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.

#### PC00948-4

**Comment:**

I am one of the "over the hill" group and would like to see this lovely community undisturbed by additional additions to LAX. NO SPACE LEFT!

This is my plea - thank you for your consideration.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC00949**

**Myers, Geri**

**None Provided**

**7/16/2001**

#### PC00949-1

**Comment:**

Only when All other airports reach their capacity and El Toro is an airport that can serve the ever growing Orange County. All cargo should be moved OUT of LAX which gives way to more passenger needs and safety.

**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. Please see Response to Comment PC00922-1 regarding air cargo.

**PC00949-2****Comment:**

Isn't that the major concern over LAX? Increase in how many more planes are needed to accomidate the increase in passenger service.

**Response:**

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

**PC00949-3****Comment:**

The expansion of LAX is a no-brainer. The simple and needed answer is 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.

**PC00950 Thompson, Robert & Patricia J. None Provided**

**7/13/2001**

**PC00950-1****Comment:**

NO ON LAX AIRPORT EXPANSION

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

**PC00951 McKessen, Mark None Provided**

**7/12/2001**

**PC00951-1****Comment:**

No Expansion of LAX! Every community in the AREA must share in the 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 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.

#### PC00951-2

**Comment:**

My home will lose value, as will my way of living. Will you pay the difference?

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

#### PC00951-3

**Comment:**

LAX is a small area in the larger issue. Expand your minds not my already noisy neighbors!

**Response:**

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

**PC00952**

**Cassel, John P. &  
Bernadette A.**

**None Provided**

**7/14/2001**

#### PC00952-1

**Comment:**

We 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.

#### PC00952-2

**Comment:**

Auto emission, emissions from idling planes and jet fuel emissions

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00043-6 regarding LAX as a source of air pollution.

#### PC00952-3

**Comment:**

and traffic NOISE.

**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.

**PC00952-4**

**Comment:**

Overcrowding of the Air Corridors may lead to likelihood of air disasters.

**Response:**

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

**PC00952-5**

**Comment:**

The Master Plan is a short-term quick fix approach. Long term planning is needed. The City of Los Angeles owns two key airports Ontario and Palmdale which should be developed as opposed to LAX. Hence, increase capacity at airports closer to where people actually live.

**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, for information on El Toro, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario International Airport, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

**PC00952-6**

**Comment:**

In order to build LAX Expressway and the Ring Road - the LAWA will have to acquire one-third of the Central Business District or Sepulveda Blvd., homes near Nielson Field and part of historic Centinela Adobe. What happens when this expansion isn't enough - whose home will be the next target.

**Response:**

The content of this comment is essentially the same as comment PC00908-2; please refer to Response to Comment PC00908-2.

**PC00953**

**Ries, Jerry L. &  
Dolores M.**

**None Provided**

**7/17/2001**

**PC00953-1**

**Comment:**

Being senior homeowners new to this area, we are hoping to never move again from this very lovely neighborhood.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

There have been enough changes in the area, mostly PDR & Playa Vista section, what a shame!!!

Please explore other options for increased air traffic & street congestion.

**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-1 regarding quality of life and 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.

**PC00954      Block, Mary      None Provided**

**PC00954-1**

**Comment:**

It is a crime to destroy Westchester as the LAWA is proposing.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC00954-2**

**Comment:**

Why don't they handle growth by moving the freight operations to Palmdale or even Ontario? It will have to happen some day. Why not now?

**Response:**

Please see Responses to Comments PC00599-54 and PC00922-1.

**PC00954-3**

**Comment:**

I realize the the airport here is L.A's cash cow, but this growth is going too far. Can't you get it stopped?

**Response:**

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

**PC00955      Shafer, Joe      None Provided      7/15/2001**

**PC00955-1**

**Comment:**

I have a comment on your Regional Soutlion "the State of California plans to build a high speed rail - - - between Palmdale and L.A." In July of 1968 our son graduated from USC. The main speaker was the U.S. Secretary of Transportation. He spoken in glowing terms of a high speed rail to be a link between Palmdale and Los Angeles. It was never built and I don't believe one will ever be built. The cost then would have been 1/3 of the cost to build it today.



**Response:**

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

**PC00955-2****Comment:**

I live in Westchester, since 1955, and I cannot see further expansion of LAX. There has to be an airport at Palmdale to keep the load of Los Angeles.

**Response:**

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

**PC00956****Daly, Andrew &  
Becky****None Provided****7/18/2001****PC00956-1****Comment:**

NO AIRPORT EXPANSION

Ruining our community  
Too much traffic, noise & pollution  
Value of our homes

WE STRONGLY OPPOSE EXPANSION!

Just say NO!

**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-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.

**PC00957****Ellias, Claire****None Provided****7/13/2001****PC00957-1****Comment:**

RE: LAX EXPANSION MASTER PLAN

I AM OPPOSED TO THIS EXPANSION PLAN BECAUSE:

1 - IT WILL CAUSE MANY PROBLEMS FOR THE WESTCHESTER AREA - IE. - TRAFFIC PROBLEMS, AIR POLLUTION, HOMES REMOVED, NOISE, POSSIBLY MORE AIR DISASTERS.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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 safety in Section 4.24.3, 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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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-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.

#### PC00957-2

**Comment:**

2 - THERE IS NO REASON WHY OTHER AIRPORTS SHOULD NOT BE EXPANDED: ORANGE COUNTY, ONTARIO, 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.

**PC00958**

**Ramos, Diana**

**None Provided**

**7/7/2001**

#### PC00958-1

**Comment:**

Regarding the development of L.A.X.: I live 2 blocks North of the airport, at Kentwood & I and my family are against any growth at L.A.X.

**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.

#### PC00958-2

**Comment:**

Take it south to accomadate the South, Bay Orange County area and East to 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.

**PC00958-3****Comment:**

The noise, pollution, dirt,

**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.

**PC00958-4****Comment:**

traffic, total street congestion at Sepulveda Century & 105 is a disgrace and crazy making. Cars should not be allowed in the airport proper. Tram service only.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Response to Comment PC02252-2 regarding banning cars from the airport.

**PC00959****Margolis, Roberta****None Provided****7/17/2001****PC00959-1****Comment:**

We believe that expanding solely LAX adequate planning is not being done to accomodate growth in air traffic. The entire LA basin requires a solution. The amount of land available at LAX is inadequate. Palmdale Ontario, and/or Orange County must be expanded to distribute the traffic. We vehemently oppose LAX unilateral expansion. Just improve LAX not expand.

**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, for information on El Toro, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario International Airport, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

<b>PC00960</b>	<b>Davis, Wyatt &amp; Nancie</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>5/10/2001</b>
----------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	------------------

#### **PC00960-1**

**Comment:**

We oppose all three of the LAX Master Plan expansion scenarios and find fault with the draft Environmental Impact Report. We feel that the EIR does not reflect the reality of airport expansion on the quality of life of those of us who live on your borders. We fully oppose any additional freeway exits, such as Arbor Vitae and also oppose your idea of a "ring road" to include Pershing and Westchester Parkways.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

#### **PC00960-2**

**Comment:**

With the size of the current airport, we never travel north from El Segundo on either Sepulveda or the 405 fwy, simply to avoid traffic. Pershing Blvd. is our only reasonable access north. I have clients in Westchester and Culver City who depend on messenger service with time sensitive jobs. More flights will create more traffic, and I worry that this will have an adverse effect on my livelihood.

**Response:**

The surface transportation impacts of the Draft LAX 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, 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, Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts, and Topical Response TR-ST-7 regarding Westchester Southside traffic.

#### **PC00960-3**

**Comment:**

More flights will create more noise! The plan represents an increase of only 44 takeoffs and landings per day, but we think this is a very low estimate. We live very close to the south runway and feel that you already have too many takeoffs per day. When we are on the telephone, we have to interrupt the conversation because we cannot hear the person on the other end when a plane is taking off. The private lear jets and cargo jets are the worst offenders. I have often reported this to the noise hotline. It's not just the telephone either, the TV volume is constantly going up every time a plane takes off, then back down until the next one takes off. I am often woken up by airplane takeoffs in the morning (5-7 a.m.) and find it hard to go to sleep at night (11p.m. - 1 a.m.). We can never leave our windows open in summer and we do not have (nor do we feel we should have to get) air conditioning. I don't think I can tolerate any more noise. I wish you could DECREASE the number of takeoffs per day!

**Response:**

The Draft EIS/EIR discussed increased airport operations (including landings and takeoffs) in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report. Specifically, Table 4 shows a total average annual day operations of 2,075 takeoffs and landings under 1996 baseline conditions. Tables 14, 21, and 28 present a total average annual day operations of 2,119 takeoffs and landings under Alternatives A, B, and C forecast

for year 2005. This represents an increase of 44 takeoffs and landings, as referenced by the commentor. Increases for average annual day operations are also projected for Alternatives A, B, and C for year 2015. Under this scenario, average annual day operations would be 2,529 for Alternative A, 2,504 for Alternative B, and 2,145 for Alternative C. This represents an increase of 454, 465, and 70 takeoffs and landings for Alternatives A, B, and C, respectively, compared to 1996 baseline conditions. Therefore, in 2015 a greater increase in takeoffs and landings than referenced by the commentor is presented. As shown in Table S7 in Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, under Alternative D the average annual day operations projected for year 2015 would be 2,121. This represents an increase of 46 takeoffs and landings for Alternative D, compared to 1996 baseline conditions. This increase is slightly less than the increase of 49 takeoffs and landings that would occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative.

While the commentor may be correct in identifying that certain Lear jet or cargo operations are loud (see Subtopical Response TR-N-6.3 regarding larger aircraft mean more noise) these aircraft are not in any violation of FAR Part 36 or of the LAVA Aircraft Noise Abatement Operating Procedures and Restrictions identified in Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement and may continue to operate.

Section 4.2, Land Use, and Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, presented 65 CNEL contours for Year 2000 conditions and provided a discussion of impacts resulting from single event noise levels that result in nighttime awakening (as defined by the 94 dBA SEL contour).

See also Subtopical Response TR-N-5.4 regarding more air cargo means more night noise impacts and Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 regarding too much noise now and in the future. Please also 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-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

#### **PC00960-4**

**Comment:**

More flights will create more toxic emissions!

**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.

#### **PC00960-5**

**Comment:**

We notice black soot on the lawn furniture which could also be from the Chevron refinery... which will have to create more jet fuel for more flights, right? I left my white car at a friends one weekend in Westchester. She lives on 83rd St. near the landing path. When I picked up my car on Monday a.m. I was appalled at how much black soot was on the car!

**Response:**

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

#### **PC00960-6**

**Comment:**

Then I heard that the airplanes dump this NOx emissions when they land. How disgusting to think we are breathing this in every day! What will this do to the health of children growing up exposed to this toxic pollution?

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**Response:**

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and health risk impacts in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment.

**PC00960-7**

**Comment:**

Your plan will triple this problem, yet you plan on mitigating only 30% of the new emissions! Shame on you!

**Response:**

Mitigation measures are being implemented on construction-related impacts as well as on- and off-airport impacts. The overall goal of the new facility is a build design that is efficient to accommodate the increased demand while minimizing air quality impacts to the maximum extent feasible.

**PC00960-8**

**Comment:**

What about a REGIONAL APPROACH? What about creating airports in Palmdale and El Toro? Expanding Ontario airport and John Wayne airport? We have friends in Bishop, CA who have to travel 5+ hours south into the brutal LA freeway system when they need to fly out of state. People like that would surely appreciate an airport in Palmdale, it would save them so much time. LAX handles travellers from all over the state, isn't it about time there were other airports to meet these travellers 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.

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, 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.

**PC00960-9**

**Comment:**

We look forward to your reply and hope that there can be a fourth expansion scenario of 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.

**PC00961      Endler, Harry      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC00961-1**

**Comment:**

I bought my home on 90th St in 1965, when the nearest runway was a mile away. Then the new north runway suddenly appeared - only a very few people knew it was coming, and it made our house almost unlivable.

LEAVE Westchester, Playa Del Rey, and El Segundo ALONE! What Playa Vista is going to do to this established neighborhood is bad enough, without expanding LAX 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. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC00961-2**

**Comment:**

No other major city in the country has an airport in the middle of such populous communities!

**Response:**

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

**PC00962      Litvak, Marilyn      None Provided      6/20/2001**

**PC00962-1**

**Comment:**

I do agree that LAX is too congested and that some modifications have to be made. The draft master plan looks good on paper - the Ring Road, the additional terminal, the extension of the green line, the people mover.

However, there is not enough physical space in the LAX area for a truly 21st century expansion that meets everyone's needs.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please refer to Response to Comment PC00260-1 regarding the level of activity that could be served at LAX under the four build alternatives. Please also refer to Response to Comment PC00539-6 for more information on the land acquisition required for each alternative.

**PC00962-2**

**Comment:**

NOR has any real consideration been given to the quality of life of people living near the airport;

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC00962-3

**Comment:**

and the impact on those who commute daily north and south past the airport to jobs.

**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. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

#### PC00962-4

**Comment:**

Rather, the airlines have said they need expansion. And their corporate interests are being served to the detriment of locals. The airlines say that the hub & spoke philosophy is critical to their bottom line. But may of their flights could be moved elsewhere or cut back.

**Response:**

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

#### PC00962-5

**Comment:**

How many flights do you need flying hourly to SFO/OAK/SJC/SAN/PSP from LAX? If Orange & San Bernadino counties are growing so rapidly, let them share the burden of airport noise and congestion.

As a travel agent with 23 years experience in the LA area, I can tell you people in Glendale/Burbank/Hollywood/Pasadena/San Gabriel Valley would do anything to avoid going to LAX. Give them that option. Expand serve at Burbank, Ontario, Palmdale. Don't give in to the airlines!

**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.

#### PC00962-6

**Comment:**

In addition, move all the cargo operations out to Ontario International airport. The big manufacturing operations are moving in that direction any way. There's plenty of freeway access and the population is increasing tremendously in that direction. Los Angeles has dependable, good weather. The airlines are not going to shift the major focus of their operations to ORD/SEA/DEN/SFO/YVR - all of which often have questionable weather.



**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00599-54.

**PC00962-7****Comment:**

Stand up to the airlines. Say no to an expanded LAX. Say yes to an improvement of the present 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-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels.

**PC00963****Goddard, Marjorie****None Provided****7/10/2001****PC00963-1****Comment:**

I am definitely opposed to any further expansion to 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.

**PC00963-2****Comment:**

Traffic. From my personal observation as an unfortunate commuter, the I-405 is becoming more and more congested, due in large part to the increased traffic to and from the airport. It makes no sense to increase the airport capacity without improving the I-405 in its ability to handle the vastly increased traffic. You have no such plan for the I-405. In addition, traffic on surface streets, such as Selpulveda Blvd., has become more and more grid locked. An oval four-lane around the airport will not help the I-405 or Selpulveda Blvd.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Responses TR-ST-4, Airport Area Traffic Concerns, Section 1, and TR-ST-2, Surface Transportation Analysis Methodology and Results, regarding the Congestion Management Program.

**PC00963-3****Comment:**

Noise. With the increased cargo traffic, the nighttime and early morning noise has increased. When living near a major airport, one accepts noise, but it is much more difficult to accept unneeded growth when there are many other facilities available.

**Response:**

As far as the use of other facilities are concerned, please see Topical Responses TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX master plan role in regional approach to meeting demand, TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale, TR-N-5, regarding nighttime aircraft operations and TR-N-6, regarding noise increase. Please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for discussion of potential nighttime noise impacts on sleep awakenings.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC00963-4**

**Comment:**

Pollution. The same argument applies to pollution. More flights mean more pollutants from aircraft, and more noxious emissions from the ever-increasing truck traffic.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC00963-5**

**Comment:**

Move the cargo haulers (aircraft and trucks) to Palmdale, or El Toro, or wherever.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC00963-6**

**Comment:**

Airport Safety. Recent studies have shown that LAX is an "accident waiting to happen" regarding runway incursions. An obvious solution is not to increase traffic, but to reduce it until solutions to this problem are incorporated. As a sometimes-frequent user of LAX, I would rather have the inconvenience of fewer available flights rather than a higher possibility of an airplane accident. I remember the 1990 or 1991 accident regarding a major airliner running into a commuter aircraft while on the ground at LAX. We certainly do not need a similar recurrence.

**Response:**

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

**PC00964      Swan, Daisy & David      None Provided**

**7/16/2001**

**PC00964-1**

**Comment:**

We live near LMV on the bluff facing Lincoln. The noise from the airport is terrible. At 1:30 AM we hear 745's taking off.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations. 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 S-C and Technical Report S-1.

**PC00964-2**

**Comment:**

The traffic on Lincoln adds to the noise level - it never stops.

**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. Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided detailed 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 Alternative D.

**PC00964-3**

**Comment:**

If there's an accident on Lincoln the traffic is diverted into the residential areas of Westchester & it's a complete mess! And this is what will happen if new routes to the airport chop up our neighborhood.

**Response:**

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

**PC00964-4**

**Comment:**

We love Westchester! There's no place on the West Side like what we have here. We know families throughout the neighborhood, send our child to Westchester neighborhood school and love being a part of this genuine community. Please don't ruin this neighborhood.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC00964-5**

**Comment:**

Take the air traffic somewhere else.

**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

---

**PC00965      Stock, Roberta      None Provided**

**PC00965-1**

**Comment:**

Please do everything possible to develop the Regional Solution to increased air travel - and not expand 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.

**PC00965-2**

**Comment:**

As a Westchester resident, I am concerned about any potential expansion.

**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. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts, and Topical Response TR-ST-7 regarding Westchester Southside traffic.

**PC00965-3**

**Comment:**

Which will add to the congestion due our way from the Howard Hughes Promenade development and the upcoming Playa Vista project.

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00148-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00148-2.

**PC00965-4**

**Comment:**

Remember "quality of life"? That's what drew us to Westchester, and we'd like to maintain some of it.

**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.

**PC00966      Bell, A      None Provided      7/15/2001**

**PC00966-1**

**Comment:**

Air Pollution -The idling airplanes pollute the air in the surrounding neighborhoods. This in turn is a long run causes upper respiratory infections and more so with the children and the senior citizens living in close proximity of the airport. The last thing that we in the Westchester/Inglewood community need is more airplanes to taxi down new runways.

**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, Air Quality. 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.

**PC00966-2**

**Comment:**

The other issue on air pollution is the disgusting black soot that is all over the outdoor furniture and blowing into the windows of our homes on hot summer days.

**Response:**

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

**PC00966-3**

**Comment:**

Noise -It is bad enough that the airplanes accounted for in this year of 2001 revving the engines during the cut off times of 11 :00 PM - 6:00 AM.

**Response:**

Each development alternative incorporates the construction of one or more Ground Run-up Enclosures (GRE) within which all run-up activity would be conducted. These facilities, when properly designed, achieve a reduction of approximately 20 decibels over run-ups conducted without enclosure. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-5.3 regarding night run-up activity. In addition, see Section 4.1, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report. 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 S-C and Technical Report S-1.

**PC00966-4**

**Comment:**

If more expansions are added to the Los Angeles Airport all of the community may as well move out.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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-LU-5 regarding noise mitigation. As was presented in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3), of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, areas exposed to high noise levels (i.e., within the 65

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

CNEL or 94 SEL) under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions are heavily populated, indicating that existing noise levels have not forced people to move.

#### **PC00966-5**

**Comment:**

As it stands I live North of the runway and there is no soundproofing done in my division of the community. My family will be looking into relocation if will be looking into relocation if LAX is expanded.

**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.

#### **PC00966-6**

**Comment:**

Traffic -Gridlock is a serious issue for the Westchester community now. To expand upon the LAX terminal/runways would only demand more traffic, road rage, car accidents and ultimately air collisions.

**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. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts, and Topical Response TR-ST-7 regarding Westchester Southside traffic.

#### **PC00966-7**

**Comment:**

Comment: We doubt that the people who support expanding the Los Angeles Airport live right here in Westchester/Inglewood neighborhoods, so it is pretty dog gone hard to talk about a community that you are not a physically part of.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

#### **PC00966-8**

**Comment:**

Go expand upon Ontario/Palmdale or Orange County communities there are people waiting in the wings for new employment opportunities in those communities.

**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.

**PC00967          Castro, Sonia          None Provided          7/14/2001**

**PC00967-1**

**Comment:**

As a new Westchester resident I am very disappointed with the plan to expand LAX. I feel that this will compromise the area greatly ie; added traffic and noise pollution. I strongly oppose the expansion of 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. 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.

**PC00968          Gutierrez, Gina          None Provided          7/14/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00967; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00967.

**PC00969          Vitaceh, Sigliude          None Provided          7/15/2001**

**PC00969-1**

**Comment:**

Pleas use the alocated Money for expansion on El Toro and 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. 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-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

**PC00969-2**

**Comment:**

With more Airplanes & Traffic there is about to be a major accident in the Air or Land. It is too populated, to risk such a event.

**Response:**

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

**PC00969-3**

**Comment:**

Our beautiful Westchester will be forlorne, because of incredible ie trafic and 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-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC00970**

**Carlson, Kenneth**

**None Provided**

**7/17/2001**

**PC00970-1**

**Comment:**

There is only so much airspace. Overcrowding over Los Angeles is likely to lead to air and ground disasters.

From our front porch, in the evening time, you can see a large number of aircraft in the sky, lining up for approach to LAX. How many more planes can the air above us and the hard working traffic controllers handle safely?

**Response:**

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

**PC00970-2**

**Comment:**

More and more planes seem to be coming in later and later at night. This huge increase will force planes to circle, delay take offs, and create a domino effect across the country. It will decrease air traffic efficiency across the nation.

**Response:**

There exists a potential for aircraft to arrive beyond their originally scheduled arrival time if they are delayed by air traffic inefficiencies elsewhere in the country. However, the number of aircraft that are forecast to arrive at night at LAX are well below the arrival capacity of the airport. Though forecasts do not indicate an increase in nighttime operations, many factors including weather can affect the actual arrival time of a flight at its destination. Forecasts identified in Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR show that nighttime departures will decrease in 2015 for three of the four alternatives identified when compared to environmental baseline and Year 2000 nighttime departures. Only Alternative B with 185 nighttime departures is forecasted to show an increase.

**PC00970-3**

**Comment:**

The only sensible solution is regional expansion, not expansion 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.



**PC00971      Biffar, Woodrow      None Provided**

**PC00971-1**

**Comment:**

I live on Airport Blvd and expansion and expressway would make life miserable for us on Airport blvd., traffic 24 hrs a day, semi trucks and desil fumes and noise within 30 or 40 ft of our bedroom and access to the street would be hazardous.

I am in favor of upgrading the airport but not disrupting the famalies of Westchester anymore. We have enough pollution, noise and dirty air now.

**Response:**

Impacts associated with traffic, noise, and air quality were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use, Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC00971-2**

**Comment:**

L.A. is growing outward why funnel all the cargo and passengers into LAX. when there are regional airports and vacant air force bases available.

**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 Response to Comment PC00922-1 for information on air cargo.

**PC00971-3**

**Comment:**

Every person or material that comes to the airport has to be moved through the streets of the neighboring cities and L.A. cloging traffic.

**Response:**

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

**PC00971-4**

**Comment:**

Please do not destroy Westchester and life here.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**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.

**PC00972      Polsky, Jeanette &      None Provided      7/18/2001**  
**Harlan**

**PC00972-1**

**Comment:**

AIRPORT EXPANSION-NO

ARBOR VITAE EXPRESSWAY-NO

We, in the Westchester area, have already lost more than 700 homes to 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. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. As indicated in TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester business district. The proposed Arbor Vitae interchange is not a part of the LAX Master Plan and has had the federal funding withdrawn.

**PC00972-2**

**Comment:**

Why is the LAX Master Plan not considering expansion of either Palmdale or Ontario, or both, airports; both of these are owned by LA World Airports. I am sure you are aware that there are THREE airports that feed into Washington, DC: Dulles, Reagan, and Baltimore. The last time we flew into DC we used the Baltimore airport. Not only were the airline rates less expensive, but it was a less crowded airport with easier in and out access and car rental facilities. With the development of Palmdale and Ontario this too could be a plus for these 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.

**PC00972-3**

**Comment:**

Now add to this a high-speed train or subway, as is done in many European countries, leading into the Downtown area of Los Angeles. Where is the creative thinking for easier and safer airports?

**Response:**

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

**PC00973      Wong, Carol      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC00973-1**

**Comment:**

I am commenting on the proposed expansion of LAX. The Master Plan is a short-term quick fix to a problem that needs long-term solutions. Other airports need to be developed first before you should consider expansion into the surrounding community.

**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.

**PC00973-2**

**Comment:**

I am greatly concerned about the increase in traffic, noise and air pollution that will result from further expansion. Also, as a homeowner I am definitely opposed to any plans for the airport to expand into my 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. 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.

**PC00973-3**

**Comment:**

It is unfair for the communities around LAX to bear the burden for another county's need for increased air commerce.

Please leave our community intact we are tired of being pushed out by 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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC00974      Wijesuriya, Asoka      None Provided      7/17/2001**

**PC00974-1**

**Comment:**

I'am a resident of the above address who opposes the proposed LAX expansion 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.

**PC00974-2**

**Comment:**

I'am a widow with congenital heart failure and live in this house all by myself. I put my house for sale last year, to move into a healthier environment because of my heart disease. A sale did not take place, as the prospective buyers, were concerned with the noise produced by constant in coming & out going air planes and the pollution that come with fuel emission. If this proposed expansion takes place you could Imagine what the communities will be faced with - more noise, more pollution!! I will be stuck in this house with congenital heart failure, without any prospective buyers.

**Response:**

Impacts associated with noise, air quality, and health were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use, Section 4.6, Air Quality, and Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

**PC00974-3**

**Comment:**

LAX expansion is a short term quick approach. I request you to consider developing the airports at El Toro, Ontario & 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. 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.

**PC00974-4**

**Comment:**

Also build a high speed rail connecting LAX to these airports!

**Response:**

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

**PC00974-5****Comment:**

It is unfair to tax the over crowded LAX and make the communities around LAX to bear the brunt of this expansion. All communities should share the 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, and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

**PC00975      Smith, Lawrence      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC00975-1****Comment:**

The street Arbor Vitae -

I'm interested in the name, why it is on your plan, its possibilities, and what makes the street interesting?

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology. As indicated in the topical response, the south half of the Arbor Vitae interchange has been included in the Regional Transportation Plan for Southern California since 1996 and is assumed to be built some time between 2005 and 2015. This project is independent of the LAX Master Plan. Please note that FHWA has withdrawn its support for a half interchange at Arbor Vitae and that the proposed half interchange is not part of the LAX Master Plan. FHWA policy is to only consider full proposed interchanges not partial ones.

**PC00976      Cooke, Genevieve      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC00976-1****Comment:**

Westchester has already given up thousands of homes & property for this airport. The airport is "eating up" Westchester.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC01160-1.

**PC00976-2****Comment:**

Traffic on the 405 & Sepulveda Blvd. is already impacted with traffic entering & leaving the airport from other areas.

**Response:**

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

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

#### **PC00976-3**

**Comment:**

If Orange County, Victorville & Palmdale, the Inland Empire had adequate airports, their travelers would not have to travel to LAX; thus reducing congestion around LAX.

**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.

#### **PC00976-4**

**Comment:**

Parking is already a nightmare at the airport.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

#### **PC00976-5**

**Comment:**

Polution - including noise, fallout & fumes from aircraft, dirt and exhaust from autos & planes - is already a problem & would become worse with more flights & street traffic.

**Response:**

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

#### **PC00976-6**

**Comment:**

The outlying areas have space for airports without displacing yet more residents & businesses.

Westchester has done its share for the airport. It's time other areas share the 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 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.

<b>PC00977</b>	<b>Heyman, E. Jacquelyn</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/17/2001</b>
----------------	---------------------------------	----------------------	------------------

**PC00977-1**

**Comment:**

We have lived in Westchester since 1951. It was an ideal community in which to raise our four daughters.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC00977-2**

**Comment:**

Community businesses on Sepulveda which the airport has destroyed and is planning on destroying more.

**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. 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 still remain available through similar businesses that are located in close proximity within the Westchester Business District.

As was 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 in contrast to the other build alternatives. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC00977-3**

**Comment:**

Traffic in the area and surrounding areas is unbearable and will only get worse with the proposed expansion.

**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. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

**PC00977-4**

**Comment:**

The noise is unbearable since we live south of Manchester & West of Lincoln. Noise not only all day long but also through the night. The numerous numbers of wave offs add a lot more noise over our house.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations. 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 information on noise impacts on nighttime awakenings. On occasion aircraft that are on approach are required to implement a missed approach as a safety measure at the discretion of air traffic controllers or the pilot in command. However, it is unlikely that there would be an increase in overall missed approaches in the Westchester area due to arrivals coming to Runway 24R would not be making right turns due to potential airspace conflicts over Santa Monica Airport. Secondly, nighttime arrivals make their approaches to Runway 6R which is the south runway in the north complex thus making the likelihood of missed approaches over your location even less likely. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of master plan alternatives on the community of Westchester, and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase. Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided detailed 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 Alternative D.

**PC00977-5**

**Comment:**

We also have a pollution problem.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-3.

**PC00977-6**

**Comment:**

According to reports LAX is just waiting for a horrible accident both in the air & on the ground.

**Response:**

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

**PC00977-7**

**Comment:**

WE CANNOT HANDLE ANY MORE AIR TRAFFIC. ALSO GROUND TRAFFIC.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC00977-8**

**Comment:**

Please think of this community and surrounding communities and please do not go forward with this planned 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.



**PC00978      Sawoski, John      None Provided      7/17/2001**

**PC00978-1**

**Comment:**

I'm concerned with destruction of the Westchester business district.

**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. 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.

Also, as was 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 in contrast to the other build alternatives. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC00978-2**

**Comment:**

Also - too many planes = unsafe.

**Response:**

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

**PC00978-3**

**Comment:**

And it's folly to think that freeway access will reduce traffic to surrounding areas. It will increase it.

**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. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

**PC00978-4**

**Comment:**

Basically I support the status quo.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC00979      Cronin, Philip      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC00979-1**

**Comment:**

**SAFETY**

How much can our Air Traffic Controllers handle? Rather than invest in an expansion of air traffic volume the concern should focus on safety. This means ground control also. LAX has been rated as one of the most hazardous airports on this issue.

**Response:**

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

**PC00979-2**

**Comment:**

**TRAFFIC**

How about extending the Green Line into the airport connecting to a people mover on the south side of LAX? Airport patrons from Long Beach could use the Blue Line to connect to the Green, and downtown patron could use the Red Line to connect to the Green Line. This should let day travelers to the Bay Area (who are business people with only carry-on luggage) to leave their cars at home.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan. Alternative D incorporates a Green Line connection similar to the commentor's suggestion. 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.

**PC00979-3**

**Comment:**

**CARGO DEMAND**

Where is the population moving? To the east. Los Angeles is filling up. The future is to the east. There is Ontario Airport. There is former Norton AFB. Both capable of handling heavy cargo aircraft. Oh, I'm sorry I left out Long Beach. Probably the most under-used airport in Southern California for either cargo or passengers.

**REGIONAL SOLUTION**

This really is the one of the solutions to the problem. LAWA should take the long term overview rather than the short term approach. (They'll be back in 20 years or so with another expansion plan.)

**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 Response to Comment PC00922-1 for information on air cargo.

**PC00979-4****Comment:**

Form a over-all master plan called something like "The Southern California Regional Airport Authority" and include the 10, or so, airports available in the area. And don't forget Palmdale which has been sitting idle for more than 30 years.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 for information on the role of the Southern California Regional Airport Authority in the development of 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.

**PC00979-5****Comment:**

Oh!,oh! I hear the the crunching and diminution of Empires, but take heart of those entrenched, bigger Empires can be built and more power can be realized.

**Response:**

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

**PC00979-6****Comment:**

Sacramento is one step ahead of LAWA (want to be left behind?) Passenger traffic is concentrated at Sacramento Metropolitan Airport, cargo is diverted to former Mather AFB, private aircraft operates out of Sacramento City Executive Airport. They have one major facility left, the former McClellan AFB, which the City hopes to develop into an aircraft maintenance 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 see Response to Comment PC00922-1 for information on air cargo.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC00979-7**

**Comment:**

NOISE AND AIR POLLUTION

Where are those new generation of aircraft that were supposed to reduce this problem? Some of the planes I see flying into and out of LAX are older than the pilots that fly them, and they do not appear to have been retro-fitted to reduce pollution. .

**Response:**

All aircraft that weigh more than 75,000 pounds that operate at LAX meet the latest, most stringent noise level requirements currently adopted by the Federal government. Some of the aircraft that the commentor may be referring to include the Stage 3 hush-kitted 727's, DC-9's and 737-200's where the engine modifications have been completed internally and cannot be distinguished externally. A small percentage of the aircraft weighing less than 75,000 pounds, typically corporate jets, continue to operate legally under earlier noise level guidelines. Please see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement, in particular see Subtopical Response TR-N-7.6 regarding public confusion over ANCA Phase-out of Stage 2.

**PC00981      Lutsky, Teresa & Jay      None Provided**

**7/16/2001**

**PC00981-1**

**Comment:**

We strongly oppose of LAX expansion. We love our community and feel expansion would make for grid locked streets, increased noise and 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. 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.

**PC00981-2**

**Comment:**

It is absurd to expand LAX when communities in Orange County, Palmdale and Ontario are growing in leaps and bounds.

Why should we have to suffer all the negative consequences of great 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, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

**PC00982      Sautter, Michael      None Provided      7/14/2001**

**PC00982-1**

**Comment:**

I'm sure you do not live in this neighborhood, if you did you would not expand the airport into your own back yard.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC00982-2**

**Comment:**

My concerns are increased noise from increased air traffic. We already deal with Jet Thrust as planes take flight.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular, Subtopical Response TR-N-3.3 regarding changes in noise levels relative to changes in air traffic.

**PC00982-3**

**Comment:**

Increased traffic on our local roads. To think that the increased traffic will be accomidated by 405 is rediculous. Lincoln & Sepulveda Boulevards will overflow with increased air travelers. We already deal with people leaving the air port and conjesting traffic. Survey Lincoln one fri afternoon and you will see many cars with luggage, limo's from the airport, shuttles going to S.M. Hotels and congestion beyond the infrastructure of the road systems capacity.

**Response:**

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

**PC00982-4**

**Comment:**

And finally on a calm day the smell of jet fuel already fills the air as on shore winds blow jet exhaust back into our neighborhoods.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding the topic of odor and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

**PC00982-5**

**Comment:**

Our beaches are already unpleasant because of noise pollution.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding 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, portions of Dockweiler Beach State Beach are currently exposed to high noise levels of 75 CNEL under 1996 baseline and

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

Year 2000 conditions, respectively. As stated in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, overall noise exposure would be reduced although portions of Dockweiler Beach State Park would be newly exposed to noise levels of 75 CNEL or greater under the build alternatives compared to Year 2000 conditions. Any increase in noise levels on portions of Dockweiler Beach State Park would not substantially interfere with the normal use of the park, which has functioned over time while exposed to high noise levels.

#### PC00982-6

**Comment:**

We already are forced to breath the toxins of jet fuel.

**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.

#### PC00982-7

**Comment:**

We already deal with air port traffic. Please don't make it worse consider the impact on your neighbors. I'm sure there is Scientific examination of my concerns use it in factoring the impact on those living daily lives near an already busy airport.

**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-ST-2 regarding surface transpiration analysis methodology and TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

**PC00983**

**Byrne, Jeanne**

**None Provided**

**7/24/2001**

#### PC00983-1

**Comment:**

I've lived in Westchester since 1979 and as the airport has expanded I've seen our 'town' change from a complete shopping area to big-box stores, no movie theater, and streets that are heavily congested.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

#### PC00983-2

**Comment:**

Sepulveda Blvd. and Manchester Blvd. have become speed-ways with no traffic enforcement; there's scarcely time for pedestrians to walk across either street.

**Response:**

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

**PC00983-3****Comment:**

Increased air traffic also raises questions of safety both on the ground and in the air.

**Response:**

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

**PC00983-4****Comment:**

Our planners can do a better job of managing air traffic without further expanding LAX and destroying huge areas of prime real estate.

**Response:**

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

**PC00984****Putt, J.****None Provided****7/16/2001****PC00984-1****Comment:**

A quick fix which would both reduce truck and runway traffic would be to move all freight operations to Palmdale.

**Response:**

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

**PC00984-2****Comment:**

Increasing runway length & parking would be desirable.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC00985****Fleming, Anthony &  
Yolanda****None Provided****7/12/2001****PC00985-1****Comment:**

In regards to the LAX expansion me & my wife just purchased a home in Westchester last July. We have a three year old daughter & we are very concerned about the potential for increased air pollution which carries NOx emissions which could lead to cancer,

**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, Air Quality. 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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

Action/No Project Alternative. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

#### PC00985-2

**Comment:**

right now we are very comfortable with the air traffic because we are far enough away from most air traffic. Bringing it closer would add more pollution, traffic & noise & I don't think any homeowner would sign up for that on any given day.

**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.

#### PC00985-3

**Comment:**

In addition my property value will reduce putting me & my family in financial risk!

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

**PC00986**

**Cantley, Linda**

**None Provided**

**7/16/2001**

#### PC00986-1

**Comment:**

This area, LAX, is already burdened w/too much traffic, noise, pollution and chaos - we still have the Playa Vista project to look forward to to increase these problems; we don't need a LAX expansion to add to the mix.

**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. Cumulative impacts associated with development of the LAX Master Plan and other projects in the general area, including Playa Vista, are accounted for in the analysis of each environmental discipline presented in Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For more information, please see Response to Comment AL00018-9. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

#### PC00986-2

**Comment:**

There is plenty of land out in the Palmdale area as well as El Toro, Ontario and Apple Valley - we carry enough of the burden here already - Give us a 'job well done' nod and leave us alone -



**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. 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.

**PC00986-3****Comment:**

As for businesses being closed down - we have so few here now - Don't trade our small businesses for more 747's.

**Response:**

Please see 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.

**PC00987****Koppel, Lorna****None Provided****7/16/2001****PC00987-1****Comment:**

The LAX expansion and "Airport expressway" will ruin our neighborhood. The expressway will open up a lot of traffic right near our house and destroy the houses on Airport blvd. Most of the houses don't have backyards so the children play in front. That won't be possible (or at least not prudent) with 1000's of cars coming through daily to the airport.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00018-13.

**PC00987-2****Comment:**

The noise will also be intollerable. Currently, our Westchester neighborhood is extremely quiet. I can leave my windows open & still sleep! Overall the expansion & expressway will create more pollution & noise, and significantly reduce the safety of our neighborhood. We have great houses and can't afford to ruin that.

**Response:**

In general the changes in aircraft noise within Westchester residential areas are projected to be small under Master Plan Alternatives A, B, C and D. Under Alternatives A, C, and D in some areas of Westchester the noise contours are projected to "shrink" in size. This translates to a decrease in aircraft noise levels. Similarly, traffic noise levels are not generally expected to increase significantly in the Westchester area as a result of the proposed project. For example, the calculated 1996 baseline noise level from traffic at noise receiver RD-32 (a single-family residence located near Rayford Drive and 91st Street) was 56 dBA Leq. The predicted 2015 No Project/No Build noise level for RD-32 is 58 dBA Leq, and the predicted 2015 Build (i.e., With Project) noise level is 59 dBA Leq. Please see Sections 4.24.3, Safety, and 4.6, Air Quality, in the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding safety and air quality.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC00987-3**

**Comment:**

Put more cargo load thru San Diego rather than routing it first through LAX then landing in San Diego - make them fly it direct. Keep people flying out of their local & closest airport! Make those airports carry their 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 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 Response to Comment PC00922-1 for information on air cargo.

**PC00988**

**Voss Jr., Philip**

**None Provided**

**7/16/2001**

**PC00988-1**

**Comment:**

The expansion of LAX would turn this area into a parking lot. The roads are already congested and we have Playa Vista to look forward to.

**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. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology, Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

**PC00988-2**

**Comment:**

Expansion would add to air pollution and to the soot I have to wipe off my window and door sills every week.

**Response:**

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

**PC00988-3**

**Comment:**

This area is one of the last decent places to live. I don't understand why it has to be destroyed to accomplish something that could be done on a regional basis.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC00989      McFadden, Joseph      None Provided      7/17/2001**  
**E. & Jean K.**

**PC00989-1**

**Comment:**

Cargo carriers & freight terminals should be moved closer to port facilities, and the Alameda Corridor. Long Beach airport, would be ideal - this would cut down on truck traffic and air pollution throughout the basin.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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. There are many reasons why cargo airlines and freight forwarders use LAX. The primary reason is the investment in specialized facilities that have been developed over time to serve the international demand. The City of Los Angeles owns and LAWA controls the operation and potential expansion of four airports: LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys. It does not own or control Long Beach Airport in Los Angeles County. The other regional airports are controlled by other jurisdictions that are responsible for their respective operation and expansion. Please also see Topical Response TR-RC-1 for a discussion of LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

**PC00989-2**

**Comment:**

Aircraft should be monitored on an individual bases for exhaust and air pollution. Those who do not meet strict standards should be grounded.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00608-2 regarding aircraft emission standards. Manufacturers of aircraft engines must certify that the engines they produce meet the applicable federal standards.

**PC00989-3**

**Comment:**

Often vibrations from aircraft cause car alarms and some house alarms to go off. Check with Pacific Division Police!

**Response:**

The LAPD Pacific Division was contacted on October 1, 2002, regarding the activation of car alarms and house alarms as a result of aircraft operations. Officer Lilomaiaava acknowledged that while there is a potential for car alarms and house alarms being activated by vibrations from cars, trucks, kids or aircraft exists, he was not aware of any records that can be attributed specifically to aircraft operations being responsible for alarm activation. The alarm activations are predominantly due to a high sensitivity setting on the alarm system. Please see Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC00989-4**

**Comment:**

Some days the smell of jet fuel is so bad it's overwhelming along with the oily residue left behind.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding odors and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

**PC00989-5**

**Comment:**

Some nights it's impossible to sleep because of aircraft noise.

**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.

**PC00989-6**

**Comment:**

All this and the resultant stress has created a very unhealthful atmosphere in which to live. Further expansion will only worsen these unhealthy conditions! The noise is unbearable!

**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.

**PC00990**

**Koziol, Edyta**

**None Provided**

**7/17/2001**

**PC00990-1**

**Comment:**

(1) The Airport Expansion project will result in significantly more traffic on our streets. How do you propose to address this??

**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. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

#### PC00990-2

**Comment:**

(2) The Airport Expansion project will remove several key shopping centers including Ralphs. Where do you expect all the residents of Westchester and PDR to shop? We certainly can't overburden to shops on Lincoln but Lincoln is our only other shopping district.

**Response:**

Section 4.2, Land Use, and Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, of 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. Regarding the removal of several key shopping centers, including Ralph's, as was further described in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, portions of an existing shopping center, rather than multiple shopping centers, would be acquired and Ralph's Supermarket is not proposed for acquisition under any of the build alternatives. Under Alternative A, portions of the Westchester Center would be acquired, including Longs Drugstore and four businesses within the Mayfair Square shopping area (an older collection of businesses and offices within the Westchester Center). Alternatives A and C would include acquisition of Office Depot, a stand alone building located across the street from the Westchester Center. Longs Drugstore would not be acquired under Alternatives B or C. 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.

As was 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, LAWA staff's new preferred Alternative D does not include any acquisition within the Westchester Business District. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

#### PC00990-3

**Comment:**

(3) Westchester and PDR are safe, residential areas. The LAX expansion will only bring more crime to our neighborhoods and decrease property values. Who will be responsible for decreasing property values in our neighborhood? Does LAX care about the millions of dollars residents of Westchester and PDR will lose when the value of their homes plummets.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

#### PC00990-4

**Comment:**

(4) What is the main reason why you refuse to expand airport in Palmdale and Ontario as well as Orange County. These airports could service local residents and decrease all the traffic coming into LAX.

**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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC00990-5**

**Comment:**

Because of LAX there is a constant bottleneck on the 405 Fwy @ the La Tijera & Century exits. Do you want to create even more traffic?

**Response:**

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

**PC00990-6**

**Comment:**

I would greatly appreciate it if you would kindly address my concerns.

**Response:**

Responses to individual comments included in this comment letter are provided above.

<b>PC00991</b>	<b>Kearney, Francis J. &amp; Victoria J.</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/12/2001</b>
----------------	--	----------------------	------------------

**PC00991-1**

**Comment:**

We are very concerned about the value of our home. This home is everything we have. If the value goes down, down goes our retirement. This is a wonderful community and has grown greatly over the last 30 years that we have been here. Even if we do not lose our home to the airport right now, we will lose value because the noise alone will deter people from wanting to buy when we are ready to leave this area.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

**PC00991-2**

**Comment:**

The noise and the traffic around the airport have already grown too much and are a safety concern. Our feeling is that this expansion of LAX will destroy the community of Westchester as we know it.

**Response:**

Impacts associated with noise, traffic and safety were described in Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use, Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC00991-3**

**Comment:**

Why is this expansion to be done here? Why not Ontario and Palmdale?

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**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.

**PC00992**

**Whale, David**

**None Provided**

**6/17/2001**

**PC00992-1**

**Comment:**

IT IS CRIMINAL WHEN YOU SACRIFICE THE HEALTH AND QUALITY OF LIFE OF THOSE LIVING IN THE CURRENT LAX FLIGHT PATTERN AND LAX AREA FOR THE BENEFIT OF OTHERS.

WHEN I BOUGHT MY HOME 44 YEARS AGO, WESTCHESTER WAS BEAUTIFUL. UNFORTUNATELY I DID NOT KNOW ABOUT THE PLANE ENGINE NOISES AND THE AVIATION FUEL FILM THAT GOT ALL OVER EVERYTHING. THE JETS HAVE IMPROVED BOTH OF THOSE PROBLEMS.

HOWEVER DOWNTOWN WESTCHESTER HAS BEEN ESENTIALLY DESTROYED. PEOPLE DO NOT TAKE CARE OF WECHESTER HOMES LIKE THEY USED TO.

EXPANSION OF LAX WILL BE THE DEATH CERTIFICATE OF WESTCHESTER'S QUALITY OF LIFE.

**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, Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition, and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

**PC00992-2**

**Comment:**

LET OTHERS SHARE THE LOAD OF HEALTH RISKS AND DEGRADATION OF LIVING QUALITY.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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 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.

**PC00993**

**Kaufman, Katharine**

**None Provided**

**7/17/2001**

**PC00993-1**

**Comment:**

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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC00994      Connolly, Annie      None Provided      7/17/2001**

**PC00994-1**

**Comment:**

I have lived in this community since 1951. I am writing to let you know what I think of the proposed expansion. As you will see I am very much against it. I think we have given enough over the years to LAX.

We already have a traffic, noise and pollution problem. I ask you do we need to add more problems to this community. Westchester has suffered enough. The answer is NO.

Our Westchester community will be destroyed. It seems you will want it all eventually. Enough is enough. Now is the time to stop.

Just think about this.

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

**PC00995      Weber, Frank      None Provided      7/17/2001**

**PC00995-1**

**Comment:**

KATHLEEN O'CONNEL CALLED THE MASTER PLAN A NO BRAINER.  
I AGREE WITH HER 100%.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC00995-2**

**Comment:**

WE NEED MORE AIRPORTS TO HANDEL THE FUTURE GROWTH OF CALIF.

**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.



**PC00995-3****Comment:**

SAFETY IS OF THE UTMOST IMPORTANCE, EVEN IF THE FAA DOESN'T THINK SO.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. As indicated in Topical Response TR-SAF-1, the FAA is charged with ensuring the aviation safety into and out of LAX and would ensure that LAX would continue to operate safely under any of the Master Plan alternatives.

**PC00995-4****Comment:**

LAX IS A 5 LB BAG, AND 10 LB'S OF ANYTHING WON'T FIT INTO A 5 LB BAG.  
PLEASE USE YOUR HEADS.

**Response:**

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

**PC00996          Roberts, Arthur          None Provided**

**PC00996-1****Comment:**

Westchester doesn't need more traffic, noise, air pollution or over crowding of airplanes. It is much better to develop Ontario and Palmdale airports and not further disrupt our lovely Westchester community. No more 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-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. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

**PC00997          Sapien, Hector &          None Provided          7/14/2001**  
**Marina**

**PC00997-1****Comment:**

We understand the situation. If they have to expand the airport - it's alright with us - we have lived here fifty years - we do not intend to move as long as it doesn't interfere with our homes.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC00998      Hunter, Paul      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC00998-1**

**Comment:**

If you stand out on Sandpiper ave and look towards the airport you will notice that from about Lincoln Blvd there is a lot of land available, already part of LAX, to the ocean room for a runway. It would require realigning Westchester Parkway closer to St. Bernards and a bridge over Pershing Dr. This would be easy as Pershing Dr. is already below- the runway level then all runways could be lengthened by 3000 ft or more and extended out over the water if necessary. Many airports in the world have runways out over the water. You would not need to destroy downtown Westchester or buy more land

**Response:**

The runway suggested by the commentor would lay cross Pershing Drive to the west and may need to extend into the Pacific Ocean to gain the required runway length. As described in the Master Plan Chapter V, Section 2.1.3, multiple ocean side scenarios and options of development into the El Segundo Sand Dunes and the El Segundo Blue Butterfly Habitat Restoration Area were evaluated as part of the first and second iteration alternatives in the LAX Master Plan. The ocean options were evaluated and determined to be infeasible due to the cost and uncertainty of building such large structures in deep water. While developing the airport into the bay would be beneficial from many standpoints including noise and air quality, the high cost (\$30 billion), long-term maintenance risk, and numerous environmental issues make these options infeasible. With extensive feedback from local residents, business owners and oversight agencies through the environmental scoping meetings and formal comment period, a re-weighted set of evaluation criteria and goals places a higher priority on environmental and community objectives over economic and air service objectives. In light of the re-weighted goals, the options of development into the El Segundo Sand Dunes and the El Segundo Blue Butterfly Habitat Restoration Area were removed from further consideration to protect the environs. For further discussion of the re-weighted objectives and the development of the alternatives, please see Chapter V, Section 3.1 of the LAX Draft Master Plan. No portion of Downtown Westchester would be destroyed to make room for Master Plan Alternative D.

**PC00999      Sharman, Joyce & Bill      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC00999-1**

**Comment:**

This is regarding any plans for expansion of LAX. We would oppose expansion for any number of reasons - especially safety, traffic and of course, noise. We have heard numerous reports that LAX is very unsafe and already is overcrowded (airways & corridors)

Please let our concerns be known! The noise would be unbearable and the traffic terrible.

**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. 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.

**PC01000      Alanis, Jose      None Provided      7/13/2001**

**PC01000-1**

**Comment:**

Although we understand the importance of providing additional facilities to operate LAX efficiently, we consider that other alternatives should be considered instead of expanding the already over crowded areas adjacent to the airport.

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

**PC01000-2**

**Comment:**

Obviously the noise, pollution, traffic and safety that motivate the increase of operations will be affecting directly all the community and residential zones near 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, traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and safety in Section 4.24.3, 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.

**PC01000-3**

**Comment:**

We suggest to study other plans to decentralize the cargo and passenger (international and domestic) flights to avoid a disaster, and instead of attracting more business, it will make LAX intorable.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC01001      Blair, Janyce      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01001-1**

**Comment:**

I adopt the views expressed on the attached sheet [Mina Bharadwa Handout]

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments PC00908-2 through PC00908-15.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01002      Garriga, Peter      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01002-1**

**Comment:**

As a long time resident of the north side of El Segundo I have witnessed the quality of my life erode due to aircraft noise and pollution:

**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 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.

**PC01002-2**

**Comment:**

- at certain times of the day I cannot keep my windows open if I want to listen to music or television without interruptions;

**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.

**PC01002-3**

**Comment:**

- everyday I must remove a small layer of grime from my patio furniture.

**Response:**

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

**PC01002-4**

**Comment:**

I have little doubt that these insidious and constant invasions upon my home are having negative effects on my health and sanity.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise.

**PC01002-5**

**Comment:**

The LAX Master Plan's proposed airport expansion will do nothing to alleviate the already near intolerable conditions under which I am forced to live. On the contrary it will only aggravate them. I therefore strongly protest its implementation.

**Response:**

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

**PC01002-6**

**Comment:**

I understand and subscribe to the philosophy that says that some must suffer for the greater good of the community in which we live. I believe I have been doing my part. I understand also the pressing nationwide safety concerns of airport overcongestion. But why should this burden be increased on those of us who have already been carrying it when alternative plans have been offered to effectively circumvent the expansion at LAX? This makes the proposed expansion all the more unjust and unwise.

I realize my decision to continue living at my home has been my own and there are other compensations for living in this small town despite these shortcomings. In the hope that I can continue living in the town I love without further deterioration of its good qualities I submit these comments

**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-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety, 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.

**PC01003      MacLellan, Douglas      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01003-1**

**Comment:**

I am an international venture capitalist who travels extensively throughout the developed and developing countries of the world. Throughout my travels I have observed the changes and expansion in over 100 various international airports. The key issue with most large scale airport expansions is that the old site are abandon for new ones located in less densely populated areas (ie: Hong Kong, Denver). If Southern California needs more airport capacity for saftely and capacity reasons then expand in areas where we currently have excess capacity such as Riverside/San Berardoe, Palmdale, etc. You current draft plan appears to be favorable to entrenched business interest at LAX such as the airlines rather than a community based plan.

**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.

**PC01003-2**

**Comment:**

Perhaps you should move to Playa del Rey and experience first hand the noise pollution your facility creates. Make the right choice expand some where else but not at 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-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.

**PC01004**

**Bast, Larry**

**None Provided**

**7/16/2001**

**PC01004-1**

**Comment:**

I am writing to voice my strong feelings against the further expansion of LAX. From all that I've read, there appear to be many flaws in the current LAX Master Plan.

**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.

**PC01004-2**

**Comment:**

First, it doesn't appear to me that the plan adequately handles the issue of increased ground traffic that will be caused by this expansion. Sure, there is talk of a "ring road" and a new terminal...but doesn't it seem logical that this will only move the bottleneck of airport traffic to the 405? Travel on the 405 around the airport area is slow already...this additional traffic will bring the 405 to a crawl.

**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.

**PC01004-3**

**Comment:**

Second, I have major concerns about the safety of increased air operations at LAX. Pilots already are calling LAX one of the most dangerous airports in the world, and increased operations merely invites a major incident, with corresponding loss of life and property.

**Response:**

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

**PC01004-4**

**Comment:**

Lastly, it just doesn't make sense to me not to utilize other existing airports for growth, especially the Palmdale area, where the city of Los Angeles already owns a huge amount of acreage purchased

specifically for this purpose. The city fathers of 1960 Los Angeles were smarter than we give them credit for . . . how can we afford not to develop 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. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

**PC01004-5**

**Comment:**

Add my name to the list of those who oppose further 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.

**PC01005**

**Meyer, Lester**

**None Provided**

**7/14/2001**

**PC01005-1**

**Comment:**

As a resident of Westchester since 1946 may I state the following:

I have seen a community of many homes destroyed due to the "expansion" of LAX.

I have seen and experienced air pollution due to the increase in air Traffic.

I have seen and experienced Traffic on our surrounding streets and highways the envy of New Yorks Manhattan all due to the "expansion" of LAX.

**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 of Businesses; air quality impacts 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 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 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01005-2**

**Comment:**

Further expansion of LAX will compound all of the above and destroy what is left of the original Westchester once mentioned, many years ago, in Life magazine as the "All American" community.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**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.

**PC01005-3**

**Comment:**

Why are Palmdale and Ontario not considered for development?

**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.

**PC01006**

**Gelineau, Claude**

**None Provided**

**7/13/2001**

**PC01006-1**

**Comment:**

IN 1970'S THE AIRPORT TOOK OVER 1,000 HOMES IN THE AREA AND REMOVED THEM. NO MORE!

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed residential relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

**PC01006-2**

**Comment:**

LET OTHER AREAS EXPAND I.E. ONTARIO, PALMDALE AND HOW ABOUT EL TORO (TO HANDLE ORANGE CO. AIR TRAFFIC GROWTH)?!

**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. 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.

**PC01006-3**

**Comment:**

WE'VE LIVED IN THE AREA OVER 35 YRS. AND HAVE SLOWLY FELT "SQUEEZED" BY THE DEVELOPMENT THAT HAS HAPPENED AND IS HAPPENING AS I WRITE. 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.



**PC01007      Paul, Jane      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01007-1**

**Comment:**

Please consider expanding services to a greater degree at other regional airports, such as John Wayne, El Toro, etc. We understand LAX needs to grow a little, but the proposed Master Plan is too large.

**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.

**PC01007-2**

**Comment:**

Our communities cannot accommodate the traffic, the noise, the pollution. Other communities will benefit more from jobs and economic activity.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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 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.

**PC01008      Bowen, Harold C. & Eve R.      None Provided      7/17/2001**

**PC01008-1**

**Comment:**

The Master Plan is a travesty!

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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

---

#### PC01008-2

**Comment:**

LAX is saturated with air traffic as evidenced by more frequent fly-overs and missed approaches; one as recently as July 15, 2001, 9:03 pm. These unexpected events are very frightening, with low flying jets just above our rooftops. How do you propose to increase air space?

**Response:**

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

#### PC01008-3

**Comment:**

Our wonderful beach community and wetlands have already been assaulted and degraded with past expansions and multi-unit housing, not to mention traffic noise, fumes and congestion. Do you wish to destroy the best part of our city?

**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, wetlands impacts in Section 4.12, Wetlands, traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, roadway noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses is provided in Appendices D, G and J-2, 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-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Response to Comment AL00017-121 regarding impacts of historic activities at LAX.

#### PC01008-4

**Comment:**

Ontario, Palmdale, El Toro and Old George airforce base for cargo could certainly be valid options, expanding economic growth and jobs needed in those areas, as well as dispersing air-traffic over a large area. Convenience of land travel to those airports for the outlying communities would be another positive result of a Regional Solution, leave LAX as 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.

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.

**PC01009      Gibson, Harold &      None Provided      7/10/2001**  
**Lavonne**

**PC01009-1**

**Comment:**

I live in Westchester & do not want any more expansion at LAX. More to Ontario or Palmdale, or El Toro. I have a rental on Morley St. in Westchester & it cost me \$1,500 a month in less rent. Let some other have some of the noise & pollutants. Sure don't need any more TRAFFIC & noise.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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, Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale, and Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values. 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, 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.

**PC01010      Williams, Karen      None Provided      7/17/2001**

**PC01010-1**

**Comment:**

I am writing in strong opposition to the plan for 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.

**PC01010-2**

**Comment:**

I am a Los Angeles property owner/tax payer whose life is regularly inundated with the noise, vibrations and environmental impact provided by the steady stream of planes landing at LAX.

**Response:**

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

---

#### PC01010-3

**Comment:**

My neighbor complains that the fumes from the planes chemically alter his pool water.

**Response:**

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

#### PC01010-4

**Comment:**

How many people know exactly when Air Force One made it's descent to land at LAX when the President visited last month? Well, I do. The noise is so bad that my neighbors' voices cannot be heard, from three feet away, above the plane noise. And I'm not even addressing the bad weather noise, airplane traffic that fails to adhere to the noise abatement schedule or increase in automobile traffic!

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement. Please also see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 regarding existing and future noise levels.

#### PC01010-5

**Comment:**

An expansion of this caliber should never be implemented without compensating each and every homeowner impacted by the LAX airplane traffic with residential soundproofing. The Residential Soundproofing Bureau needs to vastly expand its recognized compensation area to include all the neighborhoods heavily impacted by LAX airplane traffic, before any move to expand LAX is implemented. Furthermore, there should be a move to have all impacted neighborhoods tested for decibel levels so that current readings of the noise from the LAX airplane traffic is accurately documented and well publicized.

**Response:**

The noise impact area which determines residential uses eligible for sound insulation under the ANMP and monitoring methods used to validate the current 65 CNEL contour are described in Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4. 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 shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As shown on these respective figures, the 65 CNEL noise contour has decreased from the 1992 conditions that were used to establish 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. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program, in particular Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.14 regarding how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP, including expanding and upgrading the current monitoring system. Also, note that noise monitoring is currently undertaken on a continuous basis at 25 sites surrounding the area in compliance with Caltrans and County of Los Angeles requirements. The noise contours that are developed and validated using monitoring data are published on a quarterly basis and are available for public review at LAWA Soundproofing Bureau's Community Office and at City and County libraries in the vicinity of LAX. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

**PC01010-6****Comment:**

It is obvious that former mayor, Richard Riordan, expects to make financial gains from the LAX expansion. It is my opinion that LA's new mayor, James Hahn, should fight this expansion plan for all the communities in Los Angeles that will be negatively impacted.

**Response:**

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

**PC01011****David, Reva****None Provided****7/13/2001****PC01011-1****Comment:**

We live in Westchester and are very disturbed by expansion plans at L.A. Airport.

We are against expansion for the following reasons

**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. Please see Responses to Comments below.

**PC01011-2****Comment:**

1. 1/3 of our business district will be uprooted

**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. 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 still remain available through similar businesses that are 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, note that in contrast to the other build alternatives, Alternative D does not include any acquisition within the Westchester Business District. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01011-3****Comment:**

2. More traffic

### **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, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

**PC01011-4**

**Comment:**

3. Noise - more

**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.

**PC01011-5**

**Comment:**

4. Large cargo demand

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand.

**PC01011-6**

**Comment:**

5. Increased 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. Please also see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

**PC01011-7**

**Comment:**

6. Overcrowding of air corridor - more accidents

**Response:**

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

**PC01011-8**

**Comment:**

7. Need to develop Palmdale

**Response:**

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

**PC01012****Dawson, Nancy****None Provided****7/14/2001****PC01012-1****Comment:**

I was enraged when first I heard of the LAX expansion. I have lived in Westchester for 16 years now and have already seen expansion - too much.

**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.

**PC01012-2****Comment:**

My asthma has been worsened by the 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 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.

**PC01012-3****Comment:**

Westchester has always been a key community and will die if there is any more expansion.

**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.

**PC01012-4****Comment:**

People will leave, an element will come in that won't be good (with lowered prices, making our city unsafe).

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01012-5

**Comment:**

Examine El Toro to develop into a major airport to service the people south - many of whom come to L.A. to pick up Intl. flights. Examine Palmdale & Ontario.

**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. 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.

#### PC01012-6

**Comment:**

LAX cannot be expanded. We will fight this vehemently!

**Response:**

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

**PC01013**

**Ruane, Patrick &  
Ingrid**

**None Provided**

**7/16/2001**

#### PC01013-1

**Comment:**

We are homeowners in Westchester and would like to make it known that we oppose any LAX Expansion in the Westchester neighborhood & its surrounding area. We feel the noise, air pollution & traffic congestion that the expansion would inevitably bring will be detrimental to our health and our childrens, our quality of life and will greatly affect the value of our property.

Thank you for your consideration.

**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. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values, and 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.



<b>PC01014</b>	<b>Johnston, JJ &amp; Robin</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/16/2001</b>
----------------	---------------------------------	----------------------	------------------

**PC01014-1**

**Comment:**

We have a vested interest here in the Westchester Community... I was born and raised in Westchester. My husband moved here when he was only 4 years old. The community was clean safe and an enjoyable place to grow up. We have both seen many changes here in Westchester. We have seen our friends homes taken by the airport in the late 60's early 70's and my husbands home was painfully taken for the now north runway. Families lost money over the sale of their homes at this time. We have seen both hometown movie theaters vanish. We have witnessed the area at Sepulveda and Centinela change where I used to enjoy the Hamburger Handout and deliver the newspaper. Woolworth's is no longer a place to have an ice cream cone. JC Penneys is gone and remained vacant for years. The open area at the end of Airport Boulevard is gone. The homes and streets near Airport Boulevard were taken and now have hotels and car rentals companies too many to name. Business on South Sepulveda, nearest the airport, has suffered drastically and partially diminished.

**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.

**PC01014-2**

**Comment:**

I understand the expansion may even include the removal of the historic Centinela Adobe! This would be an outrage. I grew up as a Brownie going to the Adobe Home.

**Response:**

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

**PC01014-3**

**Comment:**

Nielsen Field as well is home to many baseball families and this being removed would severely impact children's sports programs.

**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. Supporting technical data and analysis are provided in Technical Report 16c of the Draft EIS/EIR. As discussed in the Draft EIS/EIR, rather than being removed, Carl E. Nielson Youth Park would be expanded by five acres and retain its current use under Alternatives A, B, and C. Under Alternative D, no impacts or changes to Carl E. Nelson Youth Park would occur.

**PC01014-4**

**Comment:**

Westchester has seen too many changes. We are not ready to see or tolerate any more changes!

**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.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

#### **PC01014-5**

**Comment:**

My husband and I both attended neighborhood schools, West Port Heights, Loyola Village, Airport Jr. High, Orville Wright and Westchester High School. The airport expansion has affected the quality of the schools as well. Airport Jr. High is no longer even there. Younger families have moved out of the Westchester area to attend schools and get away from the airport, traffic and noise. Our neighborhood schools are now full of inner city kids, kids that do not live here in Westchester. When my husband and I were small, the neighborhoods and local schools were full of local kids. You played in your neighborhood and went to the neighborhood schools. This is no longer the case.

**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.

#### **PC01014-6**

**Comment:**

The airport expansion can go elsewhere!

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

#### **PC01014-7**

**Comment:**

The automobile and truck traffic would increase beyond it levels currently and only add to the traffic mess we already have. Traffic on Lincoln has increased so much, turn lanes and signals were installed.

**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.

#### **PC01014-8**

**Comment:**

The Playa Vista Project will make a considerable impact on Westchester and we can not afford to allow any other changes to affect the Westchester area.

**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.

**PC01014-9****Comment:**

On any given evening, I can look out my back windows and see 11 to 13 planes on approach to LAX that can't be safe.

**Response:**

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

**PC01014-10****Comment:**

It only means more traffic and more people coming in and out of our little community, stop with the changes and additions of people, cars and trucks!

**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 Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic 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.

**PC01014-11****Comment:**

The noise and smell would increase to an unacceptable level. I am not willing to close my doors and windows to the fresh air we are so lucky to enjoy from the nearby beaches.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels. Please see Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding odors.

**PC01014-12****Comment:**

Our streets are at capacity now and anymore expansion would surely ruin our nice life here in Westchester. There must be an alternative to expanded LAX. Don't you think Westchester has had enough changes over the 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. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01014-13****Comment:**

Westchester is one of the only small town atmospheres left and any more changes would seriously compromise our community.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**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.

**PC01014-14**

**Comment:**

Please help us Westchester families keep our sleepy little town the same for our children and our children's children. Let us take back our school and parks. Westchester is on the comeback and we don't need the expanding of LAX to curtail any of this new growth. Expanding the airport will only make things worse. Stop with the 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.

**PC01015**

**Wells, Regina**

**None Provided**

**7/16/2001**

**PC01015-1**

**Comment:**

This is a letter to critique the Draft Environmental Impact Report and voice my opinion regarding my opposition to the LAX Master Plan. The noise, traffic and pollution has already negatively impacted my life and lifestyle both personally and professionally for many years. I have lived under the Century Blvd. airspace for 8 years and work in El Segundo. I can not imagine the negative impact of at least 44 more daily flights, double the volume of annual passengers and not to mention the additional cargo. The negative effect on the air, traffic, noise and quality of life in this area would be unbearable.

**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 potential 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.

**PC01015-2**

**Comment:**

Please reconsider the expanded use of Van Nuys, Burbank, Ontario and Palmdale airports as a viable alternative to expansion 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.

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.

**PC01016      Kutasi, Gabriella      None Provided      7/14/2001**

**PC01016-1**

**Comment:**

For EIR/EIS Comments.

NO LAX EXPANSION

KEEP OUR COMMUNITY WHOLE.

ENOUGH TRAFFIC NOISE POLLUTION

O&P WANT AN AIRPORT --

WE DON'T!

**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-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 alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

**PC01017      Beaulieu, Minerva      None Provided**

**PC01017-1**

**Comment:**

I'm a retired widow - just wanted you to know I appreciate the work & effort you are making. I'm against any further expansion of the airport (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

---

<b>PC01018</b>	<b>De Deurwaerder, Charles</b>	<b>El Segundo Residents Association</b>	<b>7/15/2001</b>
----------------	------------------------------------	---	------------------

#### **PC01018-1**

**Comment:**

In accord with Guidelines for NEPA-69 (Sect. 102[2][c]), the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, and amended US Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 (Sect.509[b][5]; the El Segundo Residents Association (ESRA) and the El Segundo Senior Citizens' Club (ESSCC) reviewed the [Feb.2001] Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) Proposed Master Plan Improvements and Draft Environmental Impact Report/Statement (DEIR/S) and respond as follows. Reviews involved reading the entire document (printed-copy graciously and supportively provided by the City of Hermosa Beach) (plus the related DEIR's for neighboring Arbovitae/I-405 Interchange, OC's El Toro Airport-use, and Mammoth-Lakes' Runway Expansion). Convinced the DEIR is incomplete and inadequately details actual full-impacts, we cannot support the identified LAX-proposals. Responses offered hereafter focus as often on issues ignored-or-slighted in the DEIR/S as what was included. Together, the Plan and the DEIR/S is flawed - bad planning at the least, intentional charlatanism at worst.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

#### **PC01018-2**

**Comment:**

Although most actual impacts directly relate to the number and character of operations, documents continually refer instead to annual air-passengers and cargo-tons as the critical (and limiting) measurements. Flawed projection-numbers minimally consider fleet-mix options, plane-manufacturer future-plane-type demands, and load-factors. Despite operational fleet-mixes and load-factors being the path to final numbers of operations, they are hardly mentioned in the DEIR/S. Arbitrarily, a load-factor of 75% (an assumption used in identifying facilities-carrying-capacity when planes on-average fly 75%-full) was used in computer-modeling. Specific figures found in the Design-Day Calculations (IV.2.1-.31) do not reveal the actual final load-factor inputted to the computer model. However, the "SCAG model arriving at the same figures used 75%". (Tim Merwin, SCAG Consultant) In fact, current LAX-user airline-loads (4/2000 and 4/2001) range from 53.4% to 76.7%. Significantly, an increase of 1% load-factor in basic assumptions would change anticipated-capacities by as much as 8-million annual passengers. An 80% figure (as a goal for airline-users) could have shown the "No-Action Alternative" capable of handling the full 89-MAP projected in LAWA's "Preferred Alternative".

**Response:**

Please see the Draft LAX Master Plan Chapter IV, Section 2, for a discussion of the methodology used to derive the design day activity including fleet mix and load factors used in the baseline schedule, and Chapter V, Section 3.3.2, for the activity assumptions associated with each of the Master Plan Alternatives.

#### **PC01018-3**

**Comment:**

Further, when potential impacts of initial proposals (with assumed-loads) were found to result in extreme impacts, no "Alternative" was offered with a prime objective of reducing those impacts.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Although all four build alternatives would result in some significant, unavoidable impacts, mitigation measures have been proposed that would avoid or reduce these impacts to the maximum extent practicable. Also please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding the range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC01018-4****Comment:**

We urge caution upon our decision-makers to resist temptations to too-quickly jump for new funding made available through the Airport Reform and Investment Act for the 21st Century (AIR-21) which is set to subsidize expansions or additions at 2000 US airports.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01018-5****Comment:**

The WorldWatch Institute (7/01) reminds us that air transport is estimated to generate some 13% of the world's carbon dioxide emissions from transportation-sources. Moreover, carbon dioxide combined with other exhaust gases and particulates from jet engines have two to four times as great an impact on the atmosphere as CO2 emissions alone. Exhaust from a single maximum-range jet may spread to cover as much as 13,000 square miles and add immeasurably to our problems of a global-warming greenhouse cover. For each passenger on a trans-Pacific flight from LAX, about a ton of CO2 is added to the earth's atmosphere.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00258-1 regarding the topic of greenhouse gases.

**PC01018-6****Comment:**

There are two approaches to "planning" -- one which begins with the ideal and builds from a base of goals, the second which begins with projections, then "plans" to accommodate those projected-figures (which then become self-fulfilling prophesies). Fleet-mix and load-factor could and should be goals rather than tools-in-a-projection-process.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Section 3.3.3, Air Service Changes, of the Draft Master Plan Addendum. A description of how Alternative D would encourage the fleet-mix adjustments is available.

**PC01018-7****Comment:**

NEPA-69 "provides Federal agencies and officials with a legislative-mandate and responsibility to consider their actions' consequences on the environment." It is a "national policy .. encouraging productive enjoyable harmony between man and environment, preventing/eliminating environmental damage, and supporting the health and welfare of man.." Patterned after that Act, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) was enacted to apply to local-government-initiated plans, projects and regulations, and to private-projects requiring discretionary approval from state or local agencies. CEQA's purposes are: 1) Inform governmental decision-makers and public of potential significant environmental effects of proposed projects; 2) Identify ways to avoid or significantly-reduce environmental impacts; 3) Prevent significant, avoidable environment-impacts by requiring project-changes, or using alternatives or mitigations; and 4) Disclose the reasons to approve a project despite significant environmental effects. "State policy is that public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives, or if feasible mitigation measures are available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effect of such projects." CEQA requires an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), our state equivalent to the federal Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). It makes public agencies responsible to avoid or minimize environmental impacts wherever feasible. When an EIR demonstrates a project would result in significant adverse impacts, decision-

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

makers must choose one of the following responses: 1) Change the proposed project; 2) Impose conditions on approval; 3) Adopt plans or ordinances to avoid the adverse effects; 4) Choose an alternative way of meeting same need; 5) Disapprove project; 6) Find it not feasible to change-or-alter project; or 7) Find unavoidable environmental impacts acceptable given otherwise-beneficial effects.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC00471-9 regarding the approval process.

**PC01018-8**

**Comment:**

The system is apparently not working!!! The fox is guarding the chickens. Environmental Impact studies are paid for by those who benefit most from study-flaws and omissions.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01018-9**

**Comment:**

Legal loopholes have left airports exempt from either reporting to the Toxic Release Inventory or regulation under the Clean Air Act.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01018-10**

**Comment:**

New airports as solutions to congestion merely eat up as much open space as entire new cities and are at the forefront of urban sprawl (increasing auto-traffic by millions of annual vehicle-miles and heavily compounding sprawl's environmental and health impacts).

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01018-11**

**Comment:**

Number-juggling (fleet-mix, load-factor, fair-share, etc.) is rampant and erodes public trust in both the system and in our decision-makers.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01018-12**

**Comment:**

NEPA's 1969-concept (for Impact Reports to be contracted [paid-for] by action-initiating-agencies/bodies who stand to benefit from project-approval) is a flawed concept. Any Impact-Report by contractors answerable to project-proponents must be suspect. Objectively-negative results would counter the interests of the agency that pays the contractor's fees/wages. Jackson's Federal Senate Bill and California's CEQA-requirements are not fulfilling next-generation environmental trustee-responsibilities, nor are they assuring safe, healthful, productive, and esthetically/culturally pleasing



surroundings; or attaining widest beneficial environmental use without degradation, health/safety risks, or other undesirable and unintended consequences; or achieving balance between population and resource-uses for high living standards and amenity-sharing.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01018-13**

**Comment:**

Recent documents, (i.e. Mammoth Lakes Airport DEIR for a Proposed Expanded-Service Runway and Related Facilities [to accommodate services by jet-757's direct from Dallas and Chicago], Orange County's DEIR 573 and Airport System Master Plan for El Toro and John Wayne Airports, and the Caltrans/FHWA Draft Initial Study Environmental Assessment of Proposed Interstate 405/ArborVitae Interchange in Inglewood) have each side-stepped their purpose. Despite reason after documented-reason that should cause project-rejection, the FAA for Mammoth Airport declared (2/01) a "Finding of No Significant Impact", Caltrans/FHWA proposed a "Negative Declaration", and Orange County was poised for airport-development until a voter-referendum stopped the action. The "Mammoth" decision is being protested by California's Attorney-General, Earthjustice Legal Defense Fund, Sierra Club, National Resources Defense Council, and the Yosemite Trust. The before-mentioned Orange-County-DEIR stated "Proposed Project would cause significant impacts in Land Use, General Plan Consistency, Noise, Air Quality, Soils Geology and Seismicity, Hydrology and Water Quality, Public Services and Utilities, Natural Resources and Energy, Recreation, Hazardous Wastes and Hazardous Materials Use, Socioeconomics, Risk of Upset, and Cumulative Effects", but the County prepared for development-action regardless. Too often DEIRs say "Conclusion: we can mitigate most impacts to the point of insignificance" while a careful review of proposed-mitigations reveals acceptance of such weak problem-solving-actions as "authorize a study", or "amend the General Plan", or "amend the AELUP", or "prepare a fiscal-impact report". Those, quite simply, are not genuine mitigations. In themselves, they do not result in shifting "significant" to "insignificant". The Caltrans/FHWA study made similarly unsupportable mitigation-proposals and preposterous assumptions of impact-reduction before concluding that the traffic-problem solving interchange warranted a Negative (no significant-impacts) Declaration. Actions by government decision-makers based on assumptions that ridiculous-measures would render adverse impacts insignificant assures that governmental-decisions are not what the '69-Congress or the '70 California Legislature sought for environment-trusteeship.

**Response:**

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR identified a number of impacts that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR identified over 130 Master Plan commitments and mitigation measures that would reduce project impacts to the maximum extent possible.

**PC01018-14**

**Comment:**

Around 1987, the City of El Segundo established an "Airport Safety and Noise Abatement Committee" to deal with continuing irritations of excessive noise and perceived-local-safety-threats (by overflights and early-turns). That Committee craftily documented LAX violations-of-agreement and regularly exposed LADOA untruths, underhandedness, and lack of concern in dealing with its LAX-neighbors. E.S. City Council erected in '89 a large "No Early Turns" warning sign along Imperial Highway (which drew national attention to our dilemma). E.S. public-forums were held by LADOA in February '97, followed by calls (from ASNAC and the El Segundo Residents Association) for a city-position regarding expansion. The first of several E.S. Resolutions was adopted in April '97 (rejecting the initial four concepts offered by LAWA/LADOA). LADOA's (now LAWA) initial four concepts for expansion were scrutinized and criticized by ESRA and ASNAC and the City staff. ESRA even offered a \$28,000 study supported by a Position-Paper and professionally-prepared Sketch-Plan offering Alternatives to the FAA-supported LAWA Concepts.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01018-15**

**Comment:**

Scoping for input to the EIS/R identified over seven-hundred-ninety public concerns regarding LAX-Expansion (including 29-specific-issues by ESRA and a statement in the ESRA Position-Paper demanding that other airports share in meeting projected regional needs (7/08/97).

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01018-16**

**Comment:**

The LAX passenger-load in '99 reached 62-million annual passengers with operations over 2,250 daily. Last year's number went to nearly 68-MAP. In addition, handling cargo (particularly small-package delivery) skyrocketed in recent years ('98-99 up 25.6%) and is regionally our fastest-growing demand-segment. Package-delivery flights escape our former night-time voluntary passenger-flight curfews and cause incredible middle-of-the-night noise.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

**PC01018-17**

**Comment:**

VALID SCOPING-REQUESTS IGNORED. During LAX-Masterplan EIR/S Scoping-Hearings, The El Segundo Residents Association (and others) requested that several specific issues be addressed and responded-to (with mitigation-proposals when appropriate). The following issue/information-items requested were apparently ignored:

**Response:**

Please see Responses to Comments PC01018-18 through PC01018-39 below.

**PC01018-18**

**Comment:**

- Fixed-percent of regional cargo/passengers to be accommodated by LAX (with a penalty-program for exceeding plans).

**Response:**

Neither the FAA or LAWA have the authority to dictate the rates, routes, or schedules of commercial airlines at LAX. The Airline Deregulation ACT of 1978, as amended, ended federal, state, and local governments' role in determining the location for air service by airlines.

**PC01018-19**

**Comment:**

- Noise-mitigation assurances and timetables to bring '93-Variance-terms to compliance with State Title 21.

**Response:**

Response information regarding noise mitigation assurances and timetables regarding the current Noise Variance were provided in the Draft EIS/EIR, Land Use Technical Report, and particularly Section 3.3.2, Existing Incompatible Land Uses/Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP). As stated in the Land Use Technical Report, LAX currently operates under a 1998 Noise Variance from land use compatibility requirements of the California Noise Standards (Title 21). The 1998 Noise Variance, granted by Caltrans, is an extension of the 1993 Noise Variance referenced by the commentor. The current Noise Variance is valid for a three-year period and may be extended as long as LAWA demonstrates good faith measures to achieve compatibility with Title 21. These measures include residential sound insulation and land acquisition under the ANMP. Progress-to-date in implementing the ANMP is documented annually and made available to Caltrans, the Airport Land Use Commission of Los Angeles County, and other interested parties. As identified in the 1998 ANMP, the estimated time frame for completion of sound insulation within all affected jurisdictions is 7 years (by 2005) and 13 years (by 2011) for property acquisition. The Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.2, Land Use, also includes Mitigation Measure MM-LU-1, which contains recommendations for accelerating the current ANMP. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program. Also, please see Technical Report S-1, Section 2.3.1, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding the 2001 noise variance from Title 21.

**PC01018-20**

**Comment:**

- Proposed CNEL contours and performance-zoned daily-noise-event limits (with per-event maximums) and penalties.

**Response:**

The initiation of noise level limits on noise from flight operations that meet federal noise level criteria established under FAR Part 36 would have to withstand the benefit-cost tests required by the Airport Noise and Capacity Act of 1990, as codified under FAR Part 161-Notice and Approval of Airport Noise and Access Restrictions. This would require lengthy additional study and analysis that may yield psychological and quality of life benefits, but would not result in the financial benefits necessary to measure against the real financial costs to the users associated with flight restrictions and operational penalties. For more information on CNEL contours and penalties, please see Topical Response TR-N-1 regarding the noise modeling approach, Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences, and Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement.

**PC01018-21**

**Comment:**

- Effective Noise-barrier Berms and Plantings identified with specifications and construction-timetables for each.

**Response:**

Noise berms and barriers are not considered to be cost effective methods to reduce noise impacts in the El Segundo area. As a relief measure for a portion of the ground noise effects normally attenuated by barriers, each master plan alternative incorporates the construction of Ground Run-up Enclosures. These are facilities that substantially mitigate the noise levels by aircraft that undergo maintenance run-ups on the airfield. Please see Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-4.1 regarding berms, barriers, urban forest, and walls proposed to interrupt ground noise. For a more detailed description see Section 7, Noise Mitigation, of Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, in the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC01018-22**

**Comment:**

- Air-quality monitors (hourly-records) for NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, hydrocarbon + particulate release (with set-limits and penalties).

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**Response:**

Air quality monitoring is conducted near the vicinity of LAX at the SCAQMD's Hawthorne Air Monitoring Station.

**PC01018-23**

**Comment:**

- Noise-mitigating and air-quality-assuring major tree-planting program (including mile-wide off-airport urban forest).

**Response:**

Construction of a mile-wide urban forest on each side of LAX to mitigate noise would take all land between W. 83rd Street on the north to El Segundo Blvd. on the south. The suggestion is impractical in that it would displace the community of El Segundo and the Westchester area of Los Angeles. Please see Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-4.1 regarding berms, barriers, urban forest, and walls proposed to interrupt ground noise. For a more detailed description of noise mitigation options see Section 7 of Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report of 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 EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC01018-24**

**Comment:**

- On-site solar and wind-energy farm locations to minimize LAX dependence on outside energy-sources.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00033-190 regarding alternative energy. For the most part, open spaces at LAX are clear zones, which must be kept free of structures for safety purposes, or are part of the El Segundo blue butterfly preserve. Free-standing Photovoltaic arrays and wind turbines could constitute a safety hazard and could affect endangered species.

**PC01018-25**

**Comment:**

- A Master-Plan for passenger-transfer and cargo-haul service (rail or road) facilities connecting LAX and PMD.

**Response:**

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

**PC01018-26**

**Comment:**

- Acceptable-plan for accommodating by light-rail 25-35% of any proposed passenger-increase.
- LAWA off-airport proposals to connect light-rail lines (Green/Blue/Red) eliminating transfers to L.A. destinations.
- Greenline lightrail extension to an 1-90/Culver Offsite-Terminal with stops at LAX, LMU, and Playa Vista.

**Response:**

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. 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-5 regarding the rail/transit plan, in particular Subtopical Response TR-ST-5.2 regarding light/convention/rail connections and Subtopical Response TR-ST-5.4 regarding the Metro Green Line extension to the west terminal complex.

#### **PC01018-27**

**Comment:**

- Identification (and proposed funding) of surface-street-improvements needed for any LAX-related off-airport roaduse.

**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. Also, please see Response to Comment AL00008-6 regarding funding.

#### **PC01018-28**

**Comment:**

- Cessation of off-site residential-land acquisition (in support of expansion or as solution to noise-mitigation needs).

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

#### **PC01018-29**

**Comment:**

- Runway-capacities and operations-limits must be identified and penalties set for excess.

**Response:**

Federal law creates substantial restrictions on the ability of an airport operator to limit aircraft activities at an airport such as LAX. Airlines choose to provide additional flights. The Master Plan analyzed the design capacity offered by each alternative and the future delays that would result at LAX in determining the level of activity that will likely occur at LAX by 2015. The activity levels for each alternative were developed by considering the airlines' likely reaction to increasing congestion. See Chapter V, Section 3.3.2 of the Draft LAX Master Plan for a discussion on the activity levels for Alternatives A, B, and C. Chapter III of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum provides a description of the activity levels associated with Alternative D. As was described in Section 3.3.2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the activity levels associated with Alternative D are comparable to those of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

#### **PC01018-30**

**Comment:**

- Facility-relocation plans must show before-and-after with acceptable minimal distances to neighbor residential areas.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

#### **PC01018-31**

**Comment:**

- Alternate-Plans should identify varied terminal-designs and sites.

**Response:**

A significant variety of terminal configurations were explored as part of the LAX Master Plan. Alternatives A, B, and C offer suggested terminal configurations to solve aircraft parking requirements and improve aircraft movement on the ground. Other terminal designs and sites can be found in Chapter V, Appendix C of the Draft LAX Master Plan. In addition, Alternative D, which was added subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS/EIR offers another terminal configuration option.

#### **PC01018-32**

**Comment:**

- Policies (methodology) for neighbor-community benefit-assurance should be a part of the Master Plan.

**Response:**

Chapter 5, Environmental Action Plan, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included a list of project design features, Master Plan commitments, and proposed mitigation measures to avoid or reduce impacts to the environment and minimize the overall impacts of the Master Plan project. The mitigation measures and Master Plan commitments will be incorporated into a comprehensive Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and a mechanism for establishing compliance with the program will be included. In addition, LAWA has proposed programs that are intended to improve conditions in minority or low-income communities that have experienced disproportionately high and adverse effects from LAX operations. These programs or benefits, which were described in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, will continue to be refined and developed with input through LAWA's ongoing Environmental Justice Program.

#### **PC01018-33**

**Comment:**

- Increased vehicle-capacity for the Sepulveda Tunnel (and proposed funding) must be part of the Master Plan.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00236-1 regarding the Sepulveda Tunnel.

#### **PC01018-34**

**Comment:**

- Penalty-policies must be proposed for operations-assurance (i.e. assuring no early-turns or runup excesses).

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00373-11 regarding noise abatement violations.

#### **PC01018-35**

**Comment:**

- Guidelines for a long-range plan must be included to set "directions" for at least 50-years.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01018-36**

**Comment:**

Adequate responses to those issues cannot be found in either the Proposed-Plan Alternatives or the DEIR/S. Issues touched-upon are found to be lacking in depth of answers (or inadequate in response). The ignored-requests seem to be begging for courtroom litigation to bring-about satisfaction.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01018-37**

**Comment:**

After scoping, in 1998, ESRA requested that LAWA include in the "Air Quality" section of the DEIR/S a graphic mapping of "isopleths" (i.e. mapped concentrations in milligrams/cu.mtr) for key pollutants (NOx, CO, etc.) for at least two climatically-typical days (i.e. Type I-W and I-S days) relative to temperature and wind directions/conditions. The 1978 LAX-EIR Figures 1-10, 1-16, etc. offered for the layman the most easily-understood explanations of relatively confusing air-quality impact information.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The maps referred to by the commentator are not required to determine whether the impacts of the Master Plan alternatives would be significant. Figures S4.6-1 and S4.6-2 in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provide the peak concentration impact location for Alternative D, the LAWA Staff Preferred Alternative.

**PC01018-38**

**Comment:**

Further, ESRA asked that in addition to CNEL contours, Noise projections be mapped in ASDS time-zones of "Daily Minutes of Exposure above 85 dBA", and that ASDS Noise-Exposure-in-minutes be mapped for a runway-vicinity 500'-square grid (to include at least all the area within the 65dB contour. The DEIR/S shows no response to the requests.

**Response:**

Table A5-8, located in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR, titled Regular and Special Grid Point Assessment - Aircraft Time Above 85 Decibels in Minutes, and Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, titled Regular and Special Grid Point Assessment - Aircraft Time in Minutes Above 85 dBA provided the requested noise levels. The grid locations, however, are spaced at 3000-foot intervals as opposed to the requested 500-foot interval, but extend beyond the 65 CNEL contour to the potential 60 CNEL contour.

**PC01018-39**

**Comment:**

Significantly, many major less-than-conventional concepts for airport design/construction/reconstruction have been introduced since the initial scoping-hearings (but before the "Year-2000 LAWA Issue of Supplemental Notice" and subsequent change of the Concepts/Alternatives and revised property-descriptions). (i.e. The unconventional-notion of making runways slightly [2-3%] sloped to assist in landing and takeoff operations, fuel-saving, and emissions-reductions; and the slight dishing cross-section of runway/taxiway lengths to cut noise and emissions from escaping the airport-site.) A case could be made that the Supplemental Notice also warranted an entirely new scoping-hearing to allow up-to-date public input.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

**Response:**

FAA Airport Design Standards preclude the type of longitudinal (along the runway or taxiway centerline) and transverse (perpendicular to the runway or taxiway centerline) grades suggested. For airports like LAX serving large aircraft, the FAA recommends that grade changes be used only when absolutely necessary and, in the case of transverse grades, only to the amount necessary to meet drainage requirements. As a point of reference, a two percent slope applied to the longest runway at LAX (Runway 7R/25L is 12,091 feet long) would require a grade change from one end to the other of 242 feet or the height of a 20 story building. From a practical standpoint, a sloped runway that may provide an advantage for landing or takeoff in one direction would be a disadvantage when using the runway in the opposite direction. As for noise and emissions and their relationship to grades on the airfield, there is no known relationship between the two.

**PC01018-40**

**Comment:**

Changes in CEQA Guidelines (10/98) set June '97 as the baseline date for comparative analyses. However, the DEIR/S has been published with continued reference to conditions-of-1994 as the baseline conditions. That inappropriate baseline colors current data like the descriptions of projected noise and air-quality improvements. The results are skewed and misleading. Operations-projections for Year-2000 (applied to passenger demands) provide figures that are 7% higher than what actually occurred. Simply carrying that 7%-surplus consistently to Year-2015 would suggest a demand for 86-MAP rather than 98-MAP.

**Response:**

The baseline year for operational data used throughout the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is 1996. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-1 regarding baseline issues.

**PC01018-41**

**Comment:**

Further, the Supplemental Notice places a new emphasis on never-really-spelled-out possible-improvements in the '81 LAX Interim Master Plan. Those "possible-improvements" are now being assumed as an "approved-measures part" of the No-Action Alternative. "No Action" has again become a path to continued incremental expansion.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-2 regarding No Action/No Project Alternative assumptions.

**PC01018-42**

**Comment:**

Incidentally, graphics accompanying the "Supplemental Notice" offer no hint of the "Ring Road" (another bad-concept) currently touted and detailed as critical to described-Alternatives.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Alternative D, Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, would not include a ring road or the LAX Expressway.

**PC01018-43**

**Comment:**

In 1928, Los Angeles City ok'd plans to "establish a great metropolitan airport of a thousand acres". An initial expenditure of \$3-million set the wheels in motion. In '44, the site was expanded by nearly 2,000 acres, and in '47, the field handled over a million passengers. A "regional approach" began with buying the Van Nuys Airport in '49 (for \$1). Jet service began in '59, and by mid-60's more than 2800 vicinity-



homes had been bought-out to ease concern about neighbor-landuse incompatibility. L.A.'s Department of Airports acquired Ontario Airport in '67 to serve residents east of Los Angeles, and almost 18,000 acres of land in Palmdale in '69 (equivalent to the Dallas/FtWorth Airport) to service north-County and relieve air-traffic congestion at LAX's limited 3500-acres. An LAX Environmental Impact Statement authorized in '71 offered "a comprehensive environmental assessment for base-year '72 and projected impacts for 1980 and 1990". Completed in '78, it led to adopting an LAX Interim Master Plan in 1981 dealing with "facilities to increase capacity for projected-growth from 23.5 million annual passengers (MAP) in '75 to 40-MAP by 1990". The adopted document (Vol.1, Pg 3) stated "City Council of the City of Los Angeles has established a limit of 40 million annual passengers for LAX." (Daily takeoff and landing operations in '72 totaled 1150.) The EIS-Section on "unavoidable adverse environmental effects" said "areas .. will be impacted by noise levels in excess of California Noise Standards ..expansion will result in technical noncompliance with Standards", and "large-scale landuse incompatibility will result"..The Expansion Project was "expected to increase NOx, HC, and CO emissions". Further, the EIS (Vol. 1, Pg 71) indicated LAX growth "will have an adverse effect on Airport-related surface traffic", and "by 1990, economic costs associated with noise within the impact area will be approximately \$96.8 million." "Continued-development and incompatible-growth in areas surrounding LAX will result in (eight-listed) adverse impacts". Considering alternatives, the report stated "After 1990, if PMD is not built, ..inability to accommodate further demands could result in adverse economic impacts" (Vol.1, Pg 76) and (on Page 80) said "Unconstrained growth would have negative-community-consequences in the LAX vicinity". The 1978 EIS was the last comprehensive Impact Assessment of LAX-expansion released to the public. Incremental changes since then included:

Gateway Cargo Center completed 8/22/85, Terminal 2 renovation with gates-increase (5-10) (6-8/88), Terminal 6 connector-building (3/89), Terminal 5 reconstruction adding 163,000 sq.ft. (6/7/88), construction of 4-level parking structure 2A adding 784 spaces (9/91), new remote gates ('92), new 22-story control tower ('93), taxiway 75 + J & K extensions, + WorldWay West taxiway-bridge & taxiway 64 ('91-93), 4-lane bridge over Sepulveda to Parking Lot C ('92-94), UAL federal customs facilities + Terminals 6 & 7 (+8) efficiency improvements ('94-96)with gate additions, 170,000sf expansion of International Terminal (12/97-98) cargo-handling redevelopment along Imperial Highway west of Sepulveda for 54,000sf Qantas, 55,000sf Nippon, + Singapore & Mercury facilities + a 283% increase in FedEx facilities ('95-98), UA terminal renovations (6/98-'99), doubled UAL air-cargo capacity and added 30 daily flights, 2-new commuter-terminals ('99), Sepulveda-Tunnel lengthening for taxiway accommodations, and announced plans for 24R runway-extension by 1000 ft + accompanying taxiway EE (12/97).

All the above-growth has occurred without assessment of cumulative impacts as is required by FAA Airport Environmental Handbook Order 5050.4A (10/8/85, Chap.3).

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00018-19 regarding cumulative impacts. Regarding the 1981 Interim Master Plan's 40 MAP volume standard, it should be noted that the 1981 Plan was explicitly "interim" and was intended to be only a short-term general guide for coordinating the development of airport facilities with that of the surrounding community. It specifically deferred addressing airport capacity and environmental impacts to a future plan. Furthermore, the 1981 plan contained no regulatory control mechanism to implement a "cap" on passenger volume. The 40 MAP standard is a tool for achieving other planning objectives and policies set out in the 1981 plan, such as airport and ground facilities (e.g., streets and parking spaces). Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 for additional information regarding actual versus projected activity levels at LAX.

**PC01018-44**

**Comment:**

The L.A. International Airport Interim Plan ('81) set noise-standards at max-level 65-decibels CNEL, and presumed to fix aircraft operations by a Standards & Criteria Section, which read "...maximum-air-passenger-volume will be approximately 40-million annually. Further increases in passenger volume are planned to be accommodated by Palmdale International Airport and satellite airports." (The accompanying EIR said more emphatically "will be required to use other airports..")

Expansion-activity since reaching 40-MAP in '84 has had no support-environmental-consequence documentation. In '86, LADOA initiated an Environmental Study evaluating growth to year-2000. Draft

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

was subsequently withdrawn with no public release (preliminary-reviews showed formidable negative impact making public-acceptance impossible to achieve.) In '91, a limited EIR/S dealt with Phasing Out Stage II Aircraft (from LAX operations). However, as planes grew quieter, annual increases in operations have more than wiped out any gains in noise abatement. Ops increased 6.5% in '98 (over '97) and seven new airlines added 25.9 daily flights between 12/97 and 11/98. UAL announced 30-new-daily-flights [4/99]. The ops continue to increase. As recently as June 5th, another new airline [Midway] announced daily service to/from LAX, and US-Senate is considering a bill July 9 reintroducing direct flights LAX/Reagan [D.C.]. Since the last EIR, operations increased more than 310 flights/day [113,150 annually] over the number that served 40MAP.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The 65 CNEL noise contour for LAX serves to delineate the areas exposed to high noise levels from daily airport operations and eligibility for the city's soundproofing program. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. Please see Response to Comment AL00018-19 regarding cumulative impacts. Please also 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.

**PC01018-45**

**Comment:**

El Segundo, since '97, has budgeted nearly \$2-million in an attempt to constrain our neighboring goliath. ESRA/ASNAC (11/98) asked the Los Angeles City Council to redraw its General Plan Noise Element to amend CNEL-based noise assessments by adding current-technology controls for "Continuous Equivalent Sound Levels [Leq], SEL sound-exposure-levels [recording distinct events like flyovers or train/truck passbys], both A-weighted and C-weighted day-nite sound levels [Ldn] with penalty-decibels added for night signals and dominant frequencies under 500Hz, Ln percentile-levels where "n" is % of measurement-time when the CNEL-standard is exceeded, and EPNL perceived noise-levels [which FAA uses to identify aircraft-noise stages]". Our concerns and suggestions were flatly rejected (by both the L.A. Plan Commission and L.A. Council). We suggested rewriting ordinances and regulations to add and subtract discrete noises from other noise and from ambient sounds, and account for temperature and wind-velocity and direction. The newly-adopted L.A. Noise Element [8/99] continues to reflect mid-twentieth-century technology. We believe the City Council was heavily pressured by LAWA lobbyists to accept a weak "Noise Element" which would allow easy conformity with LAX Plan Proposals.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01018-46**

**Comment:**

In November '98, after analyzing New-Proposal Plan #3 (amended June '99 and now the Preferred-Alternative), LAWA was reminded by ESRA that the Plan replaces, eliminates, reroutes, or relocates nearly everything currently existing on the airport-site (excepting the interior of the current terminal-circle and Terminals 1,2 and 3.) Further, almost all recently-built cargo and maintenance facilities at airport-edge show replacement long before living-out usefulness, and under-construction facilities (by plan) would be abandoned within 16-years. The Preferred-Alternative [introduced by former-Mayor Riordan with 2-north and 2-south runways] scales back earlier proposals to more modest street-adjustments (with only about 6-miles affected). Other Alternatives totally clear-and-rebuild the west-side of the airport including relocating the fuel farm (possibly to a Chevron or Scattergood Site) with new pipelines (where a break would be devastating) along Vista Del Mar within the overview-and-controls jurisdiction of the California Coastal Commission. The Riordan Plan leaves space on the westend for possible fuel-farm redo and eliminates (or hides) some earlier-proposed West-Terminal Gate-Facilities. Several early-on El Segundo design-concerns were addressed in the Preferred-Alternative and in revisions of earlier concept-plans. Tunnel-widening is still not mentioned (though tunnel-lengthening for greater on-airport taxiing-efficiency is about finished).

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01018-47**

**Comment:**

In fact, many actions called for in one-or-more Alternatives are already (before EIR-approval) in the construction-pipeline or are out seeking funding-sources (other than strictly FAA-regulated Passenger-Facility-Charge Grants). LAWA was reminded (12/98) by El Segundo's legal-team that the authorized UAL cargo-project didn't comply with California Environmental Quality Act requirements. However, anyone driving along Century Boulevard may note the major work is finished.

**Response:**

Section 2.5 of the Draft EIS/EIR identified the individual projects and improvements with independent utility having already received approval separate from the proposed Master Plan. These approved projects, including improvements to cargo facilities along Century Boulevard, have, or will have, undergone the appropriate CEQA clearance requirements and are accounted for within the No Action/No Project Alternative.

**PC01018-48**

**Comment:**

Riordan's option calls for handling triple current-cargo-loads and increasing annual passengers to 89(earlier pegged at 92)-million (down from an earlier-sought 98-MAP). (Numbers are so easy to crunch by adjusting fleet-mix or load-factors, that they become meaningless.) The Plan-Proposal suggests 500 flights/day (commuters and non-commercial) might be ejected from LAX-operations. Possibly, those flights would relocate in Hawthorne. Operations-increases-there would adversely impact southern-El Segundo and most SouthBay-communities.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-4 regarding potential environmental impacts at surrounding other airports as a result of the LAX Master Plan.

**PC01018-49**

**Comment:**

Air-Traffic Controller (Asst-LAX-Tower-Chief) Frank Sweeney assured the LAX Area Advisory Committee (11/98) that "There are limits! The Tower can safely handle (with current fleet-mix) only 84 arrivals per hour (in good weather)." Recent airline requests for service have sought up to 95-arrival slots/hour resulting in holding planes at other airports 'til landing-time at LAX falls within limits. A Daily ACTC Traffic-Count Worksheet from June '98 showed 2381 operations. LAX-Director Kennard recently called 2500-operations the anticipated tower-load.

**Response:**

The airlines make decisions regarding the operation, choice of aircraft, and scheduling of flights within the capacity limitations at an airport. The Master Plan assumes that airlines would adjust air service patterns in response to the proposed capacity constraints. One such air service assumption is that airlines would schedule a larger fleet mix. At a capacity-constrained airport, airlines typically schedule flights at, or slightly above, the airport capacity for good weather conditions. Airlines may choose to accept the risk of delays in bad weather or when the airport is operating at less than maximum capacity. The Master Plan discusses the potential delay level the airlines are expected to tolerate, and the resulting expected air service changes that would occur as a result of those delays. Please see Chapter V, Section 3.3.2 of the Draft LAX Master Plan for a more detailed explanation of the activity levels expected for each alternative and predicted air service adjustments. Chapter 3 of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum provides similar type information particular to Alternative D.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01018-50

**Comment:**

El Segundo called LAWA's attention (2/16/99) to AQMD-standards identifying fifteen daily-commercial-flights increase as the threshold requiring impact-assessment. (From 12/97 to 1/99, LAWA approved operations-increases of 35 daily-flights.) Then, UAL increases (of 31-additional daily flights) were announced in April '99, still with no plan to establish an operations-limit or account for environmental-consequence. Records show occasional air-passenger increases during the same periods as operations-declines (i.e. Ops '97-98). That indicates airline-shifts in plane-size from 2-small to a single larger plane on a given route (fleet-mix). Larger planes, however, require more time/distance between to be safe from wake-turbulence. The point is, MAP is an invalid measurement of impact. A CAP must be placed on daily operations if the neighbors are going to ever gain protection from negative (impact) increases. (Base it on "safety", a subject that both LAWA and its neighbors agree. "Overcrowded LAX is a disaster waiting to happen.") Further, the daily time-period of exposure-to-excess-noise-and-emissions must be limited. Matching the passenger-increases and fleet-mix-shifts of '97-98, LAX could handle demand in 2015 without any major facility-changes. In '97, LAX-Capacity was estimated (within safety-limits) at approximately 72-MAP. Fleet-Mix that reflects Airbus and Boeing airlines-orders in the past 4-years could shift that capacity-estimate to 86-MAP (with no other major changes needed). Projected MAP using the under-2% increase of '97-98 yields a 2015 projection of 82,686,691 (not 72-MAP).

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC01018-29 regarding the fact that airport operators and the FAA do not have the authority to limit future activity at airports (i.e., establish a "cap" as suggested in the comment). It is important to note that the airport activity levels projected for 2015 under all of the alternatives, including No Action/No Project, take into account the continuing trends of the airline industry to use larger aircraft, including New Large Aircraft (NLA). Chapters III and IV of the Draft LAX Master Plan and of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum provide the details of the activity forecasts. As described in Section 3.2.4 of the Draft EIS/EIR, growth in activity levels at LAX would be limited to approximately 78 MAP in 2015 because of landside constraints - particularly the inability of the on-airport roadway system to handle future traffic. Based on this inability to get passengers to and from their flights, the airside activity levels would not, and could not, grow to the 86 MAP levels suggested in the comment.

#### PC01018-51

**Comment:**

City Correspondence (3/99) identified El Segundo as a regional leader in residential sound-insulation (second only to the City of L.A.). Phase 5 added 71 homes insulated against LAX noise at a cost of approximately \$2,250,000, bringing our total to 112. The City projected 175-more in '99. Phase 7 is now underway. The DEIR/S indicates that when current insulation-activity is completed, LAWA will have assisted in the removal of 1458-homes from over 9000-impacted. (Residents impacted within the 65dba line still number in the thousands.) The foot-dragging pace of mitigations promised in past-EIR's (while incremental expansion has continued at breakneck-speed) hardly warrants confidence in any promised mitigation found in the current DEIR/S. In court, the City prevailed on the issue of the Airport's Noise Variance allowing noise-insulation without requiring a release from future potentials-to-sue for Airport offense. The California Superior Court found that Caltrans (and LAX) exceeded their authority in demanding avigation-easements in exchange for sound-insulation funding. In addition, the City reported that its aggressive pursuit of the early-turn issue had reduced (air) crossings of Imperial Highway by LAX-departures from an '87-average of 50-a-day to about 7-a-day. New technology is expected to reduce that further in the near future.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program and Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding noise mitigation.

**PC01018-52****Comment:**

LAWA's Proposed-LAX-Expansion DEIR/S is on the same path as the El Toro, Mammoth Airport, and Arborvitae Interchange examples. The LAWA/FAA LAX-proposals are fatally flawed. They do not comply with federal and state law. They are inconsistent with the Southern California Council of Governments Regional Transportation Plan. In fact, the DEIR/S is so full of inconsistencies that it must be set aside 'til its shortcomings can be restudied and responded-to.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please note that 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, shifting 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.

**PC01018-53****Comment:**

Many DEIR/S "unavailable-figures" not-only are often available but have been published in local newspapers. DEIR/S noise-figures reported are not accurate, and operations-numbers fail to relate to the Proposed-Alternatives.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The comment does not include in particular what figures are felt to be available through local newspapers or where and how such published numbers contradict that data presented in the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC01018-54****Comment:**

The DEIR/S fails to evaluate operations-increases noise-impacts,

**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, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.3 regarding changes in noise levels relative to changes in air traffic.

**PC01018-55****Comment:**

ignores cumulative impacts of incrementally increased operations, fails to adequately-consider already-approved proposals for nearby developments (Marina del Rey, Playa Vista, Hughes Center, Rosecrans-Corridor, MTA's Exposition-BI Line, the Alameda Corridor, etc.),

**Response:**

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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01018-56

**Comment:**

fails to fully-evaluate traffic impacts (south of the airport) or consider circulation plans of affected communities,

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology, in particular Subtopical Response TR-ST-2.7 regarding the approach to mitigating transportation impacts.

#### PC01018-57

**Comment:**

and fails to offer/examine Alternatives which would effectively reduce identified-impacts.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

#### PC01018-58

**Comment:**

The expanded activities of the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles are directly related to assumptions and proposals for LAX-expansion. LAWA's Jim Ritchie was recently quoted in the L.A. Times as saying that "cargo-handling at the Ports relates directly to air-cargo transport demands and the two are inextricably linked". Yet, there's no Plan-recognition of a relationship to the Port, or plans to tie the facilities together with ground-transport.

**Response:**

While there are specific associations between LAX and the seaports, the two types of ports typically accommodate different types of cargo. The seaports generally accommodate lower value cargo (by weight) that is not time-sensitive. Airports on the other hand, generally accommodate high-value cargo that requires faster delivery, such as computer chips and perishable items. Therefore, while some interaction will take place, that interaction would not be constant interaction. The Master Plan does not create a direct ground transportation link between the Port of Los Angeles and LAX, however the existing regional ground transportation network provides the link between the two facilities.

#### PC01018-59

**Comment:**

If the LAX DEIR/S frivolous-and-ineffective mitigation-measures are accepted as "reducing impacts to insignificance", there's absolutely no chance of relief for long-suffering nearby-neighbors. Shortcomings become apparent by comparing proposed El Toro mitigations with those of LAX-Expansion. Solutions-to-problems and possible valid-mitigations have been suggested in National Airport Noise/Air-Quality Conferences held since 1997 (and regularly attended by LAWA representatives). (Some of those problem-solutions and possible mitigation-measures will be repeated herein following the "mitigations-comparisons".)

Proposed Mitigation Measure(s) included in LAX MasterPlan DEIR/S. Repeatedly the DEIR/S states that "mitigation programs will be developed prior to final project approval. This approach refutes public input and deprives reviewing agencies of opportunities to review and comment-on project issues. The mitigation-measures themselves could have impacts that need analysis and modification. Outlining "tentative-mitigation concepts" in lieu of defined mitigation measures does not pass the test of court-demanded mitigation-measures, yet "concepts" are frequently found in the DEIR/S. They do not meet the CEQA and NEPA requirement "to avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce, or compensate for adverse

project impacts". All identified adverse impacts need to be accompanied by specific and defined mitigation measures that are and can be evaluated thoroughly.

Mitigation Tests. Unless a link is demonstrated between mitigations and addressed-impacts, an agency like LAWA or FAA may be exposed to a claim of "significant-takings". By US Supreme Court rulings, determination of mitigation legitimacy may be based on any of seven tests and result in a demand to reject and replace any failing-measures.

Test 1: Significant Physical Impact. Public Resources Code Section 21002 requires agencies to adopt feasible mitigation measures (or alternatives) to avoid or lessen significant impacts (excluding purely socioeconomic impacts). [Goleta School District v. U.C.Regents, 36 CA App. 4th 1121 1995.] Socioeconomic Impact (e.g. overcrowding) is within the purview of an EIR only to the extent that it leads to changes in the physical environment or helps gauge impact levels. Thus, EIR review of police, fire, public-facilities, and similar should focus on potential physical changes re project service-demands. Test 2: Impact Avoidance. This is the cornerstone of CEQA. Measures ineffective in avoiding or reducing significant impacts are inappropriate. Specifically mitigation must accomplish one of the following: "(a) Avoiding impact by not taking a certain action or parts thereof; (b) Minimizing impact by limiting degree or magnitude of actions and implementations; (c) Rectifying impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring impacted environment; (d) Reducing or eliminating impact over time by "preservation and maintenance operations" during the life of the action; (e) Compensating for impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments. [CEQA Guidelines 15370.] Test 3: Express or Implied Authority. CEQA confers no new or added powers to public agencies. Although agencies have a duty to avoid or reduce effects of their actions, authority for mitigation comes from other enabling legislation. Agencies (e.g. LAWA & FAA) should confirm that proposed mitigation is not outside its authority to act. Mitigations must constitutionally "advance legitimate governmental interests". Supreme Court has ruled legitimacy is based on two elements: Nollan and Dolan. Test 4: Nollan Test. An 'essential nexus' must exist between the legitimate public interest being protected (e.g. quieting airport operations) and the mitigations proposed (e.g. requiring minimal Stage-3 aircraft). A basic link between mitigation and impact is required. [Nollan v. CA Coastal Commission 1987 483 US 825 (108 S.C.314.)] Test 5: Dolan Test. Mitigations must be "roughly proportional to the project's individualized impact. They may not exceed the magnitude nor extent of the impact being addressed. That shifts the burden of proof from the opponent to the proposing-agency. With that, agencies must carefully document and quantify the magnitude of impact and the expected result of the mitigation. [Dolan v. City of Tigard 1994 (114 S.C. 2309.)] The CA Supreme Court interpreted the Nollan and Dolan tests in Ehrlich v. City of Culver City (96 Daily Journal D.A.R. 2558, 96 C.D.O.S. 1542. In Ehrlich, Court ruled that generalized fees adopted by ordinance are not subject to proportionality-limits, but that individualized fees compensating for impacts are. (i.e. Where Passenger Fees are used to cover mitigation-costs, the EIR must document the impact-magnitude and fashion mitigations accordingly.) General Plan amendments, rezoning actions, and noise-element constructions have yet to be court-tested in detail. Test 6: Restricted by Statute. Mitigation is restricted by statute in only two areas: reduction of proposed-project-scale as mitigation (if other mitigation or project alternative might accomplish the same), and mitigation for unique archaeological resources [PRC Section 21085 and Appendix K of CEQA Guidelines]. Test 7: Feasibility. Infeasible mitigation measures should be rejected. CEQA Guidelines Section 15364 defines feasible as "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time..." Therefore, mitigation measures proposed in an EIR should have a timetable included.

MITIGATIONS: A comparison of El Toro DEIR Proposed Mitigations and those of the LAXMP is revealing in its parallels. Mitigations proposed for the adverse-impacts of the Proposed LAXMP are most-often inadequate to bring the impacts from a category of "significant" to one of "Less than significant". Further, impacts identified as "Significant but unavoidable" are frequently avoidable either through an alternative design approach or through the application of a bit more funding to resolve the problem. Environmental problems are too-often given economic (negative) conclusions. Nearly every place where the authors of the LAXMP DEIR/S have used the subjective-term "significant" without any statistical reference to a "Threshold Point of Significance" the members of the El Segundo Residents Association and the members of the El Segundo Senior Citizens Club disagree with conclusions offered. An Alternative Plan which addresses modernization for safety and efficiency without inviting increased-numbers is critically needed. More is no longer better. We need qualitative not quantitative improvements. "More" brings too many negative impacts.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**Response:**

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

Please see Response to Comment AR00003-63 regarding a discussion of the mitigation measures that were included in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and the timing of preparation of a mitigation monitoring and reporting program. NEPA and CEQA require the presentation of mitigation measures for identified significant impacts irrespective of whether the lead agency has control of implementation of those measures. For mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for which control and responsibility of the mitigation measures lie outside of LAWA's and FAA's jurisdiction, the lead agency shall participate in a fair-share manner to implement the measures, or otherwise encourage or promote the responsible agency to implement the measures, as appropriate. In addition, only those mitigation measures that are feasible, were included in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. These measures provided the basis for the mitigation measures presented in this Final EIS/EIR.

Regarding the use of the term "significant", as was indicated on page 4-1 in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and page 4-2 in Chapter 4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, thresholds of significance are quantitative or qualitative measures used to determine whether a significant environmental impact would occur as a result of the project. Each of the environmental disciplines (e.g., noise, land use, air quality, etc.) that were addressed in Chapter 4 the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included a subsection entitled "Thresholds of Significance" that provided an explanation of the thresholds of significance particular to the environmental discipline and their origins.

**PC01018-60**

**Comment:**

Proposed Mitigation Measure(s):

LAND-USE. EL TORO DEIR...1. Change the General Plan. 2. Consider Zone Changes. 3. Encourage neighbor-cities to do same. 4. Noise: "Community ReUse Plan impacts fewer acres than the previously-approved Policy Implementation Line (PIL), so all's O.K. LAXMP DEIR/S... (Where residential and other noise-sensitive uses may get high noise or significant increases... they're considered significant and unavoidable.) 1. Revise existing mitigation-program.

GENERAL-PLAN INCONSISTENCY (NON-CONFORMITY). EL TORO DEIR...Amend AELUP (Airport-Environs-Land-Use-Plan) to accept revised noise contours, safety-zones, and height-restrictions for proposed OCX.

LAXMP DEIR/S... (Where incompatibilities result from land-acquisition/reuse, considered less than significant with mitigation. Mitigations include: 1. Refer to LA zoning, 2. Establish landscape maintenance program, 3. Adapt to neighborhood compatibility program, 4. Relocate incompatible uses, 5. Landscape ringroad, 6. Control lighting and 7. Set and maintain airport buffer areas, and 8. Update and integrate design-plans & guidelines.

(Where ringroad eliminates bikelanes. Less than significant.) 1. Establish a detour plan for bikes. 2. Support LA Bike Plan in principle. No other mitigation.

(Where ringroad conflicts with LAX Street-Frontage Landscape Plan and makes incompatible use, Ignore it. No Impact.

(Where LAX-Expressway is incompatible with adjacent residential use and local plans, it's less than significant with mitigations.) 1. Assess Expressway lighting. 2. Analyze Expressway views.

(Where relocated fuel farm is incompatible with adjacent residential uses [in El Segundo] ... Keep mum!

(Where navigational aids construction/relocation impacts sensitive-habitat, it's less than significant with mitigation.) 1. Replace State-Designated Sensitive-Habitat elsewhere.



(Where construction-related traffic and detours impede access to/from adjacent communities, impacts are significant and unavoidable.) 1. Deal with construction mitigations, but ignore incompatible landuse.

(Where construction-noise renders landuse incompatibilities within 600', impacts are significant and unavoidable.) 1. No mitigations proposed for landuse conflict.

**Response:**

The statements presented by the commentor are not presented as clear comments and recommendations on the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Therefore, a specific response can not be provided. However, please see the following sections of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for an analysis of the issues raised: Section 4.1, Noise; Section 4.2, Land Use; Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences and Businesses; Section 4.18, Light Emissions; Section 4.21, Design, Art and Architecture Application/Aesthetics; 4.14, Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers; Appendix K, Supplemental Environmental Evaluation for LAX Expressway and State Route Improvements; 4.10, Biotic Communities; 4.11, Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna; 4.4.4, Community Disruption and Alteration of Surface Transportation Patterns; and 4.20 Construction Impacts. Under Alternative D, LAWA Staff's preferred alternative, there will be no disruption of the Bike Path; also there is no proposal for a ring road under Alternative D and therefore no potential impacts would occur.

**PC01018-61**

**Comment:**

TRIP-GENERATION INCREASES. EL TORO DEIR...Prepare a TDM plan prior to issuing building-permits.

LAXMP DEIR/S . . . (Where vehicle-demand on various street links increase, DEIR/S says "Less than significant". Some street and intersection improvements are proposed in the masterplan (but none for neighbor communities).

INTERSECTIONS-ROADS-FREEWAYRAMP GRIDLOCKS and PARKING DEFICIENCIES. EL TORO DEIR...1. Coordinate hiway improvements inter-jurisdictionally. 2. Prepare Phasing-Plans before issuing building-permits. 3. Identify which road-related facilities belong to whom. 4. Enforce County-zoning parking & loading activity.

LAXMP DEIR/S ... No mitigations for traffic increases on inbound upper-level ramps in Central Terminal Area.

(Where parking is considered, Impacts described as less than significant.) Road Intersection problems are "significant and unavoidable". Proposed plan improvements are offered as mitigations. Freeway-changes impacts considered less than significant. Construction traffic is considered significant and unavoidable.

**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. Traffic demand management would be a major component of the Traffic Coordination Office, proposed as Master Plan Commitment C-1, and an expanded Coordination Office proposed as Mitigation Measure MM-ST-9. Such a plan would be in place prior to any airport construction. This will include the facilities under each individual agency's jurisdiction. Feasible mitigation was identified for any impact that reached the level of significance, as was shown in Section 4.3.2.4 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Preliminary phasing plans were included in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Zoning and parking will be closely coordinated during construction via the Traffic Coordination Office.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01018-62

**Comment:**

NOISE-INCREASES. EL TORO DEIR... 1. Construct soundwalls. 2. Assure that noise impacts are equitably shared. 3. Prohibit encroachment into formidable and effective buffer zones.

LAXMP DEIR/S... (Where total population/dwellings exposed to aircraft-noise above 65 CNEL -- No-Project numbers decrease, Alternatives increase. Sensitive-locations over 65-CNEL decrease for No Project, increase for Alternatives. Many populations/dwellings in 65-CNEL are exposed to increases of 1.5 CNEL. Many residents will be newly-exposed to 65-CNEL. Increases are considered significant and unavoidable.) 1. Update Noise Abatement Program (adapting to new airport-configuration). 2. Implement revised Noise Mitigation Program.

(Where sensitive locations in the 60-65 CNEL would be exposed to increases of 3.0 CNEL. LA WA's concern indicates that because law doesn't cover below-65CNEL, the level of significance after mitigation is not applicable. Mitigations suggested duplicate those noted above for other Noise Impacts. Apparently even a 3.0-dB rise in noise doesn't concern LAWA, even though it might be perceived by neighbors as a major impact.

**Response:**

The commentor draws comparisons between the El Toro Draft EIR prepared by Orange County for the proposed civilian aviation reuse of the former installation and the contents of the LAX Draft EIS/EIR. Not all Alternatives increase total population and dwellings exposed to aircraft noise above 65 CNEL. Only Alternative B increases the total population. See Section 4.1, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a more detailed analysis. Responses to numeric comments follow. 1) The Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program will be updated to include any area that is newly exposed to noise above 65 CNEL as a result of the project actions. Boundary modifications will, in accordance with California Title 21 requirements, be based on measurement-adjusted noise contours submitted in future Quarterly Noise Reports to the California Department of Transportation. 2) There are no plans to base noise mitigation eligibility on inclusion within areas exposed to 3.0 CNEL increases within the 60-65 CNEL contour range. For further information, also see Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding increases of 1.5 CNEL and exposure to an increase of 3 CNEL between 60-65 CNEL contour over population and sensitive uses. Please see Section 7.1, Potential Noise Abatement Measures, of Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR, to address noise abatement measures and particularly Section 7.2, Alternative Specific-Abatement Measures. Please see Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-2.2 regarding the character of impacts below 65 CNEL. Noise impacts are 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-C1 and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

#### PC01018-63

**Comment:**

Roadway noise increases, being less than the 12dB Leq threshold at noise sensitive receptors, are considered less than significant .. and thus require no Mitigation. We disagree! Even where roadway noise exceeds 67-Leq at noise sensitive receptors, increases are considered less than significant. Proposed mitigations read "abatement procedures will be implemented for the four impacted receptors".

**Response:**

Measurement and analysis of the assigned thresholds were determined by using approved Federal Highway Administration and Caltrans models. For additional Roadway Traffic Noise Key Conclusions, please see Section 4.1, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration.

#### PC01018-64

**Comment:**

INTOLERABLE AIRCRAFT, NIGHTTIME, ROADWAY and CONSTRUCTION NOISE INCREASES. EL TORO DEIR... 1. By constructing soundwalls, assure noise impacts are fair-shared equitably. 2. Use County/City Noise Ordinance to penalize construction-noise offenders. 3. Monitor OCX noises and set up noise-complaint program. 4. Set 86-dB SENEL (single-event) restriction for OCX noise-sensitive zones. Monitor/penalize offenders.

LAXMP DEIR/S ... "...would exceed ambient levels by 5 Leq or more at noise-sensitive locations." "Changed noise-contours from changed ops may result in adverse health effects." Considered significant or potentially-significant and unavoidable. Mitigations proposed include 1. Noise control devices. 2. Construction staging. 3. Program maintenance. 4. Equipment replacement. and 5. Construction scheduling. Mitigation for noise/landuse a continuance of currently ineffective and minimal accomplishments.

**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 information and analysis presented therein were based on the specific characteristics of the project site and the specific characteristics of each alternative. The noise impacts, mitigation measures, and significance conclusions presented in the EIR for the previously proposed Orange County International Airport (OCX), as a reuse plan for the former MCAS El Toro, are based upon the specific characteristics of that project. Using the EIR for the OCX project to evaluate the conclusions of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is not a valid basis for comparison. With respect to the mitigation measures proposed for the OCX project, the essence of the measures identified in the comment are already accounted for in the Master Plan commitments and mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Such measures for the LAX Master Plan build alternatives include use of soundwalls where appropriate (i.e., ground run-up enclosures and recommended roadway sound walls), required compliance with the City noise ordinance regarding construction noise, continued implementation of the City's aircraft noise abatement program that includes noise monitoring and a noise-complaint program, and mitigation measures recommended for single-event noise.

#### PC01018-65

**Comment:**

REGIONAL A-Q EMISSIONS EXCEED SCAQMD THRESHOLDS; WILL EXCEED NO<sub>x</sub> LOCALLY. EL TORO DEIR ...1. Implement TDM program. 2. Let AQMD handle it. 3. Minimize OCX taxi-in/out times. 4. Use air/electric ground systems for servicing jets, 5. Electric outlets for ramp and GSE vehicles. 6. Use hydrant-fueling systems. 7. encourage reduced -engine-taxiing. 8. Save energy. 9. Use Runway 34R to minimize gas concentration near Transport Center. 10. Encourage maximum jet-fuel delivery by pipeline. 11. At least 90% GSE power by diesel-alternatives. 12. Minimize jet-engine use for taxiing, use tugs for gate approach and push-backs. (Note: San Diego Judge McConnell twice ordered a redo of pollution analysis after opponents sued over initial-study inadequacy.)

LAXMP DEIR/S ... "Air pollutant emissions from on-airport sources would increase" ... "Significant and unavoidable" ... Mitigation offered = 1. Revise air quality mitigation programs.

..."Changes in ops would affect ambient air-quality pollutant concentrations" ... "Significant and unavoidable" ... Mitigation offered = 1. Revise air quality mitigation programs.

... " Surface traffic and construction would increase emissions" ... "Significant and unavoidable" ... Mitigation offered = Revise air quality mitigation programs.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

... "Increases in airport-related traffic may cause CO concentration hotspots at affected-intersections" ... "Less Than Significant". We disagree. Define significant with actual figures and thresholds please! ... No mitigations offered.

... "Increased operations-emissions and construction would trigger conformity requirements" ... Not-to-worry! Just revise Air Quality Mitigation Programs.

Note: Air quality mitigation programs have not been effective ever since they were first mentioned in the '78 EIR. LAX continues to operate under a court-granted variance for noise. Less than 33% of objective reductions have been accomplished in the last 10-years. "Let the peasants die!" seems to be LAWA's response. Airport profitability comes first!

**Response:**

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included a revised air quality mitigation measure, which contained many components, that described in greater detail those efforts being carried forward as well as their associated emission reductions. LAWA intends to adopt and implement all feasible measures to reduce the project's adverse environmental impacts. 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.

**PC01018-66**

**Comment:**

SIGNIFICANT and UNAVOIDABLE TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANT EMISSIONS. EL TORO DEIR ... 1. Minimize jet-fuel supplied by truck. 2. Require 90% GSE power by diesel-alternatives. 3. Minimize engine-use for taxiing. Use electric tugs for gate approach and push-back.

LAXMP DEIR/S ... Avoids admission of toxicity of contaminant-emissions. Comment: Get real! See "Symposia". Additional treatment of the subject found in "Health & Safety".

**Response:**

Please refer to Chapter 3, Summary of Selection of TAPs of Concern, in Technical Report 14a of the Draft EIS/EIR. This chapter described sources of toxic air pollutants associated with airport operations and the procedures used to estimate TAPs emissions. Please refer to Chapter 5, Toxicity, in Technical Report 14a of the Draft EIS/EIR for an evaluation of potential human health effects from exposure to TAPs related to aircraft and airport operations at LAX.

All post-mitigation analyses were revised since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR and were presented in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment (subsection 4.24.1.9, Level of Significance after Mitigation), 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 fuels, 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 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.

**PC01018-67**

**Comment:**

HUMAN HEALTH and SAFETY (CEQA), and HEALTH-RISK ASSESSMENT. ... EL TORO DEIR ... couples response into the more specific air-quality concerns.

LAXMP DEIR/S ... "Increased cancer risks from exposure to toxic air pollutants (in 2005) for nearby communities."

Mitigation: Revise Air-Quality Mitigation Program. Level: "Potentially significant and unavoidable." "Nearby communities get increased non-cancer health-hazards from TAP-exposure (in 2005 and 2015)". This is "Less than significant" in 2005 so, no mitigations, but Potentially significant and unavoidable in 2015 so "Revise air-quality mitigation program." "Airport workers exposed to TAP-concentrations over PEL-TWA occupational standards (in 2005 and 2015)." It's less than significant -- no mitigations. Comment: LAWA attitude appears to be totally callous and unsympathetic to reality. Where are the "right-to-lifers"?

**Response:**

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.

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. 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.

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 fuels, 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 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.

**PC01018-68**

**Comment:**

IMPACTS RELATED to COMPRESSIBLE-SOILS and SEISMIC-ACTIVITY. EL TORO DEIR ... 1. Require a report before issuing grading-permits. 2. Design according to seismic concerns and Uniform Building Code.

LAXMP DEIR/S ... Claims the site is safe from adverse impacts despite the former presence of sizeable mud-flats, trenches behind secondary and tertiary dunes, fault-lines (including the Newport-Inglewood and Charmock) through and adjacent, and all lands in the surrounding district exhibiting problems with subsidence and liquefaction. Another case of "head in the sand" makes it go away. DEIR/S indicates the following are "less than significant": 1. Additional structures and people exposed to seismic-ground-shaking, 2. Low potential for surface-rupture and ground-deformation in eastern portion LAX (Note: New Terminal is proposed in western portion.) 3. Localized areas susceptible to liquefaction and settlement throughout LAX (which could damage structures and injure people). 4. All structures could settle as result of weight of new structures, de-watering (note diminished recharge described in Hydrology), excavations and tunneling. 5. Expansive soils could damage foundations and engineered-structures. 6. Earthwork activities could change all existing ground-conditions. and 7. Oil-fields and production-facilities in vicinity makes this a potential concern! ... No mitigations required

**Response:**

Please see Responses to Comments AL00033-221 and PC00242-1 regarding geologic hazards.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01018-69

**Comment:**

WATER-POLLUTANT CONCENTRATIONS and HYDROLOGY. EL TORO DEIR ... 1. Protect the landfills, monitoring facilities, and cleanup projects from excessive or contaminated runoff. 2. Establish a stormwater permit process. 3. Use pollutant-control technology and management practices.

LAXMP DEIR/S ... Admits to "Increased peak flows would exacerbate existing (unmitigated) flooding problems", "Increased impervious areas would decrease subsurface recharge", "Changed landuse may increase pollutants discharged to receiving water bodies (i.e.SantaMonica Bay)", "Sources for dry-weather flows may increase (increasing pollution to Bay)", and "Construction can generate additional pollution sources and increase pollution to Bay". All that adverse impact is deemed "Less than significant", thus warranting "none required" mitigation. Even airports like LAX end up with a residue of de-icing fluid spray when some aircraft-types are sprayed to prevent ice-formation on upper-wing-surfaces in cold high-altitude operation.

**Response:**

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR stated that these potential increases in flooding and pollutant loading will be addressed through implementation of mitigation measures identified in Master Plan Commitment HWQ-1 and Mitigation Measure MM-HWQ-1. Deicing is not performed at LAX. Also, please see Topical Response TR-HWQ-2 regarding Master Plan Commitment HWQ-1.

#### PC01018-70

**Comment:**

GENERATION/EXPANSION of HAZARDOUS-MATERIAL PRESENCE. EL TORO DEIR ... Specs & Plans on asbestos and lead-paint removal. Monitor gas-presence during underground work-periods. Relate work-specs to hazardous waste and materials. Guide site-runoff from landfills. Ensure no development/construction 'til contaminated-site remedial-action is implemented. Make DON remediate contaminated sites.

LAXMP DEIR/S "Contaminated soils could be unearthed during construction, exposing all to haz-mat." (Does this mean there's hidden contamination throughout LAX-site? Probably, yes!) "Construction and demolition-of-existing facilities could require closing some active-remediation systems temporarily." (5-15 years?) "Haz-mat like asbestos, PCBs and lead-based paint could be present in demolitions," Note: Nearly 80% of LAX-site would be subject to construction/demolition under Preferred-Plan C, a totally foolish addition of costs with no reasonably-associated benefits when compared with building anew at PMD (thus producing two working potentially-profitable airports instead of one. Despite all of the adverse-impacts noted, DEIR/S says "Less than significant".

POTENTIAL for GROUNDWATER POISONING. EL TORO DEIR ... Measures as above for Hazardous Materials.

LAXMP DEIR/S ... "Increased use and generation of hazardous materials increases chance of spill or release during handling or storage." "With increased cargo activity more haz-mat in airtransport and ground-transport to/from LAX is expected." "Increased haz-mat needs more haz-mat waste-disposal."

**Response:**

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR acknowledged the presence of existing contamination both on-site and in areas to be acquired for each of the proposed Master Plan alternatives within Section 4.23, Hazardous Materials (subsection 4.23.3), with supported technical data in Technical Report 13 and Technical Report S-8. As described within Master Plan Commitments (subsection 4.23.5), plans are in place to handle existing and previously undetected contaminated materials encountered during construction. The economic benefits 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 and Technical Report S-3.

#### PC01018-71

**Comment:**

ACCIDENT-DAMAGE POTENTIALS and TEMPORARY SERVICE-DISRUPTIONS. EL TORO DEIR ... 1. Provide a site for a County Sheriff facility. 2. Stick with Codes for bird elimination (as aircraft threats). 3. Make a Waste-Reduction Plan. 4. Respond to Specs for construction-protections and utility/service connections. 5. Design transit service into the Plan. 6. Prepare Fiscal Impact Report.

LAXMP DEIR/S ... "Altered ground-access during 5-15year construction could impede movement of emergency vehicles."

"Central utility plant poses risk of upset from potential sulfuric acid release" "Fuel-farm poses risk of upset from potential catastrophic fuel-release with and without subsequent ignition." Note: Report seems to ignore potential catastrophic result of fuel pipelines to/from farm locations -- particularly through or adjacent to sewage-treatment plant, and on west side of dune facing Santa Monica Bay, or even as currently existing routing directly through an El Segundo residential neighborhood [down Virginia Avenue]. The Daily Breeze reported in covering a terrorism-threat at Chevron-Refinery (11/2000) that 4.2-million gal/day flows to farm from refinery. However, DEIR/S records all of these concerns "Less than significant":

INCREASING PUBLIC-HEALTH/SAFETY RISKS through UPSET (i.e. jet-fuel spills). EL TORO DEIR ... County must make an effort to lease or use (by agreement) pipeline for conveying all jet fuel to OCX. [Q. Does "making an effort" guarantee a reduction of risk-potential?]

LAXMP DEIR/S ... Covered above in discussion of Health/Safety risks.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The risk of upset associated with the fuel farm under each of the Master Plan alternatives was discussed in Section 4.24.3, Safety, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, as discussed on page 4-963 in Section 4.23, Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIS/EIR, most of the jet fuel is delivered to LAX through underground pipelines from refineries located in the vicinity of LAX. These pipelines are subject to pipeline safety requirements contained within the Pipeline Safety Act as enforced by the California State Fire Marshall. These requirements include design specifications, as well as provisions for construction, operation and maintenance, and release reporting. Please see Response to Comment AL00040-156 regarding fuel pipelines associated with Alternative B. As was indicated in Section 4.24.3, Safety, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA has met all federal airport security requirements and will incorporate any future airport security requirements set forth by the federal government. Such existing and future safety requirements are intended to prevent future acts of terrorism at LAX facilities.

#### PC01018-72

**Comment:**

SPEEDING AG-LAND CONVERSION-RATE. EL TORO DEIR ... 1. Get the Sheriff-Coroner to agree to using 40-acres of their designated land for permanent ag-use. 2. Continue to lease non-developed lands for ag-use.

LAXMP DEIR/S ... Condition is generally not applicable until taken in context with loss of open space at Ballona Wetlands, Playa Vista, Hughes Office complex, etc. and all of the lands being gobbled for airport cargo operations. Much LAX landscape is suitable to urban-gardens development (which could mitigate the Environmental Injustices underway).

**Response:**

Comment noted. The project's contribution to cumulative impacts for each environmental discipline (e.g., noise, land use, surface transportation (traffic), air quality, etc.) were evaluated in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. A discussion of cumulative impacts associated with each Master Plan alternative was included in each section in Chapter 4 under the heading "Cumulative Impacts." It should be noted that, with the implementation of mitigation measures, the impact of the build alternatives on biotic communities would be less than significant.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01018-73

**Comment:**

COASTAL RESOURCES, FLOODPLAINS, WETLANDS, and NATURAL RESOURCES. EL TORO DEIR ... Discussions relate site to nearby open spaces and adjacent mountains. No particular conservation plan is offered.

LAXMP DEIR/S ... "Roads, runways, facilities and construction-activities would encroach on floodplain (notably on 13-acre FEMA-designated site. Wetland sites would be relocated as faux-wetlands habitat for endangered shrimp. "Sensitive bioresources are located within the Dunes in the coastal zone. Pershing Drive improvements (and thereby ringroad) are in the coastal zone. Vehicle access to the coast on arterials would be altered. Bike and pedestrian access to coast would be altered. fuel farm pipelines along Vista del Mar would limit all coastal access during construction." "Butterfly habitat may be affected by dust particles during construction." Adverse-impacts considered "Less than significant." No mitigations offered.

**Response:**

As indicated in Section 4.13, Floodplains, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the 13-acre parcel is no longer designated as a 100-year floodplain by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Therefore, the LAX Master Plan alternatives would not have any impact on floodplains. As discussed in Section 4.14, Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with implementation of mitigation measures that were described in Section 4.10, Biotic Communities, and Section 4.11, Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna, the Master Plan alternatives would not have a significant impact on coastal zone resources. These same mitigation measures would reduce impacts to biotic communities, endangered and threatened species of flora and fauna, and wetlands to a level less than significant.

#### PC01018-74

**Comment:**

EXTRAORDINARY JET-FUEL CONSUMPTION. EL TORO DEIR ... Just the way it is! No Mitigations offered.

LAXMP DEIR/S ... "Consumption of Jet-A fuel would increase." (All other energy-sources would experience similar increases -- from electricity and natural gas to LNG, CNG, propane, gasoline, and diesel fuel.) "Construction and revised configurations would require new electrical and natural-gas distribution infrastructure and relocation/renovation of airport energy facilities." There's no recognition of an Alternative which might locate any Terminal, taxiway, or runway expansion in a manner to minimize taxi-distance from landings or takeoffs to gates.

**Response:**

Aircraft-related energy consumption is dependent upon a number of factors. One factor is the distance between the runway and the gate. However, more important for fuel consumption is the taxi/idle time-in-mode. Idle or queue time is affected by several factors, including the number of aircraft scheduled to takeoff in a given hour, and whether arriving aircraft have to sit at the end of a taxiway after landing while other aircraft takeoff (or land) before proceeding to the gate. Under all of the build alternatives, a centerfield taxiway would be constructed between each pair of runways. These taxiways would allow aircraft to move towards the gates after landing (or towards the runways before takeoff) while other aircraft are landing and taking off. This would reduce an aircraft's taxi/idle time and, therefore, fuel consumption, even though distances to the runway from the gate may increase. All of the build alternatives would result in improved (i.e., reduced) taxi/idle times on a per aircraft basis, compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative.



#### PC01018-75

**Comment:**

Energy concerns are considered "Less than significant" despite the continued mystery of fuel-farm relocation. Alternative B places Fuel Farm on Scattergood site which demands plugging an onsite low-producing oil and natural gas well.

**Response:**

The Draft EIS/EIR addressed the fuel farm relocation and abandonment of the existing oil well within the El Segundo Oil Field in Section 4.17.2, Natural Resources (subsection 4.17.2.6.3, Alternative B -- Added Runway South). Under Alternative B, the fuel farm would be relocated to either the Scattergood site or an the oil refinery south of LAX.

As was indicated in the Draft EIS/EIR, due to the low volume of oil produced from the well, the associated plugging of the oil/gas well required by placement of the fuel farm at the Scattergood facility would not constitute a significant energy impact. Moreover, available drilling methods would allow access to the petroleum resources from alternate locations; therefore, permanent loss of access would not occur.

#### PC01018-76

**Comment:**

There's no mention of the possibility of wind or solar energy-farming on site despite the expanses of suitable open space and major-scale flat-roof buildings for locating facilities.

**Response:**

Please see Responses to Comments AL00033-190 and PC01018-24 regarding alternative energy.

#### PC01018-77

**Comment:**

REDUCING RECREATION-BENEFITS. EL TORO DEIR ... Develop new Open Space plan. Unavoidable noise over rec-facilities to continue.

LAXMP DEIR/S ... There's been discussion of turning some of the LAX-newly-acquired land into open-space park use (i.e. Manchester Square). That would add to the district's quality of life. On the other hand, there's a perceived threat to the use of land near the airport for the Westchester Golf Course. LAWA could easily demonstrate good-faith by making the west-facing slope of the dune adjacent to Dockweiler Beach accessible to the public as a major green parkland. The site is identified as Blue Butterfly habitat simply because LADOA called it that after buying out the former housing tract.

Leaving the fenced-off street-pave remnants of the site's past use merely reminds the public of the Airport-Board's lack of concern.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Regarding the suggestion to convert the Manchester Square area into a park, this was supported by former council woman Ruth Galanter. No action was taken by the Los Angeles City Council to implement this idea. Regarding the suggestion to convert the west-facing slope of the dune adjacent to Dockweiler State Beach accessible to the public as a green parkland, the Dunes are recognized as providing important habitat at the local and federal levels. The southern two-thirds of the Dunes is a protected as a Habitat Restoration Area for the endangered El Segundo blue butterfly, which would preclude use of this area as a park. Moreover, City Ordinance No. 169,767, approved in 1994, limits development within the 104-acre northern portion of the Dunes to a nature preserve and accessory uses. A 1998 recovery plan for the El Segundo Blue Butterfly prepared by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service includes the Los Angeles/El Segundo Dunes as one of four recovery units that contain restorable habitat for the federally-endangered El Segundo blue butterfly. The entire 307-acre Dunes is also designated as a County Significant Ecological Area.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01018-78

**Comment:**

DEPLETING COUNTY'S AVAILABLE-HOUSING-RESERVE. EL TORO DEIR ... Change forecasts for regional employment, population, and available-housing.

LAXMP DEIR/S ... Available low-cost low-income housing continues to shrink as LAWA acquires neighborhoods which allow landuse conversion from housing to industrial (cargo-handling) use. No mitigations are offered.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation. Please also see Response to Comment AL00033-120 regarding Master Plan Commitment RBR-1, Residential and Business Relocation Program (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), which is proposed as part of the Master Plan and would facilitate the timely relocation of displaced residents. As discussed therein, Master Plan commitments adopted as part of project approval will be incorporated into a comprehensive mitigation monitoring and reporting program, with provisions made to ensure that these measures are fully enforceable.

#### PC01018-79

**Comment:**

WATER USE, WASTE (solid), and WASTEWATER. EL TORO DEIR ... Systems developed for MarineBase use are considered adequate for start up period 5-15 years as commercial airport.

LAXMP DEIR/S ... "Potable and reclaimed water use within MP-boundaries would increase. Fire-flow pressure and its location would be altered. Proposed Alternatives require new water-distribution infrastructure as well as relocation/renovation of on-airport facilities. New subsurface structures for water may interfere with existing supply/distribution facilities." Adverse-impacts considered "Less than significant". No Mitigations needed. Plan relocations. Maximize use of reclaimed water.

Wastewater systems prompt similar comments. Again "Less than significant". "Develop a program" is not real mitigation. "Recycling program" is only mitigation offered for Solid Waste increases. Note: That deals with just a part of generated wastes.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AR00003-63 regarding mitigation measures and Master Plan comments included in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Regarding impacts associated with water use, as was indicated on page 4-728 in Section 4.25.1, Water Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternatives A, B, C, and D would not have any significant impacts relative to project-related water use. Master Plan Commitments W-1, Maximize Use of Reclaimed Water, and W-2, Enhance Existing Water Conservation Program, would reduce water use associated with these alternatives. In addition, Master Plan Commitment PU-1, Develop a Utility Relocation Program, would minimize potential conflicts with subsurface utilities during construction. As a result, none of the build alternatives would have significant impacts to water supply or water facilities during construction and no mitigation would be required.

Regarding impacts associated with solid waste generation, as was indicated on page 4-537 in Section 4.19, Solid Waste, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, although total solid waste generation within the Master Plan boundaries associated with Alternatives A, B, C, and D would be less than that under the environmental baseline, LAWA would implement Master Plan Commitments SW-1, Implement an Enhanced Recycling Program, SW-2, Requirements for the Use of Recycled Materials During Construction, and SW-3, Requirements for the Recycling of Construction and Demolition Waste, to reduce airport-related solid waste generation from these alternatives. As a result, Alternatives A, B, C, and D would not have any significant impacts relative to project-related solid waste generation, and no mitigation would be required. Mitigation Measure MM-SW-1, Provide Landfill Capacity to Accommodate Cumulative Solid Waste, is recommended to reduce cumulative solid waste impacts.

Regarding impacts associated with wastewater generation and treatment, as was indicated on page 4-733 in Section 4.25.2, Wastewater, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternatives A, B, C, and D would not have any significant impacts relative to project-related wastewater generation and treatment capacity. Therefore, no mitigation would be required. Master Plan Commitment PU-1 would minimize potential conflicts with subsurface utilities during construction. As a result, none of the build alternatives would have significant impacts to wastewater facilities during construction, and no mitigation would be required. Mitigation Measure MM-WW-1, Provide Additional Wastewater Treatment Capacity to Accommodate Cumulative Flows, is recommended to reduce cumulative wastewater impacts.

#### PC01018-80

**Comment:**

CUMULATIVE INCREASED-IMPACTS in TRANSPORTATION, NOISE, AIR-QUALITY, BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES, NATURAL RESOURCES and ENERGY, and SOCIOECONOMICS (in the housing situations). EL TORO DEIR ... comments that local noise-increases = regional-beneficial noise-reduction (through spreading out the impact). Air-quality suffering is unavoidable. Biological Resources will suffer from habitat-destroying urban-growth. Incremental loss of ag-lands and increased energy & water use is unavoidable. OCX will cause, not resolve, socioeconomic housing problems. Mitigation is merely an assurance of fair-share problem distribution. Redesign proposed roadways.

LAXMP DEIR/S ... Relies on a possible land-site-trade in addressing Bio-Resource Threats. Although experience has proven that creating new "natural" sites does not work, LAWA still proposes to make new sites for shrimp, butterflies, primroses, mature-trees, etc. It's surprising that no presumption of site-trade for blue-butterflies might allow extending north runways west rather than east. Comment: "Cumulative" seems to be a concept not-understood by airport planners or environment-assessors. In fact, mitigations and assessments should be using the 40-MAP year of 1984 as the baseline for all impact-measurements. Since that time, incremental expansion has continued to accumulate greater and greater adverse impacts. Until all of the negatives accrued since '84 are fully mitigated, LAX should be put into a holding-pattern with a moratorium on any further development.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR's and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR's use of the 1996 environmental baseline and use of the Adjusted Environmental Baseline for evaluation of the project's individual and cumulative impacts are consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15125 (Environmental Setting) and Section 15130 (Discussion of Cumulative Impacts). Use of the year 1984 would not be consistent with the requirements of CEQA. Under NEPA, the individual and cumulative impacts of each build alternative are measured against the No Action/No Project Alternative. As such, use of the year 1984 as the baseline for impact measurements also would not be consistent with the requirements of NEPA. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-1 regarding baseline issues. The potential impact to the El Segundo Blue Butterfly would be mitigated on-site and any relocation of Riverside Fairy Shrimp would be accompanied by a management and monitoring program. Please see Mitigation Measures MM-ET-1, MM-ET-2, MM-ET-3 and MM-ET-4 in Section 4.11, Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna, in this Final EIS/EIR.

#### PC01018-81

**Comment:**

LAW-ENFORCEMENT and FIRE-PROTECTION. EL TORO DEIR ... Devise a plan to shift military facilities and staffing as needed.

LAXMP DEIR/S ... "Demand for law-enforcement and fire-protection increase with expanded numbers." Changes in circulation and surface-traffic could hamper emergency access. Construction has potential to hamper and delay emergency response. Westchester-Southside development brings new demand-increases. Admittedly, traffic congestion has potential to degrade emergency response times at the airport and within the entire traffic analysis area. Relocating on-airport police facilities could temporarily compromise law-enforcement services." ... All that is again "Less than significant." Mitigation is merely a promise to come up with new adequate facilities and routinely evaluate them.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**Response:**

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed law enforcement and fire protection services in Section 4.26.1, Fire Protection, and Section 4.26.2, Law Enforcement, with supporting technical data provided in Technical Report 16, Public Services Technical Reports of the Draft EIS/EIR. Increases in demand for law enforcement services were addressed in part by Master Plan Commitment LE-1, which requires routine evaluation and provision of officers to keep pace with forecast increases in activity and development at LAX. Increases in demand for fire protection services would be addressed through ongoing evaluation pursuant to LAFD procedures and Federal Aviation Regulation requirements. Master Plan Commitments FP-1 and LE-2 addressed emergency access through compliance with design requirements of and coordination with airport law enforcement and fire protection agencies. Master Plan Commitments PS-1 and C-1 addressed potential impacts on law enforcement and fire protection services during demolition and construction activities including maintenance of required response times. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed law enforcement issues associated with the Westchester Southside project through Master Plan Commitment LU-1, which would ensure that key provisions for law enforcement contained in City of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 159,526 are incorporated into Westchester Southside. As was stated on page 4-1189 of the Draft EIS/EIR, these zoning conditions "include a requirement that the developer consult with law enforcement personnel regarding the provision of private security guards and security-enhancing design measures, including access and security lighting." Also note that a new 110,000-square foot police station is proposed to be located within the Westchester Southside development as part of the LAX Master Plan. As stated on page 4-752 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, "With implementation of Master Plan Commitments LE-1, LE-2, PS-1, PS-2, LU-1, C-1, and ST-9 through ST-22 along with mitigation measures identified in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, the impacts on law enforcement services from Alternatives A, B, C, and D would be less than significant." Please see Response to Comment PC01210-4 regarding emergency access and response times.

Concerning the enforceability of mitigation, mitigation measures are required to be implemented by law and pursuant to Public Resources Code 21081.6, which ensures mitigation measures are adopted, monitored, and reported on to ensure compliance during project implementation.

The City of Los Angeles and LAWA do not control the future development of the former MCAS El Toro Base. Decisions to develop an airport are the responsibility of local government. In the case of the former MCAS El Toro, Orange County as the Local Redevelopment Authority has discontinued pursuit of the base for reuse as a civilian airport. The Department of the Navy, as the property owner, has decided to dispose of the base for non-aviation reuses.

#### PC01018-82

**Comment:**

Orange County was ready to proceed with OCX development based upon the assumption that the ridiculous measures proposed would render most of the project's adverse impacts insignificant. Caltrans/FHWA (on the Arborvitae Interchange Proposal) made similarly-flabby mitigation-proposals and preposterous assumptions of impact-reduction before concluding traffic-problem-solving interchange warranted a "Negative (no-significant-impacts) Declaration." New analyses showed significant air pollution from El Toro to John Wayne attributable to aircraft emissions that cannot be mitigated. Similar efforts to expand terminal facilities at the San Diego Airport were rejected when studies showed that impacts could be cut (by significant percentages) by relocating proposed new terminal-facilities closer to existing freeway access. We hope decision-makers dealing with LAWA's LAX Master Plan DEIR/S will be more diligent with their responsibilities for future generations. It took a court order to revise the '96 El Toro EIR to stop the earlier momentum.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

#### PC01018-83

**Comment:**

It's time to hire a new consultant -- one with the express objective of determining how to statistically define "significant" for every place that the term is used, one whose express-purpose is to produce an

"Alternative" with problem-solutions which will render the "unavoidable" avoidable, and one whose judgment will match that of the policies of both SeaTac and SFO "Any and all airport-related construction is only justifiable if it produces net environmental gains for the region". Alternative designs offered to-date merely reinforce the clear determination that the LAX site is too small for the activities now scheduled (including buffering noise and emissions), and any expansion simply makes matters worse. For god's sake, and for the sake of the health and safety of all within the LAX-influence zone, accept the fact that there is a "limit" beyond which things get worse. Most mitigations offered do not reduce significant to insignificant. Most adverse-impacts are not unavoidable if one accepts that expansion is avoidable!!

**Response:**

Comment noted. The overall basis for how thresholds of significance are applied in the EIS/EIR analysis was explained at the beginning of Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures, of the Draft EIS/EIR, and additional discussion was provided at the beginning of Chapter 4 in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. More detailed explanations of the nature of, and basis for, determining the significance thresholds used specifically in the impacts analysis were presented throughout Chapter 4 for each environmental discipline. As described in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Draft EIS/EIR, dozens of alternative concepts for the proposed Master Plan were considered in the process of selecting four alternatives to analyze in the Draft EIS/EIR. The formulation, refinement, and evaluation of these alternatives included substantial public input. The formulation, refinement, and evaluation of potential alternatives for the Master Plan continued on even after the publication and review of the Draft EIS/EIR, with the introduction of Alternative D. This new alternative was also based on public input, and the environmental impacts associated with it were addressed in a comprehensive environmental analysis - the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

The processes used in the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for the identification and evaluation of alternatives and the recommendation of feasible mitigation measures were consistent with the requirements of CEQA and with FAA Order 5050.4A, Airport Environmental Handbook. It should also be noted that, although environmental consultants have provided assistance and technical expertise in the preparation of the subject documents, LAWA and the FAA are responsible for the contents of the documents.

**PC01018-84**

**Comment:**

Although, since the introduction of the Proposed LAX-Expansion Plan-Concepts in 1997, LAWA-representatives have been in attendance annually at the National and International Airport Noise Symposia (and since yr-2000 the related Airport Air Quality Programs) of the UC-Berkeley Institute of Transportation Studies Technology Transfer Program, there seems to be little LAWA-reception of the technology transferred. ISSUES, FACTS and QUOTES Pertinent to LAX-EXPANSION Proposals came from each of the Programs. Few ideas have been incorporated into either the Plan Alternatives or the DEIR/S. Applying any number of ideas from the Symposia would have indicated a more-sincere effort on LAWA's part to mitigate negative impacts and might have pacified ESRA/ESSC in their concerns.

**Response:**

Please see Responses to Comments PC01018-85 through PC01018-110 below.

**PC01018-85**

**Comment:**

From the Airport-Noise Symposia San Diego. Revelations by the "Experts": "Aircraft noise is a significant 'annoyance' across America. Noticed in the '60's, Congress ('69) made FAA 'noise-responsible'." However, even today, the FAA says it's a "local-responsibility". FAA trust-funds are set up for noise-mitigations. FAA offers a useful graphic of Noise Contour Diagrams and Contour Areas for Representative Aircraft at 100 LTO's (showing B727Q7 [Stage-2], 727EM1 [Stage 2 Hushkit], MD82 [Stage 3], 727QF [re-engined Stage 2], MD9028 [Stage 3], and 757PW [Stage 3] -- with noise footprint-reduction in the order of planes listed. McCain's '97 Act making new rules effective spring 2000, to reduce noise over national parks (doesn't affect urban areas). It makes rules for making rules. W.A. Withycombe (FAA)

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

Accept a 55dB contour (rather than 65dB) as the "threshold of significant damage/annoyance." Noise growth far-outstrips gains made by switching to new Stage 3 aircraft (due to huge increases in airport operations during the same periods as switchovers). Half of residential El Segundo lies within 65dB range. 100% of residential community is within 60dB range. Noise-impacts are horribly understated! Despite LAX being Stage-3 compliant, impacted acreages have increased proportional to increases in LAX-operations. John Gaines, El Segundo City Council. (Comment: A more-long-range solution would direct toward Palmdale-development where LAWA already owns 17,500 undeveloped acres that would allow greater-buffer-zones. A Palmdale-focus would lead [not follow] urban development.)

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-2.3 regarding evaluation of impacts should extend beyond the 65 CNEL contour to all sensitive areas under flight tracks and Subtopical Response TR-N-2.2 regarding the use of the 65 CNEL to determine significant impacts. Those areas located in El Segundo that exceed 65 dB are eligible for sound insulation. Sound insulation programs are administered by the surrounding communities. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale and Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program. 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.

**PC01018-86**

**Comment:**

SFO requires Chief-Pilot of UAL (biggest SFO-carrier) to attend monthly noise-roundtable meetings. SFO conducts quarterly Stakeholder's Meetings with all interested environmental groups and locally in-range communities. SFO - Policy is that "Any and all airport-related construction is only justifiable if it produces net-environmental gains for the region." John Martin (SFO Director). SeaTac tried directing TO&L on a cross-pattern using crossing-runways - Scattering noise equitably didn't work. Merely increased complainers. Complaint-total relates to operation-numbers. Locals upset by FAA experiment changing flight-tracks. Seatac finds "complainers wear down in about 4-years (and stop complaining)".

Frustrated? Noise-tolerant? John Musgrave, Seatac Mngr. Palm Springs locals (ROARE) stopped expansion '87, and are now heard in all management activities. Residents Opposed to Airport Rezoning and Expansion demanded a Part-150 Study (with proof that a noise-wall berm would/wouldn't have significant-effect). Study-completed (indicated walls work), ROARE challenged runway-extension, undertook a lawsuit and voter initiative (Measure M). Airport filed motion-to-dismiss (w/court-support from Burbank Airport involved in similar battle). Court demanded "reasonable effort toward conflict-resolution". Re noise-berms .. "homes in sound-shadow cut utility-costs, dust-intrusions, and noise-disruptions and volumes." Some berms on-airport, others at edge of affected neighborhoods, and selected homesites. One airport in Florida has on-field berms 45'-high planted with 35' trees. Jerri Riddle, Aviation-Dir., DOT Palm Spgs Reg-Airport.

Amsterdam's Schipol (320,000 ops '96) measures noise differently (Kosten-units -- equivalent to A-weighted sound-levels plus "B" noise-load-unit correlating sound to perceived-disturbance. Disturbance-perceived is a percentage of total impact zone that claims given noise-level is "severely-annoying". Air traffic shows 6% annual-growth. Although noise zone is "fixed", it may be modified on significant demand by periodic noise-load phone-checks to affected residents (re single-events). (3500-calls = annual check.) Phone-checking has proved computer-generated impact zone invalid. Roland Wijnen, Delft Univ. of Technology. Tempe residents sued Phoenix Sky Harbor, FAA, and EPA in '94. Settled out of court.

Residents gained full access to all airport-data and ability to demand/receive any reasonable additional info they want. Settlement resulted in monthly reports on local WEB site, and defined-limit on runway acceptable-noise corridors 2-5-8000' wide, no flights outside corridors, and FAA commitment to community/fed./industry coop. All communities in flight-path now have defined corridor with capacity-limits set for each corridor. GPS keeps planes on paths and assures accessible data (re every flight). Ash Campbell, Planner, Tempe, AZ.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The LAX Community Noise Roundtable was created in September 2000 and is intended to reduce and mitigate the adverse noise impacts that the users of LAX create on the surrounding communities and their environs. Membership of the Roundtable consists of local elected officials and staff, representatives of congressional offices, members of recognized community groups, the FAA, the ATA and LAWA Management. This forum provides a mechanism that attempts to insure cooperation between the Airport and local impacted communities in achieving noise impact reduction to those communities wherever possible. The Roundtable meets the second Wednesday of every odd numbered month. 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, 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 has recently installed a PASSUR system to assist the community in tracking aircraft operations. By going to the LAWA website [www.lawa.org](http://www.lawa.org) and entering the Noise Management section, community members can specifically identify LAX operations that cross their community. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program. Alternative D initiated as a result of comments from the Draft EIS/EIR and the events of September 11, 2001, calls for a regional approach and accommodates a constrained 78.9 million annual passengers. Please see Topical Response TR-N-1 regarding the noise modeling approach, Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences, Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase. Please see Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-4.2 regarding berms, barriers, urban forest, and walls proposed to interrupt ground noise.,

**PC01018-87**

**Comment:**

On FAA and LAX, "Plan reflects input from partnership (between/among the public, airports, and industry), coming up with \$24 billion value in development items." Problems of expansion are problems of serving public and industry needs, not problems of an individual airport. LAX anticipates 33% increase in operations '97-2001. Peter Melia, FAA, Airport-Planning, W-Pacific Region.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01018-88**

**Comment:**

"Temperament adjustments" relate to noise-impacts on humans. 15-yrs of research shows "airport noise impacts children profoundly". 11-studies (since groundbreaking LAX/Inglewood study found negative impacts on learning-abilities) reinforce findings. "Students on noisy side of a school-building (disrupted every 4.5 minutes by avg-89dba overhead jet) lost 11% of teaching/learning time due to auditory-disruptions (compared to quiet-side avg-59dba ambient of same building). (Findings similar for nearby freeways and truck routes.) JFK-study of 65dba-zones in-or-out found little impact-differences relating to sound-perceptions (music, rock, rap, etc.), but major positive-correlation of disruptions to speech-perceptions (heard "goat" instead of "boat", etc.). Studies show noise-impacts slight regarding easy-learning-tasks, but major for tougher-tasks. Noise disruptions diminish ability to think clearly (by breaking continuity) and produce lifelong disabilities. Aircraft-noise interruptions instill "learned helplessness" in children. 20-minutes of disruptions (up-to 100dBA) in a day leads to a lifetime "frustrated give-up" response to problems. In those conditions, kids quit trying after 4-minutes on a task, respond similarly 10-years later. Gary Evans, PhD, Cornell University (formerly of UC-I).

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to 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.

**PC01018-89**

**Comment:**

"Stage-3 doesn't resolve noise problems. It defers the growth of complaints." Each airport must study its operations. Each operation affects noise-contours differently. Six daily ops (Stage-1 Concorde) at JFK account for 20% of the size of 65dB contour. MD90 and B-757 are quietest. Some planes are quieter on landing, some on takeoff. Airport dBA contours depend more on fleet-mix than on ops-number. Some planes already are operable at 7-8 dB below Stage 3. (FAA Noise-Goals: Reduce number of impacted persons, Minimize footprint of Non-compatible landuse, and Focus on modifying noise-impacts within 65-dB zone.) Can local flight tracks be changed by impacted residents? Yes, use a Part-150 study, get a Task Force assigned, or enter into a law suit. FAA will not respond in any way to complaints by an individual. William Albee, FAA Mngr Environment/Energy.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01018-90**

**Comment:**

Across the U.S. nighttime-ops are up slightly for passenger flights, more in cargo-only, and up phenomenally in air-freight-mail. No change in federal policies since '93. Many more complaints from folks outside demarked 65-db zones. U.S. Airlines committed to \$4.8 billion for hushkitting. Little real progress made in reducing noise. U.S. and Europe dividing on noise issues. Europe rejects hushkitted planes. U.S. anxious about losing \$ in huskit industry. Peter Stumpp, VP SH&E, Cambridge MA. FEDEX solutions (hushkits) aren't acceptable to Boeing test-engineers. They demand and get more fuel to counteract loss of power by hushkitting engines. Raisbeck solutions optimize hi-lift devices assuring external tailpipe mix, reduce drag to safely-short of stall-speed, and maximize performance while near airport. Different airlines retire planes at different exhaustion-levels (Delta at 55,000 air hours) Shannon 707 Stage-R Kit will reduce thrust and fuel-consumption without changing emissions. Use of most other kits affect emissions. James D. Raisbeck, CEO, Raisbeck Commercial Air Group, Inc.

**Response:**

The commentor quotes several authorities on the application and use of hushkitting (i.e., engine sound reduction retrofit system), but does not relate the quotations to a comment on the proposed Master Plan projects. Therefore, this is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC01018-91**

**Comment:**

European airports set fixed-limits -- London Heathrow 70-MAP, CDG Paris 60-MAP, Frankfurt 50-MAP. Paris has Orly with full nighttime curfew, 250-daily-ops and/or 295,000 annual ops limit. 5-runways plan, 80-MAP proposed '93. Opposition to 80-MAP '94 brought "divert further increases to other (additional) airports". '95 Study-Commission determined need at one-new-airport. '96 public-hearings allowed debate. Required gov't to answer questions in writing with Independent Authority validating all answers. "Economic Development Charter" set growth-and-profit-parameters. Profitability percentage-increase set with tax-mechanisms to absorb overages. In '97, CDG limited runways to 4, set noise quantities by-event and limit average, and limit size to 55-MAP. Set noise-monitor network to guarantee limits. Independent Authority to validate answers and provide negotiating-table is critical to airport planning. CDG-System provides info-available noise-level indicator at key spots to allow anyone to



calculate noise at their home-position. 12% of CDG-fleet yields 37% of noise. Fix airline-penalty system (\$2-10,000 per offense). Yr-'99 CDG 145 penalties produced \$1-million community-payback. Jean-Luc Drapier, French CAA, Paris.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Chapter 3, Alternatives (Including Proposed Action), of the Supplement to Draft EIS/EIR which addressed Alternative D, the Enhanced Safety and Security Plan. Alternative D, initiated as a result of comments from the Draft EIS/EIR and the events of September 11, 2001, calls for a regional approach and is forecasted to accommodate a constrained 78.9 million annual passengers. LAWA has recently installed a PASSUR system to assist the community in tracking aircraft operations. By going to the LAWA website [www.lawa.org](http://www.lawa.org) and entering the Noise Management section, community members can specifically identify LAX operations that cross their community. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

**PC01018-92**

**Comment:**

ANDS (a software-program for awareness of noise-impacts) would allow an audience (from 1 to 100) via accurate-simulation to hear, see, measure, map, and devise mitigation-options for single and accrued noise events related to aircraft takeoffs and landings. The Computer-software (auditorium suited) demonstrated (accurately for 1st-4-rows of listeners) exact full-sound heard by an observer at any specific off-airport location when planes are taking-off and landing. Generically, we heard aircraft-noise at 65, 70, 75, 90, and 95 decibels. He reminded "at 1000' distance (1.5 average-city-blocks) from flightpath, a jet taking off or landing (at 500' elevation) would register about 97 dBA as it passed nearest the listening station". Noise took about 20-seconds to build to maximum (as jet approached) and another 20 to dissipate (after passing). Lecture continued at normal tone through demonstration to illustrate 65 point where conversation became unintelligible (65dB); at 70dB, in 4th row, we could hardly distinguish talking; at 75dB, his comments were drowned-out; at 90, noise was deafening; and at 100, actually painful. With GIS-maps showing area around airport, using computer, hypothetical listener was relocated allowing audio-check of noise at any chosen spot. Hypothetical sound-walls between jet and ground-stations demonstrated potential effectiveness of berms (while noting that once the plane was airborne berm utility disappeared. System then took a 1-second SEL-compression out of the single event, averaged out whole-event into LdN measurement, and identified noise in daytime/nighttime equivalents. For each event (within a normal 65-dBA CNEL contour), voice (or conversation) is wiped out for a full 3.4 seconds. System can sum up sound-energy of each event (SEL) and a 10-dB penalty could be added to noise coming in the night (to achieve a better-than-now measurement/reporting (and penalizing) system. System showed how windflow, temperature, moisture-level and emitter-altitude of the moment could be inserted into computer-program to give more-accurate impact levels of singular events. (Variables each may account for a dB variation up-to 4 decibels.) Edwards AirBase has Dubbink ANDS in place (used by neighbor-realtors to demonstrate actual-noise-impact at potential sale sites. Noise Management Institute (SLO) aiming for a \$695 sales price for software after refinement. Dykeman, retired FAA, CPSLO Planner, available to demonstrate system. Dykeman referred to demo-system as "Farewell Fair-Winds and Falling-Seas". David Dubbink, Director, Noise Management Institute, SLO. Designer of ANDS, and partner Paul Dykeman, Deputy-Director FAA Environment & Energy.

**Response:**

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

**PC01018-93**

**Comment:**

technically described often-inaccurate INM system of measurement as model for noise-measurement. They stated "computer-modelled noise is consistently lower than what might be accurately measured on-site". Further, they stressed that wind and temperature have major effects on perceived noise, so noise-perceptions on or near the ground are strongly distorted. Public is heavily influenced by planes that are either exceptionally high (on TOAL) or exceptionally loud. They stressed importance of thrust-management in control of noise. Takeoff-noise varies greatly in proportion to the plane load-factor. It doesn't match noise-figures measured on the ground. INM uses average 59-degrees temp. for sea-

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

level calculations. A range from 30 to 90 degrees has little impact on noise at ground level, but in the air temperature affects volume significantly. INM Model needs C-weighting to account for vibration. Atmospheric absorption, empirical spreading, lateral attenuation, and terrain are not accounted for in standard INM's. Directional noise is distorted by force (and vacuum power) of jet blast. INM assumes grass-covered ground (discounting effects of houses, bumps, pavements, and trees). Model is most inaccurate (with nearly a 14-dB attenuation-loss) as its estimates approach the horizon. It's designed for noise over soft-ground, and simply doesn't work over water (atmospheric absorption is ignored). When temperature drops and humidity remains the same, noise gets louder. Nicholas Miller, President HMMH Inc., and Jeff Olmstead, INM Program Manager, ATAC Corp. Note: Noise contours produced using INM-modelling are not to be trusted. A 65-CNEL line will probably be at different location on any two measurement days. What we presently use is not an average but a calculation modelled on an average day. Therefore it is wrong probably 364 day of every year.

**Response:**

Many of the statements in this comment are incorrect or misleading. For example, the INM does in fact account for atmospheric absorption, empirical spreading, lateral attenuation, and terrain (elevation). Information about these functional algorithms and capabilities can be found in the INM User's Guide and Technical Manual. Moreover, while the INM does use standard or default values for aircraft profiles (e.g., aircraft-specific thrust settings at typical flight stages) and for atmospheric conditions (e.g., standard-day temperature of 59 degrees Fahrenheit), the model is very flexible and allows these and other standard settings to be modified to better reflect local operations and conditions. Please see Responses to Comments AL00033-70 and AL00051-75 regarding the noise modeling approach.

**PC01018-94**

**Comment:**

Goals on creating Noise-Reports should be "Evaluate, Educate, Communicate, Document-DNL, and Recreate a Complainant's-Flight". Noise-Office workers are "bean-counters". Applying several variables, Office creates a record of actual flight-information (which in turn could be used to produce a daily set of noise CNEL contours, rather than accept a single average for the year). Because contours vary with weather and climate conditions, flightpaths shift slightly from one season to the next (avoiding home-cluster overflights). Flightpaths have been adjusted to minimize complaint numbers. Sacramento has successfully shifted 90% of their cargo-only flights to a secondary airport. John Long, Airport Noise Officer, Sacramento International.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC01018-95 regarding noise complaints. Please see Topical Response TR-N-1 regarding the noise modeling approach, Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences, and Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement.

**PC01018-95**

**Comment:**

On Permanent Noise Monitors, complainant should ask airport to respond (in writing) with who (which airline) did it, and request current record for that airline. Airport should produce a slope profile for each plane-type in fleet and a record of monthly fleet-mix. Fleet-mix is the major seasonal CNEL-Contour modifier. Lynae Jacobson, Community-Program Manager, SeaTac.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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, 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 has recently installed a PASSUR system to assist the community in tracking aircraft operations. By going to the

LAWA website [www.lawa.org](http://www.lawa.org) and entering the Noise Management section, community members can specifically identify LAX operations that cross their community. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

#### PC01018-96

**Comment:**

On O'hare. Run-up noise has been attenuated 20 dB for single events through construction of Ground Run-Up Enclosures. Using PFC funds, \$3.2 million was spent to cover all construction but the final ground surfacing. 70-80% of planes leaving O'hare use GRE. They were sited carefully (with good access and no interference with radar). Three types were considered: Pens (3-sided like at Heathrow), Shells (2-sided with roofs and rear-blast deflectors), and fully enclosed Hush Houses. Airport Noise Information Office, Port of San Diego, by HMMH. Ted Woosley, Landrum & Brown, Cincinnati.

**Response:**

Comment noted. For more information on ground run-ups please see Section 3.1, Future Aircraft Operating Conditions, of 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. Please see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement.

#### PC01018-97

**Comment:**

Air quality standards for aircraft are still not adopted by the state of California. Ships, locomotives, and aircraft are exempt from meeting AQMD standards. California (ARB) (pre-Davis) is lobbying federal government to reduce/relax AQ conformity process. Paul Brown, Environmental Quality Specialist, Port of San Diego, Lindberg Field.

**Response:**

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

#### PC01018-98

**Comment:**

"At JFK (86-MAP, 2.8-mil. tons cargo, and 1.2-mil. annual ops) noise abatement costs total is the equivalent of the funds needed to construct a 4th major regional airport." LaGuardia has a restricted capacity, yet has more delays than any other major airport. "Expanded East Coast Plan" (a juggle-the-flightpath plan) by FAA in '87 was disastrous. Proposed (and tried) solutions multiplied (noise) complaints exponentially. '88-study confirmed that complaints were justified. All this despite pre-adoption EIS at \$6 million. New York area cut 2-million impacted residents (1972) to 50,000 residences by shifting noise standards to require quieter planes. Richard Halik, Airport Engineer, Port Authority NY & NJ. "Communities should be involved in all flightpath rerouting efforts." One Geospec-study indicated "by adding a seven-minute flying-time per plane (O'hare or Newark), flying over all clustered habitation could be avoided." Glen Bales, President Geospec, Inc.

**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-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

PC01018-99

**Comment:**

NOISE POLITICS. Human noise is political from its inception - because it lends itself so well to political conflict. It's both an objective and subjective phenomenon - dealing with facts as well as emotions. The fact that the mature human ear can endure about two continuous hours of a power drill but just thirty-minutes of a typical video arcade before sustaining permanent hearing loss, and the related fact that eighty-year-old Sudanese villagers hear better than thirty-year-old Americans, are just that: facts. On the other hand, why airports affect neighbors in different ways, leaving some depressed or hypertensive and others relatively unfazed, is as variable and invisible as sound itself. Noise (usually defined as "unwanted sound" - like assault is "unwanted attention") hates nature and nurture alike. Some bird species fail to learn mating songs (and therefore fail to reproduce) in noisy environments. Noise research in 1975 (Bronzaft) found in reading-ability, that children on the El-train-side of a NewYork Public School lagged a year behind students on the other-side of the school. Even relatively low levels of noise interfere with conversation (at 55-60 decibels). The price of "making ourselves heard" is a loss of nuance, inflection, vocal stamina -- in every sense, a loss of voice. Noise has been linked to heart disease, high blood-pressure, low birthweight, gastrointestinal disorders, headaches, fatigue, insomnia - - in short, to nearly every known by-product of stress. Noise deafens us aurally, and, there's strong evidence to suggest, morally as well. People subjected to high noise-levels are less likely to assist strangers in difficulty, less-likely to recommend raises for workers in their management-chain, and more likely to administer electric shocks to other humans.

Noise speaks danger; it both threatens and invites aggression. It triggers a physiological chemistry of the "fight-or-flight" response. An audio-terrorist turns into decibels the dynamics of every relationship based on unrequited power: My noise can penetrate your quiet, but your quiet can never penetrate my noise. "My noise is my right" means "Your ear is my funneling-hole." Now in all this, the kid with the boom box is one thing; the Federal Aviation Administration, which virtually regulates itself, is quite another. Quiet is such a treasure. Have you ever remarked in the forest "It's so quiet here"? "So peaceful." ..And so vulnerable! Quiet, after all, is the most assailable form of wealth. The same thief can forever be stealing it. It can grow back in a brief respite, only to be devoured by the screaming eagles once again in the next moment. People move to escape noise, and by moving they find it. Many now expressing concern over the LAX din, are individuals who had moved from a noisy place to a quieter, only to have that quieter place grow loud. (Jets over Inglewood ring out a cool 95-Db every eight or nine minutes during part of each normal day.) Such noise is an attack on our quality of life. Offending noise has always been there, but it used to be tolerable. It grew from that -- simply by the numbers. The thought of a neighbor airport going from 250,000 passengers when jets began service (1959) to 68-million last year while maintaining that that airport is trying to be a "good neighbor" is ludicrous. It's something like King Kong being a good lover to Fay Wray. It may be sincere, even noble, but if you're the one in the big hairy paw, it's obscene. Soundscape provides diversity and instructive analogy as well. Smaller sounds can coexist with other smaller sounds, but even lots of smaller sounds can't coexist with one big noise. Those who dismiss the noise issue as "aesthetic" are, of course, ignoring the well-documented medical and psychological effects of noise. They also forget that, in relationships, aesthetics become ethics - and louder and more frequent noise is simply unethical. In 1989, LAX allowed 637,117 takeoffs and landings. In 2000, the figure grew to 783,433 (7% less than the DEIR/S projection). The forecast for 2015 is 1,066,165 ops. If a consistent 7%-differential were applied, 2015 would see a demand for 991,533 ops, or 86-MAP.

I used to wonder why some men I talked to spoke so loud, 'til I realized they'd been deafened by millwork, chainsaws, or tractors. I imagine to many of these men, someone with an indoor job or a university education being sensitive to noise amounts to something like a personal insult, like holding your nose at the smell of a laborer's sweat. But, from the other side, some displays of noise are intended as personal-insults - like the kid with his car shaking with boom, boom, boom. Coincidentally, a poorer life is frequently a noisier one. Those with low incomes are more likely to work next to the mill or motorway, and live next to the airport. Strangely, controversies between communities and a noisy airport may pit neighbor against worker (at least to the worker who sees the neighbor as someone with a good job who doesn't mind threatening someone-else's job). Power, often grows out of the barrel of a gun. But, it also grows out of an exhaust pipe or anything else that makes a good loud bang. Class-warfare can come down to sensibilities: Mess with me and I'll park my big ugly truck across from your living-room window. Upset me further, and I'll teach it to sing. Noise pollution may very well be the

secondhand-smoke issue of this century. And then, there's the issue of airport-related emissions. Garret Keizer. Harper's Magazine.

**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. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed impacts to hearing in Section 4.24.2, Health Effects of Noise, with supporting technical data provided in Technical Report 14b. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed effects of single event aircraft noise relative to nighttime awakening in homes and speech interference in schools in Section 4.1, Noise, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts to sensitive species in Section 4.10, Biotic Communities, and Section 4.11, Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna.

**PC01018-100**

**Comment:**

At the Airport Air-Quality Symposia (2000 & '01) the "experts" revealed:

Degraded air-quality around airports is a product of aircraft, ground service, and surface-transport-vehicle emissions. (David Rompf, U.C.I.T.S.T.T.P. Mngr.) "In relation and proportion to efforts made to reduce noise-pollution in 22-years, ozone-related emissions have been increasing. ...Clean-Air-Act-Standards are not being achieved. ... NOx levels are expected to rise 40% by 2020". (M. Vigilante, Pres., Synergy Consultants, Inc., Seattle.) EPA's "Evaluation of Air Pollutant Emissions" stated airport air-quality issues have three-fronts: 1. Aircraft engines and auxiliary-power-units [APU], 2. Ground service equipment (GSE), and 3. ground-access vehicles (GAV). "15,000 tons of air-toxics (EPA) were traced to aircraft in 1996. Of all pollution-source categories (EPA), the aviation-sector is only mobile source expected to expand in coming years (notably NOx, hydrocarbons, and hydrogen contaminants). Of Los Angeles' regional mobile-source emissions, Commercial Jet Aircraft will go from 1% of regional NOx (1990) to over 3% in 2010." (Sabrina Johnson, Policy Analyst, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, D.C.) '99 EPA Report (EPA 420-R-99-013) says "Increasing aircraft NOx emissions at airports may become regional NOx emission concern. Los Angeles data shows an increase in aircraft-related NOx from '90 to 2010 going from .9% of total regional NOx to 2.4% of total regional NOx." Larger aircraft increase LTO NOx/Passenger (adds fuel weight for longer-range or ferrying fuel or eliminating refuel-delays)(more LTOs needed in Hub/Spoke System). One-Engine Taxi and Towing gives significant NOx-Reduction for larger aircraft. Exhaust Collection-System on takeoff shows NOx-reduction but is not practical. Engine retrofits reduce NOx for older engines but benefit less on newer engines. Assessments show Direct-Operating-Costs add \$.02-.09/passenger (300-50 pax-planes) for emission-reductions. (J. E. Rohde, Emissions Reduction Proj.Mngr, NASA Glenn Research Center. SDO.)

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-7 regarding NOx emissions.

**PC01018-101**

**Comment:**

Major emission products from evaporation of jet fuel or emitted from jet engines are

- Inorganic gases [carbon monoxide (CO), carbon dioxide (CO2) + nitrogen oxides (NO, NO2, NOX)]
- Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) [hydrocarbon compounds alkanes, cycloalkanes, alkenes and aromatic hydrocarbons, and compounds like pentane, butane, acetylene, naphthalene, 1 - 3-butadiene, benzene, toluene, and xylene];
- Oxygenated organics including such carbonyl compounds as aldehydes which include compounds such as formaldehyde and acetaldehyde; and
- Aromatic hydrocarbons, including polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) benzo(a)pyrene, chrysene, benzo(a)anthracene, and fluoranthene.
- Above products all contribute to formation of ozone downwind from airports.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**Response:**

Comments noted. However, the compounds are generated by many other sources other than airports. Therefore, the contribution of airport-related emissions to ozone formation must be viewed in this context. As such, airports are generally a very small (i.e., less than 3 percent) factor in ozone formation.

**PC01018-102**

**Comment:**

"LAX's alternative-fuel ground-fleet (more than 250-vehicles) constitutes just 35% of the total fleet. Goal is 50% on alternative-fuels by 2003." Note: By airport-planner standard of 1.4 vehicles required to service each passenger, and LAX's 62MAP, the offered-figures suggest LAX's fleet has only 714 vehicles although LAX generates traffic involving 86,800,000 vehicle-trips in a year. Their incentive program in support of alternative fuels, allowing 365 days use of 714 vehicles [260,610] indicates it affects 3/10 of 1% of LAX-accountable vehicles. They have a right to be modest.) "More than 75,000-passenger vehicles enter LAX's Central Terminal Area daily. The Central-Terminal-Area offers 11 public-use electric-vehicle charging-stations (with 20-more planned for 2001)." LAWA got "99 Clean Air Awards" from SCAQMD and USDOE. (Note: Analyzing figures makes a farce of recognizing real environmental progress.) "In '98, 41% LAWA employees shared rides (saving 3.1 million commuter-miles and 205,000 gallons of gas). Using a 9/80 work-schedule, LAWA reduces employee trips by 1-day every 2-weeks and vehicle-emissions by 3-tons per year." (Note: One gallon of gasoline produces 4.2 lbs. emissions. EPA '85. In '93, SCAQMD claimed LAX was responsible for 31 of 751 tons/day of hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxides poured into the LA air-basin. LAWA reported '97 LAX aircraft + traffic emissions totalled 524 tons/day.) "Traffic-management techniques cut authorized vans from 600 to 470 (in '99). LAWA will require phase-in of alternative-fuel vehicles within 42-months. With commercial-vehicle i-d, LAX charges shuttles for each circuit of Central Terminal Area. By increasing fees, LAWA discourages repeated-cruising partially full. LAX's big-success in emissions-reduction is 'Flyaway'. 758,000 passengers '99 boarded at Van Nuys and bussed to LAX." (Note: "Bussing to Palmdale would have added 20-miles per trip but would've significantly reduced demand on both LAX and the I-405 congestion-zones. LAWA avoids 'Flyaway' encouragement that could be accomplished by luggage-checkin at satellite terminals. Marin-County, Switzerland and Sweden programs work fine up to 35-miles out [sometimes requiring nite-before baggage collection]. Penalties for pounds or tons of emissions attributable to airlines, taxi-fleets, shuttles, or private-cars was also suggested.") (Judy Christian, Transportation Manager [landside], LAWA.)

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01018-103**

**Comment:**

.."Modeling to evaluate Impacts at LAX is part of Master Planning Expansion + Modernization of LAX. From '94 to '96, 30 plans evolved, were modeled and tested, and led to 4 Concepts late '96. Restated results show LAX will grow just 64% by 2020, while OC grows 379%, Burbank 196%, Ontario 243%, and Palmdale ups 500%. "By State Implementation Plans, LAX's Emissions Budget, '94 Ozone-SIP calls for 80% reduced VOC and CO emissions by 2010 and 50% reduction in NOx emissions by 2010. '97 AQMP demands 38% reduction in VOC commercial jet emissions by 2010, 26% reduced Nox by 2010, and 15% reduced CO by 2010. (J.R. Pehrson, Snr A-Q Engnr, Camp Dresser & McKee, Irvine. SDO.)

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01018-104****Comment:**

Air Quality Management at California Airports is a responsibility of CARB. CARB finds a strong correlation between PM-levels and children's health (particularly with regard to respiratory problems). 5% of the formaldehyde in the air in the state is aircraft-related (with indications of a strong tie to high cancer-rates). Besides aircraft, airports concentrate diesel (truck) activities, and diesel toxics are an easily-understood villain. CARB says "LAX has over three-times the emissions of a large refinery. Airport air-pollution is a growing part of our air-quality problems." (Gary Honcoop [and Kim Rogalski], California Air Resources Board) SCAQMD Air Quality Studies around LAX summarized & revised 10/99, released through El Segundo City Manager's Office 3/31/00, conclude: LAX fallout-samples show more PM10 oil-soot particles than elsewhere in the air-basin (suggesting aircraft aloft may be the source). Key toxic compounds detected were Benzene, Butadiene, and diesel particulates (all associated with mobile sources). Higher elemental carbon was detected (Aviation Blvd) at the east edge of the airport. Sampling was done in May (the most seasonally-favored month for low PM10 levels in the Basin). However, PM10 levels still were higher (in 24-hr measuring periods) than in nearby Hawthorne (the closest comparative-monitor site). Most days, they exceeded Basin-average (but stayed below federal 24-hr standards). Ethylene (an ozone-promoting compound) levels were roughly five times higher than Basin-average. Propane and Isopentane levels were about two times greater than the Basin-average, and Benzene and Toluene concentrations were approximately double the Basin-average for May. All noted-compounds are related to gasoline combustion and evaporation ("Chemicals known to the State to cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm are found in gasoline, crude oil, and many other petroleum products and their vapors, or result from their use").

**Response:**

Please note following the SCAQMD study referenced by the commentor, SCAQMD conducted a month long fallout sampling that included the Inglewood area under and near the flight path to LAX. A principal finding of the study was "There is no discernible pattern of either carbon mass or total fallout mass under LAX's flight path which would indicate a predominate influence from aircraft fallout. Current monitoring techniques cannot determine when small impacts from sources may occur." (Inglewood Particulate Fallout Study Under and Near the Flight Path to Los Angeles International Airport, South Coast Air Quality Management District, September 2000).

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition and Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, regarding health risk of air quality impacts.

**PC01018-105****Comment:**

Only SMF (Sacramento), ONT, and SJC (SanJose) are currently regulated by California AQC's Air Quality Certificates -- federal-funds required "Governor Certification" (Section 509 [b][7][a] Airport-Airway Improvement Act '82) administered by CA Air Resources Board (CARB). Note: Sect.47106[c][1][B] "Transportation Sec. can approve project-grant-application only if Governor certifies that the project will comply with applicable air and water quality standards". FAA Order 5050.4A Chap.9 Sect.94[b][1][d] requires "appropriate air and water-quality certificates for projects involving runway locations or major-extensions". LAX Exp.-plans show "runway relocations". Emissions-Reduction Charts show in average-idling-time 2-minutes-saved would cut 31 tons of emissions, cutting powerback time 1-minute reduces emissions by 32 tons. At DIA, up to 23 planes may be running at "high idle" simultaneously, waiting for takeoff, and some wait up to 40-minutes. (Jim Humphries, AQ Coordinator, Sac. International Airport.)

U.S. Dept of Transportation (DOT): "A Boeing 747 spends a per-flight average of 32-minutes landing, taxiing, and taking off. In that time, it can generate 87 kilograms of nitrogen oxides (Nox) -- equivalent to over 85,000 kilometers of automobile emissions. If LAX's 2000 + flights a day were all 747's, it would generate some 174 metric-tons of NOx a day, or roughly the amount that might be produced by all the cars in a city of 4-6 million people. According to NCAR, each gallon of jet-fuel burned pollutes over 8,400-gallons of air to a level of toxicity that would be dangerous, if not lethal, to breathe. "In the first 2-

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

minutes after a 747 takes off, it emits as much air pollution as 3,000-cars in the same period." (Ed Ayres, WorldWatch International.)

**Response:**

Comment noted. Water quality certificates would be required prior to the implementation of the LAX Master Plan. On December 12, 2003, President Bush signed into law the FAA reauthorization bill known as Flight 100- Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act. This act eliminates the governor's certificate previously required under AAIA.

Please note, without detailed information, one cannot confirm or deny the data presented in the first paragraph of this comment. Using FAA and EPA approved methodology, it can be shown that one Boeing 747-400 with four PW4056 engines emits 80 pounds of nitrogen oxides and roughly 66 pounds of carbon monoxide, 6 pounds of hydrocarbons, and 6 pounds of sulfur oxides during one LTO cycle which includes taxi/idle, takeoff, climbout, and approach. In 75 degree Fahrenheit weather, 85,000 vehicles traveling for one mile at 55 mph collectively emit roughly 25,000 pounds of carbon monoxide, 4,250 pounds of hydrocarbons, 600 pounds of nitrogen oxides, and 26 pounds of sulfur oxides.

The commentor refers to "if" the entire aircraft fleet at LAX were comprised solely of Boeing 747 aircraft. Since the fleet at LAX is not solely Boeing 747 aircraft, the statistics presented based on a single-aircraft fleet at LAX are futile. Please see Response to Comment PC00797-8 regarding an additional comparisons between aircraft and vehicular emissions.

#### PC01018-106

**Comment:**

ON HEALTH: "Reaching NAAQS (National Air Quality Standards) in southern California would annually avert 2700 deaths, cut 24-million reduced-activity days, prevent 121-million headaches and 202-million sore-throats, and generate \$14.3-billion economic-benefit." (M. Hansen, Ass.Prof. Civ.Eng, ITS, UC-Berkeley. SDO.) Note: LAX claims credit for 85% of the southern-California aircraft operations which contribute to those health-costs. ... Seattle/KingCounty Public Health Report "Addressing Community-Health Concerns Around SeaTac" (regarding glioblastoma + cancer risk-factors, jet-exhaust emissions, chemicals, and other near-airport health problems) concludes: There's been inadequate VOC and PM monitoring. Since '82, death-rates for lung cancer and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease were higher in SeaTac community than in County as a whole. Hospital admissions for pneumonia, asthma, and influenza were elevated for folks under 65. Glioblastoma (brain-tumors) showed a statistically significant elevation in the 3-mile zone around SeaTac. Within 1-mile and within 5-miles, rates exceeded expected-numbers in all but 3 years from '86 thru '95. (Note: Seatac records only 1/3 the daily operations of LAX.) ..'95 SeaTac Study (MF&G Inc.) studied toxics + CO (w/meteorological-sets and varied airport-ops). Mean-concentration VOCs (acetaldehyde, formaldehyde, acrolein, benzene, carbon tetrachloride, 1-2-dichloroethane, and dichloro-methane) were higher than acceptable. ..'94 Radian Corp. Study said road-vehicles are primary source of SeaTac Hazardous Air, and aircraft contributions are insignificant except maybe near aircraft-facilities. (M.Vigilante, S.C. Inc, Seattle.) State of Washington's Health Dept. Census comparing '91-95 health data for people near SeaTac with those of Seattle residents overall, found "infant mortality near the airport was 50% greater, heart disease was 57% greater, cancer deaths were 36% greater, and overall life-expectancy was 5.6-years shorter. A similar comparison near Chicago's O'Hare had similar patterns but cancer-rates were 70% higher than for Chicago-overall. (Sharon Skolnick, Earth Island Institute.)

**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. Please also see Response to Comment PHP00017-2 regarding the SeaTac Study and Response to Comment PC00599-5 regarding epidemiological studies near Chicago's O'Hare and Midway airports.



#### PC01018-107

**Comment:**

San Diego's air-basin exceeds ozone standards (classified as "serious non-attainment area"). New-project net-emissions must not exceed de minimis levels (50-tons/year), or full-analysis must show ambient-air-quality won't be degraded. Moving all Terminals closer to Interstate and Rail Access is the best alternative for emissions-reduction. (Compared to earlier proposed masterplans, 20%-reduced hydrocarbons and -4% nitrogen oxides are achieved by locating the proposed new terminal closer to interstate & rail facilities. 48% & 9% by moving all terminals closer to I-8/rail.) (R. Burke, Aviation Env. Dir., CH2M-Hill, Los Angeles.) ..Note: LAX-Expansion Proposals don't consider moving or adding any new LAX-terminals closer to existing transportation infrastructure. Proposed West Terminal is as far as can be from existing rail and freeways.

**Response:**

An analysis of the San Diego air basin is not applicable to LAX. Please note that Alternative D, the LAWA staff preferred alternative, would move the project closer to the I-405.

#### PC01018-108

**Comment:**

ICAO Standards And Recommended Practices (SARPS) (Annex 16, Convention on Int'l Civil Aviation '44) and Policies (in a '98 Resolution) limit Nox, CO, HC, and smoke (mass of emissions per engine-thrust-unit) for landing/takeoff cycle (LTO) below 3,000'. Near airports, ICAO focusses on potential (health/environmental) effects. More widely, aircraft emissions may contribute to acid rain. "Aviation and the Global Atmosphere" (IPCC ICAO Report 2000) says "Aircraft contribute 3.5% of total radiative-forcing (climate-change) of all human activities." (Jane Hupe, Technical Advisor, Aviation Environmental Protection Comm., ICAO.) Swiss Clean Air Legislation limits pollutants and deals with polluters. Zurich's Airport region has NO2 concentrations 30% higher than the allowable limit (1540 tons NOx/year and 540 tons VOC (volatile organic compounds) in 1998. Aircraft accounted for 83% of NOx and 34% of VOCs. (Ground access is heavily by train rather than auto like in U.S.) Economic incentives (emissions-charges 9/1/97) reduce air-traffic related emissions (with fees and penalties) and accelerate introduction of best-available-engine-technologies. Geneva Airport and Sweden's airports have since followed suit. Aircraft-engine emission-charges added are a percentage of landing fee. Law stipulates airports must consider emissions when setting landing fees. (Emanuel Fleuti, Environment-Head, Zurich Airport Auth., SW)

**Response:**

Comment noted. Under current FAA regulations, emissions-based landing fees would not be considered viable in the U.S.

#### PC01018-109

**Comment:**

El Segundo's Mayor Gordon, (12/29/98) requested that California Air Resources Board review and comment on an El Segundo assessment of LAX's Impact on Local/Regional Air Quality (referring to the Final Report EIR/EIS - LAX Interim Master Plan, 1/12/81-L.A. City Council, that identified impacts of facilities/operations for a maxed-out 40-MAP and 560,000 annual air operations (1,534/day) reached in 1986). The E.S. assessment referred also to a '91 Stage-II-Phaseout DEIR identifying 669,034 annual operations that year, 109,034 (299 flight-ops/day) over limits of previous study (indicating 11,650 lbs of excessive daily-emissions). The '91 EIR indicated each flight (Stage-III aircraft) produces an average 39-lbs of pollutants (addressing only airside, no landside activity). That EIR said 687,000 annual air operations will service 65-MAP. In '97, LAX reached 763,148 ops, in '00 783,433 and climbing (that's 12,402 lbs of emissions/day over the maximum operating level last addressed). The "Symposium" concluded airside-ops are responsible for less than half of airport-related pollution. Client-vehicles produced nearly twelve-times that related to flight activity in '97. CARB has not produced the review/comment requested by Gordon.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01018-110**

**Comment:**

NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL STUDY "FLYING OFF-COURSE". Feb '98: "Most nonattainment air-quality areas in U.S. include major airports. LAX is in top-20 polluters. Aircraft cause 2-3% of the nation's CO2 pollution. Three-fourths of world's aircraft are U.S. owned, making it our problem. At currently proposed growth-rates of 5% for passengers and 7% for freight (LAX master-plan), LAX-area can expect 14% increase in air pollution. Of NO2 (nitrogen oxides), 4% of manmade pollution goes into upper atmosphere, where it stays 25% longer than at ground-level. In NRDC opinion, '96-International Agreement on Global Warming doesn't go far enough, because it 1. Focusses only on the engines themselves. 2. Needs to consider fuel aerodynamics. 3. Focussed on under-3,000-ft elevation. (NO2 problems need more thorough look, especially upper-atmosphere impacts). and 4. Should include production cutoffs. One way to reduce pollutants is to cut number of engines idling on ground. Delta uses this procedure for fuel-use reduction and saves \$6-million annually at Atlanta Hartsfield by reducing engine-idling numbers. Others have rejected process, claiming safety risks. Idling-engine reduction-procedure was studied at Newark in terms of air pollution and showed pollution-reduction would amount to approximately 1-ton per day. Other methods include developing alternative fuels, increasing use of shuttles (to gates), increasing dependency on gate-electrification (vs APUs). Air pollution, global-warming, and noise are all parts of the same problem. They must be looked at together, not separately. Think about air-pollution and greenhouse gas reduction and fuel-improvement programs as a single combined effort. More stringent limits to be identified and fixed. Financial incentives need to be developed. (i.e. tax credits, and R&D funding.) Accountability needs to be improved in monitoring, reporting, and regulation enforcement. Safety and economics must be considered in conjunction with pollution control and noise mitigation. As long as U.S. remains capitalist, a quest for profits through expansion will threaten hopes for a healthy and satisfying quality of life. Politically, our best hope is to convince regionally-elected leaders that qualitative-expansion could produce the same profit-gain as quantitative expansion - with far fewer negative impacts. Richard Kassel, Senior Attorney, NRDC, New York,

**Response:**

Comment noted. LAWA is proposing to incorporate a number of the mitigation options identified in the comment as was detailed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and Appendix S-E of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC01018-111**

**Comment:**

It's time now to develop a fully-comprehensive Transportation Master Plan for handling Southern California movement needs/demands including aviation coordinated with surface-vehicle planning (from mass-transit to high-speed-rail and including freight, passenger, mail, and commuter movement). Such a plan must include a LAWA Plan for its four-airport portion of the SoCal picture. (SCAG's RTP falls woefully short of the mark. Because SCAG has no power to implement, manage, or require conformity to plan-elements, the region presently has no effective planning-mechanism to deal with regional-scale needs. SCAG's strength lies only in its ability to cut-off federal fund-sources when constituent bodies will not coalesce behind a plan.) The LAX-portion of the LAWA Plan should include an Alternative which 1. Fixes a limit on operations (based on safety and neighbor quality-of-life issues. 2. Identifies policies and programs to shift a major part of current service by automobile to one which relies on mass-transit. 3. Locates any new or reworked (passenger and cargo) service facilities closer to (not-further-from) existing major auto/rail access lines. 5. Accepts that LAX may be a stop on an intermodal and continuous regional ground transit system (and not the terminus for such a system). 6. Proposes the ideal in handling passengers and cargo off-site (which could mean finding ways to fund such airport-assisting developments as interconnecting Green-Blue-Red-and-Orange transit lines and developing several off-site terminals like VanNuys with bus-and-rail connections to LAX). 7. Eliminates any need for a ring road which merely adds 6-7 miles of dedicated limited-access miles to entering or exiting the 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.

**PC01018-112**

**Comment:**

Los Angeles World Airways assures us that there will be more, and more-frequent, flights in and out of LAX in the years to come. The numbers are staggering - even with the no-grow alternative. Anyone who has ever come southward over the Sepulveda Pass in summer-heat would recognize that a coastal-zone approximately 4-miles wide from Santa Monica to Redondo Beach is climatically the most comfortable place in the region for living and recreation. With ocean-breeze and prevailing winds continually flushing the zone, the foolishness of locating pollution-generating industry in that belt has negative impacts which reverberate throughout the entire Los Angeles basin. In the early part of the 20th Century we made several siting-mistakes with decisions to locate refineries, industrial-plants, and a major airport where they potentially share all of their worst characteristics with the rest of the region. In the 21st, we could begin to undo the damage -- or at least avoid compounding it further. Wise site-planning is critical to a healthy-happy future. Expanding LAX is not wise site-planning. It is simply short-range profit-planning with disastrous long-range effects.

Through our paid-and-appointed quasi-governmental servants and agencies, I beseech my elected representatives to work on revising governmental-will so that available environmental-safeguards will again assure positive actions by decision-makers as trustees for the next generation's 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.

**PC01019**

**Bush, C**

**None Provided**

**7/17/2001**

**PC01019-1**

**Comment:**

This is my second letter regarding LAX expansion "NO"

I've been a resident here for 24 yrs. Our neighborhood is very proud of all the improvements we've done in 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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01019-2

**Comment:**

We like to live here & think LAX should use Palmdale & Ontario as alternatives.

I'm sure those areas would love not to commute this far.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

#### PC01019-3

**Comment:**

Let's keep Westchester as a neighborhood.

LAX has expanded enough with all the vacant lands in Playa Del Rey.

Let people enjoy the community

**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.

**PC01020**

**Fletcher, E. Noel**

**None Provided**

**7/15/2001**

#### PC01020-1

**Comment:**

Re: AIRPORT EXPANSION and ARBOR VITAE OFFRAMP

For 40 years I have observed in California's anti-growth, anti-development movements the attitude:

"NOW THAT WE ARE HERE, AND WE ARE HAPPY, LET'S KEEP EVERYONE ELSE OUT, SO THEY WON'T RUIN IT FOR US"

Protestors want:

1. More power plants, but not near them,
2. More low income housing, but not near them,
3. More convenient transportation, but not near them.

I do not agree with those protesting airport expansion and the Arbor Vitae offramp.

I wish the protestors were not near me.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01021      Olofsson, Mr. & Mrs. Kurt      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01021-1**

**Comment:**

WE OPPOSE THE EXPANSION AT LAX. THE EXPANSION SHOULD BE AT THE ONTARIO AND PALMDALE AIRPORTS,

**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-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

**PC01021-2**

**Comment:**

AND BUILD RAIL SERVICE TO L.A. FROM THE AIRPORTS.

**Response:**

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

**PC01022      Barnett, James      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01022-1**

**Comment:**

PLEASE LOOK FOR THE PALMDALE EXPANSION  
  
NOT LAX

**Response:**

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

**PC01023      LaPlant, Jean      None Provided      7/14/2001**

**PC01023-1**

**Comment:**

I am very much opposed to any further expansion of LAX because it has reached its capacity and community limits.

Further expansion would create more smog and endanger the passengers and people on the ground from overcrowded skies.

**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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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.

#### PC01023-2

**Comment:**

I think Palmdale and Ontario should be developed.

**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.

<b>PC01024</b>	<b>Ciafardini, Jean</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/17/2001</b>
----------------	-------------------------	----------------------	------------------

#### PC01024-1

**Comment:**

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.

#### PC01024-2

**Comment:**

The city of Palmdale & Lancaster Want the airport. Palmdale is ready! Streets are wide & turn signals are on all the main streets. The streets are in excelent condition, not like Sepulveda & others - Pot-holes & very few turn signals. Housing & employees are ready. Train tracks are in, just need to extend passagner trains from Santa Clerata to the Lancaster station. Or develop El Toro & Ontario.

**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. 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, Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale, and Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

#### PC01024-3

**Comment:**

Westchester & sourounding cities has had enough! We don't want or need anymore traffic Noise or 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01025      Smith, Donna      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01025-1**

**Comment:**

This note is to Voice my loud No for the LAX Expansion. I have lived in Westchester all my life and I now raise my family in Westchester. This is a wonderful "island" of friendly community people. It seems to be a step back into the 50's.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC01025-2**

**Comment:**

I worry that the proposed LAX expansion would kill our peaceful community. There would be an increase in noise and street traffic. Could our children ride their bikes in safety?

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. As further described in Topical Response TR-LU-2, the number of dwelling units in Westchester exposed to high noise levels would decrease compared to 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions, regional airport traffic would be separated from neighborhood traffic, and overall airport operations with implementation of the Master Plan are not expected to significantly change or degrade the quality of life in nearby neighborhoods.

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 Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR also addressed potential effects on bicycle lanes and compliance with the City of Los Angeles Transportation Element and Bicycle Plan in Section 4.2, Land Use. As stated in Section 4.2.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternatives A, B, and C would remove the existing bike lane and bike path along Imperial Highway and result in the temporary removal of the bike lane along Westchester Parkway during construction. The bike lane along Westchester Parkway would be replaced with a Class I bicycle path provided as part of the Westchester Southside development project. As indicated on page 4-98 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Master Plan Commitment LU-3 would ensure compliance with bicycle policies and plans that promote bicycle access in the vicinity of LAX, provide bicycle access to LAX transit centers and parking lots, and provide a bicycle lane along Imperial Highway. Under Alternative D, existing bicycle facilities would not be affected. However, as described on page 4-99 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Master Plan Commitment LU-5 would also ensure compliance with bicycle policies and plans that provide bicycle access in the vicinity of LAX, and to LAX transit centers and parking lots. As a priority, Master Plan Commitment LU-5 would establish a Class I bike path along Aviation Boulevard. All bicycle lanes and paths would be designed to ensure safety for those riding their bicycles. Bicycle safety along neighborhood streets is not expected to be affected by implementation of the LAX Master Plan as airport traffic would be directed along major arterial and collector streets.

**PC01025-3**

**Comment:**

What about air pollution and it's affects on our lungs?

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

**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.

**PC01025-4**

**Comment:**

How safe would we be with an increase of plane traffic over our heads?

**Response:**

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

**PC01025-5**

**Comment:**

It's time to expand the out laying airports so people won't have to commute in to LAX to catch their plane.

**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.

**PC01025-6**

**Comment:**

Palmdale is a rapidly growing community. Now it the time for the airport to buy more property there and give better service to the Northern most communities.

**Response:**

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

**PC01025-7**

**Comment:**

Westchester has always been a wonderful place to live. A place that is safe & relatively quiet. With more airplane traffic it will all be a memory.

**Response:**

Please see 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 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. Also, please 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 to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels 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 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, LAWA Staff's preferred Alternative, with 5,957 fewer units exposed compared to the 1996 baseline and 1,753 fewer units exposed compared to Year 2000 conditions.

**PC01026      White, Scott      None Provided      7/13/2001**

**PC01026-1**

**Comment:**

EXPANDING LAX WILL SERVE ONLY ONE PURPOSE. IT WILL MAKE IT MORE ECONOMICAL FOR THE AIRLINES.

**Response:**

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

**PC01026-2**

**Comment:**

LAX EXPANSION IGNORES:  
1) THE WISHES OF PASSENGERS. NO TRAVELER WANTS A MORE CROWDED LAX

**Response:**

Passenger traffic is projected to continue to increase at LAX, even with the No Action/No Project Alternative (which considers no improvements at LAX). Without the Master Plan improvements, congestion and reduced levels of service would be experienced at LAX. Please see Section 2.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR for more information. Travelers would make individual choices regarding which airport to use for air travel depending on their individual tolerance for the delays at LAX. 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.

**PC01026-3**

**Comment:**

2) THE NEEDS OF SAN FERNANDO AND OTHER TRAVELERS BOTH NORTH & SOUTH.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01026-4**

**Comment:**

3) THE FUTURE NEEDS OF ALL CONCERNED. SOONER OR LATER LAX WILL NOT BE ABLE TO HANDLE THE FLOW OF TRAFFIC.

4) THE AIRPORT WAS NOT DESIGNED FOR THIS VOLUME OF TRAFFIC

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00814-6 for a description of the extensive capacity and activity analysis that was conducted as part of the Master Plan. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

**PC01026-5**

**Comment:**

5) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT & QUALITY OF LIFE

THIS IS TYPICAL OF OUR GOVERNMENT THESE DAYS

**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 environmental impacts both adverse and beneficial in Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures.

<b>PC01027</b>	<b>Sullivan, Patrick &amp; Sharon</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/17/2001</b>
----------------	---------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------

**PC01027-1**

**Comment:**

We do not want the LAX to expand in our Westchester neighborhood. It would be a real detriment to our area.

NO NO NO

**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.

<b>PC01028</b>	<b>Laner, Richard</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/13/2001</b>
----------------	-----------------------	----------------------	------------------

**PC01028-1**

**Comment:**

I do not want the LAX expansion to take place. I have already lost one house to the airport during the first "buyout" of homes in the '70s. I have lived in Westchester my whole life & I hope to stay here. The expansion of LAX would inhibit my ability to remain in Westchester.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**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.

**PC01028-2**

**Comment:**

The expansion of LAX would also bring about an increase in traffic and air/noise pollution. Westchester is a wonderful community but the expansion would cause severe problems to this community.

**Response:**

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-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.

**PC01029      Marinez, Horace      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01029-1**

**Comment:**

"No" expansion at LAX.

Mayor Hahn "must" keep his pledge.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00578-1 regarding the development of Alternative D-Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, which was developed at the direction of Mayor James Hahn.

**PC01030      Endler, Harvey      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC01030-1**

**Comment:**

I am opposed to any expansion of the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). My home is located between Lincoln Blvd., Manchester Ave., Pershing Dr. and Westchester Parkway.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC01030-2**

**Comment:**

Due to the proximity of my home to LAX, any expansion of LAX would have dramatic impact on my neighborhood and on the value of my property.

### 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.

**PC01030-3**

**Comment:**

Your web site ([www.lax2015.org](http://www.lax2015.org)) lists several alternatives to developing LAX. All of the alternatives include a proposal to develop the vacant land bordering Westchester Parkway. The interactive map on your web site refers to this area as "Westchester Southside". The "Westchester Southside" proposal includes building offices, retail spaces, restaurants, recreational areas, industrial and commercial areas. This proposal places these types of businesses and services behind my home! I feel that developing this portion of vacant land is unnecessary. Our community does not need anymore retail space, restaurants, or office space.

To the north of my neighborhood, the development of Playa Vista continues. The Playa Vista development includes 3,000 residential units, low-income housing, 3.2 million square feet of office space, retail areas, schools, and is expected to generate 57,000 new jobs. To the east of my neighborhood is the Howard Hughes Center. This development includes offices, retail, restaurants, and a movie theater. Based on this information, I feel that our community has more than enough retail space, restaurants, and office space available. We do not need any development in "Westchester Southside".

**Response:**

Please see Section 4.2.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR for a description of uses proposed under Westchester Southside. See Topical Response TR-LU-2 for a discussion of features that would be incorporated into LAX Northside/Westchester Southside to ensure compatibility with the Westchester community to the north. The cumulative development of the LAX Master Plan and Playa Vista was considered in Section 4.2.7 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Response to Comment PC00261-2 regarding compatibility with adjacent residential uses.

**PC01030-4**

**Comment:**

Your proposal to expand LAX would generate 425,000 new jobs. Combine this with the 57,000 new jobs in Playa Vista and this means that 482,000 people will be in my neighborhood every day.

**Response:**

As was discussed in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, of the Draft EIS/EIR, the No Action/No Project Alternative would support 424,968 jobs in the Los Angeles region in 2005 and 350,110 jobs in 2015; Alternatives A and B would support the same level of employment in 2005 and 448,083 jobs in 2015; and Alternative C would support the same level of employment in 2005 and 425,389 jobs by 2015. As was discussed in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D would support the same level of employment in 2005 and 350,557 jobs by 2015. These employment levels represent total airport-related employment throughout the region, based on a baseline employment (in 1996) of 407,670 persons. Therefore, the number of new regional airport-related jobs associated with Master Plan implementation could range from about 17,719 to 40,713 employees, depending on the alternative selected (the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative D would each result in a net job loss by 2015). Additionally, within Section 4.4.1 of the Draft EIS/EIR, Table 4.4.1-2, LAX On-Airport Employment, indicated the net change in the number of on-airport employees expected under Alternatives A, B, and C, which is more reflective of workers utilizing the roadway network immediately surrounding LAX. As shown, net employment growth at LAX would range from 6,421 to 11,824, depending on the alternative selected. Similar data for Alternative D was provided in Table S4.4.1 2, LAX On-Airport Employment, within the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, and indicated that a net reduction in on-airport employment would occur. It should also be noted that the Playa Vista project was substantially scaled back as of November 2002 and is currently undergoing environmental review. As such, the number of employees at the Playa Vista site who may utilize the adjacent roadway network will be reduced relative to earlier estimates.

**PC01030-5****Comment:**

Your proposal includes building new roads and expanding the Green Line. However, you cannot build enough roads to accommodate the daily traffic generated by 482,000 people. This doesn't even include airline passengers!

**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.

**PC01030-6****Comment:**

Our neighborhood already has enough traffic problems. Lincoln and Sepulveda Boulevards are the main arteries in and out of Westchester. These roads are already overburdened. Any expansion of LAX, including developing "Westchester Southside" would make it impossible to get in and out of Westchester.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Responses TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01030-7****Comment:**

I urge you to not expand LAX and the "Westchester Southside" area. In closing, thank you for the opportunity to express my opinion about 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.

**PC01031      Tripp, Sandra****None Provided****7/15/2001****PC01031-1****Comment:**

As a Westchester homeowner I am opposed to LAX expansion.

**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.

**PC01031-2****Comment:**

For traffic considerations why should Orange County residents have to drive to LAX - develop El Toro for that growing population.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

**PC01031-3**

**Comment:**

Having lived here for 15 years I have noticed the buildup of jet fuel residue on plants & sills - inside also it builds up on floors - seems like a health problem - we don't need more of this.

**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 and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

**PC01031-4**

**Comment:**

Additional traffic is already promised by Playa Vista, adding more at the airport would be unacceptable. It's almost gridlock at times now.

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00148-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00148-2.

**PC01031-5**

**Comment:**

The idea of tearing up a nice neighborhood for the Ring Road is abhorant.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation issues. Mitigation specific to the LAX Expressway and associated improvements is 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.

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.

**PC01031-6**

**Comment:**

LAX should remain at the current volume and all of the other airports expanded to support their populations.

**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.

**PC01032      Bender, Alma      None Provided      7/17/2001**

**PC01032-1**

**Comment:**

We've lived in our home since 1963 and Watched those beautiful homes overlooking the water being taken by the airport.

Now you want to chase more people out of their homes and bring more Congestion to our area.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation. 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. Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition.

**PC01032-2**

**Comment:**

Please put your airports at Palmdale and Ontario. Many people live in those areas.

**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.

**PC01033      Sondheim, Gloria      None Provided**

**PC01033-1**

**Comment:**

We have enough 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

**PC01033-2**

**Comment:**

We have more air pollution than is healthy!

**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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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.

#### PC01033-3

**Comment:**

We have traffic grid lock on many surface streets!

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, in particular Subtopical Response TR-ST-4.1 regarding increases in traffic in an already congested area.

#### PC01033-4

**Comment:**

We have LAX as it is. Unfortunately YOU cannot diminish any of the above problems unless you steer some of the air traffic to another site.

No don't, under any conditions, build or add or change LAX to make it more tolerable and more profitable for the airlines! You cannot help us poor folk who live under the intolerable noise in the 90066 postal area.

**Response:**

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

#### PC01033-5

**Comment:**

If you build an International airport in Palmdale, people will come. Ventura County, Santa Barbara County and the Valley cities will gladly use it. Anything not to use LAX!

**Response:**

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

#### PC01033-6

**Comment:**

Los Angeles county can then provide jobs building speedways to Palmdale airport and put in a light rail.

**Response:**

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



**PC01034      Poritzky, Charles      None Provided      7/17/2001**

**PC01034-1**

**Comment:**

Keeping Our Community Whole - In order to build LAX Expressway and the Ring Road - the LAWA will have to acquire one-third of the Central Business District on Sepulveda Blvd., homes near Nielsen Field and part of historic Centinela Adobe. What happens when this Expansion isn't enough - Whose home will be the next target?

**Response:**

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC00908-2; please refer to Response to Comment PC00908-2.

**PC01034-2**

**Comment:**

TRAFFIC: Increase in cargo volume will lead to thousands more trucks.

**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.

**PC01034-3**

**Comment:**

TRAFFIC: Construction will bring more traffic, though it may be temporary.

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00908-4. Please see Response to Comment PC00908-4.

**PC01034-4**

**Comment:**

Expansion would add numerous cars to our surface streets and 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.

**PC01034-5**

**Comment:**

There are no mitigation measures for handling the traffic on the freeways.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

**Response:**

This comment is identical to comment PC00887-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00887-2.

**PC01034-6**

**Comment:**

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

**Response:**

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC00148-7; please refer to Response to Comment PC00148-7.

**PC01034-7**

**Comment:**

Homes in the 65 CNEL are eligible for soundproofing. More noise and soundproofing may mean that people will have to remain indoors with their doors and windows closed!

**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.

**PC01034-8**

**Comment:**

CARGO DEMAND - The LAWA is focusing its expansion to meet projected cargo demand. Areas of concern include larger cargo aircraft, more flights, and heavy aircraft operations.

**Response:**

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC00908-9; please refer to Response to Comment PC00908-9 regarding cargo demand.

**PC01034-9**

**Comment:**

AIR POLLUTION - Auto emission, emissions from idling planes and jet fuel emissions. LAX is already one of the region's single largest source of NOx emissions - the primary precursor to ozone. The EIR/EIS predicts that the increased ground and air traffic will result in increased emissions of all five EPA classified major air pollutants.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00043-6 regarding LAX as a source of air pollution.

**PC01034-10**

**Comment:**

This could affect the respiratory systems of some people and may cause cancer.

**Response:**

This comment is identical to comment PC00908-11. Please see Response to Comment PC00908-11.

**PC01034-11****Comment:**

SAFETY - Overcrowding of the air corridors may lead to likelihood of air disasters.

**Response:**

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

**PC01034-12****Comment:**

REGIONAL SOLUTION - The Master Plan is a short term quick fix approach. Long term planning is needed. The City of Los Angeles owns two key airports - Ontario and Palmdale - which should be developed as opposed 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.

**PC01034-13****Comment:**

El Toro (Orange County) should also be developed. Why should the communities around LAX bear the burden of Orange County's need for air commerce?

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

**PC01034-14****Comment:**

The State of California has plans to build high-speed rail that would provide a direct link between Palmdale and Los Angeles.

**Response:**

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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01035      Seymour, Grace      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01035-1**

**Comment:**

I think LAX could gain a lot of room for expansion by moving all parking off the present space used. Go East and set up shuttle service while a rail service is built to go around to the different Airline Depots. Go overhead (as Disney does)

**Response:**

Alternative D has configured the landside ground transportation in exactly the manner described. All public and commercial curbside, parking facilities and regional intermodal centers are moved to a location east of the Central Terminal complex. The conveyance of passengers and their escort visitors to and from the terminals would be with an automated people mover system running in an aerial guideway that passes over the city streets.

**PC01035-2**

**Comment:**

Move private planes to Hawthorne. This could be done fairly quickly.

**Response:**

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

**PC01035-3**

**Comment:**

Westchester has already made a big sacrifice. Westchester and El Segundo are desirable Communities. We will all move and take our taxes. Don't destroy this affluent pocket of charm in Los Angeles. This would buy time to do the long term Solution!

**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.

**PC01036      Kamei, Tom      Japanese Chamber of Commerce Southern California      7/10/2001**

**PC01036-1**

**Comment:**

Whenever visiting Los Angeles International Airport, I strongly feel that there must be a serious improvement to be done at LAX in many ways.

We have fortunately had an opportunity getting a presentation of LAX Master Plan by Mr. Jonathan Kaji and his colleagues and learned this project in details at our board meeting last month.

On behalf of the Japanese Chamber of Commerce of Southern California, I would like to welcome and support the proposed LAX Master Plan and would like to congratulate you in your efforts to realize the needs for the future Los Angeles air transportation.

I look forward to seeing your successful work for this great project.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01037      Eriksen, Dennis      ATI Systems      7/5/2001**

**PC01037-1**

**Comment:**

I support the expansion and updating of LAX.

While upgrades of the region's other airports is appropriate, it cannot be done at the exclusion of upgrades to LAX. LAX will remain Southern California's crown jewel for international commerce. It needs to be a first class, efficient facility.

My experiences traveling in metropolitan areas like Frankfurt Germany and London England is that their ground mass transit systems interact well with the airports - We must to go to work to and connect LAX efficiently to the 405 and 105 Freeways and to the Green Line.

My experience traveling in smaller countries like Saudi Arabia and Singapore is that their airport facilities are admired as modern and comfortable by passengers - not so at LAX. I am embarrassed when I meet arriving international passengers at the Bradley Terminal. The arrival area presents our welcome and first impression to our city; and we have work to do for LAX to come close to other cities (US or International).

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01038      Godoy Jr., Frank      Hacienda Hotel at LAX      7/9/2001**

**PC01038-1**

**Comment:**

During the last several years, I have served as a member of the El Segundo Board of Directors and as an active member of the LAX subcommittee, which has enabled me to become familiar with the proposed LAX expansion plan.

During my twenty six years as the General Manager of the Hacienda Hotel in El Segundo and as resident of the same city, I have witnessed the many changes LAX has gone through. I have seen how these changes have positively impacted not only the El Segundo area but all the surrounding communities as well.

LAX is directly and indirectly the source of thousands of jobs. It pours millions of dollars into the local economies and keeps businesses like the Hacienda Hotel prospering; it also helps us weather the economic downturns and through it's gates, millions of tourists and business persons arrive to L.A. contributing further to the health of our economy.

I know how unpopular and politically incorrect it has become to be for growth of anything these days; well, here at the Hacienda Hotel, we are for growth. We want to see LAX continue to grow, continue to contribute to our economy, continue to increase our property values, continue to provide jobs and the many other benefits it offers. I want market conditions to dictate the future of LAX, not politicians worrying about their own futures.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01038-2

**Comment:**

I also want to encourage LAX to grow in a sensible manner, meaning, that as you grow, you need to improve the infrastructure around LAX by whatever means is necessary; more specifically in solving traffic issues. It doesn't matter how much LAX grows if arriving passengers cannot get to us or if we cannot take our guests to LAX due to 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. 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.

#### PC01038-3

**Comment:**

More often than not, growth and prosperity are tied to unpleasant side effects such as pollution, traffic, noise, etc. In my opinion, as long as those side effects are reasonably mitigated, I am all for the growth.

I encourage you to review and to offer solutions to the specific traffic mitigation issues outlined in the El Segundo Chamber of Commerce letter to you of June 12, 2001.

Our best wishes for continued success and I hope that all those who oppose a bright future for LAX won't wear you down.

**Response:**

Please see Responses to Comments PC00537-4 through PC00537-30 regarding the El Segundo Chamber of Commerce letter.

**PC01039**

**Nikolic, Miodrag**

**NIK**

**7/6/2001**

#### PC01039-1

**Comment:**

We thank you for your effort to modernize LAX in any shape or form.

We are located at the Airport for past 25 years and could see need to develop and modernize LAX. We have provided this community with lot; employing people and paying taxes. No one should stop development on the way for the better of the community. The community benefited from all of the good things around the LAX. Some minor things will happen and some people will have to be moved relocated. This is normal always in the name of progress. Those people disagreeing with this Master Plan should be compensated and modernization should go on. To mention energy crises. What is happening every one was NOT IN OUR BACK YARD but know when they do have problems losing jobs and not having energy for their homes they are for it. This is same with the LAX it must go on and be modernized as more people are benefiting from it than some which are opposing it.

Please do everything in order to bring OUR Airport to be the best and biggest in the world.

**Response:**

Comment noted. No residential relocation is proposed under Alternative D. Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

**PC01040**      **Gayton, Julie & Anthony**      **None Provided**      **7/10/2001**

**PC01040-1**

**Comment:**

I'm very concerned about a decline in the quality of our lives in Westchester especially for those families who have kids.

**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.

**PC01040-2**

**Comment:**

I'm on a street where (I believe) houses would be torn down and an off ramp built.

**Response:**

The commentor's home address was located on the 1997 Thomas Guide Map to evaluate its proximity to the proposed LAX Expressway alternatives. The proximity of the residence to the proposed LAX Expressway alignment indicates that the house would likely be acquired in-full or in-part upon implementation of the proposed LAX Expressway under design Alternative 2. LAX Expressway design Alternative 3 directly avoids impacting this particular property. Please see Topical Response TR-APPK-2 regarding LAX Expressway and State Route 1 (SR-1) property acquisition and relocation. If the property is impacted by the project, the owner would be entitled to assistance and compensation through the final Relocation Plan. Please note that Alternative D, the LAWA staff's preferred alternative, does not include the proposed LAX Expressway as a project component.

**PC01040-3**

**Comment:**

It just seems that there are other solutions!!

Please consider the alternatives so that quality of life does not decline for these hardworking families.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

**PC01041**      **Cavallo, Daniel & Anita**      **None Provided**      **7/12/2001**

**PC01041-1**

**Comment:**

NO Expansion -

We don't want anymore noise/traffic or pollution in Westchester. The airport has damaged a great deal of our lifestyle already.

**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;

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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 potential effects of Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester and 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.

#### PC01041-2

**Comment:**

To expand would be detrimental to my health - "asthma."

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

#### PC01041-3

**Comment:**

The planes should be rerouted to other airports such as Long Beach, Orange County and what happened to Palmdale - valley residents could utilize that much better than LAX.

**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. The FAA does not 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. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

#### PC01041-4

**Comment:**

We are very much against the expansion of Ring Road also. LAX is trying to ruin our neighborhood even more and it needs to stop NOW. The airport should not be able to drive people out of there homes!! We were here first!

**Response:**

Impacts associated with the ring-road are addressed in Draft EIS/EIR Appendix K, Supplemental Environmental Evaluation for the LAX Expressway and State Route 1 Improvements. Also, as described in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D does not propose a ring road or residential acquisition. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.



**PC01042      Karwoski, Julio      None Provided      7/14/2001**

**PC01042-1**

**Comment:**

It is of my greatest concern that the expansion plan of LAX will result in an extreme environmental effect on our city. Please consider 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.

**PC01042-2**

**Comment:**

Increased cargo traffic (trucks, diesel emissions)

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic, in particular Subtopical Response TR-ST-1.1 regarding the truck traffic plan for LAX Master Plan Alternative C. Alternative D would not increase cargo handling facilities at LAX. As was 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.

**PC01042-3**

**Comment:**

Increased passenger traffic (its inevitable, even with trains or shuttles)

Even a 10% increase in the traffic on the 405 will bring traffic on this already grossly congested freeway to a stop.

**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.

**PC01042-4**

**Comment:**

Air traffic safety (danger of a disaster will increase proportionately).

**Response:**

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

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

#### **PC01042-5**

**Comment:**

- Aircraft pollution

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

#### **PC01042-6**

**Comment:**

Noise (which despite numerous complaints continues to increase from aircraft. Depending on wind direction and direction of takeoff can be almost deafening.)

**Response:**

Weather plays a role in the perception of noise to the listener. 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.

#### **PC01042-7**

**Comment:**

- Noise shielding will not help outdoors. (Will we have to live permanently inside our homes? Our children need to be protected from this nuisance).

**Response:**

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-LU-5 regarding noise mitigation.

#### **PC01042-8**

**Comment:**

There are other alternatives (Palmdale airport with the state's fast train plan and expansion of 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.

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.

**PC01042-9****Comment:**

Please consider that Westchester is a bedroom community of many thousands of residents. They will be negatively affected by this expansion plan.

**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.

**PC01043****Mendiondo, Marie****None Provided****7/12/2001****PC01043-1****Comment:**

Absolutely no expansion required. Air traffic too congested at this time. Other airports will also have an opportunity for expansion...i.e... Ontario - able to receive international traffic and not as affected by coastal "fog" situation. Will allow this community as well as Palmdale/Lancaster to grow without as much consequence to local residence. Much more "open" areas of expansion available in both areas without consequence to local residence. Additionally, most international as well as local arrivals transition to other suburban areas around LA. Some may actually be closer to their destinations if given the opportunity to fly into either Ontario or Lancaster. Even if traffic is directed to either of these airports due to weather conditions. Land travel will still be limited as they currently are when traffic is diverted to other airports at this time.

**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.

**PC01043-2****Comment:**

This expansion will not only affect local residence, business, but the pleasure of our visitors at the local beaches. Increased air traffic will also affect Manhattan Beach, Malibu and costal buseniss due to the additional noise! Polution!

**Response:**

Impacts on Dockweiler State Beach (the local beach closest to LAX) as a result of increased air traffic was evaluated in Section 4.8 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As concluded in that evaluation, Dockweiler Beach State Park would experience an overall decrease in the area exposed to high noise levels. Although some portions of Dockweiler Beach State Park would experience a significant noise increase, the projected noise level increase would not substantially interfere with the normal use of this park. 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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As described in Section 4.2.3 and shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR, no noise-sensitive uses within Manhattan Beach and Malibu are currently exposed to the 65 CNEL from LAX operations, under the 1996 baseline. Noise-sensitive uses exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour under Year 2000 conditions were described in Section 4.2.3 and shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As presented in Section 4.2.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, there is a reduction in noise-sensitive uses exposed to the 65 CNEL under Alternatives A, B, C, and D compared to both 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions and no noise-sensitive uses are newly exposed in Manhattan Beach or Malibu under these alternatives. 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. This area is defined by the 94 dBA SEL noise contour. The 94 dBA SEL contours for the 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions are shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and do not extend to Manhattan Beach or Malibu. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels, and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

#### PC01043-3

**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.

**PC01044      Somma, Vito & Gina      None Provided**

**7/11/2001**

#### PC01044-1

**Comment:**

We oppose L.A.X. expansion.

Please help us fight the airport expansion. L.A. doesn't need anymore noise pollution and air pollution. What about the safety, the noise, the traffic and all the people loosing their homes.

**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. In addition, 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.

#### PC01044-2

**Comment:**

Since there are other alternatives like Ontario, Palmdale and El Toro why should L.A. suffer for 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.

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.

**PC01045      La Rouche, Maureen      None Provided      7/14/2001**

**PC01045-1**

**Comment:**

The effect of the proposed expansion on this neighborhood would be a true disaster!

**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.

**PC01045-2**

**Comment:**

On the economic side you say look at all the new jobs. But they don't do us (the area) any good. The only new jobs are temporary and are not people who live in this neighborhood. So what good are we going to get?

**Response:**

The geographic distribution of incremental direct job growth (1996-2015) and total direct jobs (2015) associated with each of the Master Plan alternatives was provided in Tables 46 and 47 of Appendix 5, Economic Impacts Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Tables S13 and S14 in Technical Report S-3, Supplemental Economic Impacts Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As shown therein, the majority of projected job growth and future jobs occur within the City of Los Angeles and the cities and communities surrounding LAX. Although it is difficult to determine the geographic distribution of future job-seekers applying for projected airport-related employment, it can be safely assumed, given the wide distribution of jobs, that such individuals will reside throughout the region and in the areas surrounding the airport in particular. Furthermore, neither the Draft EIS/EIR nor the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR indicated that airport-related employment associated with Master Plan, aside from construction-related employment, would be temporary in nature. It should also be noted, as was mentioned in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, of both documents that the projected direct airport-related job growth would foster additional indirect and induced job growth in the City and County of Los Angeles as well as throughout the region. Similarly, the economic output generated by LAX subsequent to Master Plan implementation would promote indirect and induced economic growth, benefiting in the City and County of Los Angeles, including areas near LAX, and the region as a whole.

**PC01045-3**

**Comment:**

And then what about the land values of this area? Currently I live outside of the flight path - but with this plan I will be living next to a new cargo facility - are you going to compensate us???

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

Would you want to buy here NOW?

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values. Master Plan Alternatives B and C involve the development of a cargo facility within the Manchester Square area, approximately one mile south of 7831 Toland Avenue. Alternative D involves the development of a Ground Transportation Center in that location. Regardless of which alternative is selected, facilities would be sensitively designed for functional and visual compatibility with surrounding uses, and appropriate landscape amenities would be provided.

**PC01046      Zimmerman, Kelly      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC01046-1**

**Comment:**

The Master Plan proposes increases in noise, smog, air traffic and car traffic. These changes will adversely affect the Westchester 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. 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.

**PC01046-2**

**Comment:**

The Plan is not a viable solution to increasing the air traffic capacity in Southern California. A large number of LAX passengers are going to other areas. Other regional airports (especially Palmdale) should be expanded and the air traffic should be diverted to them. The number of flights into and out of LAX should be decreased not increased.

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

**PC01046-3****Comment:**

DO not expand LAX into residential Westchester!

**Response:**

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

**PC01047****Kray, Debbie****None Provided****7/12/2001****PC01047-1****Comment:**

Any expansion of LAX will directly affect me and my family. We live near Sepulveda and 76th streets. Access to Sepulveda at this intersection is already difficult. The traffic on Sepulveda through the downtown area is very slow at peak hours. I shop at neighborhood stores on a weekly basis. Not everyone would take the proposed Arbor Vitae off ramp, and Sepulveda is the logical alternative.

Any changes to Airport Blvd. in Westport Heights would be devastating to our neighborhood. Airport is already a busy street, which I cannot easily cross on foot.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, in particular Subtopical Response TR-ST-4.1 regarding increases in traffic in an already congested area. Also Response to Comment AL00008-8 for more information regarding the status of the proposed Arbor Vitae interchange.

**PC01047-2****Comment:**

If it were to be modified to increase traffic, the neighborhood would effectively be cut into 2. we would lose our sense of community.

**Response:**

No widening of Airport Boulevard, including that portion north of La Tijera in Westport Heights, is proposed under the LAX Master Plan. 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. As was stated on page 4-296 of the Draft EIS/EIR, impacts to arterial streets and local streets - particularly to the north - would be minimized by shifting much of the north airport demand to the new LAX Expressway. Although development of an LAX Expressway is not proposed under Alternative D, other traffic improvements and surface traffic mitigation measures would enhance traffic circulation in the vicinity of the airport and provide a direct connection to airport facilities thereby reducing traffic impacts on surface streets. 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. As was stated on page 4-442 of the Draft EIS/EIR, since Westchester contains its own essential community services and facilities, and no changes in arterial roadways within Westchester is proposed, access to essential community services and facilities would not be compromised by the project's alteration of surface transportation patterns. As was described on page 4-346 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, changes to circulation patterns under Alternative D would also not significantly affect access to essential community services. Consistent with finding in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, no division or disruption of Westport Heights or access of Westport Heights residents to community services, facilities, recreational areas, residences, or businesses would occur as a result of transportation

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

improvements proposed under the LAX Master Plan build alternatives. See also Subtopical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

**PC01048                      Stranczek, P                      None Provided                      7/15/2001**

**PC01048-1**

**Comment:**

I have lived on 83rd & Sup for 25 yrs. The tariff has become unbearable. If we have any more expansion it will be impossible.

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

**PC01049                      Taylor, Nichole                      None Provided                      7/15/2001**

**PC01049-1**

**Comment:**

I feel that the noise, traffic, pollution is enough reason to not build on 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; 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.

**PC01049-2**

**Comment:**

People from all over Los Angeles County use LAX, Ontario, Burbank, Palmdale and even John Wayne Airports should make their place more accessible for people and people would use other Airports besides LAX.

**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.

**PC01049-3**

**Comment:**

Wildlife of Westchester & playa Del Rey are already being hurt enough after the LAX expansion.



**Response:**

Comment noted. Impacts on biotic communities within the coastal zones were addressed in Section 4.11, Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR 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. Recommended mitigation measures would result in the no net loss of habitat value and are adequate to reduce potential impacts of proposed Master Plan improvements to below the level of significance.

**PC01049-4****Comment:**

We will probably have no frogs, foxes, birds etc. they will be pushed out of their home!

**Response:**

Impacts on biotic communities within the coastal zones were addressed in Section 4.11, Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR 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.

**PC01049-5****Comment:**

Los Angeles is a "spread out city" so lets go with that and divert traffic from LAX & not towards it.

**Response:**

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.

<b>PC01050</b>	<b>Jensen, Rhiner</b>	<b>None Provided</b>
----------------	-----------------------	----------------------

**PC01050-1****Comment:**

1. The traffic going to airport blocks many of our surface streets daily.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, in particular Subtopical Response TR-ST-4.1 regarding increased traffic in an already congested area.

**PC01050-2****Comment:**

2 The pollution from air is increasing.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

**PC01050-3****Comment:**

3. Noise from aircraft in air and on ground has shown a significant increase and has affected all of Westchester

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase. In addition, please see Alternative-Specific Abatement Opportunities in Section 7.2 of Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, and in particular Section 7.2.2, Alternative A, and Section 3.1.6, Alternative D Mitigation, of Appendix S-C, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, 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-LU-2 regarding potential effects of Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester.

**PC01051      Judkins, Bernadine      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01051-1**

**Comment:**

I have been to several meeting -

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01051-2**

**Comment:**

The expansion will lower the value my hous.

**Response:**

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.

**PC01051-3**

**Comment:**

I live on corner of Airport Blvd & Flight PI - my garage is on Airport - So is going to make it difficult for me to get out if you make Airport Blvd. Expressway -

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00934-6 regarding Airport Boulevard.

**PC01051-4**

**Comment:**

Right now I get no noise - or very rarely. But soundproofing I don't want to be locked up in my house - now I can have it all open -

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

**PC01051-5**

**Comment:**

There is other airport you can use to make it better -

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC01051-6****Comment:**

The airport took our house we owned - So cannot afford to buy another at my age - 81 years old. Help us -

**Response:**

Comment noted. The areas of, and process for, acquisition of properties that may occur in conjunction with the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation. No residential acquisition is proposed under Alternative D.

**PC01052****Roffey, John****None Provided****7/12/2001****PC01052-1****Comment:**

There are no benefits for Westside residents in the Airport Expansion Plan. It is in fact difficult to imagine any benefits for the residents of Los Angeles with the exception of those who do, and those who will, work for the Airport.

**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. The economic benefits 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.

**PC01052-2****Comment:**

The rerouting of Lincoln Blvd. alone will have a negative impact on traffic and the affect on Sepulveda Blvd during construction is inconceivable.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-3 regarding construction traffic.

**PC01052-3****Comment:**

Noise affect is hard to estimate because the Airport, to the best of my knowledge, has been using a variance since 1985 to overcome the noise requirements of California State Noise Regulations. Those regulations required a 'community noise equivalent level' (CNEL) of 65db to be achieved by 1985. Even if averaged over the 24hour period I'm sure the Airport exceeds those limits even today.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**Response:**

LAX continues to operate under a variance. Information regarding how noise affect is estimated and evaluated was provided in Section 4.1 and Section 4.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Noise-sensitive uses (such as residential, schools, parks, libraries, hospitals, and churches) currently exposed or newly exposed to aircraft noise levels of 65 CNEL, as well as those noise-sensitive uses that would be exposed to an increase of 1.5 dB or greater, within the 65 CNEL were identified in Section 4.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, Section 4.2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR presented Year 2000 65 CNEL noise contours for informational purposes, and a corresponding summary of noise-sensitive uses exposed to high noise levels for the Year 2000 is provided in Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. A discussion of the current Noise Variance is provided in Technical Report S-1, Section 2.3.1. , LAX currently operates under a 2001 Noise Variance from land use compatibility requirements of the California Noise Standards (Title 21). The 2001 Noise Variance is an extension of the 1998 Noise Variance. The variance was originally requested by LAWA in 1986. The current Noise Variance is valid for a three-year period and may be extended as long as LAWA demonstrates good faith measures to achieve compatibility with Title 21. These measures include residential sound insulation and land acquisition for those existing incompatible land uses within the 65 CNEL noise contour, as shown on the current ANMP. Progress-to-date in implementing the ANMP is documented annually and made available to Caltrans, the Airport Land Use Commission of Los Angeles County, and other interested parties. As identified in the 2001 ANMP, the estimated time frame for completion of sound insulation within all affected jurisdictions is 14 years (by 2015) and 20 years (by 2021) for property acquisition. The Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.2, Land Use, also included Mitigation Measure MM-LU-1, which contains recommendations for accelerating the current ANMP. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

**PC01052-4**

**Comment:**

Most people in Westchester, and I have lived here since 1962, feel that when it comes to noise, the Airport does whatever it wants to do. The CNEL concept of averaging noise over 24 hours is absurd anyway because even now, conversation between residents, standing a mile away, are frequently interrupted by aircraft taking off or landing during the daytime.

**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. The Draft EIS/EIR stated in Section 4.1 that the CNEL noise measurement was used because it is the standard mandated by California law and accepted by the U.S. Department of Transportation, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development for evaluation of noise levels. CNEL is a cumulative noise metric which characterizes the collective noise exposure from multiple noise events for an average day. In addition, CNEL applies a penalty to noise events that occur during the evening or nighttime hours to account for the increased sensitivity to unwanted sound. Section 4.2, Land Use, also identified noise levels between 65 and 75 CNEL as affecting outdoor speech. Please see Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

**PC01053**

**Fisher, Gregory**

**None Provided**

**7/14/2001**

**PC01053-1**

**Comment:**

"Are the planes always this loud?" a would-be home buyer asked me one night.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

**PC01053-2****Comment:**

The amount of pollution from the present airport is enough.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-3 regarding local area air pollution.

**PC01053-3****Comment:**

I do not feel that Westchester should be further inconvenienced because Orange County and others don't want to be.

**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.

**PC01053-4****Comment:**

Finally, and worse of all, we are working beyond capacity now at LAX. I oppose a quick-fix that puts more lives in danger.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The proposed Master Plan improvements are not a quick-fix, but a long term solution to addressing safety and efficiency. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. 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.

**PC01054****Smith, Virginia****None Provided****PC01054-1****Comment:**

Our area is crowded enough!

**Response:**

Comment noted.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01055**      **Salerno, Lana**      **None Provided**      **7/16/2001**

**PC01055-1**

**Comment:**

I am a fairly new resident in Playa Del Rey. Since moving here approx. 2 yrs ago, I have noticed and increase in the noise and air pollution. We have a home where all our windows are "double paned" and the noise still can be heard inside. I can't even imagine what the expansion will do.

**Response:**

See Response to Comment PC00499-01 for explanation of increased noise impacts in Play Del Rey. 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-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

**PC01055-2**

**Comment:**

Secondly, I've noticed the air pollution has gotten worse. I park my vehicle outside and see the "soot" from the planes on my white vehicle only days after washing my car.

**Response:**

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

**PC01055-3**

**Comment:**

Being a mother of a 1 1/2 yr old, I'm concerned about the safety of her health as well as my husbands and mine.

**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.

**PC01055-4**

**Comment:**

We decided it is our responsibility to our daughter that we voice our concerns regarding the expansion of LAX. We oppose the expansion and if there is anything we must do to help you fight the expansion, please contact me via mail, person or email. I will do my part in fighting the expansion. Thank you for your efforts!

**Response:**

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

**PC01055-5****Comment:**

P.S. please notify me of further meetings or issues.

**Response:**

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

**PC01056****Clark, John****None Provided****7/12/2001****PC01056-1****Comment:**

I live near LAX & the noise level is getting worse.

**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.

**PC01056-2****Comment:**

The traffic congestion is very bad on the whole west side of L.A. due to commuters & people trying to get to LAX. We do not need to expand LAX & make this situation 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. 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.

**PC01056-3****Comment:**

The auto exhaust & jet exhaust is causing a bad air pollution at this time.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-3 regarding local area air pollution.

**PC01056-4****Comment:**

What should happen is to further expand Ontario to handle air freight, where rail & freeways already exist to handle trucks. Palmdale & El Toro could accommodate the next generation of super jets.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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.

**PC01057      Riley, Eileen      None Provided**

**PC01057-1**

**Comment:**

Noise - especially during early morning hour. Noise apparently caused by the planes engines gaining power - some nites the sound causes a lot of headache

**Response:**

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.

**PC01057-2**

**Comment:**

Traffic - has become extreme - its' dangerous driving on Sepulveda near the airport especially inside the tunnel, which is dark and dangerous with lane changes.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00236-1 regarding the Sepulveda Tunnel.

**PC01057-3**

**Comment:**

Fall out of dirt has increased greatly - Each day I have to wash all the car windows to be sure I can see while driving

**Response:**

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

**PC01057-4**

**Comment:**

The airport official lies constantly - I remember when they promised residents that the new runway they wanted, would be used only for emergencies, the Westchester resident signed and then the runway was used for routine operations, two schools had to be closed because of the danger & noise from low flying aircrafts

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01057-5**

**Comment:**

It's about time other airports are used to relieve the pressure on the residents around Westchester

**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



### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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.

#### PC01057-6

**Comment:**

How many more homes are you going to tear down for a larger airport

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00040-46 regarding residential acquisition issues.

#### PC01057-7

**Comment:**

It's about time we, the people, receive more consideration then the corporation and city officials who want to claim the title to the largest 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.

**PC01058      Beard, Margaret      None Provided**

#### PC01058-1

**Comment:**

I live two blocks North of Manchester and the airport polution is very bad. I have a bird bath and the black dust is floating on the water. You can't sweep the cement - it has to be washed down - and even then the oily residue is brought into the house marking the floors and carpet.

I can put up with the noise but PLEASE no expansion - it's dirty enough already.

**Response:**

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

**PC01059      Stein, Norma      None Provided      7/15/2001**

#### PC01059-1

**Comment:**

Please no expansion plan! I believe that the neighborhoods near LAX have been impacted enough over the years & that no further expansion should be done.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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

---

#### PC01059-2

**Comment:**

Any expansion of LAX without a regional approach that links Palmdale, Ontario, & development of the old El Toro Marine base airfield for public use is flawed.

**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-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.

#### PC01059-3

**Comment:**

Any movement of the north runway, to accomodate taxiways will encroach on existing homes that already bear the brunt of noise pollution & air quality diminution.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Relocation of Runway 6L/24R is not proposed as part of Master Plan Alternative D.

**PC01060**

**Balko, Greg**

**None Provided**

**7/15/2001**

#### PC01060-1

**Comment:**

As a four-year resident of Westchester, I am opposed to the expansion of LAX. I believe the easiest solution to additional cargo and airport travelers is to expand LAX. I also think it is the wrong one.

**Response:**

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

#### PC01060-2

**Comment:**

The amount of traffic on the surrounding streets and freeways will never be able to accommodate the increase trucks, shuttle buses and passenger cars. The environmental impact of these new vehicles cannot be good for the general area and its residents.

**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, Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts, Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic, and Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

**PC01060-3****Comment:**

The better option would be to use the alternative airports in the region to minimize the sole reliance we currently have on LAX. It makes no sense for residents from Ventura and Orange Counties to have to drive to LAX when airport facilities can and need to be developed in their regions. I look to New York City with several airports in the New York and New Jersey areas that have distributed the airplane traffic throughout 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.

**PC01060-4****Comment:**

Please take this under consideration when you analyze this matter. The new major of Los Angeles has come to this conclusion and we urge you to do the same.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00578-1 regarding the development of Alternative D-Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, which was developed at the direction of Mayor James Hahn.

<b>PC01061</b>	<b>Bond, Mildred</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/13/2001</b>
----------------	----------------------	----------------------	------------------

**PC01061-1****Comment:**

As a long time (30 years) resident of Westchester I'm sitting here going over all the many reasons to oppose LAX expansion - traffic, noise, loss of community etc etc. But I'm not going to embarrass myself by reporting the obvious. I just want to go on record stating my & my families many objections to expansion. LAX expansion will go ahead, Westchester will continue to disappear and I will relocate to another community. Shame on everyone involved!

**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 community disruption impacts in Section 4.4.4, Community Disruption and Alternation of Surface Transportation Patterns. 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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

PC01062

Klingberg, Paul

None Provided

7/15/2001

PC01062-1

**Comment:**

I feel the LAX Expansion Plan will have a negative effect on the people of Westchester. This proposed expansion will destroy long-standing homes, businesses and parks in our community. Our quality of life will be harmed with more noise and air pollution from heavy jet traffic and a dramatic increase in auto, bus and truck traffic. Any claims that these frightening impacts can be mitigated are empty promises delivered by individuals who do not live in the area.

**Response:**

Impacts associated with acquisition were addressed in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. 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. 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 was described in Section 4.4.2, (subsection 4.4.2.6), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, note that in contrast to the other build alternatives, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's Preferred Alternative), does not propose any acquisition within the Westchester Business District.

As was described in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR, under Alternatives A, B, and C, 84 homes would be acquired along the northern edge of the airport. Acquisition would be addressed through Master Plan Commitment RBR-1, which would ensure that full relocation assistance and benefits would be provided in accordance with the Uniform Act. The Uniform Act requires that no resident be relocated until comparable, decent, safe and sanitary housing is made available. Also, as was described in Section 4.4.2, (subsection 4.4.2.6), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, note that in contrast to the other build alternatives, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's Preferred Alternative), does not propose any residential acquisition.

As was indicated in Section 4.26.3, Parks and Recreation (CEQA), of the Draft EIS/EIR, no acquisition of park or recreation facilities is proposed. Master Plan Alternatives A, B, and C would have largely beneficial effects on the park and recreational facilities in the vicinity through a 5-acre expansion of Carl E. Nielson Youth Park, a 6-acre expansion of the Westchester Golf Course, and the incorporation of bike paths, greenbelts, and a potential new park within the Westchester Southside development area. As was indicated in Section 4.26.3, Parks and Recreation (CEQA), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D would not involve acquisition of park or recreational facilities and would have the same beneficial effects as the other build alternatives, although it would not include expansion of Carl E. Neilson Youth Park.

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.

Concerning implementation of mitigation measures, please note that pursuant to Section 21081.6(a) of CEQA, LAWA and the FAA will adopt a mitigation monitoring and reporting program when making the necessary findings in conjunction with project approval to ensure compliance with mitigation measures during project implementation. Also, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

#### PC01062-2

**Comment:**

What is also concerning to me are the wider implications of this Master Plan. Projects like the building of an LAX Expressway, the potential Arbor Vitae interchange, the expansion of Sepulveda Blvd and the extension of Airport Blvd. from the Howard Hughes center will tear our neighborhoods apart.

**Response:**

Appendix K of the Draft EIS/EIR disclosed the number of homes, commercial businesses, public and community facilities along the I-405, Arbor Vitae Street, the Sepulveda Blvd/Arbor Vitae Street intersection and Lincoln Boulevard/La Tijera Boulevard intersection that would potentially be impacted by the proposed off-airport transportation improvement projects (see Section 5.1, Land Use, of Appendix K, and Figures 3.1-1 through 3.1-4). Where impacts were identified, mitigation measures are recommended to reduce such impacts to acceptable levels. LAX Master Plan commitments and Mitigation Measures related to the LAX Master Plan were summarized in Chapter 5, Environmental Action Plan, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts. Please note that Alternative D, LAWA staff's preferred alternative, does not include the proposed LAX Expressway as a project component.

#### PC01062-3

**Comment:**

What is needed is a long-term regional solution to the air commerce needs of southern California that incorporates other airports such as Ontario, Palmdale 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.

#### PC01062-4

**Comment:**

What will happen years from now when LAX needs to expand again? Whose homes and business will be threatened then? Why should Westchester and neighboring communities bear the burden for all of southern California?

We have a choice about where we build our airports 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

### 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-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01063      Bray, Everett      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01063-1**

**Comment:**

Destroying our community with a ring road and the so called LAX expressway, which will eliminate countless homes and businesses is not acceptable especially since you did a similar type of atrocity 25 yrs ago!

**Response:**

Impacts associated with the ring road and LAX Expressway are addressed in Draft EIS/EIR Appendix K, Supplemental Environmental Evaluation for the LAX Expressway and State Route 1 Improvements. Also, note, as described in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, that the new LAWA staff preferred alternative, Alternative D, does not include a proposed ring road or the LAX Expressway. Furthermore, it does not propose residential acquisition or acquisition of businesses within the Westchester Business District. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01063-2**

**Comment:**

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH ESPECIALLY WHEN YOU HAVE OTHER LAWA OWNED AIRPORTS TO GROW AND BUILD UP WITHOUT AFFECTING THE COMMUNITY

**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.

**PC01063-3**

**Comment:**

YOUR PROJECTION OF ANNUAL CARGO VOLUME TO BE 2,275,236 TONS OR AN INCREASE OF 120% OF TODAY'S LEVELS WILL MAKE TRAFFIC AND SIX MAJOR INTERSECTIONS "SIGNIFICANTLY IMPACTED"

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic, in particular Subtopical Response TR-ST-1.4 regarding neighborhood impacts from trucks and Subtopical Response TR-ST-1.5 regarding truck diesel pollution/air quality. 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 are described in Section 4.3.2.6.1 (beginning on page 4-293) of the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC01063-4**

**Comment:**

WHAT ARE YOU THINKING?

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01064**

**Grady, Michael**

**None Provided**

**7/15/2001**

**PC01064-1**

**Comment:**

1. It strikes me that the master plan as presented on the comparison page on the web employs scare tactics that are simply designed to generate support from people who take the statements at face value. The comparison sheet claims that if no activity is taken the number of passengers served by LAX will increase drastically (from 58 MAP to 79 MAP) and the number of daily flights will increase significantly. Of course it doesn't have to happen if measures are taken to limit the number of flights and number of passengers and the measures are adhered to.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Alternative D, Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was 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.

**PC01064-2**

**Comment:**

2. In addition to these scare tactics the plan is significantly silent on non-LAX alternatives which it would seem to me would serve the whole Southern California area better. Specifically the comparison sheet is silent on the development of the airports in Ontario, Palmdale and Orange County. It seems to me that the Southern California area includes much more than the areas easily served by LAX and eventually those areas will have to significantly contribute to bearing the air traffic load. The sooner they are developed the sooner they can come online and the sooner the economic base of the entire area will be expanded making the whole area economically more robust and better able to handle the vagaries of the economic ups and downs we always experience. In other words it seems unbelievably short-sited and self-centered for the Airport Commission to delay development of these resources.

**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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01064-3

**Comment:**

3. I am seriously concerned about the effect that ANY expansion will have on the safety of the citizenry. I am concerned on several levels.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments PC01064-4 through PC01064-6.

#### PC01064-4

**Comment:**

a. Even if you increase the number and length of the runways and taxiways you CAN NOT increase the amount of physical space and this means that significantly increasing the number of flights will significantly increase the DENSITY of the airplane traffic both in the air and on the ground. This will significantly increase the probability of accidents and therefore the number of injuries and deaths due to these accidents.

**Response:**

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

#### PC01064-5

**Comment:**

b. Increasing the amount of air traffic into and out of LAX will create more traffic in the local area again with out and increase in the amount of physical space. This will increase the traffic density in the area and again the number of traffic accidents. Even if you try to widen Sepulveda, add some kind of off ramp from the 405 and 105 freeways, and do things like add more traffic access within the airport proper it still does not add physical space. If nothing else it will just make the problem worse further out from the airport, e.g. the 405 will start seriously jamming up further out from the airport exits creating higher densities and more accidents on the 405 and 105.

**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.

#### PC01064-6

**Comment:**

c. There will be MUCH more commercial traffic, e.g. delivery trucks, shuttles, taxis, etc. As these drivers are ALWAYS IN A HURRY they tend to drive faster and more aggressively than the average driver on the street. Thus, again increasing the likelihood of an accident.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The primary surface transportation components of the alternatives, such as the Ring Road and LAX Expressway, would benefit commercial vehicles as well, 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.

#### PC01064-7

**Comment:**

4. I am also concerned about the negative impact on the quality of life in the areas surrounding LAX. Again there are several areas of concern. Expanding LAX will significantly increase the amount of traffic, both air and ground. This will have the following negative impacts. There are of course plans to mitigate these problems. Unfortunately those plans will do just that, i.e. they will reduce the impact of these problems but they won't solve or eliminate them. They will not and can not maintain the status quo in the following areas.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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.

#### PC01064-8

**Comment:**

a. The increased noise pollution will be intolerable for some near the airport and will create a serious decrease in the quality of life for those who live in the local community but not very close to the airport. Even if the airport is willing to install soundproofing in those homes that qualify near the airport it will mean that in order to avoid the added noise pollution the people who live in those homes will be prisoners in their own homes including the children who live in those homes. The parents of those children will be more reluctant to allow them to play outside and when they do they will have to keep their windows open to watch over them. Under these circumstances the soundproofing will be useless. This form of pollution and the resultant reduction on the quality of life will be felt most severely by the communities who live under the approaches to the runways. As an example of the measures that are being offered that are not going to solve the problem are the promised roundtables to address the community noise concerns. They can hold all of the community roundtables on the community noise concerns that they want, the additional noise will be there and CAN NOT BE COMPLETELY REMOVED OR EVEN SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCED.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels, including thresholds used to identify significant noise levels, Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program, and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. The LAX Community Noise Roundtable is not proposed as a mitigation measure in the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. See Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding noise mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, which would revise the aircraft noise mitigation program (ANMP) to include noise-sensitive uses newly exposed to high noise levels and outside the current ANMP boundaries. As indicated in Topical Response TR-LU-5, significant impacts would remain for certain outdoor uses, interim impacts prior to sound insulation or recycling of incompatible land uses, and properties that are ineligible due to inconsistent zoning or building code constraints.

#### PC01064-9

**Comment:**

b. Air pollution will create both quality of life issues and health issues for everyone in Los Angeles but most of all by those living in the communities around LAX. The level of air pollution will increase due to more flights and much more commercial truck and automobile traffic.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

**PC01064-10**

**Comment:**

This increase will make life more unpleasant for those living around the airport and for those with respiratory problems who have to travel through, work, and/or live in the area near LAX the added pollution could represent a serious health hazard.

**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. The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR evaluated the potential risk of adverse health effects for each of the Master Plan Alternatives based on the emissions associated with each of the alternatives. The No Project/No Action Alternative assumes that no substantial changes are made to current LAX facilities, and is based on projections of growth in airport activity between 1996 and horizon year 2015. Airport congestion during this time is expected to grow worse without additional capital improvement. In all cases, build alternatives are expected to relieve current and predicted future congestion by making airport operations, particularly aircraft operations, more efficient.

After implementation of mitigation measures, the build alternatives would reduce predicted impacts to human health compared with the No Project/No Action Alternative. Implementation of any of the build alternatives is therefore anticipated to reduce future health impacts for most people living, working or going to school near the airport. However, as was indicated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, predicted chronic non-cancer human health impacts for maximally exposed residents under Alternatives B and C are slightly higher for some areas than those predicted with the No Project/No Action Alternative.

**PC01064-11**

**Comment:**

I think it is noteworthy that this issue is not addressed on the comparison sheet. I presume from the page on the environment that the Airport Commission is taking measures to solve this problem but of course all of the same measures can be taken without the expansion and there would be more improvement in the air quality.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00192-1 regarding mitigating the baseline conditions without a project under CEQA/NEPA.

**PC01064-12**

**Comment:**

c. The transient population in the area will increase and this has the potential to increase the amount of both violent and non-violent crime in the area. Of course this will have a negative impact on the quality of life in the area.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00378-2 regarding crime impacts.

**PC01064-13**

**Comment:**

d. In order to expand the airport will have to acquire what is currently private property. This will displace people from their homes and some businesses will have to be relocated or will disappear altogether. There are three things about this that REALLY concern me. First the people who are displaced may or may not get market value for their homes but even if they do if they have lived in these homes for any length of time they probably will not be able to find a home in the area that is comparable to the one they are losing. I have spoken with several people who experienced this phenomenon in the last expansion and they ALL told me that they were not able to buy as nice a home in as nice an area with the money they received from the airport and I see no reason to believe that this expansion round would be any different.

**Response:**

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

**PC01064-14**

**Comment:**

Second I am not convinced that what is being projected for the property acquisition (84 family units and between 250 and 300 businesses) will be the end. As with all plans there will be some error. How much error and who will suffer as a result of the error.

**Response:**

Property acquisition that was addressed in Section 4.4.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR was based on the nature, extent, and location of the improvements specifically proposed for each of the build alternatives. It should be noted that subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D was added, which would require substantially less acquisition than the other build alternatives (i.e., 77 acres versus 216-345 acres).

**PC01064-15**

**Comment:**

The third thing is more long term. This is the second expansion of the airport proposed in a relatively short period of time. The first one that was proposed was actually implemented and some of Westchester and other surrounding areas disappeared. If this one is allowed to occur and absorb more of Westchester and the surrounding community then how long will it be before there is a third expansion and the airport completely eats Westchester, Inglewood, El Segundo, Playa del Rey and other local communities.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels. As described therein, the last overall improvement program for LAX occurred in the early 1980's, largely in preparation for the 1984 Olympics.

**PC01064-16**

**Comment:**

In summary the proposed expansion will have a seriously negative impact on the quality of life in the surrounding communities. Expansion will mean a more unpleasant environment for every one in the area. Something as simple as taking a walk will not be pleasant with the added airplane noise, air

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

pollution, increased transient population resulting in more fear of crime, increased traffic creating noise, air pollution, and less safe conditions on the 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-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; 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 and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed law enforcement service needs in Section 4.26.2, Law Enforcement, with supporting technical data provided in Technical Report 16b of the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC01064-17**

**Comment:**

I think it makes much more sense (except possibly to a relatively small number of people and businesses in the Los Angeles area who would profit) to expand and diversify the air traffic support resources available in the Southern California area to create a broader and more robust system which will serve a much broader area and has the potential for making the whole area economically stronger rather than focussing narrowly on the Los Angeles area. This would also more equitably distribute the negative aspects of supporting the necessary air traffic to the 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.

<b>PC01065</b>	<b>Shbaro, Mr. &amp; Mrs. Zuhair</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/13/2001</b>
----------------	--	----------------------	------------------

**PC01065-1**

**Comment:**

NO LAX EXPANSION! Keep our community whole. We have enough traffic, noise, pollution and airplanes! We have a wonderful neighborhood - lets keep it safe & beautiful for our children.

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

**PC01065-2****Comment:**

Make use of Ontario and Palmdale and El Toro. We don't need to keep taking all the burden.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC01066****Davis,****None Provided****PC01066-1****Comment:**

Each counties should develop larger scales of Int'l airport, Since L.A. County, Orange County are both Congested w/ additional population & cars. It is very unfair only LAX neighbors to sacrifice for expansion. Or else move Int'l airport to between two 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. 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.

**PC01067****Hedin, Peg****None Provided****7/1/2001****PC01067-1****Comment:**

(1) Cargo-based expansion should be spread to airports which have other access to the LA area.

**Response:**

Please see Responses to Comments PC00599-54 and PC00922-1 regarding cargo activity.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01067-2

**Comment:**

Increased cargo trucking should not go through a small Community and LA to get to surrounding areas. 405 is already too heavily traveled and often grid locked.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic. Alternative D, 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.

#### PC01067-3

**Comment:**

(2) Areas that are responsible for the increased need for air traffic should bear the attendant problems it creates. e.g., Orange County. A Study should be done to see which areas these are.

**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.

#### PC01067-4

**Comment:**

(3) Los Angeles needs to be a city that responds to its people at least as much as it responds to its businesses and political interests.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

#### PC01067-5

**Comment:**

(4) LAX expansion will destroy Westchester.

**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.

**PC01068      Shimazu, Darryl      None Provided      7/13/2001**

**PC01068-1**

**Comment:**

- I donot think the LAX expressway and the ring road is a good idea. It will displace homes near Nielsen Field, and hurt the central business district and hurt Centinela Adobe.

**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.

**PC01068-2**

**Comment:**

- It will increase traffic that we do not want - increased cargo volume will lead to more trucks

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic, in particular Subtopical Response TR-ST-1.1 regarding the truck traffic plan for LAX Master Plan Alternative C. Alternative D, addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, would not increase cargo handling facilities at LAX. As was 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.

**PC01068-3**

**Comment:**

- LAX expansion will bring more noise to the community

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

**PC01068-4**

**Comment:**

- Expansion will bring larger cargo aircraft - more flights - very dangerous

**Response:**

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

**PC01068-5**

**Comment:**

- Expansion will bring more air pollution - with jet fuel emissions.

**Response:**

Please see 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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01068-6**

**Comment:**

- Overcrowding of the air corridors above.

**Response:**

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

**PC01068-7**

**Comment:**

This plan needs a better solution. Don't expand LAX... expand other city 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.

**PC01069**

**Fost, Betty**

**None Provided**

**7/14/2001**

**PC01069-1**

**Comment:**

Our community has lived through this for many years. The powers that seem to be do not care about community, as they have torn it apart & put it at risk again. Lives are ruined by noise, traffic, threat of more damage to lives who have been under fire for too long.

**Response:**

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed community disruption impacts in Section 4.4.4, Community Disruption and Alteration of Surface Transportation Patterns, noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and safety impacts 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.

**PC01069-2**

**Comment:**

Let the cities & the people from distances away stop traveling here & build another airport or more to spread out the usage problem. Cargo can manage from farther points, No., East, South, or wherever. This plan is only a bandaid.

**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.

**PC01069-3**

**Comment:**

The problem needs to be addressed so people in our community can relax & live normal lives. We do not need any more pressure in our life.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

**PC01070**

**Hill, Douglas**

**None Provided**

**7/16/2001**

**PC01070-1**

**Comment:**

I say no to the draft master plan. We need a regional solution to the airport problem:

Palmdale  
Van Nuys  
Burbank  
San Bernardino County  
LAX  
Ontario  
Riverside  
Long Beach  
John Wayne  
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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

<b>PC01071</b>	<b>McCall, Kelly &amp; Robert</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/15/2001</b>
----------------	---------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------

#### **PC01071-1**

##### **Comment:**

As eight year residents of Westchester, we have grown to love this neighborhood and community. We are extremely concerned about the impact the expansion of LAX would have on the quality of life here. Between the Howard Hughes Promenade, Playa Vista and LAX expansion, we feel that pollution, traffic, & noise would increase to an intolerable level and force us to abandon our beloved 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. 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. 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. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

#### **PC01071-2**

##### **Comment:**

This area has made an incredible turn around economically in the last eight years and now the LAX expansion threatens all of this.

##### **Response:**

The economic impacts associated with the Master Plan were discussed in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics (subsection 4.4.1.6), of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition to direct employment and economic output (gross sales) generated by each of the alternatives, indirect and induced job growth and economic growth would occur. Furthermore, construction of each of the build alternatives would have a "multiplier effect," yielding indirect jobs (i.e., those related to purchases of goods and services by companies directly involved in the design and construction of the project) and induced jobs (i.e., those related to the re-spending of earnings by direct and indirect job holders), as well as indirect and induced economic output associated with construction expenditures, benefiting the City and County of Los Angeles, including areas near LAX, and the region as a whole. Please see Response to Comment PC00013-5 regarding business acquisition and relocation impacts and proposed collateral development at LAX Northside/Westchester Southside, Response to Comment AL00018-1 regarding commercial property acquisition within the Westchester Business District, and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

#### **PC01071-3**

##### **Comment:**

This expansion will not serve the community in the long run. The increase in travelers to this region will not be able to be sufficiently dealt with by LAX alone. We need regional solutions and participation. If this expansion took place it would most likely be obsolete by the time it was fully implemented, and therefore solve no real problems and impact this community, that is already being barraged from all sides, with irreparable harm.

**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.

<b>PC01072</b>	<b>Rangel, Linda &amp; Angel</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/13/2001</b>
----------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	------------------

**PC01072-1****Comment:**

We are completely against the LAX expansion. There is enough traffic & noise already. We, along with many other families, moved in this area because of the close-knit, small town feel that Westchester is known for.

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

**PC01072-2****Comment:**

As spread out as the Southern California community is - business & tourist - it makes total sense to expand other regional airports to support the travel 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 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.

**PC01072-3****Comment:**

PLEASE - do not expand LAX in our community.

### 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.

**PC01073      Vallone, Anthony      None Provided      7/13/2001**

**PC01073-1**

**Comment:**

When is this LAX airport expansion is going to stop? You already moved me out of my house 28 years ago because of the first expansion. Now you (the city) will do it again? This is crazy.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00040-46 regarding residential acquisition issues.

**PC01073-2**

**Comment:**

Please think about the people's well being at least once in a while. Think about the people health affected by noise pollution, traffic in the area, cancer due to chemical and exhaust. Enough is enough!!!

**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 in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment. Supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, and 14a of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, and S-9a 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.

**PC01073-3**

**Comment:**

Expand Palmdale or Ontario or El Toro. Leave th people around LAX in peace. 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. 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.

**PC01074      Walker, Mary      None Provided      7/13/2001**

**PC01074-1**

**Comment:**

The Westchester area is already substantially impacted with traffic, noise and air pollution from the airport. Any expansion could only worsen it.

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

**PC01074-2****Comment:**

We don't need more of LAX. We need an airport in Palmdale or El Toro to serve people living in those areas of the county and lessen the load on 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.

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.

**PC01074-3****Comment:**

Please, no more problems for Westchester, El Segundo area.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01075****Koehler, Eugene &  
Joyce****None Provided****7/13/2001****PC01075-1****Comment:**

As residents (owners of house) since 1971 we are very concerned about the various negative impacts of the LAX expansion proposal. We fear it will lead to:

1. Increased traffic/accidents/resulting greatly increased air pollution /noise pollution from autos & trucks

### 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 human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, noise 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, 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.

**PC01075-2**

**Comment:**

2. increased cargo should be handled elsewhere - regional solution. Nearby LAX residents should not have to suffer the increased burden of increased demand/expansion for the rest of the region.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00599-54 regarding cargo activity.

**PC01075-3**

**Comment:**

3. increased air pollution & noise from increased planes & autos & trucks both passenger and cargo will lead to more cancer/respiratory problems for residents in area

**Response:**

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR address 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.

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-3 regarding air pollution increase, Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding land use and noise mitigation and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR evaluated the potential risk of adverse health effects for each of the Master Plan Alternatives based on the emissions associated with each of the alternatives. The No Project/No Action Alternative assumes that no substantial changes are made to current LAX facilities, and is based on projections of growth in airport activity between 1996 and horizon year 2015. Airport congestion during this time is expected to grow worse without additional capital improvement. In all cases, build alternatives are expected to relieve current and predicted future congestion by making airport operations, particularly aircraft operations, more efficient.

After implementation of mitigation measures, the build alternatives would reduce predicted impacts to human health compared with the No Project/No Action Alternative. Implementation of any of the build alternatives is therefore anticipated to reduce future health impacts for most people living, working or going to school near the airport. However, as was indicated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, predicted chronic non-cancer human health impacts for maximally exposed residents under Alternatives B and C are slightly higher for some areas than those predicted with the No Project/No Action Alternative.

**PC01075-4****Comment:**

4. increased flights will lead to increased likelihood of air accidents/disasters.

**Response:**

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

**PC01075-5****Comment:**

\* Regional Solution is the answer as the LAX area residents shouldn't bear the brunt of the entire region - Orange County/even San Diego County/Riverside County/ and San Bernardino even.

**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.

**PC01076****Matus, Sue & Joel****None Provided****7/12/2001****PC01076-1****Comment:**

We are strongly opposed to any further expansion of LAX. We have lived in Westchester for over twenty years and are homeowners. LAX expansion has already caused the loss of many good homes in Westchester. More people should not lose homes to airport expansion, especially when there are airports in Ontario and Palmdale which could be developed and used.

**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-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale, and 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. Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition.

**PC01076-2****Comment:**

The level of noise is just tolerable now. With increased traffic noise levels will become intolerable.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01076-3

**Comment:**

Further, increased traffic will increase air pollution.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

#### PC01076-4

**Comment:**

This will cause health problems 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. 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.

The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR evaluated the potential risk of adverse health effects for each of the Master Plan Alternatives based on the emissions associated with each of the alternatives. The No Project/No Action Alternative assumes that no substantial changes are made to current LAX facilities, and is based on projections of growth in airport activity between 1996 and horizon year 2015. Airport congestion during this time is expected to grow worse without additional capital improvement. In all cases, build alternatives are expected to relieve current and predicted future congestion by making airport operations, particularly aircraft operations, more efficient.

After implementation of mitigation measures, the build alternatives would reduce predicted impacts to human health compared with the No Project/No Action Alternative. Implementation of any of the build alternatives is therefore anticipated to reduce future health impacts for most people living, working or going to school near the airport. However, as was indicated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, predicted chronic non-cancer human health impacts for maximally exposed residents under Alternatives B and C are slightly higher for some areas than those predicted with the No Project/No Action Alternative.

**PC01077**

**Billups, Eleanor &  
Steve N.**

**None Provided**

**7/16/2001**

#### PC01077-1

**Comment:**

My husband and I have owned homes in Westchester for 18 years. We love this community! Please spare us any increased noise pollution, increased air pollution, and more traffic congestion. Let some other community with more open spaces get the benefits of an improved and/or larger airport, and preserve the small-town spirit of Westchester.

Let LAWA build elsewhere! LAX is too big already.

**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 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.

**PC01078      Carlson, Carol      None Provided      7/14/2001**

**PC01078-1**

**Comment:**

SUBJECT: NOISE

The increase of airplanes and cars to LAX will greatly increase the noise level. This is especially true since it is indicated that larger aircraft, including more cargo planes, will be using LAX. The EIS/EIR does not properly analyze the noise impacts imposed by expansion because:

- the criteria used to measure the changes in noise is improper;
- LAWA's noise exposure contours are under-stated.

**Response:**

For more information please see Topical Responses TR-N-1 regarding the noise modeling approach, Topical Response-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences, Topical Response TR-N-5, regarding nighttime aircraft operations, and Subtopical Response TR-N-6.2 regarding relationship between traffic levels and noise levels.

**PC01078-2**

**Comment:**

Sound proofing does not stop noise. Sound proofing homes requires that one lock themselves inside their homes and do not go outside. People live in this area because of the cool summers and moderate winters. No air-conditioning is needed and only a small amount of heat. Where are those cool ocean breezes when one is locked inside with windows closed? This is no quality of life.

**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, including thresholds used to identify significant noise levels, and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding quality of life.

**PC01078-3**

**Comment:**

Let us keep our quality of life. Develop a regional airport plan instead of expanding 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-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

<b>PC01079</b>	<b>Ductor, Serene &amp; Joseph</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/15/2001</b>
----------------	------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------

#### **PC01079-1**

**Comment:**

As long time residents of Westchester (51 years) we are very concerned about the expansion of LAX. We are especially concerned about the additional traffic, noise, pollution and overcrowding.

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

#### **PC01079-2**

**Comment:**

This area has a strong sense of community and will be devastated by the removal of a large section of the business district and many surrounding homes.

**Response:**

Impacts associated with acquisition were addressed in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residents or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

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 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.

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. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

#### **PC01079-3**

**Comment:**

A reasonable solution could be the use of Ontario or Palmdale for all cargo and LAX for passenger travel.

**Response:**

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. Please see Response to Comment PC00922-1 for information on air cargo.

#### PC01079-4

**Comment:**

We already have myriad huge trucks all day on Century Blvd. Imperial Blvd. Aviation, etc. Driving these streets has become hazardous.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

#### PC01079-5

**Comment:**

Most major U.S. cities have airports many miles from the city itself and with rapid transportation, this would be feasible.

**Response:**

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

#### PC01079-6

**Comment:**

If it is true that air traffic will doubled if the expansion is carried out as planned, the potential for an air disaster seems more than probable.

**Response:**

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

**PC01080**

**Sales, Tony**

**None Provided**

**7/15/2001**

#### PC01080-1

**Comment:**

It's bad enough that the pollution in the Westchester area has gotten worse in the past 14 years. What more if the LAX expansion pushes through?

**Response:**

Please see 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.

#### PC01080-2

**Comment:**

The traffic congestion has also gotten 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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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.

#### PC01080-3

**Comment:**

and so is the noise in spite of the soundproofing program.

**Response:**

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR described the soundproofing program, included under the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP), in Section 4.2, Land Use. The ANMP provides for residential sound insulation for eligible residents within the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL contours. As was shown on Figure 4.2-6 of the Draft EIS/EIR, 1996 baseline 65 CNEL contours have decreased since 1992. As was presented in Figure S1 in Technical Report S-1, Land Use Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the Year 2000 65 CNEL contours are also fully within the contours established for the ANMP. These decreases in area within the 65 CNEL contours since 1992 are primarily due to the phasing out of older and noisier aircrafts. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for further discussion of the ANMP and TR-N-1 regarding the noise modeling approach.

#### PC01080-4

**Comment:**

As residents of Westchester we totally disapprove of the LAX proposal and strongly believe that all these problems can be resolved if other airport areas such as Ontario and Palmdale will be taken into consideration.

**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.

#### PC01080-5

**Comment:**

We want to live in a safe environment, and we want our children and grandchildren to grow up happy and healthy.

**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.

**PC01081      Johnson, Avis      None Provided      7/14/2001**

**PC01081-1**

**Comment:**

- Cargo planes should use Ontario or Palmdale airports

**Response:**

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. Please see Responses to Comments PC00599-54 and PC00922-1 regarding cargo activity.

**PC01081-2**

**Comment:**

- Extend #105 on south side of Airport. Do not take Nielsen Field + Westchester business.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology, in particular Subtopical Response TR-ST-2.7 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 alleviate airport-related traffic in Westchester. Any land acquisition, including businesses, would be kept as minimal as absolutely necessary. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC01081-3**

**Comment:**

- Extend Green Line to Airport using south side (Imperial).

**Response:**

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

**PC01082      Conn, Kathryn      None Provided      7/15/2001**

**PC01082-1**

**Comment:**

I am responding to the EIS/EIR regarding the expansion of Los Angeles International Airport. Absolutely not! Westchester is one of only a handful areas that have fostered a "community feeling" and a strong sense of pride. There are few remaining areas affordable to the average person on the Westside of town that remain affordable and desirable in which to raise a family.

**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.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

#### **PC01082-2**

**Comment:**

The central business district will be eliminated, as well would homes near the Nielsen Field as well as part of the historic Centennial Adobe.

**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.

#### **PC01082-3**

**Comment:**

And as time continues, the desire for more land acquisition will continue to destroy what is left of the neighborhood.

**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. As indicated in TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester business district.

#### **PC01082-4**

**Comment:**

Noise

The increased noise is unacceptable as is the current solution. Sound proofing one's home is tantamount to volunteering oneself to becoming a prisoner inside our own homes.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program, Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels, Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding noise mitigation, and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

#### **PC01082-5**

**Comment:**

Not to mention the devaluing of the property that is part of our future retirement.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

#### **PC01082-6**

**Comment:**

Pollution

LAX is already one of the regions single largest sources of Nox emissions. The EIR/EIS predicts that the increased traffic will result in increased levels in all 5 of the EPA classified major air pollutant.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

**PC01082-7**

**Comment:**

This will affect the quality of air we breathe as well as the respiratory systems of older people. I would believe that there is also a causal effect with cancer in addition.

**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. Please also see Topical Response TR-EJ-1 regarding potential air quality and health risk impacts on low-income and minority communities.

**PC01082-8**

**Comment:**

Traffic  
The increase in traffic due to the cargo demands is absurd.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic. Alternative D, 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.

**PC01082-9**

**Comment:**

The idea that the Arbor Vitae interchange will mitigate the current traffic problem on the 405 is nonsensical. That is not where the traffic slow downs are most prevalent. Traffic problems on the 405 have little to do with the airport as it is configured now. How about working on the traffic concerns a bit further north as around the Santa Monica Boulevard exit up to the Sunset exit. If we honestly are attempting to solve problems let us be honest about where the problems lie.

**Response:**

FHWA has withdrawn its support for a half interchange at Arbor Vitae, and that the proposed half interchange is not part of the LAX Master Plan. FHWA policy is to only consider full proposed interchanges, not partial ones. The Arbor Vitae interchange is not proposed as a mitigation for any airport impacts. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01082-10

**Comment:**

The LAX expansion will only increase traffic that can be resolved by taking more homes and again destroying the sense of community that have been part of the quality of life in Westchester. The projects targeting the expansion of Sepulveda Boulevard, the extension of Airport Boulevard from Howard Hughes Center will virtually tear apart one of the nicer neighborhoods in the area. Are we not just perpetuating the image that Los Angeles has no history and no real neighborhoods that are safe and enjoyable in which to live? Why must we continue to destroy what we have, though be it fragile?

**Response:**

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed acquisition impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residents or Businesses, community disruption impacts in Section 4.4.4, Community Disruption and Alteration of Surface Transportation Patterns, and surface transportation impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. 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-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

#### PC01082-11

**Comment:**

Regional approach

The realistic and honorable plan is a master plan that looks at this city with a regional approach to a truly regional problem. Long term planning to address the expansion of the Palmdale, Ontario and the El Toro airports. Let each community bear their fair share and responsibility to handle the load of air commerce. The Westside of town is currently too congested, as a result of pushing an unrealistic share of responsibility on one area. By taking a regional approach the traffic would be mitigated, the noise lessened, and then the issues remaining would be to modernize LAX without ruining the surrounding communities.

**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.

#### PC01082-12

**Comment:**

I oppose the expansion of LAX in any form and the wider implications of 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.

**PC01083      Rivas, Fernando &      None Provided      7/14/2001**  
**Nina**

**PC01083-1**

**Comment:**

This with regards to the expansion of LAX. Since we moved to Westchester in 1958, the airport has been gradually eroding this 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-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01083-2**

**Comment:**

The LAX expansion would further destroy our community with increased traffic, excessive noise, air pollution emitted by increased air traffic, trucks (cargo) and increased auto traffic.

**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 and Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

**PC01083-3**

**Comment:**

In addition, the business district will be destroyed by acquisition.

**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. 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 was described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6.5), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, note that 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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01083-4**

**Comment:**

Why not expand Ontario, Palmdale, Long Beach or John Wayne?

**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. The city of Los Angeles does not have the authority to make decisions to further develop Long Beach Airport or John Wayne Airport - Orange County.

**PC01083-5**

**Comment:**

My family & neighbors are totally opposed to your Master 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.

**PC01084**

**Gianola, Theresa &  
Ernestine**

**None Provided**

**7/12/2001**

**PC01084-1**

**Comment:**

Airport expansion should not take place.

**Response:**

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

**PC01084-2**

**Comment:**

Our Area will be completely destroyed because of added air pollution, traffic congestion, added street repair because of heavy cargo movement.

**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 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. Regarding the potential effects of cargo movement on streets, LAWA would continue to work with the City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works to ensure that all roadways serving the airport are adequately maintained.

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01084-3****Comment:**

Our safety is in jeopardy even now with noise and flights that are being added.

**Response:**

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

**PC01084-4****Comment:**

Additional expansion in the LAX area is definitely a No-No! Other alternatives are available.

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

**PC01085****Korban, Jennifer****None Provided****7/14/2001****PC01085-1****Comment:**

Expansion of LAX is un-necessary and un-fair. The traffic, noise, air pollution and safety are already out of control. Why make it worse? Are you trying to force all the residents out of this area? It sure seems that way! There must be a more practical solution.

**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. One of the objectives of the LAX Master Plan, stated in Section 2.1, The Purpose and Objectives of the Proposed Project, of the Draft EIS/EIR is 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." 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.

**PC01086****Burke, Richard****None Provided****7/13/2001****PC01086-1****Comment:**

We object to further airport 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.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

#### **PC01086-2**

**Comment:**

Noise - We can't hear the TV now when the sliding glass door is open. At one time LA had a noise restriction that was overturned by the FAA, supposedly they were going to lesson the noise allowed by the planes. If they did it is not noticeable. It is impossible to carry on a conversation outside when a plane is taking off. Increasing the number of flights is going to make the noise continuous.

**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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase. Please see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-7.6 regarding ANCA Phase-out of Stage 2 aircraft.

#### **PC01086-3**

**Comment:**

Traffic - The traffic is heavy now in Playa Del Rey with the people south of us coming through going north. They have made our residential street unsafe for children.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

#### **PC01086-4**

**Comment:**

With the airport entrance moving to Pershing we will have all the airport traffic in addition to what we have now.

**Response:**

Under Alternatives A, B, and C, the Pershing Drive access to a future west terminal was planned to prohibit traffic from entering or exiting the west terminal from the Pershing Drive north of Westchester Parkway, or from Imperial Highway, west of Pershing. Furthermore, access to the Ring Road from Main Street in El Segundo was designed to provide access to and from the east only. These steps were taken to minimize any west terminal airport traffic from using residential neighborhood streets in Playa del Rey or El Segundo. Alternative D has no ring road or west terminal. 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-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

#### **PC01086-5**

**Comment:**

Safety - How can doubling the number of flights make the air and ground more safe from accidents? Increasing the number of cars on the freeways hasn't made them safer.

**Response:**

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

**PC01086-6****Comment:**

Communities - The airport has already taken over much of Playa Del Rey and Westchester. Do you plan on eventually eliminating both of them? Why should this area carry the burden for the entire metropolitan area?

**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. As indicated in TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester business district.

**PC01087****Atkinson, June****None Provided****7/14/2001****PC01087-1****Comment:**

I wish to express my opposition to the 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.

**PC01087-2****Comment:**

1) The Centinela Adobe Park is about two blocks away from my house in the Osage section of Westchester, and any infringement on that little oasis will adversely affect the whole Osage section, especially those homes within walking distance. If part of the park is taken, that must mean that my home, which is now buffered from the offramp/onramps in that area will ultimately be right next to the freeway.

**Response:**

Figures 3.1-1 through 3.1-4 and Figures 3.1-6 through 3.1-10 included in Section 5.1, Land Use, of Appendix K of the Draft EIS/EIR identify those properties that would be potentially (directly) impacted (partial or full acquisition) by either of the proposed expressway build alternatives. Those properties do include homes along Midfield Avenue under LAX Expressway Alternative 2 that can be considered the Osage section of Westchester. Homes along Goodard Avenue and W. 76th Street may experience negative indirect impacts from the proposed split viaduct (Alternative 2) such as noise, light/glare, shade/shadow. However, noise abatement in the form of sound barrier walls are proposed on the Top-of-Slope to minimize and reduce potentially adverse noise impacts to these residences. With the installation of these sound walls, projected noise levels of approximately 76 dBA would be reduced to 66 dBA. Residences in the Osage area would be potentially exposed to additional light and glare spill over affects during the nighttime hours given the presence of light standards on the proposed expressway. Mitigation measures are proposed for addressing such a light/glare impact and involves restricting the lighting intensity by no more than two foot-candles above existing conditions.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01087-3

**Comment:**

2) The expansion will add to freeway and other road traffic in my area, which has already increased unbelievably over the past twelve years. The ultimate effect will be a taking of my property for the good of the airport and city revenues.

**Response:**

The 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. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding the proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. The proposed airport development Alternatives A, B, and C would require additional land acquisition of 273, 345, and 216 acres, respectively. The specific areas to be acquired were detailed in Volume 4, Chapter 5, Section 3.3, Final Iteration Alternative Development and Refinement, of the LAX Master Plan document.

#### PC01087-4

**Comment:**

3) My home does not qualify for the 65 CNEL noise impact soundproofing even though the noise will be considerably more. Has any measurement been contemplated for what will happen as a result of the expansion? When will measurements be done? Will they be done prior to the next expansion but after this proposed expansion?

**Response:**

Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6) of the Draft EIS/EIR included tables of dwelling units and population that would be newly exposed to the 65 CNEL or experience an increase of 1.5 CNEL within the 65 CNEL for Alternatives A, B, and C compared to the 1996 baseline 65 CNEL, the No Action/No Project 65 CNEL, and the ANMP 65 CNEL. This information was also presented for Alternative D in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6.5), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6) presented a table of residential uses by jurisdiction newly exposed to the 65 CNEL or 1.5 increase within the 65 CNEL compared to Year 2000 conditions for informational purposes for all alternatives. Subsection 4.2.6 also identified those residential uses that would be newly exposed to high single event noise levels (defined as the 94 dBA SEL noise contour) that would result in nighttime awakening for Alternatives A, B, C, and D compared to the 1996 baseline, Year 2000 conditions, and the No Action/No Project Alternative. In addition to areas being newly exposed to high noise levels, some areas would be removed from areas currently exposed to high noise levels and some jurisdictions would experience an overall reduction in the area, dwelling units, and population exposed to the 65 CNEL or greater contour compared to 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions. See Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4 for a description of monitoring methods used to validate the current 65 CNEL contour and Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.14 for a description of how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the implementation of the ANMP, including the provision of fulfilling existing commitments to owners wishing to participate within the current ANMP boundary prior to proceeding with newly eligible properties. The proposed Master Plan project that would guide airport development through the year 2015 is the only airport expansion project being contemplated by LAWA, as described in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

#### PC01087-5

**Comment:**

4) As the whole reason for expansion is to bring in more flights and larger planes which will result in more noise and pollution, both from air and from the trucking activities. LAX should be reserved for passengers and light cargo, with all the rest going out of town.

**Response:**

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. 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 Response to Comment PC00922-1 regarding air cargo.

**PC01087-6**

**Comment:**

5) The likelihood of air collision is presently a concern, and will be more of a concern as the traffic is increased.

**Response:**

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

**PC01087-7**

**Comment:**

6) Have you considered the existing rails from Ontario and from North of LA?

**Response:**

The existing rails will not support high-speed service. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand.

**PC01087-8**

**Comment:**

7) I put all the money I could into a home in a safe, affordable location. As I probably will have to sell, I will lose my dream home.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation, including affordable housing.

**PC01087-9**

**Comment:**

8) Is there any class action or other action that you know of which I can join to stop the expansion or require the airport to pay a reasonable price for my home?

**Response:**

Residential 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. As indicated in subsection 4.4.2.1, Introduction, compensation for acquired properties is governed by the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, its implementing regulations, FAA guidelines, and related federal laws. It should be noted that Alternative D does not propose residential acquisition.

**PC01088      Houchin, Richard A.      None Provided      7/14/2001**  
**& Mary K.**

**PC01088-1**

**Comment:**

1) We have lived here for 10 years + and are in process of thinking of retirement. This was to be our retirement home. But if your plan goes through, we will be forced to move. Please reconsider the expansion of LAX for the obvious reasons:

- 1) Traffic - all ready very bad
- 2) Noise - since we lived here noise has all ready gotten worse
- 3) Air Pollution
- 4) Safety - due to overcrowding
- 5) Short term fix for LAX - we need a long term fix.

**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-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.

**PC01089      Cuiilty, Alex H. &      None Provided      7/16/2001**  
**Anita Jo**

**PC01089-1**

**Comment:**

We have lived in Westchester/Playa del Rey area since 1966. We raised a family here, and we love this community. We do not want to lose it. If the LAX expansion goes through we will. All of the young families that have moved in will have to leave. Raising children in the area would be dangerous if the expansion goes through.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition. 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.

**PC01089-2**

**Comment:**

As you must be aware traffic now is becoming unbearable. No room for increased roads.



**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.

**PC01089-3**

**Comment:**

We want to be out doors not inside. The noise would be unbearable also. Again the children would be exposed to dangerous levels of noise and pollution. They cannot stay indoors always.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise. In addition, please see Topical Responses TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels and TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts associated with air pollution.

**PC01089-4**

**Comment:**

We have other airports to consider using. We have Orange County, San Fernando Valley Area, all of Los Angeles and surrounding areas using this airport. Just looking at the number of people and the miles between us should give us the idea that the LAX can not service everyone. The airport was really only intended to service Los Angeles.

**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.

**PC01089-5**

**Comment:**

We strongly urge you to reconsider the expansion. Please look at it with Compassion for others, Consideration for others, and plain old practicality.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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

---

**PC01090      Iacono, James      None Provided      7/13/2001**

**PC01090-1**

**Comment:**

No to LAX expansion!  
Noise is too much already.  
Traffic is too bad already.  
Exhaust soot is too bad already.  
Enough is enough!  
LAX expansion will seriously hurt my property value!

**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-AQ-1 regarding soot and 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.

**PC01091      Ballard, Mr. & Mrs. Roy      None Provided      7/13/2001**

**PC01091-1**

**Comment:**

We are against the LAX expansion plan. The expansion will increase traffic, noise and air pollution to an intolerable level.

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

**PC01091-2**

**Comment:**

We already have major building development on both Sepulveda and Lincoln Boulevards (Playa Vista) several apartment units in Marina Del Rey area. New larger apartment buildings on Manchester replacing smaller units. All streets are lined with parked cars and a new hotel is planned for Admiralty Way. We soon won't be able to leave our homes.

**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.

**PC01091-3****Comment:**

Why not make use of Palmdale, Ontario and El Toro Marine Base? Why should we have to bear the brunt of all these problems. Its time to share the burden!!

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC01092****Rosen, Lawrence****None Provided****7/10/2001****PC01092-1****Comment:**

As we contemplate the impact of possible LAX expansion on our neighborhood, we wonder if the LAWA commission can answer the following questions:

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

**PC01092-2****Comment:**

- What measures are being taken to expedite traffic flow?

**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. A series of measures are being taken to expedite traffic flow, both as part of the project and as part of mitigation. Please see Section 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, and Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for details of the traffic plan.

**PC01092-3****Comment:**

- The 30,000 new Playa Vista residents: their impact on traffic.

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00148-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00148-2.

**PC01092-4****Comment:**

- Will LAWA compensate homeowners for the increase in noise -via soundproofing?

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program, in particular Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.9 which states that sound insulation does not incur any cost to the homeowner, and also Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.14 regarding how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP.

**PC01092-5**

**Comment:**

Will there be help for the mental sanity issues that will arise from the increase noise & pollution?

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise. Proposed mitigation for impacts to air quality are provided in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC01092-6**

**Comment:**

How safe will it be to fly with more air traffic? There is already a problem "up there" with current load.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. The statutory responsibility of the FAA is to ensure the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace. The FAA will continue to ensure that minimum separations between aircraft are maintained to ensure safety of aircraft operations both on the ground and in the air.

**PC01093**

**Amirkhan, Ph.D.,  
James**

**None Provided**

**7/13/2001**

**PC01093-1**

**Comment:**

Over the last few years, the traffic problem in Playa del Rey/Westchester has become intolerable. It is impossible to leave for work using Lincoln, Sepulveda or Culver Blvd. Returning from work, especially on Thursday and Friday, traffic on the 105W freeway is at a standstill, due to the LAX Airport exit.

We are very concerned that an expansion in LAX will increase the volume of traffic - not only due to passenger vehicles/shuttles/taxis, but also due to increased cargo transportation. We can barely handle present traffic conditions;

**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, Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts, Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic, and Topical Response TR-ST-7 regarding Westchester Southside traffic.

**PC01093-2**

**Comment:**

the completion of the Playa Vista project will worsen the situation;

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00148-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00148-2.

**PC01093-3****Comment:**

the LAX expansion will ruin it completely.

**Response:**

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

**PC01093-4****Comment:**

Please do not let this happen!

**Response:**

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

**PC01094**

**Szekely, Aaron,  
Claudia & Pedro**

**None Provided**

**PC01094-1****Comment:**

As a family that has lived in El Segundo for eleven years, I would like to express my profound concern regarding the proposed expansion of LAX. I would like for you to address in particular, the following most pressing concerns:

**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.

**PC01094-2****Comment:**

1. The proposed expansion of LAX will likely generate far more than the 89 to 98 million passengers the airport claims. The current airport was projected to handle 40 million passengers per year and now serves 67 million. The history of LAX suggests that the Master Plan could well result in volumes as high as 120 million annual passengers. We are concerned with the impact associated with this much higher volume.

**Response:**

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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01094-3

**Comment:**

2. An environmental impact report must consider a reasonable range of alternatives to the project. What regional alternatives are proposed by the EIR?

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding the range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR, and Supplement to 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.

#### PC01094-4

**Comment:**

Does the EIR consider any alternative that would result in fewer adverse impacts than LAWA's preferred plan, Alternative C?

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. 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. 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.

#### PC01094-5

**Comment:**

3. LAWA says the plan represents an increase of only 44 takeoffs and landings per day. However, aren't these projections held artificially low by favorable unjustified assumptions about fleet mix? What would be the impact from additional takeoffs and landings?

**Response:**

Please see responses to Comments PC00599-7 and PC00593-1 for a discussion on the fleet mix assumptions and operational levels. The environmental analyses in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, including noise and air quality, addressed the potential impacts under the most practical and most likely activity level for each alternative. The environmental impacts associated with aircraft operations could vary according to the number of aircraft operations as well as other factors such as the type of aircraft and different airport operational characteristics. The Draft EIS/EIR evaluated a reasonable range of alternatives as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

#### PC01094-6

**Comment:**

4. The I-405 is already averaging 18-23 mph during peak hour. Because of regional growth it will slow to 10-16 mph in twenty years. Wouldn't the LAX expansion only make that worse? Is the impact of the LAX expansion on the I-405 examined in the EIR?

**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.

**PC01094-7**

**Comment:**

5. LAX is already the region's largest single source of smog-forming NOx emissions. The expansion plan will as much as triple the NOx emissions from the airport. Yet, LAWA plans to mitigate only about 30% of the new NOx emissions. This is unacceptable.

**Response:**

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

**PC01094-8**

**Comment:**

6. All three expansion scenarios propose to more than double cargo activity at LAX. That will double the truck traffic and diesel emissions LAX neighbors will have to breathe. This too is unacceptable.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

**PC01094-9**

**Comment:**

7. Arterials like Sepulveda Blvd. are already gridlocked at rush hour. The expansion of LAX will turn Sepulveda Blvd. into a parking lot. Needless to say, this will be unbearable, considering that many of us must already leave home before 6:00 am in order to avoid the traffic later on.

**Response:**

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

**PC01094-10**

**Comment:**

There are several communities willing and eager to be given the opportunity to develop their airport facilities and to expand the economic opportunities and job creation process that an expansion of their facilities would bring. LAX neighboring communities are already bearing more than a fair share of the burden. Why not consider a regional solution that would benefit economically other communities? Why not consider a regional solution that would not unfairly burden one community exclusively, to the detriment of hundreds of residents and property owners when, there are so many alternatives that would be agreeable to all interested parties?

**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.

#### PC01094-11

**Comment:**

We know the quality of life in El Segundo will be irreversibly damaged and consequently, property values will suffer if the expansion of LAX is approved by the Los Angeles City Council. We urge you to consider that for many El Segundo residents, our homes are our only savings. The airport expansion could significantly erode property values.

**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. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D, the 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 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.

#### PC01094-12

**Comment:**

Why impose such a heavy burden on a few communities (including low income families who are already struggling to make ends meet) in this manner when there are solutions that would distribute the burden more equitably and to the economic benefit of these other communities eager to expand their airport capacity?

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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. Also, 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.

**PC01095**

**Lioio, Rick**

**None Provided**

**7/14/2001**

#### PC01095-1

**Comment:**

I am a 25 year South Bay resident strongly against LAX expansion. The proponents of expansion are the proponents of uncontrolled growth who's only real interest is in making more money by trashing the quality of life in this area which is already overcrowded. They argue expansion is needed to handle the increased traffic from increased business and commerce and that it will mean more jobs and more business in the area. We don't need more jobs and business here. If more jobs are not created here people will go elsewhere. And that's the way it should be.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

#### PC01095-2

**Comment:**

People like me who have lived here and invested our personal capital-time and hard work-into building a decent life also have a right to enjoy what all our labor has earned us-a decent quality of life. Not more overcrowding, more noise and more pollution. The object of progress should be to improve quality of life not to constantly erode it so yet more people can be crammed into an area just so developers can make more money.

**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 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.

#### PC01095-3

**Comment:**

It's time this crap stopped. I am appalled at how Riordan, the LA City Council and our political leadership have rammed the Master Plan down the throats of LA residents with virtually no regard for all the objections and protests. It shows total disregard for legal democratic process and how political leadership has been bought by developers. It's a shocking disgrace and I and others like me will use what political and legal power we have to stop it and force power back to the people who have invested their life in this area.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

#### PC01095-4

**Comment:**

Specifically, even though I live in Redondo Beach 8 miles from the airport and chose this location to stay away from airport noise, the noise from LAX has been steadily increasing over the years and is now a constant rumble like continuous distant thunder, sometimes all night long. It may be amazing to some that the noise spreads this far but it does. Lately, there have been repeated noise incidents past 11 PM which I am told by the LAX noise desk are caused by older jets overloaded by express freight carriers which are very slow to gain altitude. Their over flights create enough noise to wake the entire household and have occurred after 1 AM.

**Response:**

The commentor may be affected by easterly takeoffs circling back to the west on their departures to Asia. LAVA 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. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay. Additionally, please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-5.2 regarding east flow operations at night. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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.

#### PC01095-5

**Comment:**

These incidents show that noise regulations are routinely ignored in the name of "business". Expansion will only increase this problem until the entire South Bay suffers the way El Segundo does currently. I for one will not tolerate it.

**Response:**

LAX only has an informal set of noise abatement rules. These are described in detail in Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement. New air traffic routes will not be developed over the South Bay communities as a result of the Master Plan projects. Regardless of the master plan alternative, the air traffic routes now used throughout the region and in areas beyond the initial departure and final approach courses will continue to be used by aircraft operating at LAX. As described by Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay, the new procedures recently implemented to reroute traffic south of LAX during departure are independent of the Master Plan and have nothing to do with the implementation of any of the proposed development actions. These changes were reported in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, Section 7, of the Draft EIS/EIR for informational purposes and included in the modeling of future noise conditions, but not within the environmental baseline condition of 1996 since they had not been implemented at that time. 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 Alternative D.

#### PC01095-6

**Comment:**

I work in an office near the airport. Even though I park in a covered structure, it is shocking to see the fine, greasy black dirt which coats my car every week. It's pollution from the jets and it's not only on the car but in my lungs.

**Response:**

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

#### PC01095-7

**Comment:**

The airport does not belong in the middle of a densely populated area. Of course the airport was here first and the area developed around it. Of course airports draw business. But we have a chance to be smart and correct the problem-not compound it and make it worse. And our political leaders should be smart enough to realize it. I believe they are, but they are manipulated and blinded by money. The smart thing to do is to move most of the airport outside the city. That will solve the problem for another 25 years until Palmdale or wherever becomes developed. Of course that will hurt the developers who have plans here and have paid one way or another to move their plans forward. But that's too bad. They made risky business decisions and sometimes they will lose. It's an issue of a few developers versus at least a million 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 and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

**PC01095-8****Comment:**

I commute each day on Sepulveda and PCH. They are the only access roads in the area. Over the years traffic has steadily grown to where the 7 mile trip takes a half hour. That's 14 MPH. The recent widening of Sepulveda has made an enormous improvement in my commute, cutting time by 30%. Traffic density is more like other cities I've been in-tolerable for human beings in the 21st century in the most advanced country in the world. I know the widening was done in response to criticism about airport-related traffic. However, driving conditions are now closer to what they should be. There is no room on the road for more traffic. The widening only corrected an existing problem. It does not support additional traffic.

**Response:**

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

**PC01095-9****Comment:**

Get your heads screwed on right. You're not listening to us. We should be working to improve living conditions not to make them worse. I use the airport a lot for business and personal travel. I know many people who connect by shuttle from the valley. The prospect of a bus, van or train ride to and from the airport does not bother me. I have dealt with this at Dulles where the airport is appropriately situated. The airport expansion and other development decisions must be based on realistic criteria that enhance quality of life not degrade it. Business and money are not the only reasons people live in LA and they must not be the major considerations in planning. If our elected leaders don't get that message, it's up to the people to protect their interests. And we will do that.

**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.

**PC01096****Bholat, Esoof****None Provided****7/12/2001****PC01096-1****Comment:**

I received a letter in regards to the expansion of the LAX airport. Before any further advancements, please take into consideration the homes and families in the LAX area.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01096-2****Comment:**

My home resides under the landing pad runway. It has become a health concern and a tremendous burdensome having a plane come over my house continuously every minute. When I called the sound installation department of the LAX, they told me my home is qualified for fixture of soundproof windows and doors. However, every time I call in regard to this installation they decline to give me any further notice or dates on when my home will be fixed. (Furthermore, I believe that the homes that fall under the landing pad runway should be fixed first.) Therefore, I am against the expansion of the LAX airport.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**Response:**

Existing conditions that have the potential to pose potential health risks in the vicinity of LAX were presented in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment (subsection 4.24.1.3), of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program, in particular Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.8 regarding how priority for receiving sound insulation is determined and Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.14 regarding how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP. Generally, sound insulation is prioritized for homes within the noise impact area that are experiencing the highest noise 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.

**PC01096-3**

**Comment:**

Also, as far as I know, planes should not land from the east to the west between midnight and 6am. This does not seem to be the case as I wake up in cause of the disturbance from the planes 10 to 15 times a week.

**Response:**

LAWA has undertaken an evaluation of sleep disturbance which is provided in Section 4.1, Noise, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Its mitigation program includes implementation of restrictions on easterly departures during over-ocean procedures at night and sound insulation of significantly impacted properties that are not mitigated by that action. 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.

**PC01097**

**MacLellan, Nora**

**None Provided**

**7/13/2001**

**PC01097-1**

**Comment:**

Safety (1) More air traffic = more near collisions and possible disaster

**Response:**

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

**PC01097-2**

**Comment:**

(2) Potential Terrorists: LAX, El Toro, Ontario etc. - spread the risk!!

If a terrorist attacks LAX, the West Coast is at a stand still. Other airports allows diversion of traffic

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments PC02236-02, PC01881-31, and PC02131-5.

**PC01097-3**

**Comment:**

(3) More ground traffic = more congestion! more pollution!

Pollution

More air traffic = more street congestion = more pollution

**Response:**

While increasing roadway and airfield congestion may increase emissions of some air pollutants, any of the Master Plan build alternatives described in the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR will have the effect of reducing congestion when compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative. Therefore, in general, pollutant concentrations will be lower in the future under any of the Master Plan build alternatives than would exist under 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 air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. 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.

**PC01097-4**

**Comment:**

Noise:

(1) I am out side the 65 CNEL area and I have to ask people to hold on the phone until the plane goes by or shut my window.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels. Please also see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

**PC01097-5**

**Comment:**

(2) I am awoken every night because of noise from the airport

**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.

**PC01098      Mikolajczyk, Eugene      None Provided**

**7/13/2001**

**PC01098-1**

**Comment:**

I do not intend this as a nimby response, but I oppose the increase in traffic, noise & pollution that we will suffer when locals like those in El Toro fight to oppose doing their share of sacrificing to help with airport congestion. Why are we the only ones who suffer while other communities refuse to help.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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 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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01099      Felicioni, Ronald      None Provided**

**PC01099-1**

**Comment:**

My family objects to the expansion (modernization) of LAX because of the increased volumes of traffic, noise, pollution, and demand on local infrastructures, levels which are not shared by other communities within the region.

Palmdale, Ontario, El Toro, Long Beach, March AFB, and other locations within the region are viable options, long term, that will improve the quality of life for all served

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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 traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and public utilities in Section 4.25, Public Utilities. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendices D and G and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4, and 15 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendices S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-2, S-4, and S-10 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC01100      Morris, Kay      None Provided**

**PC01100-1**

**Comment:**

The purpose of this letter is to express my total opposition to your LAX expansion plan and to comment on specific problems I see with the plan.

**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.

**PC01100-2**

**Comment:**

- Excessive Air Pollution: Pollution from planes and increased auto traffic will create excessive levels of pollution. In fact I understand that smog levels are expected to increase 1302 percent.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase and Response to Comment PC00746-4.

**PC01100-3****Comment:**

- Excessive Traffic: Even with the improvements in the plan with the freeway access the traffic projections seem to be grossly understated.

**Response:**

The methodology used incorporated industry-accepted techniques. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

**PC01100-4****Comment:**

They do not for example take into account the build out of neighboring Playa Vista which with 25000+ additional homes will place more pressure on airport roads and those approaching and around the airport.

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00148-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00148-2.

**PC01100-5****Comment:**

- Regional Airports Not Given Consideration: The concept of spreading more of the traffic to areas where population growth is the greatest seemed to get only lip service in the planning. Ontario airport needs to be expanded much more before LAX and the Palmdale facility must be opened. Also, a freight only airport should be established at one of the closed air bases in the region. Concentrating more flights at LAX only puts more pressure on our roads and environment.

**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. 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.

**PC01100-6****Comment:**

- Questions: 1) Was pressure on airport approach surface streets like Pershing Drive considered?

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

**Response:**

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

**PC01100-7**

**Comment:**

2) Will calculations concerning traffic be reconsidered using Playa Vista projections?

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00148-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00148-2.

**PC01101      Ayala, Christina      None Provided      7/14/2001**

**PC01101-1**

**Comment:**

I am opposed to LAX expansion and am very concerned about the increased air pollution that will result. The EIR/EIS report predicts an increase in emissions that are classified as major air pollutants. As a mother of 2 something of this nature that can possible lead to cancer is intolerable.

**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, Air Quality. 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.

**PC01102      Ayala, Christina      None Provided      7/14/2001**

**PC01102-1**

**Comment:**

I believe that other airports in Ontario, Palmdale & El Toro should be developed instead of LAX. It is unjust that Westchester and surrounding communities should bear the burden of Orange County's need for air commerce.

**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. 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.

**PC01103      Redulfin, Roy & Michelle      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01103-1**

**Comment:**

Our family does not want 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.



**PC01103-2****Comment:**

Our area of the 405 freeway is already a nightmare, and creating more ways to get to the airport is not going to help.

**Response:**

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

**PC01103-3****Comment:**

I am unable to leave my windows open in the front of my house because of the noise of air traffic.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels. Outdoor noise levels from 1996 baseline traffic noise and combined aircraft and roadway noise were presented in Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.3.2), of the Draft EIS/EIR. Outdoor noise levels from Year 2000 traffic noise and combined aircraft and roadway noise were presented in Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.3.2), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC01103-4****Comment:**

The expansion of LAX is only a short term fix to our growing population we need to concentrate on other airport sites. The west side is at critical mass and there is little space available. The population growth is in the outer areas of LA County (Palmdale and Ontario). These areas will have to have airports in the very near future. Why not start now. Ontario airport can be expanded with less disruption of people and their communities.

**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-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, for information on El Toro, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario International Airport, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

**PC01103-5****Comment:**

I like my neighborhood. We moved here because it is a nice place to live. I want my children to be safe and I want them to feel part of a wonderful community. Please leave Westchester alone!!!

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01104      Maloney, John      None Provided      7/14/2001**

**PC01104-1**

**Comment:**

The document does not sufficiently cover the use of alternate airports such as Ontario, El Toro, Pt. Mugu and Palmdale. Utilizing all available airport resources will reduce emissions from airport trips and entrance safely at LAX by reducing the demand for airport resources. Although El Toro has not been currently defined as a commercial airport and Pt. Mugu is still used as a military facility, both these airports should be included in the study. Another omission from the alternatives is the use of Hawthorne Airport as a commuter airport. Building a people mover directly to the airport would make Hawthorne a sensible alternative to adding an additional runway identified under alternatives A or B. The document needs not more fairly and realistically consider appropriate alternatives.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 and Response to Comment AF00001-56 regarding range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The use of Hawthorne Airport with a direct connection to LAX was considered as one of the LAX Master Plan alternatives early in the LAX Master Plan process. The Notice of Intent and Notice of Preparation that were circulated in June, 1997 included such an alternative. As indicated in Topical Response TR-ALT-1, due to public comment received during the scoping process, this alternative was eliminated from further consideration for environmental and jurisdictional reasons.

**PC01105      Kotoff, Bettie      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01105-1**

**Comment:**

The attached paper says it all why I am opposed to the LAX expansion. [Part of Mina Bharadwa Handout]

**Response:**

Comment noted. The attached letter is identical to the attached letter in Comment Letter PC00908. Please see Responses to Comments PC00908-2 through PC00908-15.

**PC01105-2**

**Comment:**

Anyone who is for it, should also be subjected to travel up & down Sepulveda Blvd at peak times & tell me how we could handle more traffic.

**Response:**

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

**PC01105-3**

**Comment:**

My original home in Westchester was taken by the airport years ago. & I hate to see my several friends lose theirs that are in the area that will be wiped out.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00040-46.

**PC01106****Britton Edkins,  
Catherine****None Provided****7/16/2001****PC01106-1****Comment:**

IT IS INCOMPREHENSIBLE THAT IT WOULD EVER LEAD TO EXPANSION OF LAX.

THERE IS ONLY ONE REASONABLE, PLAUSIBLE SOLUTION.  
USE THE OTHER 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.

**PC01106-2****Comment:**

DO NOT DESTROY OUR NEIGHBORHOODS AND COMMUNITY MORE THAN IT ALREADY HAS BEEN! NOISE, POLLUTION, TRAFFIC. IT IS TIME TO STOP LAX EXPANSION HERE AND 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 in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses 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. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

**PC01107****Wickliffe, H.****None Provided****7/12/2001****PC01107-1****Comment:**

I wish to express my extreme opposition to any expansion of the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). I appreciate LAWA's efforts to address current problems of access and traffic congestion as presented in the LAX Master Plan. However, I must vehemently oppose LAX expansion on the grounds that it would subject my family and my fellow Inglewood residents to additional (and excessive) nuisance and environmental and economic harm.

**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 economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2, S-3, 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

---

#### PC01107-2

**Comment:**

It is true that LAX provides important transportation to the greater Los Angeles area. Yet it is unreasonable to further burden Inglewood residents with the additional environmental and economic detriment that will result from LAX expansion. Expansion will subject us to:

- Increased noise and pollution from additional automobile and airplane traffic
- Reduction in real estate values from additional noise, pollution and traffic congestion
- Increased health risks from prolonged exposure to airport related pollution
- Decreased quality of life from additional noise, pollution and traffic congestion

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

#### PC01107-3

**Comment:**

The LAX Master Plan proposes that expansion will alleviate the current congestion problems. The plan does not explain how less traffic will result from a larger airport. It is more likely that a larger airport will simply be a busier airport with more flights, noise, pollution and traffic congestion.

**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.

#### PC01107-4

**Comment:**

In addition, the EIR/EIS falls seriously short in demonstrating that LAWA gave due consideration to the negative impacts LAX expansion will have on surrounding communities, specifically the City of Inglewood.

**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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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.

#### PC01107-5

**Comment:**

The baseline data used for much of the reported analysis does not provide accurate representation of the negative impacts of LAX current operations on Inglewood residents.

**Response:**

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

#### PC01107-6

**Comment:**

Further, it is disconcerting that LAWA's plans for mitigating the egregious harm that LAX expansion will inflict on Inglewood residents is not explicitly defined in the report.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

#### PC01107-7

**Comment:**

Lastly, the EIR/EIS fails in many respects to comply with the requirements of CEQA or NEPA.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

#### PC01107-8

**Comment:**

It is time to be fair in sharing the environmental and economic burdens of regional air transportation. I strongly urge LAWA to reconsider expanding LAX and instead urge them to seek more environmentally and economically fair alternatives to alleviate the current traffic congestion 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-ALT-1 regarding range of alternatives analyzed in 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.

**PC01108**

**Wickliffe, W.**

**None Provided**

**7/12/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01107; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01107.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01109      Blackmon, Alice      None Provided      7/11/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01107; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01107.

**PC01110      Moore, Shirley      None Provided      7/14/2001**

**PC01110-1**

**Comment:**

I have lived in Westchester over 39 years. I keep seeing changes in the area - some for better but a lot for worse -

It has become so noisy - especially in the last 10 years - I guess more planes are taking off & landing. It used to be a quiet neighborhood but with all the traffic from more cars & noise from the airport, it has become difficult for me to understand why I am still here - My children all grew up in Westchester & to them this is home - I guess that's why I'm still here but I really do worry about my health with all the pollution from the cars & planes - I would love to continue living here - hopefully the airport won't expand & make it more miserable than it already is.

**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-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.

**PC01110-2**

**Comment:**

Please take the excess traffic & pollution to Palmdale or an area where it isn't as populated as Westchester.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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. 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.

**PC01111 Sanders, Ruth None Provided 7/14/2001**

**PC01111-1**

**Comment:**

We want to keep the community whole. Whose house will go next?

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00908-2 and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding acquisition within the Community of Westchester. See also Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

**PC01111-2**

**Comment:**

We do not need the increase in cargo volume which will only lead to thousand more trucks. We have enough traffic!

**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.

**PC01111-3**

**Comment:**

The noise from the airport is enough. We do not need more noise and more air 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.

**PC01111-4**

**Comment:**

Overcrowding of the air corridors may lead to air disasters.

**Response:**

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

**PC01111-5**

**Comment:**

Ontario and Palmdale should be developed as opposed to L.A.X. El Toro should also be developed. Why should the communities around L.A.X. bear the burden of Orange County need for air commerce?

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**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. 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.

**PC01111-6**

**Comment:**

Don't you people understand we want no more expansion! We want to keep the L.A.X. community whole, clean, safe and as noise free as possible!

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, 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, 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. 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.

<b>PC01112</b>	<b>Tang, Kara</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/12/2001</b>
----------------	-------------------	----------------------	------------------

**PC01112-1**

**Comment:**

THIS PLAN WILL NOT SATISFACTORALLY MITIGATE THE ADDITIONAL POLLUTION, TRAFFIC, AND AIR SAFETY RISKS THAT WOULD ALL BE SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASED IF THIS PLAN IS PASSED.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Proposed measure to mitigate significant air quality and traffic impacts were identified in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, respectively, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, and provided the basis for the mitigation measures presented in this Final EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

**PC01112-2**

**Comment:**

PLEASE RECONSIDER & EXPAND REGIONAL AIRPORTS. DON'T HAVE DISTANT PASSENGERS HAVE TO DRIVE LONG DISTANCES TO GET TO 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.

<b>PC01113</b>	<b>Siegel, Judith</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/15/2001</b>
----------------	-----------------------	----------------------	------------------

**PC01113-1**

**Comment:**

I am totally against building the LAX EXPRESSWAY & the RING ROAD.



**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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 or Ring Road.

**PC01113-2**

**Comment:**

Westchester already has all the Air Pollution it can handle. We don't need more respiratory & cancer 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.

The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR evaluated the potential risk of adverse health effects for each of the Master Plan Alternatives based on the emissions associated with each of the alternatives. The No Project/No Action Alternative assumes that no substantial changes are made to current LAX facilities, and is based on projections of growth in airport activity between 1996 and horizon year 2015. Airport congestion during this time is expected to grow worse without additional capital improvement. In all cases, build alternatives are expected to relieve current and predicted future congestion by making airport operations, particularly aircraft operations, more efficient.

After implementation of mitigation measures, the build alternatives would reduce predicted impacts to human health compared with the No Project/No Action Alternative. Implementation of any of the build alternatives is therefore anticipated to reduce future health impacts for most people living, working or going to school near the airport. However, as was indicated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, predicted chronic non-cancer human health impacts for maximally exposed residents under Alternatives B and C are slightly higher for some areas than those predicted with the No Project/No Action Alternative.

**PC01113-3**

**Comment:**

Its about time Ontario, Palmdale, & El Toro share the burden.

**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. 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.

**PC01113-4**

**Comment:**

Safety in the overcrowding of the air corridors could be the cause of future air disasters. Our problems can only get worse with this plan.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**Response:**

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

**PC01114      Zywan, Robert      None Provided      7/13/2001**

**PC01114-1**

**Comment:**

NO LAX EXPANSION  
LOS ANGELES IS FULL

**Response:**

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

**PC01115      Bauske, Irene      None Provided      7/15/2001**

**PC01115-1**

**Comment:**

Like many of my neighbors I don't understand parts of the draft EIS/EIR. I think something as important as the LAX expansion deserves more than a one-day hearing.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process. Also, the LAX web page at [www.laxmasterplan.org](http://www.laxmasterplan.org) is very helpful with information.

**PC01115-2**

**Comment:**

LAX benefits most of southern Calif. one small community should not bear the burdens alone. It's time other communities shared the noise, pollution, and traffic caused by an international 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. 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.

**PC01115-3****Comment:**

A while ago council person Galanter suggested cargo transport should be shifted to Palmdale and leave LAX to passengers. This made sense to me, but I haven't heard anyone say this since Ms. Galanter.

**Response:**

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

**PC01115-4****Comment:**

Please include this suggestion in the transcript. Don't destroy Westchester and surrounding areas.

**Response:**

Responses to individual comments included in this comment letter are provided above. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01116      No Author Identified,   None Provided****PC01116-1****Comment:**

NO AIRPORT

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01117      Weil, Phyllis      None Provided      7/15/2001****PC01117-1****Comment:**

I am very much 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.

**PC01117-2****Comment:**

I especially oppose the traffic plan as presented. Building an off ramp from the 405 that would impact the historical Centinela Adobe is a terrible idea.

**Response:**

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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01117-3**

**Comment:**

I also object to LAX taking more land from Westchester to increase space for more cargo.

**Response:**

The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed land acquisition for each of the alternatives in Chapter 3 and Section 4.2, Land Use. See Topical Response TR-LU-2 concerning impacts to the Community of Westchester. 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 will be provided to any person displaced from their home or business. Also please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

**PC01117-4**

**Comment:**

Let Orange County develop El Toro and encourage the growth of Ontario and Palmdale airports!  
We do not need more air and noise pollution!

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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 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.

**PC01118**

**Fujiyama, Sandra**

**None Provided**

**7/15/2001**

**PC01118-1**

**Comment:**

Please NO LAX expansion.  
Noise and air pollution will increase, as will the amount of traffic through the area.

**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.

**PC01118-2****Comment:**

The Master Plan appears to be a short-term quick fix approach. The City should look into expansion of the other airports in the City.

**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.

**PC01119****Meagher, Alice****None Provided****7/16/2001****PC01119-1****Comment:**

I have been a Westchester resident for 40 years. I moved here to a beautiful now - polluted Community to raise my family now with all the expansions (LAX wants to expand more.) LAX is taking away all that we have worked for.

**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. Also, please refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01119-2****Comment:**

Not a day goes by where I open my windows or walk outside I smell the emission that pollutes our air and now it affects my lungs.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding the topic of odor and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

**PC01119-3****Comment:**

Also, the impact of all the aircraft 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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01119-4

**Comment:**

The increase in traffic makes it very tiring just to drive to the stores on Sepulveda Blvd. Expansion would add numerous cars and more trucks to our surface streets and freeways.

**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 the proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

#### PC01119-5

**Comment:**

The solution to this problem is to develop ONTERIOR and PAMDALE and ORANGE COUNTRY should also be developed. Why should the communities around LAX bear the burden of Orange County's need for air commerce?

**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.

#### PC01119-6

**Comment:**

The LAX BOARD of DIRECTORS continues to spend millions of dollars promoting expansion. Our primary efforts must be to remove these people from office and replace them w/ people more understanding of our communities needs.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01120**

**Kasabian, Helen**

**None Provided**

**7/15/2001**

#### PC01120-1

**Comment:**

Have been a homeowner in the Westchester area since 1950, have seen the airport grow from 'Mines' Field to today's LAX.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

#### PC01120-2

**Comment:**

I am against any new growth; of the airport. With the Playa Vista project on going at this time, which will be creating more traffic more pollution. I think 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. 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. 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. Also please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

**PC01120-3**

**Comment:**

Spent the billions in Palmdale & Ontario. If there is a disaster and LAX must shut down, that not good planning. Palmdale airport was in the picture some 25 yrs ago, now is the time-

**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.

**PC01121 Cummings, Nancy & None Provided  
Hugh**

**PC01121-1**

**Comment:**

We're writing to complain about the latest expansion plan for LAX. We have been residents of Westchester for the last 25 years. We chose this location to raise our family for its location, schools churches and accessibility to our work. Since we have lived here the DOA has continually chipped away at what is Westchester.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of Master Plan alternatives on the Community of Westchester. 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.

**PC01121-2**

**Comment:**

With the new expansion and the north runway being moved further north the noise will be louder. The traffic which is already heavy will be worse. PURE GRIDLOCK! The smog that will be generated will be unreal and for health reasons that will be a detriment to all THAT LIVE IN THE AREA.

**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. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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**

---

#### **PC01121-3**

**Comment:**

We already have a lot of building in the area that is adding traffic. Howard Hughes Center and Playa Vista.

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00148-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00148-2.

#### **PC01121-4**

**Comment:**

The LAX Expansion we do not need!

**Response:**

Comment noted.

#### **PC01121-5**

**Comment:**

Certainly, there are other answers for air travel and air freight that could be shared by the surrounding cities and the people that reside within them. Why does LAX have to be the DO ALL! There are many People affected by this airport... NOT JUST A FEW! There are wide open areas in Orange County and San Diego County that should be used to handle International flights and freight. What is wrong with El Toro? Maybe they could use part of Oceanside Marine Base. Obviously, SAN and SNA can't cut it...They want to use our backyards for travel and keep theirs pristine! SFO and SJC are both international airports. It's obvious that south of LAX there is a NEED! Why not NOW! NOT LATER! In the last month a brother, sister-in-law, cousin, cousin's husband and niece respectively from SAN, SNA and SNA departed from LAX on Intl flts. . .

**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.

#### **PC01121-6**

**Comment:**

We like our Westchester but you are cutting it to pieces!!

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.



**PC01122      Klouzer, Ken      None Provided**

**PC01122-1**

**Comment:**

Expanding LAX makes no sense. Look at a map with LAX on it. Notice ... its on the coast and serves 1/2 the population of most big city airports. Also consider on that same map where a good portion of travelers go to & come from LAX. Hope you agree it foolish to expand an airport that is so congested already (check recent near miss figures & where we stand compared to other cities) John Wayne & Palmdale quickly come to mind as a viable option. I wouldn't mind a comment on the above!!!

**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.

**PC01123      Conneally, Charles      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01123-1**

**Comment:**

NO on airport expansion. Let Orange County have their own "International" airport. Also utilize Palmdale which could expand forever at little or no cost. Enough already destroying Westchester for the sake of making city government bigger is not good sense. El Toro would be a great 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 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

---

**PC01124      Kasabian, George      None Provided      7/14/2001**

**PC01124-1**

**Comment:**

I AM OPPOSED TO ANY INCREASE IN THE SIZE OF L.A.X. WHY SHOULD LAX SERVE PEOPLE FROM AS FAR AS 80 MILES, WHEN THEY CAN & SHOULD HAVE THEIR OWN INTERNATIONAL AIRPORTS.  
THE VALLEY COULD HAVE PALMDALE.  
THE INLAND COUNTIES COULD HAVE ONTARIO.  
ORANGE COUNTY COULD HAVE 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-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, for information on El Toro, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario International Airport, 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.

**PC01124-2**

**Comment:**

ALSO NO INCREASE OF CARGO INTO L.A.X.

**Response:**

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 cargo forecast and demand.

**PC01125      Davis, Paul      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01125-1**

**Comment:**

Playa del Rey is already carrying more than its share of the burden of noise and air pollution from the air traffic in Los Angeles. It's time that other cities did their 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. 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.

**PC01126****Chang, Margaret****None Provided****7/15/2001****PC01126-1****Comment:**

Please No LAX expansion! Why should the communities around LAX bear the burden of Orange County's need for air commerce? DEVELOP EL TORO AIRPORT Ontario & Palmdale!! Airport 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.

Also, 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, 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.

**PC01127****Brown, Lyle****None Provided****7/16/2001****PC01127-1****Comment:**

Stop the obstructionist.  
We need economic development to keep pace with increasing population for the benefit of us all.  
The attitude of (I am aboard, pull up the ladder) has gone way to far

**Response:**

Comment noted.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01128      Jacobs, Edythe      Del Rey Manor Homeowners Association      7/15/2001**

**PC01128-1**

**Comment:**

I am very concerned that Lax's expansion will cause our lovely community to become more noisy, more polluted, more traffic and many other inconveniences.

**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.

**PC01128-2**

**Comment:**

Closing off Falmouth's connection to Westchester Pky will take away one of the conveniences, such as a direct route to the Westchester business district. I would go into Marina del Rey instead of Westchester.

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00217-1. Please see Response to Comment PC00217-1. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01129      Johnson, C. Richard      None Provided      7/13/2001**

**PC01129-1**

**Comment:**

I am writing to comment on the LAX Master Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report. First of all, I believe that Southern California requires additional airport capacity to support the local economy and the rising demand for air service in the area.

**Response:**

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

**PC01129-2**

**Comment:**

Secondly, I do not object to living in relatively close proximity to LAX, although I've noted that, in the past few years, the traffic congestion on Sepulveda Boulevard, I-105 and I-405 reaches unacceptable levels during peak airport traffic periods.

**Response:**

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

**PC01129-3****Comment:**

I do not support further expansion of the LAX facility as the resulting strain on the local infrastructure and the increase air pollution would, in my opinion, be unacceptable. I believe the subject EIR substantially understates the likely increase in LAX air traffic and, consequently, the increase in air pollution and the impact on the local infrastructure.

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

**PC01129-4****Comment:**

I also note that the subject EIR does not seriously address the alternative of a Southern California regional airport located 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.

**PC01129-5****Comment:**

The geography of the LAX location, "boxed in" by the ocean on the West, residential areas on the North and South and commercial properties on the East, severely constrains the options for LAX expansion. Any attempt to "shoehorn" additional capacity into the LAX location will almost certainly result in an unacceptable level of congestion, pollution and frustration for both the users of LAX and the residents and businesses in the adjoining 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 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-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.

**PC01129-6****Comment:**

In summary, I believe the subject EIR is deficient in terms of substantially understating the impact on the local area with respect to increased traffic congestion and pollution. It is also deficient in that no options for an alternative regional airport are seriously considered.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**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, shifting 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 is 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.

**PC01130      Rodriguez, Eldon      None Provided**

**PC01130-1**

**Comment:**

If you want to expand, expand toward the ocean, you won't worry about moving people or the noise move traffic in 3 or 4 different directions:

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00022-52 regarding expanding the airport toward the ocean.

**PC01131      Garnholz, Liz      None Provided      7/13/2001**

**PC01131-1**

**Comment:**

1. The California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA, requires that LAX Master Plan projects be in compliance with the Southern California Association of Governments' Regional Transportation Plan, SCAG RTP. Alternatives A, B, and C are not RTP compliant. The No Project Alternative is the only alternative that is RTP compliant. Therefore:

a) What is Los Angeles World Airway's, LAWA, justification for choosing Alternative C as the preferred alternative as it is not RTP compliant?

b) What specifically will LAWA do to make Alternatives A, B, and C CEQA required RTP compliant?

**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, shifting 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. 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. Please see also Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

**PC01131-2**

**Comment:**

2. The "Governor's Certificate" arose from the federal Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982. In California the governor delegated this certification responsibility to the California Air Resources Board,

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

CARB. The CARB developed an Air Quality Certificate process to regulate airport emissions-section 509(b) (7) (a). What is LAWA's interpretation of the invoking of the "Governor's Certificate" on Master Plan Alternatives A, B, C, and the No Project Alternative?

**Response:**

In accordance with the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, as amended, and codified in USC Title 49, Section 47106(c), the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation may approve a grant application for an airport development project involving a major extension of a runway only if the Governor of the State in which the project will be located certifies that there is reasonable assurance that the project will be located, designed, constructed, and operated in compliance with applicable air quality standards. Certification must be obtained from the Governor of the State prior to FAA approval of the project. Such certification must be provided before Alternatives A, B, C, or D could be approved by FAA. However, certification is not required for the No Action/No Project Alternative, as no approval is required for this alternative.

**PC01131-3**

**Comment:**

3. Public Utility Code, PUC 21661.6 states that a California city cannot buy land for a project until the project has been officially approved. The City of Los Angeles owns LAWA. LAWA has acquired homes in Manchester Square, the Belford apartment area, plans to acquire approximately 57 homes in the Wiley Post area of Westchester, plans to take footage from Westchester property owners along Airport Boulevard, and plans to demolish half of the business district of downtown Westchester. All this acquiring occurring without a Los Angeles City Council approved LAX expansion project. In fact, as far back as 1998 LAWA expansion maps have shown cargo facilities in the Manchester Square and Belford areas. What legal "leg" does LAWA have to ignore PUC 21661.6 by acquiring properties for the LAX expansion project when that project has not been officially approved by the Los Angeles City Council or the Mayor of Los Angeles?

**Response:**

The acquisition of residential properties within Manchester Square and Belford is an action that is not a part of the Master Plan. A separate environmental document was prepared for this project in accordance with CEQA.

**PC01132**

**Namnam, Joe &  
Rose Marie**

**None Provided**

**7/16/2001**

**PC01132-1**

**Comment:**

What is needed is another airport, not an enlargement of L.A.X.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC01132-2**

**Comment:**

Our shopping center would be demolished an for what? More noise, air pollution 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, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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. As indicated in TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not include acquisition within the Westchester business district.

#### PC01132-3

**Comment:**

We are hardly able to open a door or window now for the noise factor.

**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-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

#### PC01132-4

**Comment:**

You need a new airport, not an enlargement of LAX with all the dangers it entails.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

<b>PC01133</b>	<b>Sharp, Melanie</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/14/2001</b>
----------------	-----------------------	----------------------	------------------

#### PC01133-1

**Comment:**

I object to the expansion of LAX. We've got enough traffic, noise, smell of oil/airplane fuel in our neighborhood as it is.

**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 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.

#### PC01133-2

**Comment:**

- Long term planning is needed. Develop the other regional airports - Palmdale, Ontario, John Wayne. Put the airports where the people are.



**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, for information on El Toro, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario International Airport.

**PC01133-3****Comment:**

- Traffic on the 405, 105, 10 and all the side streets - Sepulveda, Century, La Cienega- is already way too much. We don't need more.

**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, which is where analysis of freeways beyond the immediate study area is located. 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 the proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

**PC01133-4****Comment:**

- Safety - the stories of all the near misses @ LAX is frightening. Address this question before expanding LAX.

**Response:**

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

**PC01133-5****Comment:**

- Air pollution is already bad enough - the smell of airplane fuel permeates the air

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding the topic of odor.

**PC01133-6****Comment:**

- I like Westchester, and have lived here for 47 years. Westchester has already sacrificed too much to be asked to sacrifice more. No more homes or business should be removed or relocated. Please reconsider, and really take a critical look at both the master plan and the EIR. Let others in Orange County, Ventura County, Riverside County take some of the responsibility for airport traffic and other problems. Westchester's done enough already.

### 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-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01133-7**

**Comment:**

And regarding the changing of Airport Blvd between 74th and La Tijera to any bigger/wider street to accommodate another entrance to the Promenade or to the freeway, the answer must be "NO." Such a change would forever alter whatever quiet we have in this neighborhood. My cat was killed last year by a car speeding down my already busy street.

Enough already!

**Response:**

Airport Boulevard between 74th Street and La Tijera Boulevard is not planned to be widened as part of the proposed off-airport roadway improvements described in Appendix K of the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

<b>PC01134</b>	<b>Brown, Larry</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/13/2001</b>
----------------	---------------------	----------------------	------------------

**PC01134-1**

**Comment:**

We live in Playa del Rey, and love our home and community. Expanding the airport will add substantial noise and traffic issues to our already noisy and crowded local skies and streets.

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

**PC01134-2**

**Comment:**

Please pursue other logical alternatives. Have we considered replacing all cargo planes with passenger craft to add passenger capacity. Diverting cargo planes to Ontario would reduce local truck traffic and pollution.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic, and Response to Comment PC00281-19 regarding relocating cargo operations.

**PC01134-3****Comment:**

Please stop the proposed 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.

**PC01135****Aveni, Gino****None Provided****7/12/2001****PC01135-1****Comment:**

I have lived in the South Bay for 48 years and have seen great changes over the years. Many have been tremendous and many have been disappointing to say the least. I live in a region that can boast the best climate, highest income and some of the most prestigious addresses and businesses in the country if not the world. I also, however, live in a region that is famous for its high crime rate, outrageous cost of housing, horrendous race relations, and uncomprehendable traffic and congestion. Recently, we also just narrowly escaped what would have been a devastating act of terrorism directed at LAX, chosen I am sure, because of the high profile area we have become. I cannot believe that there is not a direct relationship to the population density and the limited size of the Los Angeles basin that these conditions exist. I feel compelled, therefore, to write and ask you and the LAWA to seriously reconsider your requested plans for expanding LAX. The added burden that such an expansion would place on the surrounding communities is simply unjust and selfish. The quality of life for the local residents and businesses, as well as the reputation and appeal of the South Bay and the greater Los Angeles area will suffer as a consequence.

LAX currently sits amidst an already overcrowded community that lacks the infrastructure to support it. The current airport passenger population already exceeds what it was projected to handle by greater than 50% and there is no reason to believe that the LAWA would not exceed its current proposed projection in the future, should the proposed expansion take place. If a similar increase, above the current projection, should arise, how is such a demand on the resident population and infrastructure to be accommodated? The same question could be asked of how the currently proposed figures could be mitigated. This is an issue which, in my opinion, is not adequately addressed or considered in the EIR.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, social impacts in Section 4.4, Social Impacts, impacts to public utilities in Section 4.25, Public Utilities, and impacts to public services in Section 4.26, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2, 3, 5, 15, and 16 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, S-3, and S-10 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.

**PC01135-2****Comment:**

To accommodate such an increase in passengers and cargo, there would have to be a comparable increase in the number of take offs and landings. This can only equate to a substantial increase in the risk of accident affecting the millions of travelers that would pass through LAX, and the surrounding communities within their flight paths.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**Response:**

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

**PC01135-3**

**Comment:**

Furthermore, the existing infrastructure cannot support such a volume of traffic that would result. Passengers and cargo arriving at LAX must eventually depart for their ultimate destinations, and the present highways, designed for both high speed and local travel, are already inadequate for today's traffic. This is of great concern to both residents and businesses as they continue to struggle with increasing commute times, increased pollution, increased stress, and increased energy consumption already negatively impacting the South Bay's and Los Angeles basin's quality of life.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding the proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, addressed air pollution impacts. The concept of reducing surface transportation energy consumption is consistent with all of the alternatives, particularly the new Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, Alternative D, which is analyzed in detail in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D proposes remote parking structures with baggage check-in coupled with a people mover system (light rail) to transport passengers to the terminal area.

**PC01135-4**

**Comment:**

There is no reasonable way to expand the current capacity of our roadways, and with the inability to handle the current volume; further increases would result in gridlock for the area. This is quite evident by the progressive delays demonstrated on highways such as the 405 (San Diego) freeway and Sepulveda, both major arteries of egress from LAX. The speed of travel and volume of traffic on these examples and other highways are far below what they were designed for. If you think road rage is a phenomenon difficult to contain now, just imagine.

**Response:**

It is acknowledged that peak traffic conditions on many arterial roads and freeways on the west side of Los Angeles are over capacity, making it difficult to traverse these roads during those peak times. However, the project and its mitigation plans are designed to mitigate, to the extent feasible, all impacts from the project to a level of less than significant. Further, the addition of key traffic plan elements such as the LAX Expressway and the Ring Road are designed to alleviate traffic on critical sections of I-405 and off-load airport traffic from neighborhood streets near the airport. These types of measures are designed to improve conditions on most intersections and road segments near the airport for both airport motorists and non-airport motorists. The benefits and impacts of the project were detailed in Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

**PC01135-5**

**Comment:**

Even if it was reasonable to increase the capacity of our current roadways, the pollution that would result from both the increased air passenger, cargo, and ground traffic would have disastrous implications for the families that live in this densely populated region.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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.

**PC01135-6**

**Comment:**

The Los Angeles basin is already famous for its smog and rarely, can the surrounding mountains be seen through it. Flying into LAX is one of the most embarrassing and disgusting sites I have experienced in my years my travel.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01135-7**

**Comment:**

LAX is the largest contributor in the region to this serious health hazard and with expansion would triple its current output of noxious pollutants, while proposing a limited and meager attempt at mitigating them.

**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, Air Quality. 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.

**PC01135-8**

**Comment:**

The City of Los Angeles, LAWA, and the surrounding communities have already maximized or perhaps exceeded their geographical limitations and the further stress that would result from expansion, can only lead to unfavorable outcomes for everyone who resides in the South Bay and Greater Los Angeles area. It is time to look beyond the greedy motivation of being the biggest or richest city, airport, or port in the world and take a very serious look at making the quality of life, the premier concern of our elected officials and preeminent businesses. Please understand that increased revenue, size, and stature for the city, does not equate to quality of life for 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

**PC01135-9**

**Comment:**

I ask you to take a serious look at what is being proposed and tell me; is this what is best for the City of Los Angeles and it's surrounding communities? The obvious answer has to be a resounding NO. Los Angeles County and its entire population would be best served by expanding via a regional approach. Expanding other airports, with less impact to less densely populated communities, and linking airports and major destinations with high-speed low emission transit, will benefit everyone. In addition, it will make Los Angeles a destination that is desirable for both tourists and business, and place the city at the cutting edge of community based planning. Such a plan should receive very serious consideration by the leaders of LAWA, the City of Los Angeles, and the surrounding communities and be thoroughly addressed within the EIR. Change is inevitable, but it is imperative that it be shared by many rather

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

than heaped upon a few. The benefits should be distributed similarly. Thank you for your open-minded consideration and foresight.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand.

**PC01136      Atkinson, June      None Provided      7/14/2001**

**PC01136-1**

**Comment:**

I wish to express my opposition to the 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.

**PC01136-2**

**Comment:**

1) The Centinela Adobe Park is about three blocks away from my house in the Osage section of Westchester, and any infringement on that little oasis will adversely affect the whole Osage section, especially those homes within walking distance.

**Response:**

Please refer to Response to Comment PC01087-2. Subsequent to the publication of the 2001 Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D, the subject of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, was prepared and does not include the LAX Expressway or the proposed ring road. Alternative D is the LAWA staff preferred alternative.

**PC01136-3**

**Comment:**

2) The expansion will add to freeway and other road traffic in my area, which has already increased unbelievably over the past ten years. The ultimate effect will be a taking of my property for the good of the airport and city revenues.

**Response:**

This comment is identical to comment PC01087-3. Please see Response to Comment PC01087-3.

**PC01136-4**

**Comment:**

3) Airport noise has already significantly increased.

**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.

**PC01136-5****Comment:**

4 ) As the whole reason for expansion is to bring in more flights and larger planes which will result in more noise and pollution, both from air and from the trucking activities. LAX should be reserved for passengers and light cargo, with all the rest going out of town. This would help conserve investment value and enjoyment of property value.

**Response:**

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. 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. Please see Response to Comment PC00922-1 regarding air cargo. Please see Response to Comment PC00922-1 regarding air cargo. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

**PC01136-6****Comment:**

5) The likelihood of air collision is presently a concern, and will be more of a concern as the traffic is increased.

**Response:**

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

**PC01136-7****Comment:**

6) Have you considered the existing rails from Ontario and from North of LA?

**Response:**

The existing rails will not support high-speed service. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand.

**PC01136-8****Comment:**

7) I found the last lovely, little neighborhood where I could afford to purchase a rental home, with the expectation of it being my retirement income. Now it will be worth less as a rental and for resale. I am getting close to retirement now, and am physically affected by the potential loss, am losing sleep, and wondering if I will be forced to sell the adorable little house that I lovingly refer to as my nestegg.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01136-9

**Comment:**

8) Is there any class action or other action that you know of which I can join to stop the expansion or require the airport to pay a reasonable price for my property so as to more fairly take from me to increase city revenues.

**Response:**

Residential 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. As indicated in subsection 4.4.2.1, Introduction, compensation for acquired properties is governed by the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, its implementing regulations, FAA guidelines, and related federal laws. It should be noted that Alternative D does not propose residential acquisition.

<b>PC01137</b>	<b>Matilla, Steven &amp; Janis</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/14/2001</b>
----------------	--	----------------------	------------------

#### PC01137-1

**Comment:**

Dear. Mr. Ritchie, the LAX Master Plan & EIS/EIR are business oriented documents only.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

#### PC01137-2

**Comment:**

I have lived next to L.A X since 1976 and have watched it gobble up our communities and degrade our quality of life since I have lived here. L.A.X. never sought approval when it went from 42 million passengers/yr to its present situation.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

#### PC01137-3

**Comment:**

We virtually have no rest from noise, pollution and traffic congestion.

**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.



**PC01137-4****Comment:**

I cannot tell you how many times over the years where planes were waived off upon landing & flew just a few hundred feet over our homes just to avoid a disaster on the Runway. A disaster is going to happen.

**Response:**

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

**PC01137-5****Comment:**

L.A.X is over taxed, a Regional solution makes sense and the burden of Air commerce should be shared with other communities. We cannot afford to move! We implore LAWA to mitigate a Regional plan with long term foresight & planning. The resources exist (Palmdale, Ontario & El Toro). Please hear the cries of those who solely endure the current burdens as neighbors to L.A.X.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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, Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale, and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. 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.

**PC01138****Ruiz, Chris****None Provided****7/13/2001****PC01138-1****Comment:**

Ask yourself the following, "if I lived near LAX would I favor expansion." The answer is "No." The City is also subjecting itself to numerous inverse condemnation Claims. Forcing a larger airport on the Westside makes no sense.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition/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.

**PC01139****Raad, Glen &  
Michele****None Provided****7/13/2001****PC01139-1****Comment:**

We are opposed to the expansion of LAX for the following reasons:

### **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.

**PC01139-2**

**Comment:**

(1) Pollution - already everything outside our house gets covered in a layer of soot.

**Response:**

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

**PC01139-3**

**Comment:**

I dread to think how the airport pollution is affecting my young child's body.

**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.

**PC01139-4**

**Comment:**

(2) Noise Pollution - we already hear the planes. We don't want to be in a position where we would have to soundproof our house & keep our windows closed to keep the noise out

**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-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

**PC01139-5**

**Comment:**

(3) Traffic - we are already concerned about the traffic problems we are going to have when the Playa Vista project gets under way. Our streets / freeways cannot handle more volume.

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00148-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00148-2.

**PC01139-6**

**Comment:**

(4) There are lots of other places you can build extra runways - especially for cargo. Burbank, Ontario, El Toro, etc. etc.

**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 Response to Comment PC0599-54 regarding cargo activity.

**PC01140****Keith, Dorothy****None Provided****7/15/2001****PC01140-1****Comment:**

When my husband and I moved into our new home in Westchester in 1947 the Airport was housed in small buildings at the foot of Airport Boulevard. We have watched the Airport grow and become a "Blob". Each succeeding growth or improvement has had a negative effect on traffic, businesses, churches and schools, and homes in the community. (Because of the destruction of homes, business suffered and schools and churches lost attendance. Homes were destroyed or required expensive soundproofing.)

**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. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, economic impacts in Section 4.5, Induced Socio-Economic Impacts, and schools in Section 4.27, Schools. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 2, 3, 5 and 17 of the Draft EIS/EIR and in Appendices S-C and Technical Reports S-2 and S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC01140-2****Comment:**

Instead of creating a monster that will finally destroy a community, here are some suggestions:

**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.

**PC01140-3****Comment:**

1. Move all cargo flights to the Palmdale Airport. This is an area that would benefit from increased usage.

**Response:**

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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01140-4

**Comment:**

2. Move a portion of passenger flights to El Toro Airport, an existing facility which is ready to be utilized, and would benefit Orange County passengers.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

#### PC01140-5

**Comment:**

These changes would greatly reduce traffic on the 405 Freeway and eliminate the need to build an expensive interchange at Arbor Vitae.

**Response:**

FHWA has withdrawn its support for a half interchange at Arbor Vitae. That proposed half interchange was never part of the LAX Master Plan. FHWA policy is to only consider proposals for full interchanges only, not partial interchanges. Please also see Topical Response TR-ST-2 for information on Arbor Vitae interchange.

#### PC01140-6

**Comment:**

My question now is: who will benefit financially from a mega-airport? Who will line his/her pockets at the expense of the general public?

**Response:**

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.

#### PC01141      **Tudisco, Joseph**      **None Provided**

#### PC01141-1

**Comment:**

Why does this board insist on a bandaid solution, which is no solution at all. Expansion is what a majority of all the people of L.A. are against, not just those that live in 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.

#### PC01141-2

**Comment:**

Money should be spent for rapid transit into the airport and trying to correct all the errors of past Airport Commissioners. Such as getting people out on schedual and alleviating traffic and noise.  
NOT CREATING A BIGGER AIRPORT FOR THE COMMISSION TO REIGN OVER.

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

**PC01142      Varney, Julia      None Provided**

**PC01142-1****Comment:**

LAX should not be expanded. Ontario, Palmdale, El Toro Would welcome business sent their way - They must now travel many miles in order to catch a flight out of L.A.X. People in those communities would welcome jobs - Ontario needs more planes going in -

**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. 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.

**PC01142-2****Comment:**

We've had & are saturated with  
pollution  
Noise  
Horrendous traffic  
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.

**PC01143      Garland, Jeanne      None Provided      7/14/2001**

**PC01143-1****Comment:**

LAX NO - Expansion!!  
P.S. (AND I'm a flight attendant & we own a travel Agency) 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.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

**PC01144      Morris, Glynn      None Provided**

**PC01144-1**

**Comment:**

The purpose of this letter is to express my total opposition to the proposed LAX expansion plan 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.

**PC01144-2**

**Comment:**

- Increased Pollution: The increase in auto emissions and emissions from planes will make living in the area unhealthful and intolerable.

**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, Air Quality. 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.

**PC01144-3**

**Comment:**

LAX today is one of the regions biggest sources of Nox emissions- the primary precursor to ozone.

**Response:**

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

**PC01144-4**

**Comment:**

- Gridlock Traffic: I have reviewed the proposed road systems and like so many others have concluded that gridlock will result. Numerous cars will be added to surface streets as well as the freeways. No accounting in your estimates was made for the addition of 25000+ Playa Vista residents in the neighborhood, according to the consultants at recent Westchester presentations.

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00148-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00148-2.

**PC01144-5**

**Comment:**

- The plans for greatly expanded cargo at LAX means more and more trucks. The traffic assumptions made appear optimistic to the point of being bogus.

**Response:**

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed surface transportation impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Also, please see Topical Responses TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic and TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

**PC01144-6**

**Comment:**

- Noise: Today noise in the neighborhoods surrounding LAX is deafening. The FAA CNEL measures are on a weighted daily average basis which smooth out the obnoxious bursts of noise which require halting any conversation.

**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. 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.

**PC01144-7**

**Comment:**

- Dangerous Overcrowding: With the same runways and significantly increased traffic we are to believe that LAX can safely handle the increased flights because of some cleverly conceived new taxiways. The air traffic safety situation today is marginal, with expansion it will be downright dangerous.

**Response:**

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

**PC01144-8**

**Comment:**

The fact is that there is a good alternative regional solution involving the use of and expansion of other airports where residents want additional traffic. Ontario and Palmdale must be considered. Also why not use one of the shut down Air Force bases for a cargo only facility. It's time to stop being competitive with other regions and to seek a cooperative 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.

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 and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. Please see Response to Comment PC00922-1 for information on air cargo.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01145**      **Barry, William**      **None Provided**      **7/14/2001**

**PC01145-1**

**Comment:**

I am very concerned about two factors which do not seem to be addressed in the EIS / EIR

A. The particulate matter emissions from A/C while taking off & landing, i.e., while airborne.

**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). The aircraft component of these emission inventories include emissions generated during the take-off, landing, and airborne modes 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). Detailed and updated information of aircraft-related emissions by individual mode are contained in Attachment N, Incremental Emissions by Alternative and Year, of Technical Report S4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC01145-2**

**Comment:**

B. The airborne pollutants while the A/C are taking off & landing.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Both EDMS 3.2 and EDMS 4.1 account for emissions from aircraft in takeoff and approach modes. EDMS 4.1 adjusts idle emissions to account for aircraft landing roll. In EDMS 3.2, landing roll must be added manually to the taxi/idle times. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed how aircraft operational modes are modeled in Section 4.6, Air Quality.

**PC01145-3**

**Comment:**

I did not see any analysis or quantification of the risk to residents adjacent to the airport runways.

**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. The human health risk assessments evaluated the potential adverse health effects associated with toxic air pollutants released by airport activities for the selected alternatives. The analysis included individuals living at the location where greatest exposures occur, as well as individuals living at all locations within the study area. This area starts at the airport boundary and includes communities north, east, and south of LAX.

**PC01145-4**

**Comment:**

In addition, the mitigation measures that are mentioned in the EIS/EIR don't help me - most are not where the risk is impacting. I want protection for 90th street.



**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-HRA-4 regarding human health mitigation strategies. Please refer to Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment (subsection 4.24.1.9, Level of Significance After Mitigation), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for an analysis of the level of significance associated with the four build alternatives after mitigation measures are implemented.

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 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).

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR was prepared to integrate a new alternative, Alternative D, into the existing environmental review process and to incorporate supplemental information and analysis for the LAX Master Plan. Such information and analysis are based upon the availability of new or updated information since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR in January 2001. As described in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of 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.

**PC01145-5****Comment:**

The EIS/EIR is inadequate for its failure to address these health risks.

**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. The human health risk assessments evaluated the potential adverse health effects associated with toxic air pollutants released by airport activities for the selected alternatives. 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.

**PC01146****Goodwin, D.****None Provided****7/12/2001****PC01146-1****Comment:**

No on LAX Expansion (See enclosed attachment)

**Response:**

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

**PC01146-2****Comment:**

Stabilization of Los Angeles' growth & population is what we need not more Growth!

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

Quality of Life is what's vanishing in L.A. We need less not more (traffic, smog, noise, crime, people...)

Ask the aware citizens of the community and not the greedy corporate representatives and you'll find they aren't as concerned about bigger airports, more malls, greater number of tourists... it's the rapidly disappearing Quality of Life in this city that's on the minds and hearts of mature rational thinking residents,

Make a Difference,

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

**PC01146-3**

**Comment:**

Count me 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.

**PC01147**

**Cohen, Lorraine**

**None Provided**

**7/15/2001**

**PC01147-1**

**Comment:**

I am definately opposed to expanding L.A.X. I travel in and out of L.A.X. and the traffic is a nightmare now!

My windows can't be open because of the airplane noise.

The additional traffic and air pollution will be horrendous.

**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-4 regarding outdoor noise levels, Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase, 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.

**PC01147-2**

**Comment:**

Please listen to all of us, and expand Ontario or 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.

**PC01148      Waldman, Lorraine      None Provided**

**PC01148-1**

**Comment:**

My husband & I object very much to the expansion of L.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.

**PC01148-2**

**Comment:**

I have called & complained about the airplane noise that kept us awake at night. I am being treated for high blood pressure & these upsets effects my heath.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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 4.1, 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.

**PC01148-3**

**Comment:**

I am sure if this was occurring in Beverly Hills or Brentwood something would be done in favor of using other land sites for an airport.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Environmental justice was addressed in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR and 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.

**PC01148-4**

**Comment:**

If I resided in orange co. I would like the convenience of leaving from there 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, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01149      Skaggs, Susanne      None Provided      7/14/2001**

**PC01149-1**

**Comment:**

I am opposed to the expansion of LAX for several reason, not least of which is the safety of my children, in particular, and the community as a whole.

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

**PC01149-2**

**Comment:**

Sepulveda and La Tieja are already congested with traffic to and from the airport making a simple trip to the local Ralph's a difficult task.

**Response:**

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

**PC01149-3**

**Comment:**

Noise is another concern - - I'd like to be able to keep enjoying my yard and patio.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels and TR-LU-5 regarding 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. 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 a discussion of noise levels under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions and projected noise increases under the Master Plan alternatives.

**PC01149-4**

**Comment:**

Why isn't the solution a regional one? Ontario and Palmdale should be developed as opposed 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

### 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, for information on El Toro, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario International Airport, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

#### **PC01149-5**

**Comment:**

And O.C. should see to it's own needs by development of El Toro.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

#### **PC01150**

**Crozer, Leah**

**None Provided**

**7/16/2001**

#### **PC01150-1**

**Comment:**

As a 23-year resident of Westchester, I am dismayed over the amount of traffic and noise pollution that has increased over the years.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding the 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. Section 4.1, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise pollution.

#### **PC01150-2**

**Comment:**

I would urge the City of LA to develop Palmdale and Ontario Airports for cargo, keeping LAX for passenger travel.

**Response:**

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. 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.

#### **PC01150-3**

**Comment:**

We already have too many TAXIS, LIMOS and shuttle vans along with general traffic. We certainly don't need cargo transport as well.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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 the proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Please also see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

**PC01150-4**

**Comment:**

Leave the central business district on Sepulveda, establish "no parking" on Sepulveda, and keep the traffic flowing with coordinated signals.

**Response:**

This comment suggesting improvements to Sepulveda Boulevard has been submitted to the Westchester Office of the Los Angeles Department of Transportation.

**PC01151      Hamilton, Cynthia      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC01151-1**

**Comment:**

Really, I have just one comment: LAX expansion is a really bad idea.

Why do you want to destroy our neighborhood? The development of the Hughes Center was bad enough. Expansion of LAX would completely ruin Westchester life.

**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.

**PC01151-2**

**Comment:**

Since there are many other viable options, Why not use 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.

**PC01151-3**

**Comment:**

P.S. to Mayor Hahn: I remind you of your LAX NO-Expansion pledge and urge you to appoint the LAWA Commissioners with the same NO-Expansion mindset. Thanks.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00578-1 regarding the development of Alternative D-Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, which was developed at the direction of Mayor James Hahn.

**PC01152      Pohl, Maria      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01152-1**

**Comment:**

I AM 81 YEARS OLD AND HAVE LIVED HERE SINCE 1959. I AM AGAINST LAX EXPANSION AND THE PROPOSED ARBOR VITAE OFF-RAMP.

**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 proposed Arbor Vitae interchange is not a part of the LAX Master Plan and has had the federal funding withdrawn.

**PC01152-2**

**Comment:**

THE INGLEWOOD ADOBE DOES NOT NEED ANY PORTION OF ITS PROPERTY DELETED.

**Response:**

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

**PC01153      Webb, Jannette      None Provided      7/15/2001**

**PC01153-1**

**Comment:**

It came as a total an utter shock to read that only 911 people have taken the time to write a letter stating their comments regarding the LAX Expansion. I find it very hard to believe that out of 9000+ homes in the Westchester and Playa del Rey area only 10 percent have made their opinions known. Every morning I walk out on my porch and find yet another flyer urging people to send their comments. And today, I have decided that instead of being like every other resident that complains of finding yet another piece of paper laying there on my porch, that I myself was going to do something about it. So, maybe I am only one voice among many that has chosen to take a stand, but I feel that it is my responsibility as a resident of Westchester to make it be known how much this expansion will hurt our community. There are many factors to explore to this expansion, but to keep this brief in anticipation of you receiving many more letters such as mine, I will keep this brief and in summarized form.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

**PC01153-2**

**Comment:**

The amount of traffic that such an anticipated expansion would cause is not something that has been planned for. We already have too many cars and not enough streets. We need to work on ways of expanding or updating our freeways (405), not our airports!! Expanding the airport would only add to the traffic problems already existing.

**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 the proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Please also see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01153-3

**Comment:**

The second factor I would like to address is the acquiring of one-third of the Central Business District on Sepulveda Blvd. I myself enjoy the convenience of having our neighborhood shopping areas easily accessible and "right around the corner". It has taken quite some time to build these establishments to the thriving businesses that they have become and to take that away from them after all their hard work would not seem just.

**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 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.

Also, as was described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6.5) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, note that 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.

#### PC01153-4

**Comment:**

And last, but certainly not least the noise and air pollution factors. Many of the people that have worked on this plan do not have to deal with the everyday stress of airport noise and pollution, as many of the designers probably live outside of the area. But, this is something that we in the neighborhood already deal with on an everyday basis. It is something that is factored in to when we decide to move into this community, and when we are to buy or sell our homes, it is very much a part of our everyday lives, whether we want it to be or not. Please don't make this more of a hindrance than it already is.

**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-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding property values.

#### PC01153-5

**Comment:**

By adding more noise and more pollution, this may be just enough to have people that are considering moving into our community decide against it and make the value of our homes and community diminish.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D, the 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 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 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.

#### **PC01153-6**

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose to the LAX Expansion and hope and pray that the rest of our community will come together to show our opposition and get this "Master Plan" thrown out of negotiations.

**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.

<b>PC01154</b>	<b>Fitzgerald, John</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/16/2001</b>
----------------	-------------------------	----------------------	------------------

#### **PC01154-1**

**Comment:**

As a Westchester homeowner, we are being surrounded with unprecedented development. I am opposed to any LAX expansion.

**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.

#### **PC01154-2**

**Comment:**

I favor a more regionally balanced approach to the increased demands for air travel as supported by Ruth Gallanter and other city council members.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

#### **PC01154-3**

**Comment:**

Westchester is undergoing development of the Ballona Wetlands and Howard Hughes office and retail park. The LAX expansion plan would bring more noise and traffic to an already congested region.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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 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 noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

analyses 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 and S-2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

#### PC01154-4

**Comment:**

I applaud plans to bring the Green Line to the airport and more direct freeway access. This will alleviate congestion on Lincoln, Sepulveda and other surface streets.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

#### PC01154-5

**Comment:**

If expansion were to be pursued over local objections, I would favor development of alternative B, Southern runway expansion. The area surrounding this area of planned development is mainly commercial rather than residential.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

<b>PC01155</b>	<b>Fitzgerald, Leah</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/16/2001</b>
----------------	-------------------------	----------------------	------------------

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01154; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01154.

<b>PC01156</b>	<b>Weisman, Yaffa</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/16/2001</b>
----------------	-----------------------	----------------------	------------------

#### PC01156-1

**Comment:**

THE PLAN OFFERS NO VISIBLE SOLUTION TO THE PROBLEMS CAUSED BY INCREASED TRUCK/CARGO TRAFFIC.  
HOW ARE YOU GOING TO ENSURE  
- THAT LARGE TRUCKS DON'T USE SMALL AREA STREETS AS SHORTCUTS TO LAX?

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

#### PC01156-2

**Comment:**

- HOW ARE YOU GOING TO PROTECT THE CENTINELA ADOBE? RANDY'S DONUTS?  
WESTCHESTER PLAYHOUSE?

**Response:**

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed historic/architectural and archaeological/cultural resources issues in Section 4.9.1, Historic/Architectural and Archaeological/Cultural Resources, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix I - Section 106 Report of the Draft EIS/EIR, and Appendix S-G, Supplemental Section 106 Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The level of significance following mitigation of these impacts was

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

addressed in Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.9.1.9, Level of Significance After Mitigation. Please see Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding potential effects on the Centinela Adobe and Randy's Donuts.

#### PC01156-3

**Comment:**

- WHY DO LAX AREA RESIDENTS HAVE TO CARRY THE BRUNT OF ORANGE COUNTY 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 and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

#### PC01156-4

**Comment:**

- HAVE THE AIRLINES CONTRIBUTED IN ANY WAY TO THE STUDIES OF THE PLAN?

**Response:**

Costs for preparation of the LAX Master Plan and EIS/EIR were funded by LAWA.

**PC01157      Sill, Mr. & Mrs. Earl      None Provided**

#### PC01157-1

**Comment:**

DO NOT EXPAND THE 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.

**PC01158      Nelson, Charles      None Provided      7/13/2001**

#### PC01158-1

**Comment:**

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

#### PC01158-2

**Comment:**

The LAX Plan will increase traffic on local streets, increase noise & pollution. We want to keep the community whole as it stands today.

### 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-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01159      Orth, Marjorie      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01159-1**

**Comment:**

I am opposed to any expansion at L.A.X.

They have already made Westchester less of a city, than it was when I moved here in 1964 by removing the homes in Playa del Rey & forcing some of our businesses to leave the area due to less people to shop.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC01159-2**

**Comment:**

We don't need more traffic and noise or pollution. Enlarge the Oxnard & Palmdale 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. 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.

**PC01160      Reichardt, Sue      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01160-1**

**Comment:**

We lived in Playa del Rey & watched the airport gobble up homes & now it is doing it again to PDR & Westchester including our schools & businesses.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Sections 3.2, 4.4.2 and 4.27 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR identified the areas that would be acquired under each of the Master Plan alternatives, the impacts of such acquisition. Master Plan commitments and recommended mitigation measures supporting documentation is provided in Technical Report 17 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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.

#### PC01160-2

**Comment:**

Please expand & develop LA's other regional airports - mainly 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.

#### PC01160-3

**Comment:**

The noise, traffic, & pollution have increased considerably & will only get worse with 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase, 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.

#### PC01160-4

**Comment:**

Don't expand & ruin communities & people's lives. We already bear too much of the load. We don't want a ring road or our business district destroyed.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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 to 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 include any acquisition within the Westchester business district. Also, please note that Alternative D does not include the ring road.

<b>PC01161</b>	<b>Veluz, Virgilio</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/11/2001</b>
----------------	------------------------	----------------------	------------------

#### PC01161-1

**Comment:**

MY MAIN CONCERN IS QUALITY OF LIFE. KEEPING OUR COMMUNITY WHOLE LAWA WILL ACQUIRE 1/3 CENTRAL BUSINESS 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. 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 still remain available through similar businesses that are 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, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative), does not include any acquisition within the Westchester Business District in contrast to the other build alternatives. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01161-2**

**Comment:**

TRAFFIC INCREASE IN CARGO VOLUME WILL LEAD THOUSAND OF MORE TRUCKS.

**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 (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.

**PC01161-3**

**Comment:**

EXPANSION WOULD ADD NUMEROUS CARS TO SURFACE STREETS & FREEWAYS.

**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 the proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

**PC01161-4**

**Comment:**

NOISE. MORE NOISE & SOUND PROOFING MAY MEAN THAT PEOPLE WILL HAVE TO REMAIN INDOORS W/ DOORS & WINDOW CLOSED.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

**PC01161-5****Comment:**

AIR POLLUTION AUTO EMISSION INCREASE GROUND & AIR TRAFFIC WILL RESULT IN INCREASED EMISSIONS OF ALL FIVE EPA CLASSIFIED MAJOR AIR POLLUTANTS THIS COULD AFFECT RESPIRATORY SYSTEMS OF SOME PEOPLE MAY CAUSE CANCER.

**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, Air Quality. 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.

**PC01161-6****Comment:**

SAFETY OVERCROWDING OF AIR CORRIDORS MAY LEAD TO LIKELIHOOD OF AIR DISASTERS

**Response:**

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

**PC01161-7****Comment:**

THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES OWNS TWO KEY AIRPORTS ONTARIO & PALMDALE WHICH SHOULD BE DEVELOPED AS OPPOSED TO LAX EL TORO (ORANGE COUNTY SHOULD BE DEVELOP

**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. 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.

**PC01162**

**Barrett, Susan &  
Sean**

**None Provided**

**7/14/2001**

**PC01162-1****Comment:**

(1) Traffic on Sepulveda is awful now. Expanding the airport will only add more traffic to this load.

**Response:**

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

**PC01162-2****Comment:**

(2) The noise level will increase from both air and ground traffic. Soundproofing only helps when you are in the house - where are our kids supposed to play.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

**Response:**

Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.6.1), and Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6), of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included an analysis of air traffic and areas that would experience a significant noise increase resulting from development of the Master Plan alternatives. Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR also included an evaluation of a new Master Plan alternative, Alternative D, and a new analysis of single event noise levels. Noise level increases from ground traffic, were analyzed in Section 4.1.6.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

**PC01162-3**

**Comment:**

(3) LA Basin (LAAQMD) has done so much to help clear the air over the last several years. Expanding the airport will worsen the air.

**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, Air Quality. 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.

**PC01162-4**

**Comment:**

(4) Increased traffic on Sepulveda will make the area even less safe than it is now.

**Response:**

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

**PC01162-5**

**Comment:**

(5) The proposed expansion will do nothing to help build our community and may very well be a killing stroke. Any additional people brought in as a result of LAX expansion will not be residents interested in shopping, eating, living in El Segundo or Westchester. They will be transient and do little or nothing to help our community

(6) The quality of life in our community will decrease markedly.

**Response:**

The comment does not raise any specific issues with 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.

**PC01162-6**

**Comment:**

Therefor I strongly urge you to oppose LAX 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.



**PC01163      Varney, Julia      None Provided      7/13/2001**

**PC01163-1**

**Comment:**

Why must LAX be expended? It would be far better to enlarge Ontario, build in Palmdale or O.C. It would be appreciated by those who now have to travel miles, endure horrendous traffic in order to fly out of LAX. We have enough, noise, traffic, pollution. Give us a break!

**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. 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.

**PC01164      Weiss, Zeli      None Provided      7/13/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00517; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC00517.

**PC01165      Naftaly, Charlene      None Provided**

**PC01165-1**

**Comment:**

I am completely opposed to the expansion of LAX. It is very dangerous to the community now and will be more so in the future if this plan is implemented.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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. 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.

**PC01166      Snook, Jim & Jean      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC01166-1**

**Comment:**

Please stop the LAX expansion - we bought our 1st home here in Westchester in 1946 - on our G.I. loan. We are Pioneers here. At 1st no mail delivered & no phone - no jets & no LAX - Mines Field. We helped build Westchester - was in 1970 the airport stole our home - for parking lots - car rental & post-office. We loved this area & after looking all over & our son came home from Viet Nam - decided to resettle here again - now we are back at zero again. - How much money is our 1st home making now? When we were told it was a clearance zone? Please don't squeeze us out of our home again. I was born & raised in Inglewood on Rosewood Ave in 1923. Mina Bharadwa's comments are all true especially the regional solutions. Their plan is a short-term fix. & someday there will be no beautiful Westchester - most expensive land here, if we don't fight to save our homes & community. NO LAX

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding residential property values, 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.

**PC01167      Sullivan, Mr. & Mrs.      None Provided**  
**William**

**PC01167-1**

**Comment:**

We do not want expansion of L.A.X. for the following reasons-  
Traffic  
Noise level  
Air Pollution  
fallout from fuel causes damage To wood on our house. Car,

**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-1 regarding air pollutant disposition. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

**PC01167-2**

**Comment:**

Please less Airplane Traffic Noise & 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.

**PC01168      Sallar, Fred & Phyllis      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC01168-1**

**Comment:**

Any expansion of the airport will increase traffic of vehicles and airplanes to an unberable level and it will be the solution to the problem.

**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-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.

**PC01168-2**

**Comment:**

Residential value will depreciate. Commercial property will also depreciate, because after a few years any expansion will not be sufficient.

**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 Reports 5 and S-3. 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.

**PC01168-3**

**Comment:**

The answer is to accommodate Orange County with their own airport -

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

**PC01168-4**

**Comment:**

The noise level will also damage the schools -

**Response:**

Impacts of noise on schools 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.

**PC01169**

**Mitzman, David**

**None Provided**

**7/12/2001**

**PC01169-1**

**Comment:**

We have been residents of Westchester since 1984 and truly enjoy the "smalltown" feeling one has as a resident of this unique community within the vast Los Angeles city limits.

Westchester provides its residents with businesses who know their customers by name. If you are short a little money at the grocery store, you'll hear "bring it next time." How often in this age of high tech and big business do you hear something like this?

**Response:**

Comment noted.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01169-2**

**Comment:**

The expansion of LAX will not only takeaway much of the shopping area on Sepulveda Blvd., but will increase the traffic flow, create more possibilities (as if we don't have enough) for more auto accidents, increase pollution, noise levels will hit an all time high and above all the quaintness of Westchester will be diminished significantly.

Families move here because of the neighborhood feeling, the beautiful Westchester Park, the sports facilities, and the security knowing their children can play in front of their house or on their street without a major fear of injury or assault. Retirees remain here because of the same feelings of security and quiet neighborhoods. The expansion will only congest the residential areas more, perhaps increase levels of crime, and reduce our property values.

For the above reasons, I am appealing to you to denounce expansion of LAX and leave Westchester the way it is, an exceptional community to reside.

**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. 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.

Also, as was 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 in contrast to the other build alternatives.

Effects associated with traffic were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation (subsection 4.3.2.6), of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As was further described in these sections, the alternatives have been designed to separate regional airport traffic from local traffic and to improve the functioning of the roadway systems in the vicinity of LAX. As a result, the quality of neighborhoods in Westchester is not expected to be significantly affected by traffic impacts on local streets or increases in auto accidents. Similarly, increases in crime due to congestion in residential areas is not expected. Furthermore, as was stated in the Section 4.26.2, Law Enforcement (CEQA), of the Draft EIS/EIR, statistics have shown that for the three year period between 1996 and 1999 an 11 percent increase in passenger activity at LAX did not cause an increase in crime. Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

Noise effects were addressed 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 the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01170**

**Rowen, Edd., Milton    None Provided**

**7/12/2001**

**PC01170-1**

**Comment:**

- If this plan were adopted:
1. Our central business district would be severely reduced

**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. 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 still remain available through similar businesses that are 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, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative) does not include any acquisition within the Westchester Business District in contrast to the other build alternatives. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01170-2**

**Comment:**

2. Although we live a mile from the airport, both the noise and disturbing overflights would cause property values to be reduced, and quality of life to be diminished.

**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.

**PC01170-3**

**Comment:**

3. Emissions from aircraft on the ground - take off & landing patterns are a cancer risk.

**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.

**PC01170-4**

**Comment:**

!! 4. There are other airports available

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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

---

**PC01171      Ayala, Christina      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC01171-1**

**Comment:**

I sincerely hope that there will be no LAX expansion. I have lived in Westchester for 29 years and am very concerned over the fact that the plan requires 1/3 of the Central Business District, homes, and part of Centinela Adobe to be acquired. After having invested so much into these areas, how could we even consider tearing them down? What kind of guarantee is there that all of Westchester won't be consumed?

**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. 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. Concerning the Centinela Adobe, please see Topical Response TR-HA-1. As stated in Topical Response TR-HA-1, this historic resource would only be affected under Alternatives A and C if LAWA's preferred alignment for the LAX Expressway was not selected.

Also, as was 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, it does not propose residential acquisition, and would not impact the Centinela Adobe in contrast to the other build alternatives. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01172      Calabrese, Marion      None Provided      7/11/2001**

**PC01172-1**

**Comment:**

We don't need more traffic. The air Pollution is real bad as it is now, we don't need more.  
There is enough big airplanes as it is already.  
We don't need a larger airport.  
Leave Westchester a nice and quite neighborhood. Live in a great area for 30 yrs.

**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.

**PC01173      Pavlich, Charles      None Provided**

**PC01173-1**

**Comment:**

I believe the time has come for the move to Palmdale is in order.  
There is plenty of space out there and it would be the smart way to go!

**Response:**

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

**PC01174      Guerena, Charles      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC01174-1**

**Comment:**

(PRESENT PLAN)  
- LAX EXPANSION IS A SHORT TERM SOLUTION, THEREFORE NOT ACCEPTABLE.  
- THE SOLUTION IS PALMDALE AND POSSIBLY ONTARIO.

**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.

**PC01174-2**

**Comment:**

- THE PALMDALE SOLUTION CAN ONLY BE VIABLE IF A HIGH SPEED TRANSPORTATION IS DEVELOPED BETWEEN LAX & PALMDALE. NOTE: HIGH SPEED MEANS NO TO BUS SERVICE. THIS IS THE ONLY LONG TERM SOLUTION & IS "JOB ONE"!

**Response:**

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

**PC01174-3**

**Comment:**

MY REASONS: 1) TRAFFIC IS BAD ENOUGH NOW!!

**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 the proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

**PC01174-4**

**Comment:**

2) WITH EXPANSION PLAYA VISTA & OTHER WLA PROJECTS (BUSINESS ORIENTED) TRAFFIC WILL INCREASE W/O LAX EXPANSION.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00148-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00148-2.

**PC01175      Parsons, D.      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC01175-1**

**Comment:**

Please just stop funding! That would settle our problem. Start building in El Toro. That will stop "their" problem (partially) because there is Palmdale etc. These people would like the income as well.

**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 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. The Department of the Navy has decided to dispose of the base for non-aviation reuses.

**PC01175-2**

**Comment:**

Please leave us alone! I've lived at 6305 W 77th Place for 48 years! I'm 80 years old I raised a good family. I don't want to move. Leave me 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.

**PC01175-3**

**Comment:**

The noise, pollution, traffic is bad enough 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.

**PC01176      Sassoon, Saul      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC01176-1**

**Comment:**

AS A LONG TIME RESIDENT OF WESTCHESTER WE ARE NOT IN FAVOR OF AN EXPRESSWAY GOING THRU OUR HOMES ON 74th ST AS I LIVE RIGHT BY THE AREA OF THE PROPOSED EXPRESSWAY.



**Response:**

Comment noted. The community disruption impacts of the project were addressed in Section 4.4.4, Community Disruption and Alteration of Surface Transportation Patterns, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also, please note that Alternative D, the LAWA staff preferred alternative, does not include the LAX Expressway.

**PC01176-2**

**Comment:**

WHY DON'T YOU MOVE TO EXTEND THE AIRPORT EITHER TO ONTARIO OR AND PALMDALE WHERE THEIR IS AMPLE ROOM FOR 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 and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

<b>PC01177</b>	<b>Baruch, Jerome</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/11/2001</b>
----------------	-----------------------	----------------------	------------------

**PC01177-1**

**Comment:**

If you develop Ontario and Palmdale airports, you will eliminate grid lock congestion around LAX, You will prevent Air pollution from Auto emissions and Jet fuel.

There is no need for LAX expansion there are alternative solutions available to you right now.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC01177-2**

**Comment:**

I am a Westchester home owner, I am concerned for the future of our community.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

<b>PC01178</b>	<b>Lee-Chin, June</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/12/2001</b>
----------------	-----------------------	----------------------	------------------

**PC01178-1**

**Comment:**

First our local schools are taken over by bussing, now our small business / shopping may no longer survive.

### 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. 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 still remain available through similar businesses that are 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, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative) does not include any acquisition within the Westchester Business District in contrast to the other build alternatives. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01178-2**

**Comment:**

Along with that, home prices are going to start decreasing.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

**PC01178-3**

**Comment:**

Aside from all that, if the airport should expand would not all the schools in the area have to be sound proofed? Where would that money come from? How much more would that impact on local property tax?

**Response:**

Comment noted. Schools that would be newly exposed to the 65 CNEL or newly exposed to high interior noise levels that result in classroom disruption, 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. Please see Topical Responses TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program and TR-LU-5 regarding land use/noise mitigation. Schools without aviation easements that are determined to be newly exposed to significant aircraft noise levels are eligible for mitigation. Mitigation measure MM-LU-1 provides mitigation for schools determined to be significantly impacted by aircraft noise, excluding schools with aviation easements. Mitigation may take the form of sound insulation or relocation. Further mitigation is provided under mitigation measures MM-LU-3 and MM-LU-4 in the form of study of aircraft noise levels that result in classroom disruption and sound insulation for schools determined by the study or interim noise measurements to be significantly impacted. As stated in Subtopical Response TR-LU-5.6, soundproofing of schools newly exposed to significant aircraft noise levels, excluding schools with aviation easements, would be funded through LAWA passenger facility charge (PFC) funds, Federal Aviation Administration Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 150 Noise Compatibility Program grants, resale of acquired parcels, or other sources. No impact on local property taxes is anticipated.

**PC01178-4**

**Comment:**

Also, it may be a million and one chance but with increased air traffic there is also a chance of a major disaster involving school grounds. Imagine the lives lost or the number of students injured if a large cargo or commercial plane should crash during recess, especially if the flight patterns should change from what it is now to areas over schools.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**Response:**

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

**PC01179**

**Morris, Lori**

**None Provided**

**7/12/2001**

**PC01179-1**

**Comment:**

L.A.X. expansion is a bad idea for the Westchester community. We will have more Noise, Traffic and Air 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. 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.

**PC01179-2**

**Comment:**

I am not happy about an expansion of L.A.X. Please expanded some other 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.

**PC01180**

**Conner, Robert**

**None Provided**

**7/12/2001**

**PC01180-1**

**Comment:**

SUMMER HAS COME, BUT WE WILL HAVE TO CLOSE OUR DOORS AND WINDOWS AND ABANDON OUR BACKYARD BECAUSE OF AIRPLANE NOISE!

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels. 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 a discussion of noise levels under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions and projected noise increases under the Master Plan alternatives.

**PC01180-2**

**Comment:**

SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD HAS BECOME A PARKING AREA FOR OUT-OF-TOWN CARS CROWDING THE AIRPORT AREA!

**Response:**

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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01180-3**

**Comment:**

Pollution from airplane fuel increasingly covers our cars, houses and vegetation!

**Response:**

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

**PC01180-4**

**Comment:**

ROAD RAGE MAKES LEFT TURNS AND OTHER NECESSARY MANEUVERS IN OUR AUTOMOBILES A THREAT TO OUR LIVES AND PROPERTY!

**Response:**

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

**PC01180-5**

**Comment:**

FUTURE EXPANSION OF THE LAX MEANS DEATH TO OUR RESIDENTIAL EXISTENCE!

**Response:**

The comment does not raise any specific issues with the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC01181      Gonnoud, Kathleen      None Provided      7/11/2001**

**PC01181-1**

**Comment:**

The LAX expansion is an ill-advised plan - seeking a quick fix to a problem deserving a more considerate long-term plan. Other areas - for expanded air service must be (ie El toro) pressed to bear the burden of a increase in 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.

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.

**PC01182      Friedman, Leo      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC01182-1**

**Comment:**

WE HAVE ENOUGH TRAFFIC ON THE 405, WITH THE PLAYA VISTA BEING BUILT UP FOR ABOUT 30,000 MORE PEOPLE IN THE AREA,

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00148-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00148-2.

**PC01182-2**

**Comment:**

MORE TRAFFIC ON THE 405, THE POLITICANS DONT CARE THEY DONT LIVE IN THIS AREA. WHY DON'T THEY PUT MORE TRAFFIC WHERE THEY LIVE.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01182-3**

**Comment:**

THE NOISE FROM THE AIRPORT IS ENOUGH.

**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.

**PC01182-4**

**Comment:**

WE DO NO NEED TO ENLARGE THE AIRPORT SO THE CITY CAN COLLECT MORE REVENUE. HOW ABOUT THE PEOPLE THAT LIVE IN THIS AREA

**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 provided in Technical Reports 5 and S-3. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

**PC01183      Moreshead, Dana      None Provided      7/11/2001**

**PC01183-1**

**Comment:**

Three years ago my boyfriend and I bought a home in the Westchester neighborhood of Osage. This area was not our first choice due to the high traffic, airplane, train and highway noise - but it was the

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

only area on the Westside that we could afford. We have come to LOVE our neighborhood and we can't imagine living anywhere else.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01183-2**

**Comment:**

We are extremely worried about the Airport Expansion taking our home and or neighborhood!

With talks of the Ringroad that will destroy homes and local businesses we are becoming extremely nervous! Please fight for our rights to keep our neighborhood and allow or children to grow up in a safe and clean environment.

**Response:**

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 regarding impacts to 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 preferred alternative), does not propose any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester Business District nor does Alternative D propose a ring road. 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 will be provided to any person displaced from their home or business. Also please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

**PC01183-3**

**Comment:**

Also remind the Airport that most of the people living in Westchester cannot afford to live in other westside communities!

**Response:**

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

**PC01184**

**Obrietan, Fred &  
Marlene**

**None Provided**

**7/12/2001**

**PC01184-1**

**Comment:**

No Lax Expansion  
Keeping our community whole;  
Traffic would add numerous more cars and trucks.  
Safety Overcrowding the Air corridor may Lead LikeLihood for Air disasters  
Solution would be Ontario or Palmdale

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed acquisition impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and safety impacts in Section 4.24.3, Safety, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2, 3 and 14c. 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-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale, 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.

**PC01185      Holder, Lyle      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC01185-1**

**Comment:**

LAX is overdeveloped now. Property owners have sacrificed enough. Lets expand other air ports & let Westchester get back to its normal condition. People hate to come & use LAX because of the conjection. The Money hungry merchants have gouged us enough. It's time our leaders say no more expansion & mean it. Let Orange County take care of their own air travelers. Palm Dale & Ontario need more travel business. Lets get our heads out of the sand & do whats needed & right.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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, Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale, and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01186      Jusko, Mr. & Mrs.      None Provided      7/11/2001**  
**Andrew**

**PC01186-1**

**Comment:**

1. We need a regional approach. El Toro Ontario & Palmdale airports should be expanded. LA Times reported terrorists planned to blow up LAX. We can't put all our eggs in one basket.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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, Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale, and Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security issues. 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.

**PC01186-2**

**Comment:**

2. Too much air traffic at LAX makes it unsafe!!

**Response:**

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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01186-3

**Comment:**

3. Tax Orange County Users of LAX

**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.

#### PC01186-4

**Comment:**

4. LAX is a very large polluter.

**Response:**

The South Coast Air Quality Management District's 1997 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) provided estimates of future emissions in the South Coast Air Basin. Based on a comparison of data in Table 3-5a, Summary of Emissions by Major Source Category: 2000 Base Year Average Annual Day (tons/day) in the 1997 AQMP to data suggested by Table 4.6-6, LAX Environmental Baseline (1996) Emission Inventory for On-Airport Sources in the Draft EIS/EIR, the criteria pollutant emissions for all sources on-site at LAX comprise generally less than one percent of the basinwide emissions, with one exception. This comparison demonstrates the following relationships of on-site LAX emissions to basinwide emissions: particulate matter, 0.1 percent; volatile organic compounds, 0.7 percent; sulfur dioxide, 0.8 percent; carbon monoxide, 1.0 percent; and oxides of nitrogen, 1.6 percent.

#### PC01186-5

**Comment:**

We get a lot of odor of jet fuel near LAX.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding the topic of odor.

#### PC01186-6

**Comment:**

5. Spread out air pollution to Palmdale & Ontario

**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.

#### PC01186-7

**Comment:**

6. 405 Freeway is over-crowded - Do not expand LAX.

**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.

**PC01186-8**

**Comment:**

7. There are 6 grade schools & 3 high schools around LAX. The air pollution impact of the kids is unacceptable.

**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. The human health risk assessment specifically evaluated possible health risks for children attending grade schools at locations where air quality impacts are predicted to be highest. As was discussed in the health risk assessments, air quality is actually expected to improve somewhat at these locations. 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.

**PC01187**

**Dery, Pamela**

**None Provided**

**7/12/2001**

**PC01187-1**

**Comment:**

Please know, I'm extremely concerned about the LAX Expansion and the negative effect it will have on the quality of living in Westchester. For your information, I purchased my home in this neighborhood back in Nov. 2000 because I thought it was a "quiet" "low traffic" area. In addition to the increased traffic, noise and air pollution caused by the expansion, it's inevitable that the value of properties will decrease significantly.

**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 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, Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, and Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding 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.

**PC01187-2**

**Comment:**

It is my opinion that the LAX Expansion is unacceptable and must be stopped! If not, it will compromise the quality of living that we homeowners truly cherish at this time.

**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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01187-3**

**Comment:**

Please let me know what I can do to help stop this expansion.

**Response:**

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

<b>PC01188</b>	<b>Frackiewicz, Henryka</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/12/2001</b>
----------------	---------------------------------	----------------------	------------------

**PC01188-1**

**Comment:**

I have been a resident of Westchester for over 25 years and have found This community to be a lovely enclave within Los Angeles. It is the perfect place for families to raise their children. The LAX Expansion proposal will bring traffic, crime and pollution to our neighborhoods. One of our main shopping centers will be demolished.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; law enforcement in Section 4.26.2, Law Enforcement; and air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendices G and Technical Reports 2,3,4,5, and 16b 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 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. As indicated in TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not include an acquisition within the Westchester business district.

**PC01188-2**

**Comment:**

Airports in Ontario and Palmdale should be developed. Please reconsider this project and preserve our 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-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

<b>PC01189</b>	<b>Farello, Rocco &amp; Marie</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/12/2001</b>
----------------	---------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------

**PC01189-1**

**Comment:**

When we moved here 39 years ago from the East Coast, it was the most beautiful place to live. Please don't let a place, which we have all enjoyed, be swallowed and destroyed. Westchester is an area where residents try to enjoy every second.

Please try to find an alternate plan. There is one!

**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.

**PC01190      Younger, J.**

**None Provided**

**7/11/2001**

**PC01190-1****Comment:**

NO LAX EXPANSION!

ENOUGH OF THE COMMUNITY AND BEACHES WERE LOST IN THE LAST EXPANSION OF NORTHERN AND EXTENDED RUNWAYS.

**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, and coastal zone impacts in Section 4.14, Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

**PC01190-2****Comment:**

A NEW AIRPORT MUST BE BUILT WITH CONNECTING RAIL TRANSPORTATION AWAY FROM THE CITY.

**Response:**

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

**PC01190-3****Comment:**

THE PRESENT LOCATION IS ALREADY OVER BURDENED WITH PASSENGERS, TRAFFIC, CARGO AREAS AND POLLUTION.  
LET'S GET MODERN AND BUILD AN "AIR CITY" THAT CAN PROSPER.

**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-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, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient and efficient.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01191      Frick, Eugene      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC01191-1**

**Comment:**

A. ABOUT MASTER PLAN

If you really want more \$ from more CARGO planes + more commuter plane fees + more fees from more NATIONAL + INTERNATIONAL flights, WHY NOT BUY OUT ALL HOMES - esp in SOUTH KENTWOOD (including mine - which bears noise et al burdens due to GOLF COURSE as sole "buffer" between my home + LAX!

**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 of land uses and Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

**PC01191-2**

**Comment:**

B. ABOUT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

LAX will DRAMATICALLY ADD traffic, NOx et al to my area - WITHOUT ANY MITIGATION due to PROXIMITY of RING ROAD + NEW RUNWAYS etc.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation (see subsections 4.3.1.9 and 4.3.2.9 for mitigation measures), and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality (see subsection 4.6.8 for mitigation measures). 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, added subsequent to publication of Draft EIS/EIR, does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road.

**PC01191-3**

**Comment:**

Since PLAYA VISTA project already will also ADD traffic etc. & LAX will add to PLAYA VISTA environmental degradation - LAX + PLAYA VISTA PLANS SHOULD BE EIS/EIR reviewed TOGETHER - not SEPARATELY

**Response:**

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.

**PC01192      Terrill, Debra-Lynne      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC01192-1**

**Comment:**

The LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR must include an EIS/EIR for the massive Playa Vista development that is under construction in the Playa del Rey area to the immediate north of the airport. If this Playa Vista project is built, it would significantly impact the environmental factors identified in the airport expansion document.

In effect, the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR must include the cumulative impact EIS/EIR of the Playa Vista project in the following areas:

1. Cumulative increase in traffic
2. Cumulative increase in air pollution
3. Cumulative increase in noise pollution
4. Cumulative increase in explosion dangers, recognizing the Playa Vista project methane problems as the primary contributor

**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. Potential safety hazards, if any, associated with methane occurring at the Playa Vista project site are impact specific to that project, and cannot be considered in cumulative terms relative to the LAX Master Plan project.

**PC01193      Minch, Rick      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC01193-1**

**Comment:**

As an El Segundo homeowner, I am very concerned about the possibility of an expansion of Los Angeles International Airport.

While I realize that passenger/cargo load will increase in the coming years, I believe the best way to handle this is through expansion of the other airports in the region. To further overburden the LAX-area with more traffic, noise, pollution, etc. would be, in my opinion, irresponsible.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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 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.

**PC01193-2**

**Comment:**

My wife and I are personally affected by traffic on Sepulveda, the I-405 and the I-105; noise of planes taking off over our house and pollution which causes, among other things, our outdoor patio furniture to turn black. We certainly understood El Segundo's proximity to LAX when we purchased our home, but to try to solve the increase in passenger/cargo load in the coming years by expanding one airport and affecting one community, El Segundo, is unfair.

**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-1 regarding air pollutant deposition and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01193-3

**Comment:**

I oppose the LAX Master Plan and hope that you and your committee will arrive at a better solution. Best of luck with this difficult task.

**Response:**

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

**PC01194      Smith, Douglas J. &      None Provided**  
**Susan J.**

**7/12/2001**

#### PC01194-1

**Comment:**

My wife and I have owned two homes in Westchester for the past twenty years. We travel by air frequently and have found our proximity to LAX to be of great value to us. We have, unfortunately, also noticed a tremendous increase in surface congestion near and on LAX itself.

Several weeks ago our shuttle driver described a recently completed trip that he had made to LAX from Valencia. It took him 45 minutes to get to LAX from Valencia, and 1 hour, 15 minutes to make one loop around the terminals after he arrived. Our most recent experience mirrors that of the shuttle driver. As recently as 6 am last Tuesday morning, traffic was bumper-to-bumper on the upper level as my wife left for a conference in Denver. Sepulveda Boulevard is now virtually gridlocked several times during the day.

With such congestion occurring at our current annual passenger level of 67 million, it is impossible for us to imagine even an "expanded" LAX handling the 100 million passengers that are projected for the year 2015. If "expansion" is defined as adding one or two runways with expanded terminals and support facilities to LAX's already cramped 3425 acres, one can easily envision a permanent gridlock on the 405 and 105 Freeways, Sepulveda and Century Boulevards extending from South Bay to Santa Monica to Crenshaw. Residents of Westchester could find themselves "locked in" or "locked out" of their neighborhoods for most of the day.

**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. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts, and Topical Response TR-ST-7 regarding Westchester Southside traffic.

#### PC01194-2

**Comment:**

Our other concerns include:

- Aircraft Congestion and Safety - inbound, outbound and ground operations
- Increased noise pollution from the freeways and overhead
- Increased air pollution (1302% increase in smog!) from both vehicles and aircraft
- Loss of homes and businesses near the airport
- Unfair and discriminatory burden upon the citizens nearest LAX

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed safety in Section 4.24.3, Safety, noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, and environmental justice impacts in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendices D, G, F and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4 and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendices S-C, S-D, and S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-4, and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase, and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

**PC01194-3****Comment:**

Although LAX currently is "the problem", it can be only part of "the solution" to our air transportation needs. We must develop a truly regional solution that utilizes the city's existing facility at Palmdale as well as other regional airports. Expanding the airports in other parts of the region -- Orange County and the Inland Empire -- reduces commuting time, cuts pollution and improves service for the citizens who live in those expanding areas. We understand, for example, that at least 30% of enplaning passengers at LAX come 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 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.

**PC01194-4****Comment:**

The high-speed rail link proposed to run between LAX and Palmdale is not at all far-fetched, given the magnitude of our challenge and the funds necessary to effect any solution -- especially the current short-sighted and phenomenally expensive LAX master plan alternatives.

**Response:**

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

**PC01194-5****Comment:**

Forward-thinking cities have developed new, larger facilities many miles from their existing close-in airports:

CITY	FROM OLD	TO NEW
Chicago	MDW	ORD

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

Dallas	DAL	DFW
Denver	DEN	DIA
Houston	HOU	IAH
Kansas City	MKC	MCI

At the time each new facility was being planned, it was thought to be so far out and inconvenient that no one would ever use it - neither the airlines nor their passengers. It is fortunate that their planners were able to see beyond quick and easy solutions to these regional transportation requirements. Are we Southern Californians less visionary than our midwestern colleagues?

The following table compares 1998 aircraft operations and passenger loading per acre at four major U.S. airports:

	Ops/year	PAX/year	Acres	Ops/acre	PAX/acre
DIA	550,000	40,000,000	33,920	16.21	1,179.25
DFW	880,000	59,000,000	17,500	50.29	3,371.43
ORD	1,000,000	75,000,000	6,600	151.52	11,363.64
LAX	800,000	58,000,000	3,500	228.57	16,571.43

What's wrong with this picture?

None of the currently proposed expansion alternatives are acceptable. We strongly oppose any "quick fix" or short-term approach that would attempt to "expand" LAX while choking our neighborhoods. Only a truly regional approach as supported by SCAG, our County Supervisors, Councilmember Galanter and Representative Harman makes sense for 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.

**PC01194-6**

**Comment:**

Please register our strongest possible objections to the non-regional, unsafe, unfair, imprudent, expensive and unnecessary quick-fix plans now being considered for 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. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and Environmental justice in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix F and Technical Report 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D and Technical Report S-9 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 and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.



**PC01195      Williams, Seran      None Provided      7/11/2001**

**PC01195-1**

**Comment:**

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed expansion of LAX. As a longtime resident of El Segundo, I have seen firsthand the impact of the current state of Los Angeles International airport:

**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.

**PC01195-2**

**Comment:**

- Gridlock traffic under the runway on Sepulveda Blvd.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00236-1 regarding the Sepulveda Tunnel.

**PC01195-3**

**Comment:**

- Dangerous lines of cars waiting to exit the 105W at Nash and at Sepulveda, including last minute lane changes and "brake slamming".

**Response:**

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

**PC01195-4**

**Comment:**

- Increasing number of errant planes taking shortcuts over El Segundo

**Response:**

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

**PC01195-5**

**Comment:**

- The smell of jet fumes on still days

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding the topic of odor.

**PC01195-6**

**Comment:**

- The incessant noise of planes taking off at short intervals during the day

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

**Response:**

Comment noted. Noise-sensitive uses within the City of El Segundo exposed to the 65 CNEL under the 1996 baseline were described in Section 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 4.2.3 and were shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. See Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 regarding too much noise now and in the future.

**PC01195-7**

**Comment:**

- The lack of short-term parking at the airport

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01195-8**

**Comment:**

and the nasty airport police

**Response:**

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

**PC01195-9**

**Comment:**

- The increased numbers of recklessly driving cabbies in the area

**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.

**PC01195-10**

**Comment:**

Furthermore, there is no rush hour anymore on the nearby 405 -it is ALWAYS slow and clogged around the airport. From the 10 freeway to the 110 in either direction, it is perpetual stop-and-go traffic. Expanding the airport will only exacerbate an already bad and dangerous situation.

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

**PC01195-11****Comment:**

There are better alternatives to expanding LAX - distribute the airport traffic into the areas from which most people drive; that is, Orange County, San Bernardino, Ventura or 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. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

**PC01195-12****Comment:**

I feel that the plan is being ramrodded through the approval process without sufficient analysis of the impact that expansion will have on the immediate area, its residents and its visitors.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01196****Ryan, Brett****None Provided****7/12/2001****PC01196-1****Comment:**

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the expansion of LAX. I believe that this would prove to be disaster with catastrophic results for the surrounding areas and also Los Angeles air transportation need as a whole. I strongly urge the adoption of a regional airport approach for the Los Angeles and surrounding areas.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC01196-2****Comment:**

The negative impacts of the proposed Los Angeles expansion are considerable:

**Response:**

Please see Responses to Comments below.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

#### **PC01196-3**

**Comment:**

1. Traffic flow on the 405 both north and south is already slow around the airport area. You can almost always count on meeting a traffic snarl around the LAX airport area. This affects not only passengers traveling to the airport, but also all other travel through the area. This will only get worse by expanding 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.

#### **PC01196-4**

**Comment:**

2. The LAX airport is poorly located for passengers who are situated over a very large and sprawling geographic region. Access is already limited with the ocean bordering on one side and a freeway/transportation system that is already woefully inadequate for population density and transportation needs. It is long overdue to take a serious look at spreading the airport resource, by adopting a regional approach that recognizes the existing geographic size and ground travel limitations of the Los Angeles region. It would be most imprudent to think that the current overburdened transportation system will improve by increasing travel into and out of LAX. It would be a disaster!

**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.

#### **PC01196-5**

**Comment:**

3. The 105 freeway is already negatively affected today. Traffic to the airport, on the 105 exiting onto Sepulveda north is frequently at a standstill at all times of the day and week creating a dangerous situation. I have witnessed a great many close calls, with tires squealing as cars zigzag around other vehicles. I have also seen accidents as traffic both slowing and stopping creates a dangerous speed differential with vehicles traveling at 55+ miles per hour continuing on to Sepulveda south or Imperial Highway.

**Response:**

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

#### **PC01196-6**

**Comment:**

4. The Sepulveda tunnel is unable to carry the current traffic load and this will just get worse.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00236-1 regarding the Sepulveda Tunnel.

**PC01196-7**

**Comment:**

5. The proposed cargo expansion will further increase the heavy traffic and pollution; this is already a safety and health issue.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic (see Section 1, Truck Traffic Plan for LAX Airport Master Plan Alternative C). 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 (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. The health and safety impacts of project alternatives were addressed in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical analyses and data in Technical Report 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC01196-8**

**Comment:**

6. The current noise to the surrounding areas is significant and a detriment to the quality of life for residents on both sides of the airport as well as those affected on the flight path.

**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. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase. As described in Section 4.2 and Technical Report 1, Land Use Technical Report of the Draft EIS/EIR, noise-sensitive uses within the 65 CNEL or greater and based on 1992 fourth quarter noise contours may be eligible for noise mitigation under the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP). Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

**PC01196-9**

**Comment:**

7. Increased landings and takeoffs will result in further aircraft congestion circling, landing and taking off over heavily populated areas. I believe that the proposed LAX expansion increases the risk of an air collision and thus places passengers and people on the ground at increasingly greater risk. The result of a collision would be horrific and a significant black mark on LAWA and the city of Los Angeles. A regional concept would reduce this proposed increase in congestion and associated risks.

**Response:**

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

**PC01196-10**

**Comment:**

8. Air and other pollution is a problem today and will only get worse.

### **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 addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

**PC01196-11**

**Comment:**

9. LAX is currently the regions single largest source for air pollution of smog forming NOx emissions. The LAX expansion could triple these emissions levels.

**Response:**

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

**PC01196-12**

**Comment:**

The LAWA plan is to mitigate only about 30% of the new NOx emissions. Additional mitigation measures should be included in the EIR.

**Response:**

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR contained revised data relative to feasible mitigation measures and their control efficiencies in Section 4.6, Air Quality, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-E.

The commentor is referred to the Response to Comment PC00109-15 regarding control measures for NOx.

**PC01196-13**

**Comment:**

10. I understand that LAX was recently listed in a FAA report as a very dangerous airport, one with many close calls and likely to have more in future. This is contrary to expansion as the risk increases.

**Response:**

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

**PC01196-14**

**Comment:**

11. All Los Angeles mayoral candidates, including the newly elected mayor signed a pledge not to support LAX expansion. This would suggest that they personally disagreed with the LAWA expansion plan, or recognized how unpopular LAX expansion was viewed by the public, or both.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00578-1 regarding the development of Alternative D-Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, which was developed at the direction of Mayor James Hahn.

**PC01196-15**

**Comment:**

12. Based on what I understand to be the past practice of LAX, to inappropriately increase capacity under the veil of "Improvements," I believe that the proposed expansion will be greater than the 89 to 98

million passengers that the airport claims in the plan. The impact on the surrounding area with the proposed increase would be disastrous. More pollution, more noise, more traffic, more congestion: all very unpopular.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels. 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.

**PC01196-16**

**Comment:**

13. The environmental report was supposed to review a number of alternatives to the LAX expansion project. However, the EIR has not given serious consideration to a truly regional airport solution, which is a much better alternative for the Los Angeles region as a whole.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR and 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, and shifts the accommodation of the future aviation demand to other airports in the region.

**PC01196-17**

**Comment:**

14. The LAWA suggestion that the expansion would result in only 44 more takeoffs and landings is in my view understating the actual number that this plan would create.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments PC00599-7 and PC00593-1 for a discussion on the fleet mix assumptions. Please see Response to Comment PC00631-5. 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.

**PC01196-18**

**Comment:**

15. All three expansion scenarios propose to more than double cargo capacity at LAX. The resulting traffic and diesel emission increase is not desirable for this area.

**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-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand and 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.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

#### **PC01196-19**

**Comment:**

16. The existing traffic congestion and travel delays on Sepulveda Boulevard are significant. This affects not only residents in this area but also the high volume of north/south traffic through the area. The result of LAX expansion will be a further reduction in traffic flow and congestion.

**Response:**

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

#### **PC01196-20**

**Comment:**

17. Since LAX is located on the coast, the marine layer often results in arrival/departure delays. Passengers who travel to San Francisco are affected as well as others. A regional approach would allow other departure choices and reduce/eliminate this problem.

**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.

#### **PC01196-21**

**Comment:**

18. Passengers travel long distances, from all over the Los Angeles region because they currently have little choice other than LAX for air travel. Their ground travel time, plus the significant congestion on arrival to park at or around LAX and then reach check-in can equal or exceed the actual air travel time to their final destination. (Or significantly add to the overall travel time.) Plus the additional gas, loss of valuable time, freeway congestion and pollution created throughout the entire Los Angeles region with travelers both to and from LAX just does not make sense. A regional airport approach would have far reaching benefits by significantly reducing the issues mentioned.

19. It seems quite self-serving for LAWA to not consider a regional approach, which I believe, is widely viewed as a much more sensible and better approach. The opposition to the LAX expansion plan is significant and a very large number of communities support a regional approach. Why is LAWA ignoring so much opposition for the plan, and significant widespread support for a regional approach?

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC01196-20

#### **PC01196-22**

**Comment:**

20. The quality of life in El Segundo and all surrounding areas will continue to deteriorate with LAX 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

**PC01196-23**

**Comment:**

21. Other regional areas of the greater Los Angeles area should share the responsibility of our air travel needs. They would benefit from the resulting proximity of available air travel and economic expansion/employment in their local areas.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC01196-20.

<b>PC01197</b>	<b>Thompson, Mary</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/4/2001</b>
----------------	-----------------------	----------------------	-----------------

**PC01197-1**

**Comment:**

As a resident of Westchester for 43 years, I've seen more and more homes and businesses taken by the airport. The new plan will destroy Westchester as a special community.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see 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.

**PC01197-2**

**Comment:**

Stop more expansion and make Palmdale, Ontario and El Toro take their share of traffic, noise and pollution. Why should we have homes and businesses taken when other airports stay the same.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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 traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and acquisition 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, 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

---

#### PC01197-3

**Comment:**

Leave LAX alone and improve the 105 and the rail line into the airport which should have completed when they were built.

**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-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

#### PC01197-4

**Comment:**

I'm tired of hearing that as a community we do not count and the FAA and World Airports can do anything they want. Please expand other 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-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process.

**PC01198**

**Rosen, Sherman**

**None Provided**

**7/12/2001**

#### PC01198-1

**Comment:**

Please consider this a comment on the EIS/EIR report and let me add my voice to those who strenuously oppose 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.

#### PC01198-2

**Comment:**

Consider the additional tens of thousands of residents who will be moving into the Playa Vista complex plus the traffic that will be generated when the Howard Hughes Center is at full capacity with its hundreds (thousands?) of daily commuters and movie theater goers. Sepulveda, Lincoln and the 405 just will not be able to take any more. As it stands even today, the jam-ups are hard to take. Additional tens of thousands of person-hours will be lost on a regular basis if the LAX expansion takes place,

**Response:**

The impact of the future Playa Vista and Howard Hughes complexes were fully accounted for in the analysis as related projects, as discussed in Technical Report 3b. Please see Response to Comment AR00003-21 regarding cumulative impacts. Please also see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

**PC01198-3****Comment:**

and that also includes the trucks making their way at a snail's pace to the ill-conceived additional airport facilities.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic (see Section 1, Truck Traffic Plan for LAX Airport Master Plan Alternative C). 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 (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.

**PC01198-4****Comment:**

Let's face it. Whatever the studied arguments pro and con, the driving force behind the expansion is the protection and consolidation of political and financial power to the benefit of a miniscule fraction of all those whose lives will - in so many ways - be made more dirty, crowded and unhealthy.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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, growth in Section 4.5, Induced Socio-Economic Impacts (Growth Inducement), 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.

**PC01199****Truxal, Peggy****None Provided****7/10/2001****PC01199-1****Comment:**

As a resident of Westchester since 1954 I have lived through the past airport expansions, been a victim of its noise when the north runway was built, encouraged and was successful to have the airport purchase our noise-impacted home. We relocated in Westchester as an area that we had felt like we were part of one big neighborhood. Meanwhile we saw the W. business area reduced to "rubbles" and only recently revitalized. Are we as members of this community going to be deprived again of many of our busines, have traffic become even worse than it already is?

**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. As indicated in TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not include any acquisition within the Westchester business district. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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**

---

#### **PC01199-2**

**Comment:**

Studies have proven the damage that airport noise does to learning.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to 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.

#### **PC01199-3**

**Comment:**

The only sensible plans that I have seen 1) take some of the traffic away from the airport streets by satellite parking and processing of LAX passengers

**Response:**

Alternative D has configured the landside ground transportation in exactly the manner described. All public and commercial curbside, parking facilities and regional intermodal centers are moved to a location east of the Central Terminal complex. The conveyance of passengers and their escort visitors to and from the terminals would be with an automated people mover system running in an aerial guideway that passes over the city streets.

#### **PC01199-4**

**Comment:**

and secondly - make use of other airports as Ontario & Palmdale - eventually they will be needed to handle the increased traffic.

**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.

#### **PC01199-5**

**Comment:**

Why delay and why spend millions on LAX expansion that will be inadequate regardless of 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, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

#### **PC01199-6**

**Comment:**

We do not need increased noise and 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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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.

**PC01201      Gregory, Carolyn      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC01201-1**

**Comment:**

We have been residents here since 1990. My mother has chosen to move to Tucson, AZ. Because of the pollution that already exists. Her chronic asthma and bronccitis can't handle the air quality any longer - even though we are only 2 miles from the coastline. THIS SUCKS!!

**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-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects.

**PC01201-2**

**Comment:**

The house is currently "on the market" and it breaks my heart to even imagine this situation becoming worsened by additions to the airport and the surrounding community.

Before long there will be no-one left but new gang-members, the elderly, the sick and the CORPSES.

STOP THE EXPANSION OR LIVE WITH YOUR OWN DECISIONS.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding quality of life.

**PC01202      Hrishikesan, Anita      None Provided      6/29/2001**

**PC01202-1**

**Comment:**

I live near the Santa Monica Airport and am very concerned about the increase in jet traffic that we have experienced over the past few years.

Without FBO's (fixed base operator facilities) at LAX we foresee more and more private and business jets using Santa Monica Airport. We want this provided for in a Master Plan for the area.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-4 regarding potential impacts on Santa Monica Airport.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01202-2

**Comment:**

In addition, the impact on traffic - the 405, Lincoln and Sepulveda Blvds from an LAX expansion will be unbearable -

**Response:**

Please see Topical Responses TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and TR-ST-2 regarding the Congestion Management Program.

#### PC01202-3

**Comment:**

I support a decentralized Regional Plan (use El Toro, 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, 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.

**PC01203**

**Hawley, Jeffrey**

**None Provided**

**7/13/2001**

#### PC01203-1

**Comment:**

This is to let you know that both my wife and I are AGAINST the LAX Expressway and Ring road, and we are also AGAINST the expansion of LAX. The expansion of the Ontario and/or Palmdale airports is a much more reasonable 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. It also should be noted that Alternative does not include a 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-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

#### PC01203-2

**Comment:**

We believe that the LAX area, and the West side as a whole, have been developed enough and cannot support further increases in development with the excessive demands of traffic, housing, noise, and pollution that would entail. Please work hard and stop the LAX plans!

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; housing in Section 4.5, Induced Socio-Economic Impacts (Growth Inducement), 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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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.

**PC01204      Feldman, Artemis &      None Provided      7/12/2001**  
**Lee**

**PC01204-1**

**Comment:**

We bought our 1st home in Westchester in 1973 and loved the community so much that we bought our 2nd home in 1976, raised 2 daughters and made numerous improvements on our home over the past 26 years.

We are against LAX expansion as it would drastically change our quality of life. We do not need additional traffic, noise & air pollution nor do we need to jeopardize our safety by over-crowding the air corridors & increasing the likelihood of air disasters.

**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 Appendices D and G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendices S-C and 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-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.

**PC01204-2**

**Comment:**

We feel that Ontario, Palmdale & El Toro should be developed & expanded to carry their fair share of commerce. We do not need a short term "quick fix" to a long term major problem. We urge you to use foresight to reach a 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, 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.

**PC01205      Weinroth, Jack      None Provided      7/13/2001**

**PC01205-1**

**Comment:**

NO! TO L.A. AIRPORT EXPANSION. ONTARIO & PALMDALE - YES! I WAS A WORLD WAR II PILOT.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added 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.

**PC01206      Ter Veen, Janet      None Provided      7/13/2001**

**PC01206-1**

**Comment:**

I'm opposed to the expansion of LAX as Westchester already bears the brunt of the negative impacts of the airport which serves all of Los Angeles. Other regional airports should be expanded to serve other areas of the county.

The noise traffic & pollution problems should not be concentrated 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 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, 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.

**PC01207      Miglin, Michelle      None Provided      7/14/2001**

**PC01207-1**

**Comment:**

PLEASE KNOW THAT I KNEW THE AIRPORT HAD BEEN AROUND FOR 40 YEAR BEFORE I BOUGHT MY HOME NEXT TO IT. I AM ALSO UNDER THE SOUNDPROOFING PLAN AND APPRECIATE THE PROGRAM. BUT, ORANGE COUNTY MUST STEP UP AND DO THEIR SHARE - WE ARE NOT OPPOSED TO SOME GROWTH, BUT WE CAN NOT AND SHOULD NOT TAKE THEIR AIR TRAFFIC TOO!! LET THEM EXPAND THEIR FACILITIES 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. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

**PC01208      Sears, Ben      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01208-1**

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose LAX expansion, for all of the reasons that have been stated many times.

**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.



**PC01209****Garnholz, Liz****None Provided****7/13/2001****PC01209-1****Comment:**

1. LAX violates the State's noise standards for airports, therefore CALTrans requires LAX to reduce its' noise and attempting to reduce LAX noise is done through the LAX Noise Variance process. What is your interpretation of the affect increases in noise from increases in operations and wait-time on the tarmac will have on the CalTrans requirement for LAX to reduce/come into compliance with the State's airport noise standards for Alternatives A, B, C, and the No Project Alternative? Studies have shown that all-stage-three aircraft have not reduced noise contours. On the contrary noise contours have grown in spite of all-stage-three aircraft due to increases in operations.

**Response:**

The commentor is correct in identifying that LAX must request a Variance from the State of California's noise standards due to incompatible land areas that exceed 65 dB CNEL. LAX was deemed to be a noise problem airport by the County of Los Angeles in 1972. Each Variance is issued for a three-year period and LAX's most recent Variance became effective in March of 2001. There is additional information located in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Noise impacts, whether they are from increases in aircraft operations or from those created by aircraft waiting on the tarmac, would be based on actual noise monitoring reports. These Quarterly Noise Monitoring Reports are provided to, and verified by, the County of Los Angeles and the State of California. The commentor refers to studies regarding seeing no reduction in noise contours as a result of an all stage-three fleet. Conversion to an all stage-three fleet as required by federal law in the year 2000 is only one of the measures that LAX has taken to reduce noise impacts on the surrounding community. Additional measures include an acoustical treatment program, differential runway usage, early turn prohibitions, and a required helicopter policy. Consequently, noise variance hearings in future years will be centered on monitored noise levels associated with the future alternative selected for implementation.

**PC01209-2****Comment:**

2. Playa Vista and LAX traffic affects:

a ) What is the synergistic affect Playa Vista traffic and LAX traffic will have on the road quality of life in communities adjacent and close to the airport under Alternatives A, B, C, and the No Project Alternative?

b) How is LAWA going to coordinate/mitigate the synergistic traffic effects these two high traffic producers will have on the local region's roads for Alternatives A, B, C, and the No Project Alternative?

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AR00003-21 regarding cumulative impacts. Also, please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

**PC01209-3****Comment:**

3. The public keeps being told that offsetting impacts (it must suffer) is necessary for the "general benefit". A recent study done by CIC Research Inc. for the Southern California Association of Governments said a) the region would benefit economically whether LAX expanded or regional airports expanded and b) the growing economy of the 6-county region of Southern California is projected to be so great that LAX related economic growth will represent "only a little more than 0.5%" of the region's total growth. As LAX states it is to service the total region it is therefore the total region's economic benefit that is the issue not LAX's local economic benefit.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00033-113 regarding changed circumstances in the region's system of airports since the referenced study was prepared and SCAG's 2001 Regional Transportation Plan was adopted.

**PC01209-4**

**Comment:**

a ) What is LAWA's "general benefit" justification for making communities around LAX suffer environmentally (noise and air) wise, traffic wise, health wise, economic devaluation of property wise, and general quality of life wise for a mere 0.5% of the pie?

**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, Employment/Socio-Economics, 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.

**PC01209-5**

**Comment:**

b) What is LAWA's legal justification for saying a mere 0.5% economic benefit is the "general benefit" number needed to make those around LAX assume all the suffering incurred by having LAX the only international airport that supports all of Southern California which has an economic base that ranks 10th globally?

**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, Employment/Socio-Economics, 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.

**PC01209-6**

**Comment:**

c) This leads into why are there only LAX alternatives as LAWA owns other airports that want growth-Palmdale and Ontario, therefore what affects would substantial development and substantial expansion of these two airports have on the necessity of developing LAX to the extent proposed in Alternatives A, B, and C?

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding the range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Response to Comment AF00001-56 regarding the Draft EIS/EIR assumptions pertaining to Ontario International and Palmdale Regional airports. Please also see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

**PC01210**

**Garnholz, Liz**

**None Provided**

**7/13/2001**

**PC01210-1**

**Comment:**

1. Recent airport trade journals talk about the industries' trend of point-to-point routing of planes versus the old hub focusing, point-to-point being made possible by the long- range capabilities of the newer jets. Therefore:

- a) What is LAX's statistical basis for developing a yesterday's-hub-capabilities airport?
- b) As Southern California is the 10th largest economic base globally what would the affect be on Alternatives A, B, C, and the No Project Alternative with the consideration of point-to-point airport scenario/s?

**Response:**

Chapter III, Forecasts of Aviation Demand, of the LAX Master Plan (November 10, 2000) and the associated appendix to this chapter, Appendix III-A of the same document, provide specific assumptions and background on the subjects raised in this comment. Section 3, Issues Affecting Future Aviation Demand, and specifically, Section 3.2.3, Point-to-Point Versus Connecting Air Service, Section 3.2.4, Growth of Hubbing, Section 3.2.5, Growth of Low Fare, High Frequency Air Carriers, and Section 3.3.5, New Long-Range Aircraft, each address the issues raised in this comment and provide the basis of assumptions used in the LAX Master Plan forecast on the subject.

**PC01210-2**

**Comment:**

2. In the previous Draft EIR 2000, in the Goals and Missions section it was stated that there be no LAX requirement of having homeowners sign an avigation easement for home sound insulation money. I could not find a LAX position statement on avigation easement requirements in this EIS/EIR. In light of serious citizen opposition to the signing of avigation easements and the State's requirement that LAX make land around it noise compatible, what is LAX's position in this EIS/EIR, on avigation easements? NOTE: airports Boston's Logan, Chicago's O'Hare, and the new Denver International Airport do not require the signing of an avigation easement when receiving home sound insulation money.

**Response:**

Please see Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.13 for a description of LAWA's avigation easements and their relationship to the EIS/EIR.

**PC01210-3**

**Comment:**

3. Better community relations is a LAX mantra, yet the LAX noise complaint hot-line malfunctions repeatedly and LAX's new monthly complaint list format tells us only how many households complained during the month, some complaints are about jets, noise, helicopters, and unknowns. Dates, times, type of events, which airlines, and the reasons for the events are no longer given as of the first of this year. Question, as LAX espouses to being and desires to be a good neighbor what is LAX's reasoning for not giving meaningful airport complaint information, information we have always been given in the past? Information is what tells us what is good and what is not so good, it indicates trends, and gives the public the feeling that LAX cares-community relations. NOTE: San Francisco Airport has almost real-time detailed airfield operations information available to the public via the internet which proves it can be done

**Response:**

LAX 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 has recently installed a PASSUR system to assist the community in tracking aircraft operations. By going to the LAWA website ([www.lawa.org](http://www.lawa.org)) and entering the Noise Management section community members can specifically identify LAX operations that cross their community.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01210-4

**Comment:**

4. Currently fire and medic capabilities at LAX are scant.  
a) How are fire and medic operations being upgraded to handle the somewhat non-threatening to worst-case-scenarios for the greatly expanded LAX Alternatives A, B, and C?

**Response:**

Section 4.26.1 of the Draft EIS/EIR addressed existing fire protection services at LAX, and subsection 4.26.1.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR described proposed improvements to fire protection services that would occur under Alternatives A, B, C, and D.

As discussed on pages 4-1165 through 4-1166 of the Draft EIS/EIR, four Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) stations currently serve LAX and the surrounding community. Both the State Master Mutual Aid Agreement and the County of Los Angeles Mutual Aid Operations Plan ensure that LAX receives supplemental personnel and resources during a major emergency. The City of El Segundo also provides fire response backup and emergency medical services to LAX and, in turn, LAX provides fire trucks and personnel to the city in the event of a major incident. As stated on page 4-1166 of the Draft EIS/EIR, LAFD has indicated that "[a]ll four fire stations maintain adequate equipment and personnel to meet the response times and agent discharge rates required to support LAX air carrier operations under baseline conditions." In addition, as stated in Section 4.26.1.3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAFD is currently seeking additional staffing and equipment resources in order to address today's changing environmental needs, however, response times in and around LAX have been maintained. Also since preparation of the Draft EIS/EIR, funding to support the relocation and expansion of Fire Station 5 has been obtained through the approval of Proposition F. Furthermore, Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity that is substantially less than that proposed under Alternatives A, B, and C and is comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

With implementation of the LAX Master Plan, existing on-airport fire stations would be relocated to new sites and expanded to support LAFD facility needs and Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) requirements. Master Plan Commitments PS-1 and PS-2 would ensure that the size and locations for expanded, relocated, or future stations would support facility needs and FAR requirements anticipated with implementation of the LAX Master Plan.

As presented in Section 4.26.1.5 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Master Plan Commitment FP-1 ensures fire protection design recommendations are incorporated into the LAX Master Plan. As indicated on page 4-736 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the design recommendations would be developed in consultation with the LAFD and address: emergency access, fire flow requirements, fire hydrants, street dimensions, road turns, private roadway access, dead-end streets, fire lanes, building setbacks, building heights, construction/demolition access, and aircraft fire protection systems. The design recommendations are also consistent with the LAFD's July 1, 1997 comment letter on the LAX Master Plan NOI/NOP, as included in Appendix A of the Draft EIS/EIR.

Furthermore, ongoing LAFD reviews of staffing and equipment levels, and reviews of detailed plans for code compliance, would ensure adequate fire protection service levels are maintained at LAX.

With implementation of Master Plan Commitments FP-1, PS-1, PS-2, LU-1, C-1, and ST-9 through ST-22, along with the mitigation measures identified in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and project-by-project review to enforce code requirements, adequate fire protection services would be maintained at LAX.

#### PC01210-5

**Comment:**

- b) How are fire and medic capabilities being upgraded for the more benign expansion of the No Project Alternative?

**Response:**

The Draft EIS/EIR addressed existing fire protection services at LAX as well as proposed improvements to fire protection services in Section 4.26.1, Fire Protection. Please see the discussion on page 4-1169 which, in reference to the No Action/No Project Alternative, states in part that "consistent with LAFD standard practice, the fire protection staff serving LAX would continue to conduct ongoing reviews of staffing and equipment levels in relation to proposed development, changes in aircraft types and increases in aircraft movements and passenger activity."

**PC01211      McRitchie, Greig      None Provided      7/15/2001**

**PC01211-1****Comment:**

The airport as it exists: why are the majority of the planes taking off from the North Runways instead of the South where there is only oil ref. DWP & power plants.

**Response:**

North and south operations are traditionally nearly equal with a slightly higher utilization of the south side. Airport efficiency is achieved when the operations can be equally shared between all available runway resources.

**PC01211-2****Comment:**

Why not build walls to cut down the sound when planes land over ocean & hit retros on strip.

Put up trees on mountains to absorb sound.

I'm sure there are sound absorption cones which can be purchased and placed around.

New plans:

**Response:**

Please see Subtopical Response TR-N-4.2 regarding proposed noise mitigation and the effectiveness of these proposed measures. Please see Response to Comment PC01211-3 below regarding new plans.

**PC01211-3****Comment:**

I think extending North Runway is best and add one to South but I live on the North.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01212      Smith, Bryce      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01212-1****Comment:**

As a resident of the Westchester area for over 15 years I do not support the LAX expansion plan. I do not support the plan for the following reasons. The entire area encompassing LAX and surrounding communities is already at maximum use capacity. At the present level air pollution, noise pollution and traffic often exceed acceptable levels. Any further growth will increase traffic, noise and pollution to continuous unacceptable levels do to increased cargo, passenger and aircraft volume.

### 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 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 potential effects of Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester 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.

**PC01212-2**

**Comment:**

If LAX wants to be progressive and support the quality of Los Angeles in the long term it should expand in less developed areas outside of long established urban areas. LAX should expand into Ontario and Palmdale as well as developing El Toro to handle Orange County air commerce needs as opposed to burdening the communities around 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, 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.

**PC01212-3**

**Comment:**

Thank you for considering the comments of those most effected by this unwanted expansion.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01213      Weiman, Webb      None Provided**

**PC01213-1**

**Comment:**

Has it got to the point to where I should pack up my family and move? The noise already keeps us up, so please let me know now rather than when it's too late. Thank you,

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed effects of single event aircraft noise relative to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1.

**PC01214      Heffernan, Michael      None Provided      7/15/2001**

**PC01214-1**

**Comment:**

Re: LAX Expansion, Playa Vista development Our home of many years is midway between LAX and Playa Vista. Development has just started, yet daily Sepulveda Blvd & Lincoln Blvd in Westchester are hopelessly impacted morning & evening! How much \* is too much \*?

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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 Response to Comment AL00018-19 regarding the evaluation of cumulative impacts in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

**PC01214-2**

**Comment:**

This is a long-developed area; we need more traffic, noise, people, etc like L.A. needs another earthquake! People live & work here, too.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, growth in Section 4.5, Induced Socio-Economic Impacts (Growth Inducement), 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.

**PC01214-3**

**Comment:**

L.A. county has other less-developed areas for an airport. Can't there be two airports? It works in London; why not 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.

**PC01215      Reiff, Robert      None Provided      7/14/2001**

**PC01215-1**

**Comment:**

As a long time Resident and businessman in the area I am greatly against the LAX 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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01215-2

**Comment:**

My home in Westchester, although beautiful, can already not be enjoyed outdoors or with open windows.

**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-2 regarding potential effects of Master Plan Alternatives on the community of Westchester.

#### PC01215-3

**Comment:**

I unfortunately somehow even fall out of the area qualifying for sound proof windows, even though it is hard to hear someone in the same room when a plane passes.

**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 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 also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

#### PC01215-4

**Comment:**

This entire area is already being grossly overbuilt with so many approved projects that have not even yet impacted noise and pollution in addition to quality of life.

**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.

#### PC01215-5

**Comment:**

Perhaps if we need to expand locally to accommodate additional cargo we should consider moving all cargo flights to a more Remote area such as building an airport for this purpose and additional commuter planes in the Palmdale/Lancaster area.

**Response:**

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. Please see Response to Comment PC00059-54 for more information regarding cargo activity. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.



**PC01215-6**

**Comment:**

We can not handle any more uncontrolled growth.

**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).

**PC01216**

**Dwyer, William &  
Loraine**

**None Provided**

**7/13/2001**

**PC01216-1**

**Comment:**

No LAX 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.

**PC01216-2**

**Comment:**

We don't need more traffic on Arbor Vitae

**Response:**

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

**PC01216-3**

**Comment:**

- so many trucks now we can't travel on Arbor Vitae which causes more air pollution.

**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 (beginning on page 4-293), of the Draft EIS/EIR. 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.

**PC01216-4**

**Comment:**

The planes are polluting our air & so is all the traffic.

### 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 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.

**PC01216-5**

**Comment:**

Do not expand our airport - send some to Palmdale El Toro or 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.

**PC01217      Delaney, Tracy &      None Provided**  
**Family**

**PC01217-1**

**Comment:**

Please don't let LAX expand! There are other options & certainly other airports that could help handle the cargo. I understand Palm Dale would really like to handle the cargo. Orange County, El Toro & Even San Diego should handle some of the burden of addle. International & local flights.

**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. The City of Los Angeles owns and LAWA controls the operation and potential expansion of four airports: LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys. The other regional airports are controlled by other jurisdictions that are responsible for their respective operation and expansion. Subsequent to the publication of the 2001 Draft EIS/EIR, local Measure W was passed by the voters of Orange County that changed the zoning of the land on the former MCAS El Toro to non-aviation uses. Subsequent to the passage of Measure W, Orange County as the Local Redevelopment Authority for the former MCAS El Toro discontinued its pursuit of the base for a civilian aviation reuse. The Department of the Navy decided to dispose of the base for non-aviation reuses. The City of Los Angeles has no authority to develop a civilian airport at the former MCAS El Toro.

**PC01217-2**

**Comment:**

Orange County has had tremendous growth in recent years. Why should we handle all their population? L.A. should not be so greedy for money. I know its big business & added revenue for LA but at a terrible expense to the people who live in the 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. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 for information on El Toro, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario International Airport.

#### PC01217-3

**Comment:**

I am sure the wetlands preservation would also be adversely effected with the added noise & pollution.

**Response:**

As described in mitigation measure MM-ET-1 in Section 4.11, Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, relocation sites for wetland soils containing embedded cysts of the Riverside fairy shrimp would be restricted to areas outside Master Plan boundaries and would not be adversely impacted by Master Plan improvements. As a result of Section 7 consultation among LAWA, FAA, and USFWS, the soils containing cysts of the Riverside fairy shrimp will be relocated to property owned by the FAA and designated a habitat preserve at the former Marine Corps Air Station at El Toro, or a comparable site approved by the USFWS. The Draft Biological Opinion issued by the USFWS is included as Appendix F-E of this Final EIS/EIR. Master Plan improvements have been determined to contribute to cumulative impacts to the endangered Riverside fairy shrimp (subsection 4.11.7) and wetlands (subsection 4.12.7) however, implementation of proposed mitigation measures would reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels. The potential impacts of noise levels and air quality on sensitive biotic communities and sensitive species of flora and fauna are analyzed in Section 4.10, Biotic Communities, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

#### PC01217-4

**Comment:**

What is the effect on the local beaches & marine life - can't be good.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00033-414 regarding potential impacts associated with increased pollution on beaches and marine life.

#### PC01217-5

**Comment:**

We have a 4 1/2 year old daughter & I am very concerned about the toll that the expansion would have on the air quality. She already suffers from caughing & azmatic problems wich her Dr. has told us could be triggered by our close proximity to the airport.

**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.

#### PC01217-6

**Comment:**

The noise level has already increased since we moved here 4 1/2 years ago. I can't imagine it being worse than it is now! Many of our neighbors have double paned windows courtesy of L.A.X. due to current noise levels!

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

**Response:**

Airport noise characteristics and impacts were addressed in Section 4.1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Provided therein and in Section 4.2 of the subject documents were descriptions of LAWA's Aircraft Noise Abatement Program (ANMP), which includes LAWA's residential soundproofing program.

**PC01217-7**

**Comment:**

I am sure additional noise would effect the hearing of all of us in Playa Del Rey, Westchester & El Segundo areas. Please consider the health of our community!

**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.

**PC01217-8**

**Comment:**

Is L.A.X. & the City of LA willing to pay for our hearing problems, illnesses due to the pollution - cancer, & problems with our lungs?? Is LAX & the City of LA willing to take the responsibility of destroying the health of our young children? Are they willing to take responsibility for destroying the environment? Does anyone have a conscience?

**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.

**PC01217-9**

**Comment:**

We are already going to suffer from the Playa Vista project & the building up in the Marina Del Rey area. Must we be squeezed & tortured from all directions?

**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.

**PC01217-10**

**Comment:**

The property values will surely drop if LAX is expanded. The surrounding areas such as ours (Playa Del Rey) are not cheap homes. These are expensive beautiful homes. The Westchester area has been upgrading their homes also, and this is a wonderful area full of families. Don't turn this area into an undesirable area!! Why ruin some of the nicer areas of L.A.? And a beach community to boot.

**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. Also refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding the potential effects of the Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester.

**PC01218      Lee, Richard      None Provided      7/14/2001**

**PC01218-1**

**Comment:**

(1) Build infrastructure to other airports

- (A) Rail
- (B) Corridors
- (C) Bus Service

Ontario  
Palmdale  
El Torro  
Burbank  
Long Beach  
John Wayne  
AF Bases

**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-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, for information on El Toro, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario International Airport. 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.

**PC01218-2**

**Comment:**

(2) Reduce traffic thru - El Segundo, Westchester Playa Del Rey

**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, 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. 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.

**PC01218-3**

**Comment:**

(3) Plan for Playa Vista Expansion

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00148-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00148-2.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01218-4**

**Comment:**

(4) Assist airlines in establishing hubs at regional airports

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-2 for a discussion of airline response to market demand and deregulation, and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

**PC01218-5**

**Comment:**

(5) Complete Ring around LAX

(6) Control traffic, passengers, cargo better

**Response:**

Alternatives A, B, and C as proposed would include completion of a Ring Road around LAX and would control traffic, passengers, and cargo better than the Adjusted Environmental Baseline alternative, as discussed in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation. A complete description of these projects' benefits and impacts was included in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. See also Topical Responses TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic and TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology and results.

**PC01218-6**

**Comment:**

(7) Prepare for larger planes

**Response:**

Limited by airside capacity, the final Master Plan alternatives assume that airlines would make air service modifications to maximize their opportunities even under the constrained airfield conditions. One air service modification the airlines are projected to make that would have little effect on the airfield system but would increase the level of activity in the terminal and access system, is to increase their aircraft size wherever possible.

Please see Section 2 of the Draft Master Plan Addendum which describes how Alternative D would allow LAX to more safely and efficiently accommodate larger aircraft.

**PC01219**

**Chicoine, Dyan**

**None Provided**

**7/14/2001**

**PC01219-1**

**Comment:**

Please leave our "open" -  
Life has no problems - just solutions  
The Right Solution!

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01220**

**Funk, George**

**None Provided**

**7/8/2001**

**PC01220-1**

**Comment:**

As a frequent traveler who flies over 100,000 miles a year, with most of it originating at LAX, I understand more than most the constant need to improve and enhance the facilities there. However, as a resident of nearby El Segundo, I also recognize the need to balance the airports needs with the quality of life of my fellow residents. Like it or not, LAX is in an urban setting whose very nature precludes the type of expansion envisioned in the Master Plan. In my opinion, the airport is close to being at maximum capacity, and development efforts should be focused on making it a quality experience at current levels of capacity. This does not mean that newer, more efficient terminals cannot be built. But it does mean that more runways cannot.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Alternatives C and D do not include the construction of additional runways, but do include lengthening and relocation of runways to accommodate a new parallel taxiway to reduce runway incursions and improve airfield operations. 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.

**PC01220-2**

**Comment:**

The noise would simply be intolerable. As a resident of El Segundo, we should not be considered "Not in My Backyarders", as we chose to live where an airport is in our backyard. But there is a limit to the added noise, traffic, and pollution that residents of the surrounding communities should be expected to take.

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

**PC01220-3**

**Comment:**

More specifically, I do not believe the Draft EIR addresses the issue of increased traffic which can be expected on the already over burdened I-405 freeway. This freeway is 5 plus lanes already. How much wider can we make it? The answer is we can't.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the Congestion Management Program.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01220-4

**Comment:**

With regard to surrounding highways, Sepulveda Boulevard in particular is already at capacity during rush hour, and cannot take the increase in traffic an airport expansion will bring.

**Response:**

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

#### PC01220-5

**Comment:**

Cargo capacity will be doubled under all three expansion scenarios. This makes no sense at all, and will result in more and more trucks on our already overburdened roads.

**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 (beginning on page 4-293) of the Draft EIS/EIR.

#### PC01220-6

**Comment:**

Doesn't it make more sense to bring cargo into Ontario and other outlying airports which are under utilized, and closer to the large network of distribution centers in the Inland Empire?

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00059-54 for more information about cargo activity.

#### PC01220-7

**Comment:**

These are just a few of the reasons that why I feel LAX must not be expanded. Thanks for taking the time to read this letter. I look forward to your reply.

**Response:**

Please see Responses to Comments PC01220-1 through PC01220-6 above.

<b>PC01221</b>	<b>Velasco, Ph.D., Frank</b>	<b>None Provided</b>
----------------	----------------------------------	----------------------

#### PC01221-1

**Comment:**

The EIR Master Plan does not address the effect of airport noise on children. I have spoken to representatives of Los Angeles Unified School District who have consistently expressed to you their concerns regarding learning deficits of children living near LAX. There are two studies that clearly state airport noise effects children physically, emotionally and academically.



The first is a study conducted by the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, the Nordic Scientific Group and the German Research Foundation. Their study monitored 217 third and fourth graders, six months before opening of the new Munich Airport in Germany and 18 months after opening. They found increased blood pressure and increased epinephrine, norepinephrine and cortisol hormone levels. We know that high blood pressure in children may lead to high blood pressure in adults. Heightened stress hormones may lead to health problems such as heart attacks, high cholesterol and low immune cell count.

The second study conducted in 1977 found that children living near LaGuardia and Kennedy International Airports, exhibited reading and listening deficiencies compared with their counterparts living in others neighborhoods in New York including many depressed schools. This study was conducted by the American Psychological Association and the National Institute of Health.

Since the airport has not addressed these issues currently and since the Master Plan continues to ignore this issues, I am demanding the EIR Master Plan address this issue. Until then I will be adamantly opposed to the airport expansion.

**Response:**

Please see Responses to Comments AL00017-246 and AL00038-11. 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.

**PC01222      Velasco, Valeria      None Provided**

**PC01222-1**

**Comment:**

Please be advised that I am a resident of Playa del Rey, practice law in Playa del Rey and am President of the Alliance for Regional Solution to Airport Congestion(ARSAC) which boasts membership of thousands of residents throughout Los Angeles county, all of whom oppose the current proposed Master Plan.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01222-2**

**Comment:**

The purpose of an EIR is to disclose impacts. The EIR produced by LAX as part of its master plan is inadequate as it tries to mask the real impacts of airport expansion.

The EIR utilizes three separate and distinct baselines for analyzing the impacts of the Project. Each is employed selectively where it will serve to minimize the environmental impact at issue rather than consistently using the same baseline to obtain true measurements.

**Response:**

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

**PC01222-3**

**Comment:**

An EIR is supposed to consider a reasonable range of alternatives to the project. But this EIR never seriously considers the use of available airports in the region

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**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 the future aviation demand to other airports in the region.

**PC01222-4**

**Comment:**

and never even considers alternatives that would result in LESS SEVERE IMPACTS than the "preferred" Alternative C. Only alternatives that make Alt C look good are considered. The EIR does not provide analysis of a worst case scenario.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. This comment is similar to comment PC01094-4; please see Response to Comment PC01094-4.

**PC01222-5**

**Comment:**

According to LAWA's own projections, Alternative C represents an increase of 31.6 million annual passengers over current operations of 67 map. That is a 54.5% increase over current operations. LAWA says that to accommodate this 54.5% increase there will be an increase of only 44 take-offs and landings per day or an average of 2 additional operations per hour. These projections are held artificially low based on assumptions about fleet mix. LAWA bases their #s on the PURE SPECULATION of using bigger planes which may not even be built in the future.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00599-7 for a discussion on the development of aircraft and passenger activities for Alternative C. Please also note that 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 alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to the No Action/No Project Alternative. Chapter 3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided information on the formulation of this alternative and its consistency with the SCAG 2001 RTP.

**PC01222-6**

**Comment:**

LAX is already the region's largest single source of NOX emissions. The expansion will as much as triple the NOX emissions from the airport.

**Response:**

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

**PC01222-7**

**Comment:**

All three expansion scenarios propose to more than double the cargo activity @ LAX. That will double truck traffic and diesel emissions LAX neighbors as well as travelers will have to breathe. 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.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

**PC01222-8**

**Comment:**

But yet, the EIR contemplates mitigating only 30% of the new NOX emissions.

**Response:**

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included a revised air quality mitigation measure with many components, that describes in greater detail those efforts being carried forward and their associated emission reductions. LAWA intends to adopt and implement all feasible mitigation measures. It is important to note the mitigation measures for some types and sources of pollutants are more readily available than others. There are very few available and feasible mitigation measures to reduce NOx. Those measures which are currently available are insufficient to mitigate the NOx-related impacts of the project to below a level of significance.

**PC01222-9**

**Comment:**

Air quality health effects are so inadequately addressed as the EIR states that the pollution generated by airplane reverse thrusters is "not significant as the thrusters run only for 7-8 seconds per landing but that the charbroilers from local restaurants have more of an impact on the environment than do the reverse thrusters". This is ludicrous.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AF00001-21 regarding the use of reverse thrust in air quality emissions estimates.

**PC01222-10**

**Comment:**

Currently the cumulative and additive impacts of emissions and pollutants on the population surrounding the airport are not fully documented. A comprehensive epidemiological study is needed to truly assess the risks of the affected population.

**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.

**PC01222-11**

**Comment:**

And lastly, the EIR is inadequate as it does not specifically disclose the source showing from where the additional demands on water will be met. Will the demands be met from ground water or potable water? A letter from DWP is included with the EIR indicating that the demands for water will be met, but DWP has no new water sources to provide additional water for the expansion of LAX. A new supply for water @ LAX creates a regional issue as water will have to be diverted from the east S.F. Valley to meet the needs of LAX. What is intended to supplement the needs of the Valley is the "Toilet to Tap" project which is reclaimed sewage water for Valley residents.

**Response:**

In accordance with the California Water Code § 10910, et seq., LADWP conducted an updated Water Availability Assessment for Master Plan Alternative D (LADWP Water Supply Availability Assessment

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

for the Los Angeles World Airports Master Plan Alternative "D" Project, June 10, 2003). This assessment is included in Appendix S-A, Agency Consultation Letters, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The assessment concluded that "adequate water supplies will be available to meet the water demands of the Project" (Water Supply Availability Assessment, p.3) and that "LADWP finds that it will be able to meet the demand of the Project as well as existing and planned future uses of the LADWP's system" (Water Supply Availability Assessment, p. 19). As discussed in the Water Availability Assessment, LADWP plans to obtain water from regional groundwater basins (e.g., Owens Valley), the Los Angeles Aqueducts system (e.g., snow melt runoff) and local groundwater supplies and imported sources provided by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California. Other sources would result from LADWP's water conservation and recycling efforts, and new seawater desalination projects beginning in approximately the year 2010. As pertains to "toilet to tap" concerns, various government agencies, such as the Department of Health Services, in cooperation with LADWP, regulate the quality of water Los Angeles area residents receive from LADWP's potable water system. Regardless of the source, drinking water must meet stringent water quality standards in order to be in compliance with State and Federal safe drinking water laws. Furthermore, increased water consumption at LAX would not necessarily require diversion of water supplies from other specific areas of the LADWP service area, and would not increase the use of recycled (or "toilet to tap") potable water in any particular part or community within the region.

#### PC01222-12

**Comment:**

Therefore, the effects of the Master Plan should also include the disclosure and the impacts on the people who live in other areas of the City.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC01222-11 regarding public water sources.

#### PC01222-13

**Comment:**

For the reasons stated above, and many more, I as an individual as well as the president of ARSAC oppose the Master Plan as proposed.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments above.

**PC01223**

**Griffith, Ronald**

**None Provided**

**7/8/2001**

#### PC01223-1

**Comment:**

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed LAX expansion. The environmental impact report makes clear that the significant negative impacts of the ill-conceived expansion are not capable of mitigation.

**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.

**PC01223-2****Comment:**

The residential and business neighborhoods around LAX already bear a disproportionate share of the traffic, pollution and noise created by aviation in the Southern California region. They must not be made to suffer even more.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC01223-3****Comment:**

The only viable and rational approach for LAX is the "no action, no project" alternative. Any other alternative which contemplates additional runways or extensions of existing runways is completely unacceptable because of the severe, adverse environmental effects which it will cause to well established, stable family communities.

**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. Alternative D, the LAWA staff-preferred alternative does not include any new runways.

**PC01223-4****Comment:**

Rather than destroying existing neighborhoods with its arrogant, steamroller policy, LAX should, instead, support a regional approach to air traffic in the Southern California region. Many cities in the United States and abroad have a smaller "in-town" airport and a larger facility in the outlying areas away from the density of the city. The Southern California region, with a dispersed population base across hundreds of square miles, is ideal for a multi-facility approach to air traffic.

It is now time to reject permanently the proposed LAX expansion, recognize the limitations of the site, and actively support growth and expansion of the other regional airports in the Southern California region. Only then, will the benefits and burdens of air traffic be equitably distributed across all areas 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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01224      Junod, Mary      None Provided      7/7/2001**

**PC01224-1**

**Comment:**

We moved to Westchester in 1947. The airport was a small complex east of Sepulveda Blvd. Westchester was a family oriented community to the north. Since that time the airport has expanded and expanded - taken out hundreds of homes in Westchester & Playa del Rey with no regard to the feelings & hardships of the people displaced. As long as you have power & money, the little people be damned.

**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. 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.

**PC01224-2**

**Comment:**

Why can't cargo go to Palmdale - plenty of space & a community welcoming it? Let Orange County take care of its own. Use the several facilities available there.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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.

**PC01224-3**

**Comment:**

We pay taxes - our concerns should be considered - stop LAX expansion!!!

**Response:**

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

**PC01225      Faucher, Kim & Cory      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC01225-1**

**Comment:**

My husband & I bought a home in Westchester 2 years ago after having saved for many years. We will not tolerate the LAX expansion for many reasons: pollution, crime, traffic, noise and the overall decrease in property values that will result.

**Response:**

Impacts associated with noise, traffic, and air quality were described in Section 4.1, Noise; Section 4.2, Land Use; Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; and Section 4.6, Air Quality of the Draft EIS/EIR and the

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Regarding crime, see Section 4.26.2, Law Enforcement of the Draft EIS/EIR. Concerning potential effects on property values, please see Topical Response TR-ES-1. Also, see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of the Master Plan Alternatives on the community of Westchester.

#### PC01225-2

**Comment:**

If the City is willing to relocate us to a comparable westside location and buy our home for double it's value, we would consider the LAX expansion - that is the only fair alternative

**Response:**

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

**PC01226**

**Bess, Laura**

**None Provided**

**7/12/2001**

#### PC01226-1

**Comment:**

- Our children will attend school near LAX (at St. Anastasia's). The air quality and gunk that comes down onto the playground cannot get any worse!

**Response:**

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

#### PC01226-2

**Comment:**

- Westchester town is small enough without more businesses getting overrun by 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 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.

Also, as was described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6.5) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, note that in contrast to the other build alternatives, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative), would 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.

#### PC01226-3

**Comment:**

- We cannot handle more traffic - especially on the 405. The congestion is bad enough as it is.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the Congestion Management Program.

**PC01226-4**

**Comment:**

- The recent findings of near collisions at LAX should be reason enough to stop this. Expansion could only mean more risk.

**Response:**

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

**PC01226-5**

**Comment:**

- Orange County has got to provide their own airport needs for their own travelers.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand for a discussion of the El Toro conversion, constraints at John Wayne Airport, and the Ontario Master Plan.

**PC01226-6**

**Comment:**

Traffic on the 405 from there is getting worse and worse.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the Congestion Management Program.

**PC01226-7**

**Comment:**

- Our living condition, quality of life, health and day-to-day existence are dependent on LAX expansion not happening.

**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-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

**PC01227**

**Weitz, Jeremy**

**None Provided**

**7/12/2001**

**PC01227-1**

**Comment:**

Westchester is one of the few nice affordable (relatively speaking) areas on LA's westside. This neighborhood has a great mix of young families (like mine) and older retirees. An increase in air traffic would make this wonderful neighborhood of over 9000 homes (including Playa del Rey) unbearable to live in. The noise pollution from an increased number of cargo planes would dramatically diminish the quality of life for thousands of families and children in our community. In addition, the increased traffic could seriously diminish our community's nice quiet streets. This is a family neighborhood, not a piece



of the airport. Please think of the children (like my daughter Sara). Ontario and Palmdale have tons of space use it. Where else but here can young families live in a nice affordable westside community?

**Response:**

Impacts associated with aircraft noise were evaluated in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Traffic effects were described in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As further described in this section, the alternatives have been designed to separate regional airport traffic from local traffic, and to improve the functioning of the roadway systems in the vicinity of LAX. As a result, the quality of residential neighborhoods in Westchester is not expected to be significantly effected by traffic related noise. Also, see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of the Master Plan Alternatives on the community of Westchester and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

**PC01228      Gaspar, Beatrice      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC01228-1**

**Comment:**

I have lived in Westchester 43 years in the same house. I have seen the LAX airport grow from a small airport to what it is today.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01228-2**

**Comment:**

Also there was no freeway when we moved here & the 405 freeway is always congested around La Tijera now.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the Congestion Management Program.

**PC01228-3**

**Comment:**

1. I do not want to lose part of our central business district.

**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 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.

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), would 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

---

#### PC01228-4

**Comment:**

2. I do not want more traffic.
3. Save our air, no more pollution!!!
4. Safety - prevent overcrowding.

LAX - No Expansion!

**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, and safety in Section 4.24.3, Safety. 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-E, and Technical Reports 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. .

**PC01229**

**Bach, Dean**

**None Provided**

**7/12/2001**

#### PC01229-1

**Comment:**

I strongly support the regional plan in which we use the Ontario, Palmdale & El Toro sites (airports) to handle future increased passenger and cargo. Dulles Airport serving Washington DC is a 50 minute ride to our capitol (I have taken it) - no further a trip than to & from Palmdale.

**Response:**

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. 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.

#### PC01229-2

**Comment:**

Constructed fast rail using our already built Antelope Freeway plus cars & busses could handle it.

**Response:**

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

#### PC01229-3

**Comment:**

It is time to stop punishing Westchester residents with more noise, pollution, traffic & proven cancer causing chemicals.

**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 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.

**PC01229-4**

**Comment:**

I have lived in Westchester for 54 years, and as a small boy, saw the Lockheed P.38 at Mines Field. It was a wonderful, clean & beautiful area then.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01229-5**

**Comment:**

It is time for other adjacent Los Angeles areas to lighten our increased passenger & cargo projections. There is no reason it cannot be done.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC01229-6**

**Comment:**

Westchester does not want an Arbor Vita "expressway" nor an Airport Blvd. "expressway" (the latter one block from my home).

**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. Alternative D, the LAWA staff preferred alternative, does not include the LAX Expressway. The proposed Arbor Vitae interchange is not a part of the LAX Master Plan and has had the federal funding withdrawn.

**PC01229-7**

**Comment:**

Our new mayor (Hahn) also has publicly come out against the Westchester expansion.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00578-1 regarding the development of Alternative D-Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, which was developed at the direction of Mayor James Hahn.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01229-8**

**Comment:**

We want the LAX "Master Plan" completely abandoned & permanently.

**Response:**

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

**PC01230**

**Swanson, Estelle**

**None Provided**

**7/13/2001**

**PC01230-1**

**Comment:**

There is already too much traffic due to the airport, also the air quality will be 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.

**PC01230-2**

**Comment:**

Please expand either Ontario, or Palmdale. We do not need any more traffic going thru Westchester!

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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. 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.

**PC01231**

**Holzer, Otto**

**None Provided**

**7/12/2001**

**PC01231-1**

**Comment:**

I AM OPPOSED TO LAX EXPANSION MOSTLY BECAUSE OF THE INCREASE OF BOTH LAND AND AIR TRAFFIC IN THIS ONE 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 Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. It should be noted

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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

**PC01232      Pasco, James      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC01232-1**

**Comment:**

I was born & raised at 9329 Kellyfield in 1946 when LAX was Mines Field - our house taken, in 1968. Kellyfield no longer exists. I've seen the airport take more & more from our community and it now wants more. Downtown Westchester was prosperous but now only a shadow of what it once was.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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. 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.

**PC01232-2**

**Comment:**

Traffic, noise, air pollution and the disruption of our lives has to stop. The Ring Road again threatens our homes, the central business district (just getting back on its feet) and our health & welfare. When is enough enough?

**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; 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, 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, added subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, does not include the LAX Expressway, Ring Road or acquisition within the Westchester business district.

**PC01232-3**

**Comment:**

Maybe you can respond to this question! When did life, liberty and the pursuit happiness be put on the endangered species list!

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

**PC01233      Dickens, Mr. & Mrs.      None Provided      7/12/2001**  
**Richard**

**PC01233-1**

**Comment:**

THE PLAN TO INCREASE AIR CARGO SPACE AT LAX IS TOTALLY OPPOSITE OF WHAT IS NEEDED. ALL AIR CARGO SHOULD BE REMOVED FROM LAX AND RELOCATED TO PALMDALE, MAKING IT THE AIR CARGO HUB FOR SO. CALIF.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

WITH THE ELIMINATION OF ALL AIR FREIGHT IN AND OUT OF LAX WOULD ACCOMPLISH MUCH NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS:

- #1. MORE SPACE FOR PASSENGER FACILITIES
- #2. REDUCE AIR TRAFFIC
- #3. REDUCE FREEWAY TRAFFIC
- #4. GET TRUCK TRAFFIC AWAY FROM LAX AND LOCAL AREA STREETS.
- #5. ELIMINATE ALL PLANS TO EXPAND LAX - AND SAVE WESTCHESTER!

**Response:**

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

**PC01234      Noble, Jack      None Provided**

**PC01234-1**

**Comment:**

I wish to state my objection to any expansion of L.A. 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.

**PC01235      Courtney, Deanna      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC01235-1**

**Comment:**

Expanding LAX would be monumentally harmful to many communities... Playa Del Rey, El Segundo, Inglewood, and Westchester. We cannot take on any more traffic, pollution or noise!

**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 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.

**PC01235-2**

**Comment:**

Please focus on expanding air traffic in other areas that would not be overburdened, and would actually welcome the business. Palmdale, Ontario and El Toro make much more sense. LAX is big enough - let's share the burden!

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC01236      Whited, Beverly      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC01236-1**

**Comment:**

1. HELICOPTERS ARE SO CLOSE, YOU THINK THEY ARE COMING IN FRONT DOOR.

**Response:**

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

**PC01236-2**

**Comment:**

2. SEPULVEDA BLVD IS A RACEWAY.

**Response:**

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

**PC01236-3**

**Comment:**

3. LET OTHER CITIES EXPAND,

**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.

**PC01236-4**

**Comment:**

OUR FREEWAYS ARE TOO CROWDED ALREADY, ANY STREET OR FREEWAY AROUND LAX IS MOST OF TIME A PARKING LOT! OR RACEWAY! OR ACCIDENT! 77TH & SEPULVEDA BL MANY ACCIDENTS

**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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01236-5

**Comment:**

4. PROTECT OUR COMMUNITY! DON'T DESTROY IT WITH MORE 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 quality of life.

#### PC01236-6

**Comment:**

I'M A RETIRED RENT-A-CAR MANAGER, LIVED HERE SINCE 1984, ON THE BLUFF'S. LAX MAKES PLENTY OF MONEY, DON'T LET GREED DESTROY A GREAT PLACE.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please note that LAX 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.

<b>PC01237</b>	<b>Bray, Sandra</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/11/2001</b>
----------------	---------------------	----------------------	------------------

#### PC01237-1

**Comment:**

THE LAWA PLANS INCLUDE ACQUIRING ONE-THIRD OF OUR BUSINESS DISTRICT ON SEPULVEDA BLVD., HOMES NEAR NIELSEN FIELD AND PART OF HISTORIC CENTINELA ADOBE. WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THIS EXPANSION ISN'T ENOUGH? WHOSE HOME AND/OR BUSINESS 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 or any acquisition within the Westchester Business District. The Centinela Adobe would not be affected by Alternative D.

#### PC01237-2

**Comment:**

ONTARIO & PALMDALE NEED TO BE DEVELOPED AS OPPOSED TO LAX. THEY BOTH, AS YOU KNOW HAVE MORE SPACE & AVAILABLE LAND. LAX, AS YOU KNOW ALSO IS SURROUNDED ON THREE SIDES BY HOMES & BUSINESSES AND THE OCEAN ON THE OTHER. COMMON SENSE DICTATES ONTARIO, PALMDALE & EVEN EL TORO! WE NEED REGIONAL PLANNING AS DESCRIBED BY SCAG

**Response:**

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. 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.



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.

<b>PC01238</b>	<b>Boyce, Carie &amp; Randy</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/9/2001</b>
----------------	---------------------------------	----------------------	-----------------

**PC01238-1**

**Comment:**

As a homeowner and resident of El Segundo, I am writing to submit my comments to the LAX Master Plan and Draft EIR. Having already experienced a significant increase in noise and pollution and jets, plus increased traffic just in the past 36 months from when we moved to our home in 1998, I cannot stand by and allow several key components of the plan go forward without further analysis.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

**PC01238-2**

**Comment:**

The existing airport was projected to handle 40 million passengers per year and today handles 67 million. The history of LAX indicates that the expansion could result in as many as 120 million passengers annually, which the EIR does not analyze or consider the impact of this higher number.

**Response:**

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

**PC01238-3**

**Comment:**

Based on a number of experiences reviewing Environmental Impact Reports in my job, this report should consider a range of alternatives to the project. But it never seriously considers a truly regional airport solution.

**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 the future aviation demand to other airports in the region.

**PC01238-4**

**Comment:**

Nor does the EIR consider any alternative that would result in fewer adverse impacts than LAWA's preferred plan, Alternative C.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC01094-4; please see Response to Comment PC01094-4.

**PC01238-5**

**Comment:**

LAWA says the plan represents an increase of only 44 takeoffs and landings per day. However, it appears these projections are held artificially low by favorable assumptions about fleet mix. These assumptions are not justified and the impacts from the actual type of aircraft need to be analyzed along with the number of takeoffs and landings.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00599-7 for a discussion on the development of aircraft and passenger activities for Alternative C.

**PC01238-6**

**Comment:**

Impacts of the LAX expansion relative to the 405 freeway are barely examined in the EIR. Clearly there will be a significant impact to the already highly congested freeway, especially at peak hours when traffic is already slowed to an average of 18-23 miles per hour.

**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-2 regarding the Congestion Management Program and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

**PC01238-7**

**Comment:**

In addition, arterials like Sepulveda are gridlocked at rush hour. The expansion of LAX has the potential to turn Sepulveda into a parking lot, literally.

**Response:**

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

**PC01238-8**

**Comment:**

LAX is already the region's largest single source of smog-forming Nox emissions, which the LAWA plan would triple and only require mitigation for 30% of the new Nox emissions. Additional mitigation measures need to be included in the EIR.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC01222-3 regarding air quality impacts and further mitigation measures and Response to Comment PC01196-12 specifically regarding the 30 percent claim of NOx emissions.

**PC01238-9****Comment:**

All three expansion scenarios contemplate more than doubling cargo activity at LAX. This particularly concerns me since noise from cargo flights is currently what disturbs my family and me the most on a daily basis. Not only would an increased noise impact diminish our quality of life and property values, truck traffic and diesel emissions, which we have to breathe, will also increase dramatically.

**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. Please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand, Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values, and 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.

**PC01238-10****Comment:**

In closing, I would like to say that El Segundo residents are already doing more than our fair share of absorbing the tremendous impacts of the existing LAX. You cannot ask us to absorb more. A regional solution must be carefully studied and implemented. It is the only fair and reasonable 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.

**PC01239****Farmas, Misha****None Provided****7/8/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01223; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01223.

**PC01240****Nasman, Gail****None Provided****7/10/2001****PC01240-1****Comment:**

I was born in LA, used to drive my dad to the airport when I was a teenager, and have lived in Westchester since 1976. I have viewed and experienced the impact of the ongoing expansion of the airport for a long time.

**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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01240-2

**Comment:**

The communities of Westchester, Inglewood and El Segundo have been and continue to be negatively impacted by the operations of the airport. The reduction of the Central Business District in Westchester that currently provides support services to the 9,000 home residents is unacceptable, there isn't much left now.

**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 was described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6.5), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, note that 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. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 for further discussion of effects on the community of Westchester.

#### PC01240-3

**Comment:**

The acquisition of more homes will create more stress and financial hardships for many of the long-time residents, especially the elderly.

**Response:**

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

#### PC01240-4

**Comment:**

Traffic will increase substantially more if the expansion goes through. Sepulveda Blvd. has transitioned from a central business district with stores to a freeway lane. Most stores now have their front doors to the back and parking because you can't park on Sepulveda at peak times. How community friendly is this?

**Response:**

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

#### PC01240-5

**Comment:**

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 subsection 4.3.2.6.1 (beginning on page 4-293) of the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Section 4.20 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding construction impacts.

**PC01240-6**

**Comment:**

Where is the plan and accountability to mitigate the freeways, especially the 405 that funnels this traffic to LAX? I used to plan my freeway driving at nonpeak hours. In certain spots today, there is ALWAYS congestion, like the South Bay Curve. This is affecting the quality of life for all of West Los Angeles at a bare minimum.

**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 the Congestion Management Plan.

**PC01240-7**

**Comment:**

The Noise is already a problem. The closer you get to the airport, the louder it is of course. There is also considerable noise from the 405 freeway. 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.

**PC01240-8**

**Comment:**

People have houses and parks so they can enjoy sunshine, fresh air and peace. Soundproofing doesn't do it. Are we to remain prisoners in our own homes because outside there is an unacceptable level of noise?

**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.

**PC01240-9**

**Comment:**

Noise causes stress and is harmful to everyone's health because of it. I have been terrified by experience caused by a "wave-off" right over my bedroom in the middle of night.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

**PC01240-10**

**Comment:**

The Air Pollution already exists at unhealthy levels. 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.

**PC01240-11**

**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.

**PC01240-12**

**Comment:**

I park my car inside all night at home and all day at work in El Segundo. It starts accumulating black dust from the moment I have it washed. My roof and windowsills at home are covered in black.

**Response:**

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

**PC01240-13**

**Comment:**

Is there an Air Pollution Study for the EIR/EIS? I haven't seen it. 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. 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.

**PC01240-14**

**Comment:**

Overcrowding of the airways. LAX is already considered to be one of the most dangerous by the pilots. Any addition of traffic increases the likelihood of more frequent and serious disastrous crashes. This can happen not only at the airport but also in the surrounding neighborhoods.

**Response:**

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

**PC01240-15****Comment:**

Southern California continues to expand and the population continues to look for affordable housing farther and farther away from LAX. Developing a regional series of airports makes more sense for the citizens and 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.

If a long-term plan isn't done now incorporating a regional approach including keeping LAX at it's current configuration, it may never happen. The cost of lost opportunity for a regional solution vs. LAX expansion is so large as to be impossible to calculate. The surrounding communities will sink into the sea from the weight of the negative effects of LAX expansion. 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.

<b>PC01241</b>	<b>Crovella, Raymond</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/10/2001</b>
----------------	--------------------------	----------------------	------------------

**PC01241-1****Comment:**

We believe (and the FAA has also stated) that there should be a "regional" solution to the problem of LAX crowding. Both the benefits and burdens of airport services should be shared by Orange County residents.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC01241-2****Comment:**

Airport improvements should be limited within existing airport perimeters and further remediation of noise and pollution problems is required.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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. Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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.

#### PC01241-3

**Comment:**

The EIS/EIR Draft understates adverse effects of expansion

**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 Environmental Superior alternative and would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region.

**PC01242**

**Bray, Sandra**

**None Provided**

**7/11/2001**

#### PC01242-1

**Comment:**

\*SAFETY - OVERCROWDING OF THE AIR CORRIDORS MAY LEAD TO AIR DISASTERS

**Response:**

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

#### PC01242-2

**Comment:**

\*AIR POLLUTION - I HAVE AN OIL FILM ON MY PATIO EVERY MORNING.

**Response:**

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

#### PC01242-3

**Comment:**

LAX IS ALREADY ONE OF THE REGIONS SINGLE LARGEST SOURCE OF NOx EMISSIONS.

**Response:**

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

#### PC01242-4

**Comment:**

THE REPORT PREDICTS THAT THE INCREASED GROUND AND AIR TRAFFIC WILL RESULT IN INCREASED EMISSIONS OF ALL FIVE EPA CLASSIFIED MAJOR AIR POLLUTANTS - EMISSIONS FROM IDLING PLANES, AUTO & JET FUEL EMISSIONS.



**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.

**PC01242-5****Comment:**

HOW DO YOU PLAN TO ELIMINATE THIS SERIOUS HEALTH HAZARD?

**Response:**

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed health risk impacts in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment. This section contained a detailed human health analysis, including a Human Health Risk Assessment, which showed that cancer risk will 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.

**PC01242-6****Comment:**

LONG TERM PLANNING IS NEEDED FOR A REGIONAL SOLUTION INCLUDING ONTARIO, PALMDALE AND EL TORO. OUR COMMUNITIES AROUND LAX SHOULD NOT HAVE TO BEAR THE BURDEN OF AIR TRAFFIC AND 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.

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 for information on El Toro, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario International Airport. 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.

**PC01243      Mortimore, Corazon      None Provided**

**7/11/2001**

**PC01243-1****Comment:**

I am against LA Expansion of airport because my home will be sitting in front of Westchester Parkway freeway, if expansion happened. More pollution and unbearable noise. Please stop airport expansion. Bless your heart.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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.

**PC01244      Cavallaro, Deborah      None Provided**

**PC01244-1**

**Comment:**

My views regarding LAX modernization are as follows: any individual, company or political body who would propose a plan knowing in advance that the minute the plan is completed it will be inadequate is a fool of major proportion!

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01244-2**

**Comment:**

Stop overburdening LAX! We have several airports in the surrounding area where both passengers and freight should be routed. Develop those other airports and stop pretending that your "LAX Master Plan" is going to solve the problems. Everyone including you know that it won't solve anything!

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC01245      Watson, Carolyn      None Provided      7/11/2001**

**PC01245-1**

**Comment:**

Making LAX bigger would be a nightmare! Why spend millions to destroy a lovely, established community of homes, schools and business?

**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.

**PC01245-2**

**Comment:**

Besides more planes (and pollution) what about ground traffic? More cars, buses and trucks! Streets will be impassable.

**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-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

#### **PC01245-3**

**Comment:**

Increasing the size of LAX will create jobs, but so will building up Palmdale, Ontario, etc.

**Response:**

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. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

#### **PC01245-4**

**Comment:**

LET'S HOPE COMMON SENSE PREVAILS!!

**Response:**

Comment noted.

<b>PC01246</b>	<b>Lambert, Les</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/11/2001</b>
----------------	---------------------	----------------------	------------------

#### **PC01246-1**

**Comment:**

DRAWING OF ACCESS ROADS AND PARTS OF WESTCHESTER THAT WILL BE RAZED TO BUILD EXPRESSWAY & 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. Impacts associated with the LAX Expressway and the ring road were addressed in Appendix K of the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D, Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

<b>PC01247</b>	<b>Morgan, Kandie</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/9/2001</b>
----------------	-----------------------	----------------------	-----------------

#### **PC01247-1**

**Comment:**

I'm writing in opposition to the LAX Master 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.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

#### **PC01247-2**

**Comment:**

I live less than 10 minutes from work and it already takes me 30 minutes to get there. Not to mention the I-405 and Sepulveda are already gridlocked at rush hour. I've lived near the airport area for years and the noise that the planes create is extremely loud.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase and TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns for more information. 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.

#### **PC01247-3**

**Comment:**

All three-expansion scenarios propose to more than double cargo activity at LAX. That will double the truck traffic and diesel emissions LAX neighbors will have to breathe.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand.

#### **PC01247-4**

**Comment:**

If the plan goes through I'd hate to think about the prolonged psychical ailments people will have to endure (hearing damage/allergies, etc.).

**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.

#### **PC01247-5**

**Comment:**

The below factors should be taken into consideration as well:

**Response:**

Please see Responses to Comments below.

#### **PC01247-6**

**Comment:**

1. The proposed expansion of LAX will likely generate far more than the 89 to 98 million passengers the airport claims. The current airport was projected to handle 40 million passengers per year and now serves 67 million. The history of LAX suggests that the Master Plan could well result in volumes as high as 120 million annual passengers and the EIR should, but does not, analyze the impacts associated with this much higher volume.

**Response:**

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

**PC01247-7**

**Comment:**

2. An environmental impact report is supposed to consider a reasonable range of alternatives to the project. But, the EIR never seriously considers a truly regional airport solution.

**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.

**PC01247-8**

**Comment:**

Nor does the EIR consider any alternative that would result in fewer adverse impacts than LAWA's preferred plan, Alternative C.

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC01094-4; please see Response to Comment PC01094-4.

**PC01247-9**

**Comment:**

3. LAWA says the plan represents an increase of only 44 takeoffs and landings per day. However, we believe these projections are held artificially low by favorable assumptions about fleet mix. These assumptions, what we call "fleet mix voodoo," are not justified and the impacts resulting from additional takeoffs and landings must be analyzed.

**Response:**

Please see responses to Comments PC00599-7 and PC00593-1 for a discussion on the fleet mix assumptions and operational levels. The environmental analyses in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, including noise and air quality, have addressed the potential impacts under the most practical and most likely activity level for each alternative. The environmental impacts associated with aircraft operations could vary according to the number of aircraft operations as well as other factors such as the type of aircraft and different airport operational characteristics. The Draft EIS/EIR evaluated a reasonable range of alternatives as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

**PC01247-10**

**Comment:**

4. The I-405 is already averaging 18-23 mph during peak hour. Because of regional growth it will slow to 10-16 mph in twenty years. The LAX expansion will only make that worse. Oddly, impacts of the LAX expansion on the I-405 are hardly examined in the EIR. This omission is a glaring deficiency in the EIR.

**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.

#### PC01247-11

**Comment:**

5. LAX is already the region's largest single source of smog-forming NOx emissions. The expansion plan will as much as triple the NOx emissions from the airport. Yet, LAWA plans to mitigate only about 30% of the new NOx emissions. Additional mitigation measures should be included in the EIR.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00014-4 regarding NOX emissions. The preliminary list of mitigation measures included in the Draft EIS/EIR was modified in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR published in July 2003.

#### PC01247-12

**Comment:**

6. All three-expansion scenarios propose to more than double cargo activity at LAX. That will double the truck traffic and diesel emissions LAX neighbors will have to breathe.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

#### PC01247-13

**Comment:**

7. Arterials like Sepulveda Blvd. are already gridlocked at rush hour. The expansion of LAX will turn Sepulveda Blvd. into a parking lot.

**Response:**

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

**PC01248**

**Nakagama, Reid**

**None Provided**

**7/3/2001**

#### PC01248-1

**Comment:**

I am a concerned Westchester resident of thirty years. I have gone through its schools and and have participated in activities at the Westchester YMCA and the Westchester Presbyterian church (Indian Guides, Boy Scouts, summer fun, basketball and Youth and Government). I also graduated from Loyola Marymount University and now still call Westchester my home.

I am very much opposed to additional noise, traffic, crime and pollution that would result from the LAX expansion. LAX expansion would definitely cause an adverse quality of life for this place we have called home for the last 30 years.

VOTE NO TO 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. Please see 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 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 and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4. In addition, the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed law enforcement service needs in Section 4.26.2, Law Enforcement, with supporting technical data provided in Technical Report 16b.

**PC01249      Nakagama, Nancy      None Provided      7/3/2001**

**PC01249-1**

**Comment:**

I am a concerned Westchester resident of thirty years. We have raised our children through its schools and now seeing our grandson go through the same curriculum. We are part of the Westchester YMCA currently and have participated in its Indian Guide, summer fun, and Y-camps. We have participated in Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts (completing Eagle Scout at the Presbyterian Church, and Indian Guides. We also have two generations of Loyola-Marymount graduates in our household.

Since we love our area, we are very much opposed to additional noise, traffic, crime and pollution that would result from the LAX expansion. LAX expansion would definitely cause an adverse quality of life for this place we have called home for the last 30 years. We are retired now and are spending our golden years here. We love this area.

VOTE NO TO 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. Please see 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 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 and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4. In addition, the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed law enforcement service needs in Section 4.26.2, Law Enforcement, with supporting technical data provided in Technical Report 16b.

**PC01250      Cook, Richard B. &      None Provided  
Rena D.**

**PC01250-1**

**Comment:**

My simple response is NO.

Over the years we have seen friends loose their homes to this expansionist regime called Los Angeles International 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. Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01250-2

**Comment:**

I notice that one of the plans of expansion is to destroy what little we have left of downtown Westchester plus the elimination of many, many homes. We recently got a new grocery store, drug store and many eateries that LAX wants to destroy by expanding this airport.

**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. 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 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 remain available through other similar businesses located in close proximity within the Westchester Business District.

Concerning residential acquisition associated with Alternatives A, B, and C, please see Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residents or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR. As further described therein, 84 homes would be acquired under these alternatives with the residences relocated in compliance with the Uniform Relocation Act, state and local regulations, and FAA Advisory Circular 150/5100-17.

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 it does not propose residential acquisition. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 for further discussion of effects on the community of Westchester.

#### PC01250-3

**Comment:**

I do not want increased traffic on the freeways and on the surface streets as surely this will happen. The plan (cost) to improve traffic will not be born by the airport but will fall upon the tax payers. Traffic improvement will not happen in a timely fashion or at all. The taxpayers will be required to foot the bill for building roads to ease the traffic congestion, not the Airline Industry.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00008-6 regarding funding and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

#### PC01250-4

**Comment:**

Congestion and gridlock will definitely be the order of the 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.

#### PC01250-5

**Comment:**

I find it difficult to enter Emerson Ave from my street 6722 W. 87 Th..St. now because of all the traffic trying to by-pass Sepulveda during the morning commute. I believe that the future plan is to open up Emerson Ave. to the Westchester Parkway, this will be an utter disaster as we will not be able to leave our homes due to the traffic jams on this street.

**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. See also Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the Congestion Management Program and Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding surface transportation impacts.

#### PC01250-6

**Comment:**

We will be inundated with more pollution from both Aircraft, Aircraft support vehicles and surface vehicles trying to get to the Airport.

**Response:**

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.

#### PC01250-7

**Comment:**

I do not want to have an Arbor Vitae off ramp at the 405 freeway as it will just clog up the already congested streets.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2, Section 2.3.4, for information on the Arbor Vitae interchange. Subsequent to the publication of the 2001 Draft EIS/EIR, the FHWA withdrew its support for a half interchange at Arbor Vitae. The interchange is not part of the LAX Master Plan. FHWA policy is only to consider full proposed interchanges, not partial ones.

#### PC01250-8

**Comment:**

Extending the Green Line into Westchester will do nothing to alleviate traffic but will in turn bring more crime into our neighborhood.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail and transit plan, particularly Subtopical Response TR-ST-5.4 for more information. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed law enforcement in Section 4.26, Public Services, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3,

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

Surface Transportation. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester.

#### PC01250-9

**Comment:**

LAX has gobbled up enough land already, they do not need to expand. Since most of the LAX passengers are not from LA but are coming from Orange county and Antelope Valley. It is time for other counties to take their share of the traffic. Stop dumping on us. LAWA already Owns Palmdaleairport, USE IT AND EXPAND THERE!!!

**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.

#### PC01250-10

**Comment:**

Additionally, increased noise, outside of any building will be the order of 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.

PC01251	Duhe, Mr. & Mrs. Michael J.	None Provided	7/16/2001
---------	--------------------------------	---------------	-----------

#### PC01251-1

**Comment:**

We have lived in the Osage area (near the Centinela Adobe) since the mid 1950's. At that time, the airport consisted of just a few prop planes. We have watched LAX grow to be one of the busiest airports in the world. Please don't expand LAX any further!

**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.

#### PC01251-2

**Comment:**

Our surrounding infrastructure cannot handle more traffic. Westchester and El Segundo have so few streets flowing North and South. Our traffic is horrendous 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 Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

**PC01251-3**

**Comment:**

Widening a couple streets and adding the Ring Road will only bring more traffic into a geographically small airport area.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC01135-4 regarding the airport access plan.

**PC01251-4**

**Comment:**

The addition of cargo trucks, more pollution, and more noise (cargo planes, too) makes the growth 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

**PC01251-5**

**Comment:**

El Toro should be developed ASAP. This would alleviate so much of the Orange County traffic that heads to LAX everyday. Keep some of the O.C. traffic in Orange County!

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, for a discussion of the El Toro conversion, constraints at John Wayne Airport, and the Ontario Master Plan.

**PC01252**

**Stolper, Charles**

**None Provided**

**7/15/2001**

**PC01252-1**

**Comment:**

WHY SHOULD LAX HAVE TO BEAR THE TRAFFIC FOR THE SOUTH HALF OF CALIFORNIA FOR MOST, ALL OVERSEAS FLIGHTS? THIS CALLS FOR A REGIONAL APPROACH FOR ORANGE CO SAN DIEGO CO. SAN BERANDUR CO RIVERSIDE CO.

**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.

#### PC01252-2

**Comment:**

THE ATTACHED SHEET COVERS A LOT OF THE PROBLEMS.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments PC00908-2 through PC00908-15.

#### PC01253

**Jacobs, Dawn &  
Emmett**

**None Provided**

**7/14/2001**

#### PC01253-1

**Comment:**

As a resident of Westchester for over thirty years, I am sickened by the prospect of once again, the airport disregarding the feelings of the residents in this area, and setting forth a plan that will literally chop Westchester apart.

**Response:**

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 regarding impacts to 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 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 will be provided to any person displaced from their home or business. Also please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

#### PC01253-2

**Comment:**

In order to build the proposed LAX Expressway and the Ring Road, we will lose over one third of our central business district on Sepulveda Blvd. We are so proud of the new Ralphs, Longs, Starbucks, and other businesses that have upgraded the entire area.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The number of business establishments impacted by the proposed SR-1 improvement project are listed in Table 5.1-2 in Section 5.1, Land Use, of Appendix K. In addition, Figures 3.2-4 and 3.2-8 of Appendix K identify those businesses within the Westchester Shopping Center that could be directly impacted by partial or full property acquisition to accommodate the construction of the proposed SR-1 interchange at Sepulveda Boulevard and Arbor Vitae Street. Impacts and relocation assistance to affected properties are addressed in Topical Response TR-APPK-2. Subsequent to the publication of the 2001 Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D, the subject of the

Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, was prepared. Alternative D, the LAWA staff preferred alternative, does not include the LAX Expressway or the proposed ring road.

#### PC01253-3

**Comment:**

And as if the proposed loss of the very-hard-worked-for Nielsen Field, destruction of part of our historic Centinela Adobe, the increased air pollution, increased noise, (soundproof the house and never go outside?), and increased traffic, I was appalled by the visit to my church, La Tijera United Methodist, by Joy Granflor from the Dept. of Transportation CALTRANS, stating that they would take our playfield from the Child Care Center too.

**Response:**

Comment noted. All issue areas the commentor raised were addressed in Section 5.5, Air Quality, Section 5.6, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR and also in Sections 4.5, Air Quality, and 4.6, Noise, of Appendix K of the Draft EIS/EIR. Depending on the alternative selected, there may be impacts to the Centinela Adobe house. The Carl E. Nielsen Youth Center is the property of LAWA and would remain as open space under all the alternatives. Neither of the proposed expressway alternatives would directly impact the park. Subsequent to the publication of the 2001 Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D, the subject of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, was developed. Alternative D, the LAWA staff preferred alternative, does not include the proposed LAX Expressway or ring road. Please also see Topical Response TR-APPK-1 regarding refined analysis of LAX Expressway and State Route 1 (SR-1) impacts.

#### PC01253-4

**Comment:**

The airport, which was once considered a friend and employer, has become a cancer, eating away at our homes, our health and our hearts. Our community must be kept whole and our children spared the exposure to even more NOx emissions. LAX is already one of the region's single largest source of the major air pollutants. Are we to be sacrificed to meet projected cargo demand?

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. 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-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

#### PC01253-5

**Comment:**

The obvious solution is do away with this short-term fix called the Master Plan. Long term planning is needed. L.A. owns two airports, Ontario and Palmdale, which should be developed as opposed to LAX. And of course, there is El Toro. Why should the communities around LAX bear the burden for Orange County?

I beg you to consider a regional plan. Develop the other sites. Don't make us the offerings to pacify the great god of greed.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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.

**PC01254      Reilly, Emmett, Betty      None Provided  
& Elizabeth**

**7/14/2001**

**PC01254-1**

**Comment:**

The proposals offered re airport expansion provide a short term approach to a long term problem. The Suggestions force an airport into an already crowded residential area. No plans are made to utilize 2 airports owned by Los Angeles or to utilize 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. 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. 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.

**PC01254-2**

**Comment:**

The plan as offered increases traffic, increases fouled air and increases air traffic in a crowded air space

**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-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

**PC01254-3**

**Comment:**

We need a survey by people with no connection to LAX to consider how best to develop a regional plan for the region

**Response:**

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

**PC01255**      **Vaughn, Anthony & Kristi**      **None Provided**      **7/15/2001**

**PC01255-1**

**Comment:**

We are long time residents of Westchester and we are very concerned on the idea of LAX expansion. It is something we feel just cannot happen. It would increase traffic, add to our air pollution, and noise level.

**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.

**PC01255-2**

**Comment:**

We love Westchester just as it is and we think other areas such as Ontario & Palmdale should be expanded instead of L.A.X. Why should Westchester and surrounding communities bear the burden of Orange Counties 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, 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-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01255-3**

**Comment:**

We hope all of these issues will be taken into consideration.

**Response:**

Please see Responses to Comments PC01255-1 and PC01255-2 above.

**PC01256**      **Glass, Julie & Tom**      **None Provided**      **7/15/2001**

**PC01256-1**

**Comment:**

We are very much against the LAX airport expansion. Our neighborhood is already greatly impacted by the noise & pollution from LAX & our streets are crowded enough. We do not believe the expansion should occur.

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

**PC01256-2**

**Comment:**

Palmdale is begging for expansion - let them have 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 and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

**PC01256-3**

**Comment:**

LAX expansion will also decrease the value of our homes & we will lose many good citizens if the expansion occurs.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding the effects of LAX on property values.

**PC01256-4**

**Comment:**

LAX - 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.

<b>PC01257</b>	<b>Hofmann, Harriet</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/16/2001</b>
----------------	-------------------------	----------------------	------------------

**PC01257-1**

**Comment:**

I am totally against the LAX expansion. It is wrong to destroy our small business district or even a portion of it. The traffic is already a problem.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2, 3 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2 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. As indicated in TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not include any acquisition within the Westchester business district. It



### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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

#### PC01257-2

**Comment:**

Please use another airport for 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.

**PC01258      Marshall, Cynthia      None Provided      7/16/2001**

#### PC01258-1

**Comment:**

I AM AGAINST LAX EXPANSION BECAUSE YOU PLAN ON DESTROYING A COMMUNITY. HOW CAN YOU JUSTIFY BUYING PROPERTIES (AT LESS THAN MARKET VALUE) AND EXPANDING, WIDENING STREETS, ETC. IN ONE SMALL COMMUNITY, MAKING US BEAR THE BURDEN OF THE ENTIRE CO. OF LA?

**Response:**

Please note, as described in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, that the Uniform Act and other applicable regulations require that no resident be relocated until comparable, decent, safe and sanitary housing is made available. Pursuant to applicable regulations, amounts paid for properties acquired are based on appraisals of fair market value. Concerning the burden on local communities, the airport is a regionally serving facility. Although other commercial serving airports in the region will accept a growing portion of the region's demand for air service, the Master Plan is being proposed because, without improvements at LAX, regional demand would not be fully served and the loss of air service to the region would have significant negative consequences. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan Role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

#### PC01258-2

**Comment:**

YOU BUY 3 OR 4 HOUSES NOW - WHAT ABOUT LATER? WHO'S NEXT? THE ELDERLY WHO HAVE LIVED THERE FOR 40 - 50 YEARS - OWN THEIR HOUSE! NOW LIVE ON A FIXED INCOME? WHERE DO THEY GO TO LIVE? DO YOU CARE?

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00040-46.

**PC01259      Marshall, Cynthia      None Provided      7/10/2001**

#### PC01259-1

**Comment:**

I AM AGAINST LAX EXPANSION BECAUSE OF THE TRAFFIC PROBLEMS IT WILL CAUSE. THE 405 & OTHER CONNECTING FREEWAYS IN THE LAX AREA ARE ALREADY OVERBURDONED &, MORE TRUCKS, AS WELL AS CARS MORE WORKERS IN THE AREA WILL DRIVE IN FROM OTHER COMMUNITIES, WILL MAKE TRAVELING IN THIS AREA A TRUE NIGHTMARE. WIDENING

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

A COUPLE SURFACE STREETS TO FEED INTO THE FWY DOESN'T SOLVE THE FWY TRAFFIC AT ALL! INSTEAD OF GETTING THROUGH THIS ARE IN 1/2 HR IT WILL PROBABLY DOUBLE THAT 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. 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.

**PC01259-2**

**Comment:**

(AND MORE CARS WILL BRING MORE POLLUTION - ESPECIALLY WHEN IDLING IN BUMPER TO BUMPER TRAFFIC!)

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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.

**PC01260      Marshall, Cynthia      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01260-1**

**Comment:**

I AM AGAINST LAX EXPANSION BECAUSE I THINK IT'S WRONG FOR ONE SMALL COMMUNITY TO BE SO IMPACTED BY THIS CHANGE, AND BEAR THE BURDEN FOR ALL OF L.A. COUNTY (AND ORANGE CO.). BUILD OUT IN PALMDALE OR ONTARIO WHERE THERE WILL BE LESS IMPACT (MORE TRAFFIC, NOISE, POLLUTION, PROPERTY VALUES, QUALITY OF LIFE!).

BETTER YET - HOW ABOUT EL TORO - WHERE THERE WOULD NOT BE ANY HOMES, STREETS ETC. THAT WOULD BE CHANGED, DESTROYED, DELETED? LET ORANGE CO. TAKE SOME OF OVERFLOW - THEY HAVE OPEN AREAS - OR 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.

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. 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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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.

**PC01261      Byrne, David      None Provided      7/14/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00963; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC00963.

**PC01262      Mills, B.      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01262-1**

**Comment:**

How much more air pollution can Los Angeles take? Certainly not more jet fuel emissions -

**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, Air Quality. 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.

**PC01262-2**

**Comment:**

the increase of traffic already to the area is unacceptable & now we are expected to take more

No - No - No

**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.

**PC01263      Levicki-Lavi, Lara      None Provided      7/13/2001**

**PC01263-1**

**Comment:**

I do NOT support the proposed 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.

**PC01263-2**

**Comment:**

1. Increased traffic - it's bad enough we have to deal w/the increased traffic that the Playa Vista project will bring us.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00148-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00148-2.

**PC01263-3**

**Comment:**

2. Noise - adding even 1 or 2 planes a day will increase the noise level which will, in turn, force most of to remain inside w/ our doors & windows shut.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-5 for a discussion of 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. Section 4.1, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS identified noise impacts based on a forecast fleet mix for Alternatives A, B, C, and D, rather than noise levels associated with an individual aircraft. See also Topical Response TR-N-3, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.3 regarding the relationship between air traffic and noise.

**PC01263-4**

**Comment:**

3. Community entact - we finally have a decent shopping center on Sepulveda & now they want to tear part of it down. If they really want to do something worthwhile why dont the give the businesses on the east side of Sepulveda a face lift.

**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. 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 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 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, note that 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. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 for further discussion of effects on the community of Westchester.

**PC01264**

**Poulson, Karen**

**None Provided**

**7/10/2001**

**PC01264-1**

**Comment:**

Our highways are already at the saturation point and the spill-over traffic is making our lives difficult.

**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.

**PC01264-2**

**Comment:**

Any plans to expand the number of flights/passengers/cargo/employees without a master plan for public mass transportation directly to the airport is foolish.

**Response:**

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

**PC01264-3**

**Comment:**

Building more freeways/off ramps/ring roads will not help.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC01135-4 regarding the airport access plan.

**PC01264-4**

**Comment:**

Expand the regional airports including Palmdale, El Toro, etc.

DO NOT EXPAND 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.

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.

**PC01265      Dreher, Roland W. &      None Provided  
Elaine P.**

**7/16/2001**

**PC01265-1**

**Comment:**

ALL EXPANSION OF LAX MUST BE STOPPED. PLAYA VISTA IS ALREADY GOING TO PROVE TO BE A HUGE OVERLOAD TO THIS COMMUNITY.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the surface transportation methodology and results, in particular Subtopical Response TR-ST-2.2 regarding Playa Vista.

**PC01265-2**

**Comment:**

HAS ANYONE STUDIED THE INTERSECTIONS AT PERSHING DRIVE & MANCHESTER, OR ALMOST ALL OTHER NEARBY INTERSECTION IN THE MORNING HOURS????

**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. The intersection of Pershing Drive and Manchester would not be impacted by any alternative. The intersection analysis was included as Section 4.3.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC01265-3**

**Comment:**

WHAT ABOUT ALL THE SMOG AND AIR QUALITY THAT WILL BE LOST FOREVER IF WE JUST SIMPLY CONTINUE EXPANDING ALL INDUSTRIES THAT SIMPLY SAY "WE NEED MORE ROOM" (SO THEY BECOME EVEN BIGGER POLLUTERS).

**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.

**PC01265-4**

**Comment:**

WHY DID LAX BUY UP ALL THE LAND IN PALMDALE ??? WHY DON'T THEY JUST FORCE THE ISSUE AND TAKE THE POPULATION OUT THERE ???

**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.

**PC01265-5**

**Comment:**

WE CERTAINLY DO NOT NEED ANYMORE IN THIS AREA.

**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).

**PC01265-6**

**Comment:**

LAX = START DOING WHAT YOU HAD PLANNED ON DOING LONG AGO. GET THE WHEELS ROLLING ON DEVELOPING PALMDALE PROMPTLY.

**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.

**PC01266      Ludwig, Jeanett and      None Provided      7/13/2001**  
**Blunt**

**PC01266-1****Comment:**

I've lived in Westchester since 1943 - wouldn't live anywhere else. Saw Westchester (grow up).

If I had only known about the airport, never would have chosen this area.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01266-2****Comment:**

Last fall, I was soundproofed. It has been wonderful. Thank you so very much.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01266-3****Comment:**

What can I say, the airport is too strong to fight. I could only hope the people's voices will make a difference but I doubt it.

You can't fight city hall, you know that. Be nice if it was gone.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01267      Paz, Jeffrey      None Provided      7/13/2001**

**PC01267-1****Comment:**

IT IS CRAZY TO THINK THAT LAX IS REALLY TRYING TO EXPAND SO MUCH W/OUT UNDERSTANDING THE FULL IMPACT OF NOISE, CONGESTION & POLLUTION ON LOS ANGELES.

**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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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 Environmental Superior alternative and would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region.

#### PC01267-2

**Comment:**

THIS ARROGANCE IS MADE WORSE BY THE FACT THAT THE POPULATION GROWTH IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA WILL TAKE PLACE NOT HERE, BUT IN OUT SIDE AREAS SUCH AS PALMDALE, ORANGE COUNTY & RIVERSIDE, WHICH HAVE AIRPORTS THAT CAN EASILY BE EXPANDED

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

#### PC01267-3

**Comment:**

THEN TO CAP IT OFF. WE KNOW THAT THE TREMENDOUS AIR TRAFFIC CONGESTION TODAY MAKE LAX EXTREMELY DANGEROUS BOTH IN THE AIR & ON THE RUNWAY. A MATTER OF FACT, AS I WRITE THIS LETTER, I HAD A DIRECT FLYOVER OF A 737 OVER MY HOUSE. WE HAVE AT LEAST TWO FLYOVERS PER WEEK OVER THIS NEIGHBORHOOD. HOW MANY LIVES MUST BE LOST IN AN AIRPLANE COLLISION AT LAX BEFORE THEY FINALLY REALIZE THEIR MISTAKE.

**Response:**

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

**PC01268      Burmeister, Norman      None Provided  
H. & Roberta M.**

**7/15/2001**

#### PC01268-1

**Comment:**

Stop the expansion at LAX!! There are three other city of Los Angeles owned airports, Van Nuys, Ontario and Palmdale, use 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.

**PC01268-2**

**Comment:**

The expansion would more than double the number of people, cars for drop-off or pick-up, and shuttle vehicles.

**Response:**

The amount of traffic forecast for the project alternatives would not double the existing airport traffic, as shown in Tables 4.3.1-10 (Alternative A), 4.3.1-11 (Alternative B), and 4.3.1-12 (Alternative C) in the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.3.1. Further, the increase in airport-area traffic would be less with the projects than if nothing were done in the future (the No Action/No Project Alternative).

**PC01268-3**

**Comment:**

Air and noise quality would become even more a severe health hazard.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise. Please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts associated with air pollution.

**PC01268-4**

**Comment:**

You stated once that no private cars would be allowed for pick-up and drop-off service,

**Response:**

In Alternatives A, B, and C, the airport access plans would allow private cars to both pick up and drop passengers off at the terminal curbside. The access plans were presented in the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation. In Alternative D, private cars would not be allowed any direct access to the terminal curbside. All private vehicle access would be via the Ground Transportation Center (GTC) and Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC). That access plan was presented in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.3.1.

**PC01268-5**

**Comment:**

but a "people mover". How could people manage with luggage and children? Also the elderly?

**Response:**

It is believed that the people mover technology available today would allow most people to board with luggage and children. In fact, this same class of technology has been operating successfully for twenty years in the Orlando International Airport, which many families use to travel to Disney World. If there is a particular people mover route in the proposed plan that may accommodate an unusually high number of elderly or people with luggage, a supplemental system may be considered that could further assist these people. Further, any people mover system built at LAX will fully comply with Americans with Disability Act (ADA) requirements as part of the design. Supplemental information on the transit technologies accessing the airport and their associated alignments is provided in Topical Response TR-ST-5.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01268-6

**Comment:**

It's not morally right to expand and take over neighborhoods, where people have lived for years, and make them give up their homes. Many have come to the area for the ideal weather and climate conditions.

**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-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation. As indicated in TR-RBR-1, Alternative D does not propose residential acquisition. Please also 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.

#### PC01268-7

**Comment:**

Even with expansion, in time it still won't be able to handle all the people. Other airports will still have to 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. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

**PC01269**

**Garnholz, Liz**

**None Provided**

**7/13/2001**

#### PC01269-1

**Comment:**

1a. In the EIS/EIR 2015 it states that fuel pipelines for transferring LAX jet fuel from the Chevron Refinery in El Segundo to LAX will probably/may run under Vista del Mar Boulevard. This boulevard is at the shoreline of the Pacific Ocean thus a California Coastal Commission matter due to the fact that in the event of a bad-case-scenario there could be jet fuel seepage into the ocean. How is LAX mitigating/handling a bad-case-scenario of a jet fuel pipeline failing and jet fuel seeping into the ocean?

**Response:**

Please see the discussion of the environmental impacts associated with the proposed fuel transmission lines within Vista del Mar provided on pages 4-768 and 4-771 in Section 4.14, Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers, of the Draft EIS/EIR. Under Alternative B, construction of an off-site fuel farm at either the Scattergood Electric Generating Station or the oil refinery located south of the airport would include the extension of the existing fuel transmission lines between LAX and either of the two proposed fuel farm locations. The proposed alignment of the transmission lines is the existing right-of-way of Vista del Mar, which is in the coastal zone. As described, an underground concrete "utilidor" would be constructed to contain the piping from the fuel farm site to LAX. The purpose of the "utilidor" box is to contain any spillage or leakage from the transmission lines. A leak detection system with periodical double block and bleed closure valves would be installed as emergency fuel shutoff pints to segment the main line in case of a spill. The pipeline would be constructed in accordance with all applicable regulations and permit requirements. The "utilidor" box and leak detection system are safeguards to prevent fuel leakage to the coastal resources.

#### PC01269-2

**Comment:**

1b. One of the proposals is to have a jet fuel farm located at the Scattergood Plant at the intersection of Vista del Mar Boulevard and El Segundo's Grand Avenue. If the fuel farm is to be located at this plant the land is such that it slopes westward toward the ocean. How then is LAX mitigating/handling a bad-case-scenario of jet fuel from this fuel farm site located across the street from the shoreline from seeping into the ocean?

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00040-156 regarding fuel pipelines associated with Alternative B.

#### PC01269-3

**Comment:**

2. Recent newspaper articles, see back of this page, mention methane gas as a means of generating electrical energy. The May 22, 2001 article talks about the Hyperion (sewage) Treatment Plant in El Segundo fermenting LAX food waste with a by-product of methane gas which could be converted to electrical power-an alternative energy producing technique known as biomass. I could not find this fermentation/electrical energy biomass process in the EIS/EIR.

a) How much food waste fermentation and subsequent methane gas production for conversion to electrical power would LAX generate for Alternatives A, B, C, and the No Project Alternative?

b) In a bad-case-scenario how would LAX mitigate fermentation methane gases from affecting the coastal environment as the Hyperion Treatment Plant is at the coastline?

c) As biomass production would be a totally new production process for the Hyperion Plant presumably necessitating an EIR, what would LAWA's projected EIR biomass input be for Alternatives A, B, C, and the No Project Alternative?

**Response:**

The food waste-to-energy pilot project referred to is not related to the Master Plan, and would be unaffected by its implementation. The LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR did not take any credit for electricity that could potentially be generated through such a program.

#### PC01269-4

**Comment:**

3. The ring-road which is to encircle LAX and to be used for LAX traffic only takes away surface streets currently used by the public, in particular Westchester Parkway and Pershing Drive. These two roads are popular roads used to access beaches in particular the newly created Dockweiler State Beach Park:

a) How does LAX justify taking away roads currently used by the public to access public beaches?

b) Have not prescriptive easements made these roads public roads?

**Response:**

The project alternatives would be designed to maintain full access to Dockweiler Beach at all times, from both Sandpiper and Imperial Highway as well on Vista Del Mar. The project would provide easy access from both Westchester Parkway and Imperial Highway to Vista Del Mar. As a result, the analysis showed that these access routes would operate with good levels of service with the project, even during the peak hours. The Ring Road is designed so that all people, not just airport passengers, could use the 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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01270      Abrams, Linda      None Provided      7/11/2001**

**PC01270-1**

**Comment:**

I am a resident of El Segundo. I am already seriously adversely impacted by the current situation at LAX. I already have grave concerns about my health and safety, and the health and safety of all the people living near LAX or under LAX traffic patterns. Therefore, I am absolutely opposed to any further expansion of this airport. In fact, I believe that the operations at LAX should be considerably reduced. These are my concerns and reasons;

**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. 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. Please see Responses to Comments below.

**PC01270-2**

**Comment:**

1) The noise is always annoying and frequently intolerable. L-1011, DC-9, DC-10, and freight aircraft literally shake the windows. Planes taking off from the near runway often fly over us or very close to us.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-N-8, which discusses noise-based vibration. 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, Aircraft Technical Noise Report. 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.

**PC01270-3**

**Comment:**

Between the hours of 11:00 p.m. and 3:00 a.m. there are loud, heavy freight aircraft taking off from the near runway, often one right after another. Most of the decent sleep that I have had in years was when I was away from home.

**Response:**

LAWA has conducted an evaluation of sleep disturbance, which was reported in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It's mitigation program includes implementation of restrictions on easterly departures during over-ocean procedures at night and sound insulation of significantly impacted properties that are not mitigated by that action. The commentor lives about as near the departure end of the south runway complex as possible, and well within the area eligible for sound insulation under all LAWA guidelines. Sound insulation programs are administered by the surrounding communities. The conditions the commentor describes will continue throughout the length of the planning period. For further information regarding nighttime operations, please see Topical Response TR-N-5.

**PC01270-4****Comment:**

I have to completely close up my house in order to watch TV, talk on the phone, or even to talk to someone in my home. I have five air purifiers in my home just so we don't feel like we are suffocating in stale air. Since I moved here my long distance phone bills have increased approximately 20%, because everyone has to stop talking when a plane is taking off. I have spent a respectable sum of money trying to soundproof my home. It seems to do little good, especially with the above mentioned aircraft. How, exactly, is increased airport traffic going to ameliorate this problem?

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding residential sound insulation under the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP) and how approval of the LAX Master Plan would revise the ANMP. See also Topical Response TR-LU-5 for a discussion of noise mitigation measures presented in Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.8.1), and Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.8), of the Draft EIS/EIR and 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.

**PC01270-5****Comment:**

2) I get headaches from the emissions from the aircraft, as well as the associated ground traffic. My car, patio furniture, and windows get dirty in less than a week. Therefore, I have to assume that these emissions are not good for my health, or anyone else's 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. 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-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

**PC01270-6****Comment:**

So far, you have done a pretty poor job of reducing emissions. How do you propose to reduce all of the emissions associated with your operations now and in the future?

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC01196-12 regarding air quality impacts and further mitigation measures.

**PC01270-7****Comment:**

3) The ground traffic on the freeways and roads is already extremely heavy. I travel the roads mostly in the daytime, never during "rush hour" (I hate to imagine how bad that is).

### 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.

**PC01270-8**

**Comment:**

There are so many trucks on the road now that driving is difficult and often downright scary. Most of the time I have to dodge in between trucks to get on or off of the freeway. I am usually unable to make use of the signs on the roads since the trucks block them. I used to own a trucking company. I know that trucks produce more emissions, stop much slower, and hit much harder than cars do. Increasing the operations at LAX would definitely increase truck traffic in the entire Los Angeles area.

**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 (beginning on page 4-293) of the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC01270-9**

**Comment:**

Obviously, it would also increase other traffic. I see this as a serious safety issue, as well as a serious smog and convenience issue. I believe that traffic would come to a standstill during peak flying hours. How do you propose to solve the traffic problems that you have created and will create if you expand this airport?

**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. The traffic analysis used the airport peak hour (11:00 to 12:00 noon) as a basis for analysis, to ensure that peak flying hours are fully analyzed. Pedestrian safety was addressed as part of the proposed Neighborhood Protection Program. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding smog. Also, the traffic impacts associated with the project would be mitigated to the extent feasible. The mitigation plan was summarized in subsection 4.3.2.9 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC01270-10**

**Comment:**

4) There were two disabled aircraft (that I know of) recently given permission to land at LAX. One of them crashed into the ocean while in route. What would have happened had it made it further, and went down over a populated area? I was once a passenger on a disabled aircraft. Denver, Phoenix, Las Vegas, and Salt Lake City airports refused us permission to land, we ended up in Boise, Idaho. Why does LAX grant disabled aircraft permission to land, since this poses a serious threat to the community?

**Response:**

In the event of an in-flight emergency the pilot in command will assess the seriousness of the circumstance and develop a course of action he/she deems prudent. If the circumstance requires landing the aircraft, the pilot may elect to proceed to the nearest suitable airport and land immediately. In other instances, it may be completely safe to continue the flight for some time to reach a suitable

airport where specific maintenance capability exists. The Federal Air Regulations, Part 91, General Operating and Flight Rules delineates the responsibility and authority of the pilot in command in section 91.3 (a) stating "The pilot in command of the aircraft is directly responsible for, and is the final authority as to, the operation of that aircraft" and in Section 91.7 (b) stating "The pilot in command of a civil aircraft is responsible for determining whether that aircraft is in condition for safe flight. The pilot in command shall discontinue the flight when un-airworthy mechanical, electrical or structural conditions occur." LAX or any other public use airport with suitable facilities can not arbitrarily and capriciously deny access to an aircraft in distress.

#### PC01270-11

**Comment:**

5) I have called in several complaints about aircraft flying low over me. I was told that many of these were "wave offs", and that it was necessary to prevent a collision. This tells me that there are fairly frequent close calls. I have seen planes so heavily loaded that they are only a few hundred feet above the ground when they clear the airport. Planes do crash sometimes. Increased air traffic means a definite increase in the chances of a major disaster here. You have a huge population base in the area. You have aircraft flying over Hyperion, which has large containers of methane gas. You will be putting even more lives and property at risk than you already are at present. How can you justify this? What measures are you planning to take to protect us?

**Response:**

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

#### PC01270-12

**Comment:**

6) You have promised to enforce certain regulations for our safety and to reduce the noise impact. Things have improved a little over the years. Yet, most of these measures seem to be enforced only when it is convenient. I hardly ever call any more because it doesn't do much good. We were told that there was a moratorium on jet aircraft without modified engines, but they are still flying out of your airport. I have called in complaints only to be told that you can't make pilots use the inner runways, or that forcing foreign airlines to behave is a diplomatic problem. How do you plan to enforce these regulations?

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement, particularly Subtopical Responses TR-N-7.1, TR-N-7.6, and TR-N-7.2. 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. As to the comment regarding a moratorium on jet aircraft without modified engines still flying from LAX, as of the end of 1999, all aircraft flying to and from LAX that have been required by federal law to have engines converted to quieter versions have done so, or have been replaced. Aircraft that weigh less than 75,000 pounds (typically smaller private business jets) are not subject to this federal regulation, but virtually all such aircraft at LAX already meet the legal noise level limits. As to the enforcement of noise abatement regulations, please see Response to Comment PC-00373-11.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01270-13

**Comment:**

7) You have proposed no viable alternatives to expansion. Why not? I know that several alternatives, such as increasing the use of other existing airports, have been proposed by others. Why are you fighting all of the other options? What makes you believe that you should get more business at the expense of these other airports, their communities, and our community?

**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.

#### PC01270-14

**Comment:**

8) El Segundo is a great place to live. So are many of the other communities in your area. The only drawback for us is LAX. The impact that LAX has on us is great enough that if it increased it would be intolerable. I would be unable to live here.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

#### PC01270-15

**Comment:**

I love my home, but I would be forced to sell. I am sure that I would not be alone. Property values will plummet.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding the effects of LAX on property values.

#### PC01270-16

**Comment:**

No one will want to live with the increased noise, smog, traffic, danger, and other problems that expanding LAX will create. All of your plans for LAX expansion would probably destroy El Segundo, Playa Del Rey, and the other towns near the airport. I particularly object to Alternative C. It would have the worst impact on us. How can you justify destroying communities?

**Response:**

Impacts associated with noise, traffic and air quality were described in Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use, Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Regarding Alternative C, compared to Alternatives A and B, it has the smallest increase aircraft operations and correspondingly has fewer impacts associated with noise, traffic, air quality and a number of other issues. As described in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, aircraft operations under Alternative D, LAWA Staff's preferred alternative, are less than the other build alternatives and is designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to the No Action/No Project Alternative.



**PC01270-17****Comment:**

I would appreciate a timely response to my concerns (not just some form letter).

**Response:**

Responses to individual comments included in this comment letter are provided above.

**PC01271      Stefanski, Andrew      None Provided      6/9/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00278; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC00278.

**PC01272      Nakagama, Naomi      None Provided      7/3/2001**

**PC01272-1****Comment:**

I am a concerned Westchester resident of thirty years. I have gone through its schools and and have participated in activities at the schools, parks, and the Westchester YMCA. Currently, I am raising a son here hoping that he will have the same opportunities in this safe environment.

I am very much opposed to additional noise, traffic, crime and pollution that would result from the LAX expansion. LAX expansion would definitely cause an adverse quality of life for this place we have called home for the last 30 years.

VOTE NO TO 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. Please see 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 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 and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4. In addition, the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed law enforcement service needs in Section 4.26.2, Law Enforcement, with supporting technical data provided in Technical Report 16b.

**PC01273      Schachter, Mr. &      None Provided      7/14/2001**  
**Mrs. AI**

**PC01273-1****Comment:**

The Master Plan is a short-term approach.

Long Term planning would incorporate the Ontario and Palmdale Airports as well as El Toro for Orange County.

The communities around LAX have borne the burden of air commerce expansion long enough!

### 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. 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. 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.

**PC01274      Pleshe, Thomas      None Provided      7/15/2001**

**PC01274-1**

**Comment:**

1. WE DON'T NEED MORE TRAFFIC AND CONGESTION AROUND LAX AND ITS NEIGHBORHOODS

**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.

**PC01274-2**

**Comment:**

2. MY HOUSE AND CAR PAINT IS BEING DAMAGE BY AIRPORT FLIGHTS NOW AND WITH INCREASED FLIGHTS MEANS MORE DAMAGE AND POLLUTION - WE DONT NEED IT.

**Response:**

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

**PC01274-3**

**Comment:**

USE ALTERNATIVE AIRPORTS - PUT IN MON-RAILS.

**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.

#### PC01274-4

**Comment:**

between LAX - LONG BEACH, ORANGE COUNTY ONTARIO, AND DEVELOP PAMDALE - EL TORO. AND EXTEND MONORAIL TO PAMDALE & EL TORO.

**Response:**

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

#### PC01274-5

**Comment:**

3. REDUCE PROPERT TAXES AROUND AIRPORT, CLOSEST TO LAX MORE REDUCTION TO COVER LOSSES ON PAINT ON CAR HOMES, & POLLUTION.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

#### PC01274-6

**Comment:**

4. NO MORE NOISE - (LAX HAS NOTHING BUT \$\$ COMING IN

**Response:**

Comment noted.

#### PC01274-7

**Comment:**

5. LAX COULD NOT EVEN STAND BY THERE WORD ON MY SOUND PROOFING CONTRACT.) CALL ME ON THIS ISSUE.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Noise impacts and LAWA's Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program, including soundproofing, were described in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

#### PC01275

**Oklar, Doris**

**None Provided**

**7/11/2001**

#### PC01275-1

**Comment:**

LAX has reached maximum capacity. We have lived in Westchester for 48 yrs. We've seen a thriving community chopped into and disintegrated by the "new" (then) LAX and our friends forced out of their beautiful beach homes. Now the traffic is horrendous at any time of day and the business center is still in depression.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and economic impacts in Section 4.4.1,

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

Employment/Socioeconomics, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2, 3 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2 and S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of the Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester.

#### PC01275-2

**Comment:**

The noise level upstairs (where we sleep) is a constant roar - so much louder than street level where other houses seem to buffer it some.

**Response:**

The noise level on the second floor tends to be louder with aircraft overflights than that of the ground level. This is due, in part, to the lack of insulation that a top floor receives from the surrounding properties and from the presence of a floor above it. Secondly, aircraft noise is also perceived to be more intense at night due to the reduction of ambient noise levels. For additional information on single events impacts on nighttime awakenings, please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, Appendix S-C, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, and Technical Report S-1 Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

#### PC01275-3

**Comment:**

We hoped for soundproofing, but didn't get it. Some airplanes sound as if they're going to crash right into us.

**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 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 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.

#### PC01275-4

**Comment:**

Be satisfied with present growth - altered patterns for safety perhaps, but zero increase.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

**PC01275-5****Comment:**

Palmdale & Ontario have wide empty spaces. Use them. Let O.C. traffic go to El Toro. It's already 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, 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.

**PC01276****Wilson, Margaret****None Provided****7/15/2001****PC01276-1****Comment:**

Two weeks prior to attending the LAX Expansion Environmental Impact Report Hearing on June 9, 2001 (Furama Hotel) I attended two public meetings. Needing to acquire additional information, I waited to write. I learned from the April 12, 2001, Minutes of the Southern California Assoc. of Governments April 12, 2001, meetings (SCAG) and the Conclusions and Recommendations of the same group's June 28, 2001, meeting to review the Master Plan Draft & EIS/EIR. I focused on their recommendations all of which I concur.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

**PC01276-2****Comment:**

One was to redistribute cargo to outlying facilities such as March AFB, San Bernardino, and George AFB which would reduce the need for diesel trucks in the LAX area.

**Response:**

Please see Responses to Comments PC00599-54 and PC00922-1 for more information regarding cargo activity.

**PC01276-3****Comment:**

Another, that for certain Regional transport problems use be made of an Intra-Regional High Speed Maglev System as a way to redistribute regional demand. Also, use mitigation measures stressed in the RTP EIR plus other options such as remote terminals.

**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's role in meeting regional demand.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01276-4

**Comment:**

I am confident you know these proposals and the problems they address. All were presented at the June 9, Meeting. (1) Pollution which will worsen as the forecast shows an increase of five EPA classified major air pollutants (2) Noise as your pattern of anticipated take off and landing locations change can only increase

**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-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures and TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

#### PC01276-5

**Comment:**

(3) Traffic because, in my opinion, your July 30, 1999, proposals did not take into consideration the tremendous traffic increase on Lincoln Blvd. due to the Playa Vista Development.

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00148-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00148-2.

#### PC01276-6

**Comment:**

As important as these is the threat to the growing cohesiveness of our communities. We have created centers out of communities, Communities out of places. All of these relationships take years to develop and establish.

**Response:**

Please see Section 4.2, Land Use, and Section 4.4.4, Community Disruption and Alteration of Surface Transportation Patterns of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding compatibility of proposed land uses and cohesiveness of communities.

#### PC01276-7

**Comment:**

I am opposed to the ways Mr. John Agoglia plans to implement, "LAX must be part of Regional Airport Solution." Here I use the analogy for the image of Noah and his Ark, with this difference I see all of us who protest and oppose, as many Noahs who want to reduce, not eliminate, the flood of aircraft, people, equipment, cargo etc. that move through and over us. Our Arks are nearly full. You need now to actively divert the flood to other locations. You have already mentioned. The jobs will be there, the people will follow have more space to live. New schools which mean reduced pressure on L.A. Unified, for example. The State economy will strengthen.

For international flight passengers who wish to bypass L.A., their planes would go to Seattle or other West coast cities. The whole West Coast would profit.

Paris, Washington, D.C., New York are all examples of major cities who have made these changes. What is needed is a change in Vision and Will!

**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.

<b>PC01277</b>	<b>Teage, Danny &amp; Family</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/15/2001</b>
----------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	------------------

**PC01277-1****Comment:**

Exactly where is the "Ring Road" going to be? Will we lose businesses near "Long's" "Ralph's" and "In and Out"?

**Response:**

The alignment of the ring road proposed under Alternatives A, B, and C was illustrated in Figure 3-7, Alternative A - 2015 Added Runway North, Figure 3-11, Alternative B - 2015 Added Runway South, and Figure 3-15, Alternative C - 2015 No Additional Runway, in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Draft EIS/EIR. 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 development of the ring road nor any of the associated impacts (refer to the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for analysis of Alternative D). Please see Response to Comment AL00018-1 regarding commercial property acquisition within the Westchester Business District, Response to Comment PC00013-5 regarding collateral development at LAX Northside/Westchester Southside, and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of the Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester. As noted therein, Alternative D would not require acquisition within the Westchester Business District. Finally, the Ralph's Supermarket on Sepulveda Boulevard is not proposed for acquisition under way of the build alternatives addressed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC01277-2****Comment:**

How many families will lose there house's in the neighborhoods????

**Response:**

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

**PC01277-3****Comment:**

Is this airport "safe" now??

**Response:**

Safety issues were addressed in Section 4.24 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 for additional information regarding aviation safety.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01277-4**

**Comment:**

Why expand this airport and not one's in Palmdale 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-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.

**PC01278      Nieves, Frank & Elva      None Provided**

**7/16/2001**

**PC01278-1**

**Comment:**

WE ARE 100% AGAINST THE LAX EXPENSION. WE BOUHT OUR HOUSE 21 YRS AGO, IT'S ONE OF BEST AREAS IN L.A. TO LIVE IN. ALL THE DEVELOPE GOING ON AROUND US IS RUINING OUR NEIGHBORHOOD.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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.

**PC01278-2**

**Comment:**

THE TRAFIC ON SEPULVEDA IS GOTTEN SO BAD ITS HARD TO GET ON FROM ANY SIDE STREET THAT DOSN'T HAVE SIGNAL LITGH.

**Response:**

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

**PC01278-3**

**Comment:**

THE POLLUTION IS TERRIBLE FROM ALL THE AIRPLANES GOING IN AND OUT OF LAX. AS SO IS THE NOISE WE WANT OUR NEIGHBORHOOD TO STAY NICE AND HEALTHY.

**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.



**PC01278-4**

**Comment:**

WE DO NOT NEED ANY MORE NEW PROJECTS IN THIS AREA. GO BUILT YOUR AIRPORT SOMEWHERE ELSE

**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.

**PC01279**

**Gandia, Joan D. &  
Domingo**

**None Provided**

**7/14/2001**

**PC01279-1**

**Comment:**

All of the following problems will disrupt our homes & neighborhood.

**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.

**PC01279-2**

**Comment:**

1) Keep our neighborhood whole, No expressway or Ring Rd.

**Response:**

Please note, as described in Chapter 3, Alternatives of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, that LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative, Alternative D, does not include proposals for a ring road, the LAX Expressway or residential acquisition.

**PC01279-3**

**Comment:**

2) The traffic is impossible now. Everyone cuts through the neighborhood to try to find a short cut. No. No. No!

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

**PC01279-4**

**Comment:**

3) Enough noise and pollution now! What are you trying to do to us? A lot of retirees live here and don't need more health problems due to the noise & added pollution.

**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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

#### PC01279-5

**Comment:**

4) Use the regional solution. Give the other air-ports the business. Why should we bear the brunt of it. We already have our share.

**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.

**PC01280**

**Berrett, Catherine**

**None Provided**

**7/14/2001**

#### PC01280-1

**Comment:**

I do not understand why the million dollar real estate along the Pacific Ocean is to be downgraded to Industrial uses. While Palmdale has for the 22 years I've lived in Westchester, been searching for an industry that could provide jobs & attract people to a community that has infrastructure, schools & vacant homes waiting to be occupied.

Develop the Palmdale Airport - don't rape the Westchester - Inglewood & El Segundo area!

**Response:**

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

**PC01281**

**Carings, Hilda & Bill**

**None Provided**

#### PC01281-1

**Comment:**

We think the proposed airport expansion is a dangerous and inappropriate plan

**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. 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.

**PC01281-2****Comment:**

Safety at the Airport - We are fortunate in that no huge disaster as taken place to date - We do know the level of air traffic is scary. I have been on a plane when we had a "wave off" and had to circle and try again. Seconds are pilot competence are crucial.

**Response:**

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

**PC01281-3****Comment:**

Traffic The airport commission has neglected to consider vehicle traffic near the airport. Our local streets such as Sepulveda are sometimes impassable.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and TR-ST-2 regarding the Congestion Management Program.

**PC01281-4****Comment:**

General planning for disasters  
In case of earthquakes - war - etc. it is obviously necessary to scatter air facilities. We need a regional 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. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

**PC01282****Nakagama, Ray****None Provided****7/3/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01249; please refer to the response to comment letter PC01249.

**PC01283****Hartman, Blanche****None Provided****7/6/2001****PC01283-1****Comment:**

I have lived on Commonwealth for over 50 years and I am very worried about the jet traffic from Santa Monica Airport, for this reason, I want the L.A.X masterplan to include at least 3 F.B.O.s.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-4 regarding potential environmental impacts at surrounding other airports as a result of the LAX Master Plan.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

#### **PC01283-2**

**Comment:**

I support a Regional plan which includes using Palmdale, Ontario and El Toro 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, 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.

**PC01284**

**Robinson, Jerry**

**Logic Technology Inc.**

**7/9/2001**

#### **PC01284-1**

**Comment:**

This letter is to confirm my extreme opposition to the LAX expansion project. The LAX expansion project will effect me and our sales office directly because if it is approved we would have to move our sales office which we have been located here at 8936 S. Sepulveda, Suite #102 since 1979. It would be such a nightmare for us to have to look for another office at this point and have to move.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00018-1 regarding commercial property acquisition within the Westchester Business District.

**PC01285**

**Mantell, Gregory**

**None Provided**

#### **PC01285-1**

**Comment:**

I strongly support and encourage your plans to extend to Green Line to LAX - no matter what else may or may not happen at the airport. When building the train station at LAX, please keep in mind that this line may eventually connect to the Exposition Light Rail line to the North in Santa Monica and to the Long Beach Blue line to the South.

**Response:**

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

#### **PC01285-2**

**Comment:**

I also encourage you to support extending the Pasadena Blue line past Claremont to Ontario Airport (and/or the planned East LA Light Rail Line). Thank you!

**Response:**

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

**PC01286      Janni, J.      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01286-1**

**Comment:**

The last time I was at LAX I got "trapped" in a full parking lot. I realize the Master Plan cannot do anything about parking lots but just maybe a connection to the Green Line would help. I know the next time I have to pick someone up I'll send a taxi. But that really doesn't get another car off the road does it? Please - ever little bit you can do to modernize LAX will help.

**Response:**

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

**PC01287      Erland, Michael      None Provided      7/17/2001**

**PC01287-1**

**Comment:**

I live near the airport. If we don't do something to modernize it the gridlock and pollution will only get worse. The homeowners who are against any building are kidding them-selves. People and cargo will continue to come until LAX is overburdened to the point of non-functioning. When a serious accident happens as it is bound to, will those homeowners take any responsibility? No, they will blame LAWA and everyone else other than themselves.

I don't want Los Angeles to become Gary, Indiana. We need to modernize to keep our economy strong. If commerce is forced out of Los Angeles, jobs will follow.

I SUPPORT MASTER PLAN ALTERNATIVE C FOR A BETTER LOS ANGELES.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01288      Ortiz-Chavez, Norma      None Provided      7/17/2001**

**PC01288-1**

**Comment:**

I use the airport and it drives me crazy! Please support Alternative C and improve LAX and the surrounding roads so it's not such a nightmare!

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01289      Ikemura, Bonnie      None Provided      7/17/2001**

**PC01289-1**

**Comment:**

I support Master Plan Alternative "C"!

I support a more efficient airport!

I want a safer airport!

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01290      Bernal, Hugo      None Provided      7/17/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00603; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00603.

**PC01291      Bernal, Yolanda      None Provided      7/17/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00600; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00600.

**PC01292      Matsunaga, Patsy      None Provided      7/17/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00606; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00606.

**PC01293      Montes, Eddie      None Provided      7/17/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01289; please refer to the response to comment letter PC01289.

**PC01294      Carlton, Tim      None Provided      7/12/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00732; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00732.

**PC01295      Overton, Martin      None Provided      7/17/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00734; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00734.

**PC01296      Sodtjo, Ben      Los Angeles Sheet Metal  
Workers' Local 108      7/12/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00732; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00732.

**PC01297      Ichikawa, Wendy      Los Angeles Sheet Metal  
Workers' Local 108      7/12/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00732; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00732.

**PC01298      Ogrby, Robert      None Provided**

**PC01298-1**

**Comment:**

I was unable to attend the hearings on June 9. Instead here are my comments on the Draft LAX Master Plan and Draft EIS/EIR.

Firstly, let me congratulate you on the production of a comprehensive regional plan which addresses all the resources and activities in the region. Congratulations also on Alternative C, which proposes an improvement over current capacity of 10 MAP and 1.1 MAT of cargo with only a 21 daily flights increase.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01298-2**

**Comment:**

The plan begins with a statement of purpose founded upon the "desire of the City of Los Angeles to maintain the airport's role as a global air transportation hub". I think there is ample evidence that this is not true. A fairer statement might be that the City desires to simply cope with the increasing air traffic as best it can with the least negative impact. If this is correct then the Plan is fatally flawed and needs to be revised accordingly.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01298-3**

**Comment:**

An alternative defined as "Action/No Project" is omitted and may well be the most preferable.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternative D was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC01298-4**

**Comment:**

Its intent would be to define the actions that can be taken with no net negative/adverse impacts. Its features, derived from the list of common improvements could include:

-Construct a new west terminal and additional aircraft gates, rental car facilities and parking. These could use the existing roadways with appropriate infra-airport transportation modes. Additional new terminals could be located at the east end of the airport, accessible from Aviation Blvd.

-Construct a people mover connecting the new terminals to new concourses and all other terminals.

The above two improvements imply something important. It would shift the orientation from concentrating passengers coming off their transportation vehicles at the west of the airport to the east of the airport which is closest to their origination. It would not include a ring road. We currently have a ring road. It is much smaller than the one envisioned, but it is a significant contributor to smog and

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

congestion as vehicles circle multiple times to find parking or space to transfer passengers. The proposed ring road would simply be a larger source of similar smog and congestion. It would also increase the present very low rate of vehicle accidents.

-Having said that, a new LAX Expressway is not needed. Instead the existing off/on ramps could lead to passenger marshaling areas at Aviation Blvd., La Cienega Blvd. and, if the planned Arbor Vitae off/on ramps were completed, at Arbor Vitae. These marshaling or staging areas would be for the purpose of accepting and welcoming passengers into the airport, separating them from their vehicles and orienting them to rely on internal transportation modes, mainly people movers. These would be built to the east of the existing terminals.

-Extend the light rail Green Line directly into LAX. Consider whether this would be most feasible at the east end of the airport, without necessarily limiting the Line to only that route.

-Improve the taxiway/taxilane system of both the north and south airfields with no adverse impact

-Construct new internal roadways and cargo facilities with no adverse impact

**Response:**

The Commentor's suggestions that 1) the LAX Expressway not be built, 2) passenger staging areas be constructed in the vicinity of Arbor Vitae Street, Aviation Boulevard, and La Cienega Boulevard, 3) passengers use a people mover system to travel from the passenger staging areas on the east end of the airport to the central terminal area, 4) the taxiways for the north and south airfields be improved, and 5) internal airport roadways be constructed are all components of Alternative D. In addition, although Alternative D does not propose connecting the Green Line directly into the airport, a proposed moving pedestrian walkway and Automated People Mover System would provide Green Line passenger with an efficient and comfortable ride to the airport's central terminal area.

It is not expected that vehicle congestion and the rate of vehicle accidents would increase with the installation of the ring road proposed under Alternatives A, B and C. In fact, with limiting access for pedestrians and non-airport traffic, and few if any traffic signals on the ring road, traffic flow and accidents rates would be expected to improve when compared to the existing roadways.

See Topical Response TR-ST-2 for an in-depth discussion regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

**PC01298-5**

**Comment:**

-Build out the Westchester Southside with no adverse impact as a commercial improvement of benefit to the airport as well as the surrounding communities.

**Response:**

Comment noted. See Topical Response TR-LU-2 for a discussion of features of the LAX Northside/Westchester Southside project that include commercial improvements as well as measures to ensure compatibility with surrounding communities.

**PC01298-6**

**Comment:**

-To accommodate the new larger aircraft, extend east the existing runway that abuts Aviation Blvd. This could be accomplished with a tunnel for Aviation similar to the one on Sepulveda. But a better, cheaper alternative would be to build up the airport property with fill to a high enough level to overpass Aviation. This might be a massive project but it would be literally dirt cheap. The higher elevation for landings would also offset the negative intrusion on the eastward community from airplanes landing further east.



**Response:**

Comment noted. What is suggested is infeasible and not practical due to its environmental impacts. It would be a massive project to build the runway up high enough to overpass Aviation Blvd. as the commentor pointed out and the negative environmental impacts would be large during the construction due to the noise and air quality emission from the construction equipment moving enormous amount of fill. 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 allowable longitudinal grade is plus/minus 1.5 percent for runways and taxiways. To ease aircraft towing and taxiing, apron grades should be at a minimum and the maximum allowable grade in any direction is one percent for Aircraft Approach Categories C and D. With an 800 foot runway to runway centerline separation between the two parallel runways, a longitudinal grade between the runways would be 12 feet based on a 1.5 percent slope, and at least 20 feet elevation is needed to overpass Aviation Blvd; therefore, not only one runway needs to be elevated, but also the adjacent parallel runway, their associated taxiways and aprons, and gates and terminals. The enormous amount of fill needed would not be generated at LAX and need to be transported from elsewhere. The number of truck trips in and out of LAX just for moving the fill would be a burden to the surrounding community. A preliminary cost estimate was performed for moving the fill and re-constructing the two runways, the associated taxiways and aprons, and gates and terminals, and it concluded that elevating the south airfield is not feasible.

**PC01298-7****Comment:**

A general comment is offered in conclusion. This hemisphere and country were built by and large by pioneering-spirited people who seized the opportunities available to exploit free resources. Free in the sense that no one owned them. The conquistadores came for gold which they saw as free because they could discount the native population. The westward settlers, railroads, etc. found free land, water, timber and so on which they saw as free. again discounting the indigenous population as a simple annoyance. That era is over. It is over. And the air above us is no longer a free resource. Today's indigenous population of Los Angeles and its surrounding region owns the air and relies upon it for the very breath of life. That population must consider the value and the rental charge it must impose on the external users of its air, the airlines, when it gives up its air or its other environmental resources. The airlines bring economic benefit to us, but recognize also that none of them is based here and so their profits are exported from the region. An element of the plan to which the airlines might be invited would be a means for the airlines to contribute directly to the welfare of the community, for example by supporting medical facilities dealing with respiratory ailments.

**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-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

**PC01299****Douroux, Ph.D.,  
Marilyn****None Provided****7/7/2001****PC01299-1****Comment:**

WHERE IN THE EIR/EIS ARE THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ADDRESSED:

**Response:**

Please see Responses to Comments PC01299-2 through PC01299-7 below.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

#### **PC01299-2**

**Comment:**

WHAT WILL HAPPEN WITH THE INTRODUCTION OF THE NEW LARGER AIRBUS? WHAT WILL BE THE EFFECTS OF WIDER TURNS?

**Response:**

This comment is identical to Comment PC00686-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00686-2.

#### **PC01299-3**

**Comment:**

WHAT NEW TECHNOLOGY WILL PREVENT THE NEED FOR GREATER SEPARATION?

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC00686-3 regarding new technology that might require greater separation between aircraft.

#### **PC01299-4**

**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:**

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC00686-4. Please see Response to Comment PC00686-4 for discussion of early morning and late evening operations.

#### **PC01299-5**

**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 content of this comment is essentially the same as comment PC00686-5; please see Response to Comment PC00686-5.

#### **PC01299-6**

**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:**

Please see Response to Comment PC000686-6 regarding nighttime operations and temporary aircraft noise patterns during construction.

**PC01299-7****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:**

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00007-1 regarding the scoping undertaken for the LAX Master Plan.

**PC01299-8****Comment:**

The following are personal issues, yet probably experienced by other residents. Wherein are these addressed?

**Response:**

Please see Responses to Comments PC01299-9 through PC01299-14 below.

**PC01299-9****Comment:**

I Currently, night flights may rumble in anytime....sometimes at 1:00, 2:00, 3:30 AM...Sometimes a dozen such flights running into 6:30 am. In other words, no let-up/no sleep.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00387-3 and Response to Comment PC01096-3 regarding nighttime noise and its abatement.

**PC01299-10****Comment:**

In the latter case, this affects my husband's pressure which negatively affects my husband's kidney condition. Who wants to live on a kidney machine?

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise.

**PC01299-11****Comment:**

II. The air pollution is so bad that my house, coated and stuccoed, with trim and fence erected and painted mauve is now, 3 to 4 years later, grey.

**Response:**

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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01299-12

**Comment:**

We refuse to bear the brunt of the airport policies which negatively affect health and serenity.

**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.

#### PC01299-13

**Comment:**

We are told it may be another year and a half to two years before our home is insulated when I am just across the street (104th St) from those who are receiving it.

**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. Refer to Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.8, regarding how priority for soundproofing is determined. 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 (which includes an accelerated schedule to meet existing commitments).

#### PC01299-14

**Comment:**

Other measures MUST be found to mitigate the negative effects of expansion.

**Response:**

Comment noted. All feasible measure to mitigate significant impacts associated with the various Master Plan alternatives have been identified throughout Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. These measures provided the basis for the mitigation measures presented in this Final 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.

#### PC01300

**Voets, Terri & Gary**

**None Provided**

**7/16/2001**

#### PC01300-1

**Comment:**

I am writing as a concerned homeowner in Westchester regarding the LAX expansion. I have lived in Westchester all of my life and have seen the airport expand once before. That expansion still has its

effect on Westchester and I do not believe it to be necessary to expand anymore. I do understand that much updating needs to occur because many of the buildings and machinery is antiquated, however LAX airport handles too much air traffic as it is and should not be asked to handle anymore.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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.

**PC01300-2**

**Comment:**

One of my main concerns is safety. It was written in the Los Angeles Times the other day about how many near collisions there have been in the air and on the ground at LAX I feel this is of utmost concern to everyone who travels in and out of LAX.

**Response:**

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

**PC01300-3**

**Comment:**

I also feel very strongly on the subject of traffic in and around LAX. As it is I have recently seen an increase in traffic on Sepulveda Blvd. in Westchester. Every street in and out of LAX is strained with an overabundance of traffic on a daily basis. I am often picking up friends and relatives from the airport and it can take me 10 minutes to get to the airport, but an hour to get through the traffic in and around the airport. This is will be out of hand very soon if not addressed.

**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. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts, and Topical Response TR-ST-7 regarding Westchester Southside traffic.

**PC01300-4**

**Comment:**

LAX is swallowing up Westchester bit by bit and we don't have to stand for it. I am urging you to downscale this expansion and to respect the neighborhood. There is no need to have to destroy so many of the buildings in Westchester's business district or to destroy part of the historic Centinela Adobe!! This is just plain wrong!!

**Response:**

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. Potential impacts to cultural resources were discussed in Section 4.9.1, Historic Architecture and Archeological/Cultural Resources of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 concerning impacts within the Community of Westchester and Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding the Centinela Adobe. 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. Further, it does not include the LAX Expressway and therefore there it has no potential for impacts on the Centinela Adobe. 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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

#### PC01300-5

**Comment:**

Please listen to the people who need to deal with airport on a daily basis!!

**Response:**

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

<b>PC01301</b>	<b>Borges, Abdon &amp; Palmira</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/13/2001</b>
----------------	------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------

#### PC01301-1

**Comment:**

(1) LAX cannot be expanded any more! We are concerned already with pollution, rising traffic congestions and noise from aircrafts.

**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.

#### PC01301-2

**Comment:**

(2) Long term planning is definitely required - we can look into other areas like Palmdale and Ontario for further expansion needs -

**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.

#### PC01301-3

**Comment:**

(3) We cannot allow for homes and historical places to be demolished for expansion - we cannot imagine where it will end!

**Response:**

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. Potential impacts to cultural resources were discussed in Section 4.9.1, Historic Architecture and Archeological/Cultural Resources of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. 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. 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. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

#### **PC01301-4**

**Comment:**

(4) We are concerned with overcrowding of air corridors and any likelihood of air disasters.

**Response:**

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

#### **PC01301-5**

**Comment:**

(5) Health concerns from any more increased ground and air traffic emissions which will result in respiratory illnesses or even cancer.

**Response:**

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR address 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 G, and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, 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, Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

#### **PC01301-6**

**Comment:**

(6) We want to keep our neighborhood/community safe, healthy and less polluted/congested than it already is.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see 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 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. Please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01301-7

**Comment:**

We urge you not to continue with this expansion of LAX. As long term residents of Westchester we are truly concerned for our future and the future of our children and all residents of this community.

**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.

**PC01302      Henderson, David      None Provided      7/16/2001**

#### PC01302-1

**Comment:**

I am opposed to the expansion of LAX as proposed in the Master Plan. The homeowners around LAX cannot be expected to shoulder the total responsibility for the entire Southern California region. I am particularly upset with the plan to increase the cargo traffic. I can hardly sleep through the night now with all the noise. I can't imagine it any worse. Please consider increasing the air cargo at other regional airports. Thank you for your consideration.

**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-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic, Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand, Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding night-time aircraft operations 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.

**PC01303      Mack, Silvio      None Provided      7/12/2001**

#### PC01303-1

**Comment:**

For the past 37 years the noise, traffic and jet fuel pollution from LAX has been unbearable and increasingly getting worse.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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.



**PC01303-2****Comment:**

Prior to the purchase of my home in 1963 I was notified there would be no North Runway which turned out to be a lie.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01303-3****Comment:**

The expansion over the following years has depressed the value of my home and neighborhood by approximately 31% when compared to comparable areas.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding the effects of LAX on property values.

**PC01303-4****Comment:**

I along with my neighbors feel we have sufficiently paid economically and suffered enough due to the past expansion of LAX. Therefore any further expansion would be adding insult to injury.

**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.

**PC01303-5****Comment:**

I know expansion is needed, therefore why not utilize the 17,000 acres, plus of land that LAX owns in Palmdale Ca.

**Response:**

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

**PC01304****Topal, Linda****None Provided****7/18/2001****PC01304-1****Comment:**

I object to the Master-Plan to expand LAX. I have many concerns and objections -

**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. Please see Responses to Comments below.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01304-2

**Comment:**

one of the most significant is the noise level of airplane takeoffs. I live less than 2 miles from the existing runways. On any given day take offs begin as early as 5 AM and go through until the early hours of the next day. The noise level at present is horrendous I shutter at the thought of even more air traffic if this expansion takes place.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase. 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.

#### PC01304-3

**Comment:**

This community has enough congestion & noise - please stop any more from invading our space.

**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.

**PC01305**

**Topal, Jack**

**None Provided**

**7/16/2001**

#### PC01305-1

**Comment:**

Traffic:

My concern is with traffic congestion near the L.A.X. airport. I live in Playa Del Rey in the vicinity of the airport. I believe that airport expansion would add numerous cars to our surface streets. Specifically Lincoln Blvd. & Sepulveda Blvd. and Pershing & Culver Blvd.

**Response:**

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. Also, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

#### PC01305-2

**Comment:**

Placing a new terminal on Pershing will not ease traffic as a mitigation, but will congest Westchester Parkway and Pershing, where they intersect. Pershing South to Culver Blvd and North to Pershing are currently in gridlock with traffic backed up, esp. in the morning and evening hours. At this intersection it is one lane with a steep curve in each direction. A new terminal with increased traffic will harm our small neighborhood.

**Response:**

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. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC01306      Berri, Ron      None Provided      7/18/2001**

**PC01306-1****Comment:**

ENLARGEMENT OF LAX IS NOT IN THE BEST INTEREST OF ALL THE PEOPLE. WE IN WESTCHESTER HAVE HAD TO PUT UP WITH LAX THRU 1 EXPANSION ALREADY. SURE WE MAY HAVE CHOSEN TO BUY KNOWING OF LAX AS IT IS NOW. WE HAVE TO LIVE WITH THAT. BUT NOW YOU ARE SUGGESTING THAT OUR SURROUNDING BE AFFECTED NEGATIVELY WITH SOMETHING WE HAVE NOT CHOSEN. IT IS NOT RIGHT WHEN THERE ARE OTHER VIABLE (AND BETTER) OPTIONS.

**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.

**PC01307      Yucknat, Savannah      None Provided      7/18/2001**  
**Charlene**

**PC01307-1****Comment:**

I, Charlene Yucknat, hereby declare as follows:

I believe that the health problems I have and or the health problems that my family has, have come from the poisonous jet fuel exhaust of the LAX planes during their overflights of Inglewood, California. These planes have flown over Inglewood for many years both night and day.

I declare under the penalty of perjury of the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was at Inglewood, Ca, July 18, 2001.

/s/ Savannah Charlene Yucknat  
520 So. Oak St., Inglewood, Ca 90301  
(310) 671-5145

Please list any health problems you have that you feel are caused by jet overflights

Breathing problems.

This piece of paper towel I have enclosed was what I cleaned from my back car window yesterday morning July 17, 2001. That is what I breathe all the time.

**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. 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.

**PC01308      Malloy, Richard      None Provided      7/17/2001**

**PC01308-1**

**Comment:**

I was born and raised in Inglewood. I'm 68. We've lived in Westchester/Playa del Rey since the early 1960's.

The airport (LAX) took our first home on 93rd Pl. in 1970's during the north runway expansion. Many thousands of homes businesses were destroyed. Many businesses left Westchester - retail, doctors, restaurants, movies theaters and more.

Now LAX and its backers want another expansion. Another 1970's kill zone will take effect.

This is 2001. In 2025-30 the same thing will be tried - another expansion.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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. No residential acquisition is proposed under Alternative D. 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.

**PC01308-2**

**Comment:**

When are the planners going to put their heads on straight - Palmdale is just sitting there!!

**Response:**

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

**PC01309      Brantley, John      None Provided      7/17/2001**

**PC01309-1**

**Comment:**

I object to The Draft Master Plan and Draft EIS/EIR for several 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.

**PC01309-2**

**Comment:**

1. The plan will increase traffic in an already over-congested area. the proposed traffic improvements will not keep up with the additional people and vehicles.

**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. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

**PC01309-3**

**Comment:**

2. No matter how the runways are configured, aircraft noise will increase significantly.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.2. 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.

**PC01309-4**

**Comment:**

3. The increase in cars, buses, trucks and aircraft will increase air pollution significantly and the proposed mitigation will be inadequate to counter this.

**Response:**

LAWA will implement all feasible mitigation measures for the selected build alternative. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided an enhanced discussion of air quality mitigation measures in Section 4.6.8 and Appendix S-E Section 2.3.

**PC01309-5**

**Comment:**

4. The Westchester community will be broken up and destroyed by the elimination of our central business district. Mitigation for this is inadequate.

**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.

Regarding the adequacy of mitigation for acquisition, please see Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses (subsection 4.4.2.8), and note that LAWA would provide opportunities for businesses to relocate within nearby Westchester Southside. Furthermore, Master Plan Commitment RBR-1, as described in subsection 4.4.2.5, would ensure that LAWA implements a relocation plan for affected properties in compliance with the Uniform Relocation Act, state and local regulations, and FAA Advisory Circular 150/5100-17.

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

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

the Westchester Business District in contrast to the other build alternatives. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 for further discussion of effects on the community of Westchester.

#### **PC01309-6**

**Comment:**

5. Property values in Westchester will suffer due to the added congestion, noise and pollution. Mitigation for this is inadequate.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding the effects of LAX on 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. 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.

#### **PC01309-7**

**Comment:**

6. The 405 freeway will become even slower than it is now from the added airport traffic resulting from more passenger and cargo flights. Proposed mitigation measures will do little to lessen this impact.

**Response:**

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

#### **PC01309-8**

**Comment:**

7. Endangered, protected and threatened species living on the adjacent vacant lots are not adequately provided for in the Plan. They will be harmed or destroyed by the elimination or degradation of their habitat.

**Response:**

The adjacent vacant lots referred to in the comment are assumed to be areas 5 through 17 on Figure 4.2-3, Existing Airport Zoning, of Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR. These areas fall within the Master Plan boundaries and are within the approved LAX Northside project site. Section 4.10, Biotic Communities, and Section 4.11, Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna, of the Draft EIS/EIR addressed impacts to sensitive and listed flora and fauna within the Master Plan boundaries, including the LAX Northside project. Additional information regarding impacts to sensitive and listed flora and fauna were provided in Section 4.10, Biotic Communities, and Section 4.11, Endangered and Threatened Species, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Implementation of mitigation measures MM-BC-1 through MM-BC-13 and MM-ET-1 through MM-ET-4, detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, would reduce impacts to sensitive and listed flora and fauna to below the level of significance.

#### **PC01309-9**

**Comment:**

8. The EIS/EIR is unworkable and un-understandable because it is so lengthy as to bury significant information under tens of thousands of pages.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The EIS/EIR is carefully organized by topic, contains a clear description of the proposed project, provides an appropriate description of the environmental impacts, and includes sufficient detail to be understandable. The more detailed technical supporting information is contained separately, within the appendices and technical reports.

**PC01309-10**

**Comment:**

9. Safety will be impaired because of increasing flights in already overcrowded airspace

10. Safety will be impaired because of already overcrowded runways. Proposed mitigation measures for 9. and 10. are not adequate to lessen this impact.

**Response:**

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

**PC01309-11**

**Comment:**

11. The Plan and EIS/EIR fail to adequately consider the alternatives of a regional solution that spreads airtraffic over a number of other airports; and in particular fails to consider the significant expansion of the Palmdale Airport as an alternative.

**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.

**PC01309-12**

**Comment:**

12. Surface streets will become more dangerous and clogged with large many more trucks due to the proposed increase in cargo flights. Proposed mitigation measures cannot significantly lessen this impact.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology, and TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

<b>PC01310</b>	<b>Maeder, Diane &amp; Chris</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/18/2001</b>
----------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	------------------

#### **PC01310-1**

**Comment:**

My family and I are very concerned if LAX Expansion goes through. We live very close to the airport now and the noise level is bad now.

**Response:**

Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and 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.

#### **PC01310-2**

**Comment:**

Our kids like to play outside & I am concerned about all the pollution in the air. Our backyard gets so black from all the pollution that is released from the airport & traffic.

**Response:**

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

#### **PC01310-3**

**Comment:**

I can't even imagine what it is doing to our lungs. With the expansion it would only get worse.

**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.

#### **PC01310-4**

**Comment:**

There are so many other reasons why the expansion should not go through!

**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.



**PC01310-5****Comment:**

It would bring in larger cargo aircraft, more flights & heavy aircraft operations, this would lead to overcrowding of the air corridors. In turn this may lead to aircraft collisions. Our air traffic is already too close together.

**Response:**

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

**PC01310-6****Comment:**

The list of negatives can go on & on. Please help stop this terrible plan!  
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.

<b>PC01311</b>	<b>Cleveland, Robert</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/17/2001</b>
----------------	--------------------------	----------------------	------------------

**PC01311-1****Comment:**

I oppose the LAX expansion Master Plan 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.

**PC01311-2****Comment:**

1. The proposed expansion of LAX will likely generate far more than the 89 to 98 million passengers per year the airport claims. The current airport was projected to handle 40 million passengers per year and now serves 67 million. The history of LAX suggests that the Master Plan could well result in volumes as high as 120 million annual passengers and the EIR should, but does not, analyze the impacts associated with this much higher volume.

**Response:**

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

**PC01311-3****Comment:**

2. An environmental impact report is supposed to consider a reasonable range of alternatives to the project, however, the EIR never seriously considers a truly regional airport solution.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

**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.

**PC01311-4**

**Comment:**

Additionally, the EIR does not consider any alternative that would result in fewer adverse impacts than LAWA's preferred plan, Alternative C.

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC01094-4; please see Response to Comment PC01094-4.

**PC01311-5**

**Comment:**

3. LAWA's says the plan represents an increase of only 44 takeoffs and landings per day, however, we believe these projections are held artificially low by favorable or subjective assumptions about ambiguous fleet mix. These assumptions, what we rightfully call "fleet mix voodoo", are not justified and the impacts resulting from additional takeoffs and landings must be properly and objectively analyzed.

**Response:**

Please see responses to Comments PC00599-7 and PC00593-1 for a discussion on the fleet mix assumptions and operational levels. The environmental analyses in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, including noise and air quality, have addressed the potential impacts under the most practical and most likely activity level for each alternative. The environmental impacts associated with aircraft operations could vary according to the number of aircraft operations as well as other factors such as the type of aircraft and different airport operational characteristics. The Draft EIS/EIR evaluated a reasonable range of alternatives as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

**PC01311-6**

**Comment:**

4. The I-405 is already averaging 18-23 mph during peak hour. Because of regional growth it will slow to 10-16 mph in twenty years. The LAX expansion will only make that worse. Oddly, impacts of the LAX expansion on the I-405 are hardly examined in the EIR. This omission shows a glaring deficiency in the EIR.

**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.

**PC01311-7**

**Comment:**

5. LAX is already the region's largest single source of smog forming NOx emissions. The expansion plan will as much as triple the NOx emissions; these are emissions LAX neighbors have to breathe

**Response:**

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

**PC01311-8****Comment:**

6. All three expansion scenarios propose to more than double cargo activity at LAX; an activity that will double the truck traffic and diesel emissions; again, more emissions that LAX neighbors will have to breathe.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

**PC01311-9****Comment:**

7. Arterial roads such as Sepulveda Boulevard are already in gridlock at rush hour. The expansion of LAX will turn Sepulveda Boulevard into a parking lot.

**Response:**

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

**PC01311-10****Comment:**

We know the quality of life in El Segundo will be irreversibly damaged if the expansion of LAX is ever approved by the Los Angeles City Council.

**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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

**PC01312****Sacks, Howard****None Provided****7/17/2001****PC01312-1****Comment:**

I have resided here since 1968.  
Further expansion of passenger and cargo capacity should be permanently curtailed.  
All airline traffic should be sent to other airports, including Palmdale.  
All efforts for further expansion should be resisted and stopped.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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

---

**PC01313      Searle, Richard M. &      None Provided  
Wynnette**

**7/18/2001**

**PC01313-1**

**Comment:**

We express our opposition to the proposed expansion of LAX. LOS ANGELES WORLD AIRPORTS (LAWA). We live south of the south runway. The major impacts in our life are from the noise, traffic congestion and pollution. At times it feels like the airliner is landing on top of our home.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and 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, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendices D and G, and Technical Reports 2, 3 and 4. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

**PC01313-2**

**Comment:**

As we clean our home and windows each week, the amount of oil and black soot accumulated is alarming.

**Response:**

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

**PC01313-3**

**Comment:**

We wonder how our lungs must look with all this 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.

**PC01313-4**

**Comment:**

The traffic today makes it difficult to move in and around the airport now; we don't understand how it could be improved.

**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. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

**PC01313-5****Comment:**

Please respond to the following concerns:

**Response:**

Please see Responses to Comments PC01313-6 through PC01313-10 below.

**PC01313-6****Comment:**

1. How are we going to deal with the existing pollution before we add more pollution? Our home and lawn furniture needs to be cleaned almost every day. Can the airport promise that this pollution will be eliminated?

**Response:**

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

**PC01313-7****Comment:**

2. The proposed passenger expansion of LAX will generate more than the current estimates. As we know the current capacity is exceeded. How does one manage to a preset number of passengers? Can limits be enforced?

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels and legal limits on the ability to limit activity levels at commercial airports.

**PC01313-8****Comment:**

3. The additional takeoffs and landings will add additional noise over more hours of the day. We must stop our conversations too frequently now. I can imagine that we will never get to converse at home because of the noise. The report must address our to eliminate the increased noise.

**Response:**

Forecasts show that additional aircraft operations would be spread out throughout the day. The commenter lives about as near the departure end of the south runway complex as possible, and well within the area eligible for sound insulation under all LAWA guidelines. Sound insulation programs are administered by the surrounding communities. For additional noise mitigation measures please see Topical Responses TR-N-4 and TR-N-6 and Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report Section 7, Noise Mitigation on the Draft EIS/EIR. 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 and potential impacts on speech interference. 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 regarding noise-related mitigation.

**PC01313-9****Comment:**

4. In our mind the impact of traffic on our local streets and the I-105 and I-405 is not adequately addressed in the report.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**Response:**

Please refer to Topical Response TR-ST-2 for a discussion of the study area and facilities analyzed. 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.

**PC01313-10**

**Comment:**

5. Is there a way that more of the traffic can be handled at other area 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.

**PC01314      Plotnik, Patricia      None Provided**

**PC01314-1**

**Comment:**

The thing that distresses me is that the Westchester community has suffered so much in the past from airport development. We have lived here 46 years.

**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.

**PC01314-2**

**Comment:**

The business district is just now showing signs of revitalization and the airport should be helping it rather than trying to acquire more of it.

**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.

### 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, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative), does not include any acquisition within the Westchester Business District in contrast to the other build alternatives. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01315**      **Griffith, Dave,**      **None Provided**      **7/13/2001**  
**Rochelle, David &**  
**Charlie**

**PC01315-1**

**Comment:**

We - the Griffiths, oppose the LAX Expansion for many reasons: Increased traffic congestion & noise, but mainly; the estimated 1,302% increase in smog (you [people/humans?] apparently do not care about are health)

**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 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, 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, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see 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.

**PC01316**      **Beck, Rainer**      **None Provided**

**PC01316-1**

**Comment:**

I am opposed to the LAX expansion. Other airports should be developed, such as El Toro, Ontario, Palmdale. Why should LAX serve the needs of the people living near 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.

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

---

**PC01317      Azpilicueta, Raul & Elsa      None Provided      7/17/2001**

**PC01317-1**

**Comment:**

Traffic  
Noise    "Air Pollution"

Please stop!!

**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.

**PC01318      Cruz-Aldo, Eva      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01318-1**

**Comment:**

Please find other ways to be happy with your revenue and net profit to date. Let other regional airports take up the increased demand for flights.

This is a letter obviously in opposition of any 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. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

**PC01319      Cruz-Aldo, Carlos      None Provided      7/17/2001**

**PC01319-1**

**Comment:**

I am OPPOSED to any more expansion at LAX! This is due to already deteriorating quality of life with traffic and noise that I've seen increase already for over 2 decades. Enough is enough!

**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, 3, S-2a, and S-2b. 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 and Appendix S-C.



**PC01320      Gansert, Dr. Jennifer      None Provided      7/17/2001**

**PC01320-1**

**Comment:**

I am writing because of my concern about the black film that appears on my outdoor furniture each week. Has there been an adequate chemical analysis of this material?

**Response:**

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

**PC01320-2**

**Comment:**

As an oncologist (cancer doctor) I am aware that chronic exposure to carcinogens increases cancer risk, especially for children. I am concerned that increased traffic and airport pollution could increase the cancer risk of a child that is born and raised in my neighborhood.

**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, Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

**PC01321      Lelea, Jon      None Provided**

**PC01321-1**

**Comment:**

NO EXPANSION AT 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.

**PC01322      Chan, Paul      None Provided      7/17/2001**

**PC01322-1**

**Comment:**

We just bought are first house in Westchester and would love to stay but will move if LAX expands, the business district is reduced and housing prices decrease. This sort of "flight" will continue until Westchester's permanent residential community is depleted.

### 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 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, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative) does not include any acquisition within the Westchester Business District in contrast to the other build alternatives.

Regarding potential effects on property values, please see Topical Response TR-ES-1. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 for further discussion of effects on the community of Westchester.

**PC01322-2**

**Comment:**

Please stop the LAX expansion. The other counties should bear their share of transportation responsibility.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC01323**

**Haverly, Kiyome**

**None Provided**

**7/18/2001**

**PC01323-1**

**Comment:**

I do not want this expansion to happen in my community. there is too much traffic as it is and I hate negotiating delivery trucks and alternate routes to work as it is. the noise and air pollution factors are also of key importance to me. there is a reason i choose to pay more money and live at the beach - a healthy, stress-free lifestyle!

**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 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, 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, 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.

**PC01323-2**

**Comment:**

the city needs to further explore alternate plans for what it wishes to accomplish. don't subject our communities to the negatives of 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.

**PC01324      Friedlander, Walter      None Provided      6/30/2001**

**PC01324-1****Comment:**

As a resident of Westchester and Playa Del Rey Since 1950, I have witnessed the deterioration of the air, the noise the Quality of life, the traffic congestion and the pursuit of happiness etc. This was caused by the past expansion of the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX).

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. 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 are 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.

**PC01324-2****Comment:**

Now you want the airport to expand to carry 100 million passengers and have 24 hr cargo operations daily. I say "no expansion at LAX" and a move any and all projects for expansion (passengers and cargo to 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.

**PC01325      Paneitz, Vicki      None Provided      6/29/2001**

**PC01325-1****Comment:**

It seems every few days I am awakened at night by ground run-ups. This noise goes on and on!! What can you do and how soon can you help reduce/eliminate this noise?

**Response:**

Airport restrictions are in place that prohibit ground run-up operations during the period between 11 p.m. and 6 a.m. without express approval by the Executive Director of the airport or a designee. The Airport Operations staff is authorized to shut down any run-ups that take place during these hours. Each future development alternative includes the provision of Ground Run-up Enclosures - facilities that substantially reduce the levels of run-up noise heard in the community. Noise levels outside dwellings can only be mitigated by removal or quieting of the noise source - both are impractical at LAX. For additional information about night activity, please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, and particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-5.3 regarding night run-up activity.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

#### **PC01325-2**

**Comment:**

The freight/cargo planes are also very noisy. Please send them elsewhere.

**Response:**

Please also see Responses to Comments PC00599-54 and PC00922-1 regarding cargo activities.

**PC01326      Hollingshead, Tom      None Provided      6/15/2001**

#### **PC01326-1**

**Comment:**

Please keep intersection of Falmouth & Westchester Parkway open.

I don't want traffic from St Bernards Hi. School up & down Falmouth - & Manitoba -

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00217-1. Please see Response to Comment PC00217-1.

**PC01327      Johnson, Claude      None Provided      7/17/2001**

#### **PC01327-1**

**Comment:**

#1 Please DO NOT expand LAX.... locate "overflow" to PALMDALE

#2 see above

**Response:**

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

#### **PC01327-2**

**Comment:**

#3 DO NOT close off Falmouth exit to Westchester Pkwy. It will only make Falmouth overcrowded with traffic from Manitoba AND from St. Bernard's school

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00217-1. Please see Response to Comment PC00217-1.

**PC01328      Maddox, Ruth      None Provided**

#### **PC01328-1**

**Comment:**

Please do not close the Falmouth entrance to Westchester Parkway. This entrance is particularly important for school (St. Bernard's) traffic.

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00217-1. Please see Response to Comment PC00217-1.

**PC01329      Ulrich, Tad      None Provided      7/17/2001**

**PC01329-1**

**Comment:**

Further expansion of LAX serves no further purpose than to contribute to overcrowding, pollution, needless monetary costs and further disruption of surrounding communities.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed land use impacts in Section 4.2, Land Use, economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socioeconomics, growth inducement in Section 4.5, Induced Socio-Economics (Growth Inducement), and air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendices G and S-E, and Technical Reports 1, 4, 5, S-1, and S-3. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. .

**PC01329-2**

**Comment:**

Ontario and Palmdale airports should be aggressively developed instead. This would create job opportunities in those areas. It would also reduce traffic congestion caused by people nearest those airports who are now coming to LAX.

It seems ridiculous to continue a mindset of one airport (LAX) expansion given this region's vast population. Mere convenience dictates development of other airports. The old adage "spread the wealth" has never been more appropriate.

**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-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

**PC01330      Barbour, Henrietta      None Provided      7/17/2001**

**PC01330-1**

**Comment:**

I..To those who would expand LAX endlessly; when Bruce R. Barbour and I purchased this home in late 1947 (he was with L.A.P.D, we were both veterans) the promise told us was for a well-developed community of good homes, fine businesses, schools, recreation areas and libraries into future years. A very early map shows that promise of yet undeveloped land for those purposes. And the purchase of 17,000 acres for Palmdale Airport seemed to fulfill a good faith promise. But it wasn't long before a house we had considered buying on El Manor and all its neighbors were gone . . .swallowed up by LAX,

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

. . . then the beautiful homes in lower Playa del Rey. . . then West Westchester gone - all those hundreds of homes! By this time schools, churches, businesses were most severely affected. Our entire community being torn asunder piece by piece with each grab. The story was, "All we're asking for is expansion to this limit" no more, as they made their arbitrary figure choice. And meanwhile our homes and property are showered by constant petroleum fallout carried at the will of wind.

**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, Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

**PC01330-2**

**Comment:**

This has gone on far beyond any and All promises ever made and must STOP NOW! After 54 years of lies, grandiose expenditures, it's time to put those billions into Palmdale Airport along with those "pillars of light" and get that vast acreage earning it's keep. . . we here have already been decimated!!

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC01330-3**

**Comment:**

II. the phony pullout of the "last commercial flight from Palmdale + 3 yrs ago was a stall they hoped would be forgotten. take those so called "planners", "designers", "engineers" on a bus trip North on I5, thru' the array of developments, malls, business - far as the eye can see. then hear them try to say, the populations out there are not large enough to support an airport! Or that there is no high speed rail service, then show them the bus services for the folks in Santa Barbara, Bakersfield, Antelope Valley who have ridden them for years. the people who bought lots adjacent to "Palmdale Airport" 30+ years ago will be delighted to know they could now build for their own spacious community, or sell to makeup for the many years of taxes and empty promises.

**Response:**

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

**PC01330-4**

**Comment:**

I'm told, and still try to believe, Westchester IS a part of Los Angeles, not just a poor relative from the wrong side of the tracks. Go to Palmdale to satiate your greed. LAX, and allow this community to rebuild and regain what we had over 50 years ago and were told it could only get better.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC01331      Abdelkerim, Samy & Adrienne      None Provided      7/17/2001**

**PC01331-1**

**Comment:**

We have concerns regarding the Safety Issue and the Air Pollutions that increase Air Traffic may cause.

**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.

**PC01331-2**

**Comment:**

The area community needs to kept as a whole and undisturbed.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01332      Harrington, Patricia      None Provided      7/15/2001**

**PC01332-1**

**Comment:**

It is obvious to anyone, who isn't involved for financial gain, that there is more than enough noise and traffic around LAX 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, 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.

**PC01332-2**

**Comment:**

I sit in my house and cannot hear the T.V. because of the airplane noise. One cannot carry on a conversation inside the house on the phone or in person. This is ridiculous!! And they want to add more?

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels. Also see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-5 for a description of thresholds used to identify significant noise impacts and mitigation measures that would be implemented under the LAX Master Plan, including revisions to the

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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

#### PC01332-3

**Comment:**

Getting to your ticket station can be a challenge. Traffic has increased, what. . .300, 500%? in the last few years? In 1995 it was like this only on holidays, now it's every day --- and they want to add more?

**Response:**

Comment noted.

<b>PC01333</b>	<b>Sheehan, Rita</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/18/2001</b>
----------------	----------------------	----------------------	------------------

#### PC01333-1

**Comment:**

As a home owner since 1966 I love my neighborhood & community! Progress is inevitable, yes, but not to the extent it would uproot families and style of living, such as traffic: even now on Sepulveda BI & the development at the Hughes area - The promenade and Playa Vista -

**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.

#### PC01333-2

**Comment:**

More in depth study is needed to soften the future stress on the area - As is noted, the other airports.

**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 Environmental Superior alternative and would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region.

#### PC01333-3

**Comment:**

I realize the city will desire much more in property taxes than on residential homes.

**Response:**

Comment noted.



**PC01333-4**

**Comment:**

The outlying airports should be able to handle cargo as well as at LAWA.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC01334      Bentley, Steven      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01334-1**

**Comment:**

What's going on with El Toro airfield. How about Long Beach?

**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. Long Beach Airport's potential to attract additional passenger activity is further constrained by the current City of Long Beach policy limiting air carrier flights to 41 per day.

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.

**PC01335      Bishay, Mounir      None Provided      7/18/2001**

**PC01335-1**

**Comment:**

We are against the LAX expansion plan. It will bring lots of noise to our neighborhood and increases 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. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

**PC01336      Jagodowski, Stanley & Winifred      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01336-1**

**Comment:**

It is totally unreasonable to expand LAX which is already in overload. Much of this load comes from passengers & cargo from Orange County. The solution to this is to put a major airport there. Namely El

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

Toro. This has been a working military airport for years. The Orange County "NIMBYS" must be over ridden. They need to share their fair part of the air traffic with us in LA.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

**PC01336-2**

**Comment:**

The Expansion of the Palmdale airport is another good plan that need to be implemented.

**Response:**

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

**PC01337      Matsubara, Norm      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC01337-1**

**Comment:**

AS A RESIDENT OF WESTCHESTER I AM VERY CONCERNED OVER THE INCREASE TRAFFIC WHICH WILL RESULT IN THE PROPOSED LAX EXPANSION. I REALIZE THAT THIS WAS ADDRESSED, BUT IT WAS ALSO ADDRESSED IN THE HOWARD HUGHES CENTER DEVELOPMENT. THE ALSO STATED THAT THE INCREASE IN TRAFFIC ON SEPULVEDA BLVD. WOULD BE MINIMAL, BUT THEY WERE WRONG. THIS INCREASE IN TRAFFIC IS TERRIBLE, AND DANGEROUS. I HAVE TO MAKE A LEFT TURN GOING DOWN SEPULVEDA BLVD (SOUTH) AND TURNING WEST ON CENTINELA. I DON'T KNOW HOW MANY ACCIDENTS HAVE OCCURRED, BUT I SEEN SEVERAL NEAR MISSES.

**Response:**

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

**PC01337-2**

**Comment:**

ALSO, I AM CONCERNED OVER THE INCREASE IN POLLUTION, FROM THE ADDITIONAL VEHICLES COMING INTO THE AIRPORT AND ESPECIALLY THE INCREASE IN TRUCKS. THE POLLUTION FROM THE INCREASE IN FLIGHTS WILL HAVE THE MOST SIGNIFICANT IMPACT SINCE PLANES EMISSIONS ARE NOT REGULATED.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00801-2 regarding air quality impacts of the build alternatives. Please note that it is not true that emissions from aircraft are not regulated. Section 233 of the federal Clean Air Act (42 USC 7573) preempts any entity other than the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) from regulating emissions from aircraft or aircraft engines. EPA has established standards for aircraft engine emissions of oxides of nitrogen, hydrocarbons, and smoke which are consistent with emission standards established by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO).

**PC01337-3**

**Comment:**

I BELIEVE REGIONAL AIRPORTS WOULD BE A BETTER 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.

**PC01337-4**

**Comment:**

THE NEED FOR A MAJOR AIRPORT IN ORANGE COUNTY IS ALREADY THERE AND NEEDS TO BE EXPLORED.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

<b>PC01338</b>	<b>Lavenberg, William &amp; Maggy</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/18/2001</b>
----------------	---------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------

**PC01338-1**

**Comment:**

The purpose of this communication is to strongly express our non-support to any LAX expansion, either at the present airport site or surrounding access streets. We are extremely distressed to any plans to turn Airport Boulevard into an airport access route starting from the Howard Hughes Parkway off-ramp (Interstate 405).

**Response:**

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

**PC01338-2**

**Comment:**

We have lived in Westchester for over forty years and have seen a continual down grading of our community associated with LAX. Street traffic, together with its noise and air pollution continues to increase. Any added expansion to LAX and its surrounding streets will only increase and compound the problem. Increasing the size of LAX would also increase air traffic. A larger airport would mean more noisy flights overhead. How many more homes and businesses would be lost?

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and health and safety impacts in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendices D and G, and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4 and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and in Appendices S-C and S-E 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-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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01338-3

**Comment:**

Planners need to put their efforts in seeking alternative airport sites. Why does Westchester have to be the only primary airport location? Los Angeles has failed to develop its own property in Palmdale, Van Nuys, or Ontario. Why do residents of Santa Ana need to go to LAX when that city has its own airport that could be expanded. What about using the recently vacated airport at the former Naval Air Station, El Torro? Also the Long Beach airport could be increased in capacity.

What needs to be done is cause other airports to assume a greater portion of the current and future air traffic load.

**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.

<b>PC01339</b>	<b>Dunwoody, Alicia</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/16/2001</b>
----------------	-------------------------	----------------------	------------------

#### PC01339-1

**Comment:**

Thanks for the form & activism in the community. Everyone wants convenience to & from L.A. The Rich dictate the actions here. Well, soon the rich will blow this place up!

**Response:**

Comment noted.

#### PC01339-2

**Comment:**

LAX expansion Means no more (privacy) Westchester Community.

**Response:**

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR and the concern regarding privacy is not clear.

**PC01339-3****Comment:**

LAX expansion means Westchester LAX West Way entrance to 15 MIL + people to airport. Need to expand Long Beach! So. Orange County (John Wayne) Get real! Plus, still no Metro System North & South in L.A.!

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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, Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale, and Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

**PC01340****Spiro, P.****None Provided****7/13/2001****PC01340-1****Comment:**

Long term planning only - develop Ontario & Palmdale airport to take up load - no expansion into Westchester - at all - 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.

**PC01341****Markwith, Jeff****None Provided****7/17/2001****PC01341-1****Comment:**

I AM AGAINST 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.

**PC01341-2****Comment:**

-TRAFFIC - THE INCREASE OF TRAFFIC ON LINCOLN, SEPULVEDA & THE 405 WILL BE DANGEROUS & UNACCEPTABLE.

**Response:**

Please see 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

---

#### PC01341-3

**Comment:**

-NOISE - INCREASED SOUNDPROOFING OF HOMES IS NICE, BUT DOES NOTHING TO PROTECT OUTDOOR LIVING - BBQ'S, SOCCER & BASEBALL GAMES, BEACH ACTIVITIES.

**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, including thresholds used to identify significant noise levels.

#### PC01341-4

**Comment:**

-CARGO - IT MAKES NO SENSE TO TRUCK CARGO FROM ORANGE CO. TO LAX. THIS INCREASES TRAFFIC & POLLUTION BOTH IN THE AIR & ON THE GROUND. THE SENSIBLE SOLUTION IS TO FLY ORANGE CO. CARGO OUT OF ORANGE CO. AIRPORTS.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, for a discussion of the constraints at John Wayne Airport and the reasons why El Toro will not be converted to commercial aviation use. Without the planned capacity of El Toro and with the very limited capacity of John Wayne Airport, Orange County does not have and will not have the facilities to serve its own air cargo needs.

LAWA's new Alternative D for LAX, which is consistent with SCAG's RTP, would constrain LAX's cargo capacity to approximately 3 MAT. According to SCAG, the Inland Empire airports will significantly increase their cargo handling capacity. Therefore, Alternative D's cargo capacity constraints at LAX should create opportunities for some combination of the three Inland Empire airports that are closest to Orange County (March, Ontario, and San Bernardino) to serve more of Orange County's future cargo demand.

#### PC01341-5

**Comment:**

-POLLUTION - AS A SO. CAL. NATIVE & A LIFELONG SUFFERER OF ALLERGIES & RESPIRATORY PROBLEMS, I SAY THAT THE INCREASED AIR POLLUTION FROM ADDITIONAL PLANES & ADDITIONAL CARS & TRUCKS IS UNNECESSARY & UNACCEPTABLE.

**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, Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

#### PC01341-6

**Comment:**

-SAFETY - OVERCROWDING OF ROADS & AIR CORRIDORS WILL RESULT IN LOSS OF LIFE.

**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.

**PC01341-7****Comment:**

-IT IS PATENTLY UNFAIR TO FORCE THE WESTSIDE TO BEAR THE COSTS FOR THE ENTIRE SO. CAL. REGION. THE EQUITABLE SOLUTION IS TO ACCOMMODATE INCREASED AIR TRAFFIC THROUGHOUT THE REGION - DEVELOP ONTARIO, PALMDALE, EL TORO, ETC. DO NOT TAKE THE FOOLISHLY CONGESTIVE SOLUTION OF ROUTING ALL AIR TRAFFIC THRU LAX! ASKING LOCAL RESIDENTS TO PUT UP OR MOVE IS AN EXTREMELY SHORTSIGHTED SOLUTION TO THE NEEDS OF 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.

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.

**PC01342      Horompoly, Louis &      None Provided  
Ester**

**7/17/2001**

**PC01342-1****Comment:**

DUE TO THE INCREASED CONGESTION ON THE ADJOINING SURFACE STREETS (INCLUDING OURS) AND THE MEASURABLE INCREASE IN NOISE AT LAX I/WE FIRMLY OPPOSE 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, 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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01342-2

**Comment:**

WOULD LIKE TO SEE PALMDALE AND OTHER NEARBY AIRPORTS (EL TORO, JOHN WAYNE, ONTARIO, ETC.) DEVELOPED AND MORE THOROUGHLY UTILIZED.

**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-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.

#### PC01342-3

**Comment:**

ESPECIALLY IF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA HAS PLANS TO BUILD HIGH-SPEED RAIL BETWEEN LOS ANGELES & PALMDALE.

**Response:**

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

#### PC01342-4

**Comment:**

TO LESSEN TRAFFIC EL TORO & JOHN WAYNE SHOULD BE UTILIZED FOR ORANGE CO.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

**PC01343      Schoellerman, Laura      None Provided**

**7/16/2001**

#### PC01343-1

**Comment:**

No on Airport Blvd

No on the Expansion period

Im a homeowner here I dont won't any more traffic I don't wont any more noise from the airplanes we already have enough noise enough noise from the traffic.

**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.



**PC01344**      **Vanderville, E.  
Lugene**      **None Provided**      **7/14/2001**

**PC01344-1**

**Comment:**

I have lived in my home for 59 years! I have seen our area taken advantage of - by the airport expansion!! Taken our homes and business. In fact our Sepulveda area of shopping is making a big effort to improve the area. Keeping our area for its residences!

**Response:**

Comment noted. Section 3.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR identified the areas that would be acquired under each of the Master Plan alternatives. Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the impacts of such acquisition and identifies Master Plan commitments and recommended mitigation measures. No residential acquisition is proposed under Alternative D.

**PC01344-2**

**Comment:**

On the expansion of the airport - they should develop Orange County or Palmdale - it would be less expensive than LAX (also El Toro).

**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-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.

**PC01344-3**

**Comment:**

Traffic is terrible on Lincoln Blvd & Sepulveda already

**Response:**

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

**PC01344-4**

**Comment:**

and with Playa Vista and other housing being built - it will get worse not better.

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00148-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00148-2.

**PC01344-5**

**Comment:**

Noise is getting worse and with LAX getting bigger it will be taking on more cargo etc - and those planes make more noise!

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**Response:**

A forecasted doubling of air cargo volume does not correlate to a doubling of flight operations. The volume increase is predominantly due to the forecasted increase in aircraft size to include some of the loudest individual aircraft that would be operating, but the efficiency of cargo space on newer larger aircraft and size increase would not result in a large increase in operations. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

**PC01344-6**

**Comment:**

Pollution - our air is bad enough we don't want it to get worse.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-3.

**PC01344-7**

**Comment:**

Safety is a big factor if LAX enlarges - Its not able to take on more planes to land and take off.

**Response:**

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

**PC01344-8**

**Comment:**

I believe those that picked Westchester for their homes should have some say on such a plan that will destroy us!!

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process. All residents of Westchester have the opportunity to provide input, as do all other interested parties.

**PC01345      Adair, John      None Provided**

**PC01345-1**

**Comment:**

Relief of airport congestion involves the whole region, indeed the whole nation. All other areas must bear their share, esp. 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.

**PC01345-2****Comment:**

Expediting traffic in and around LAX is futile. Near gridlock exists on major thoroughfares nearby, including the #405 freeway.

**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. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

**PC01345-3****Comment:**

LAX is rated the most dangerous of US airports by pilots, more LAX air traffic increases danger.

**Response:**

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

**PC01346****Tittle, Nelda****None Provided****7/17/2001****PC01346-1****Comment:**

Expansion of LAX seems to not meet the needs of Southern California. Spreading air traffic & the pluses & minuses out makes more sense. People in outlying areas don't have ready access & would be better served with satellite 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.

**PC01346-2****Comment:**

My life would be adversely impacted since I live close to LAX if expansion is allowed.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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

---

#### PC01346-3

**Comment:**

Traffic is the biggest problem. It is already difficult to access & travel on the main arteries in the community. The airport ring road does nothing about traffic on the 405 freeway & there certainly is no guarantee that Sepulveda & Lincoln traffic would be alleviated by that same ring road.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. Also, the alternatives were planned to satisfy the future airport demand while also mitigating any impacts on the surrounding street system, including 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 alleviate airport-related traffic in Westchester. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

#### PC01346-4

**Comment:**

The most ridiculous part of the proposal is Westchester Southside. We already have Playa Vista being developed, the new Howard Hughes Center not to mention all the shopping areas that already exist. To add the confusion of that traffic on the airport ring road really makes no sense. It isn't as though the airport needs additional revenue streams.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-7 regarding Westchester Southside and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the integration of Playa Vista into the transportation analysis. In addition, please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or the Ring Road.

#### PC01346-5

**Comment:**

It seems apparent that there are safety concerns relative to the air traffic that currently exists. Upgrades to eliminate those safety concerns should certainly be implemented. But to expand the amount of traffic coming into & going out of LAX will only exacerbate the traffic, noise & pollution problems that already exist.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see 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.

#### PC01346-6

**Comment:**

The increased commerce & revenues certainly could be spread around the Southern California area & there are other airports that could more easily absorb the traffic & noise.

**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.

**PC01347      Slawinski, C.      None Provided      7/20/2001**

**PC01347-1**

**Comment:**

I am a disgruntle homeowner because of the aircraft noise from the North Runway. The aircraft produce excessive noise pollution during take off and aircraft reversing. Just along Lincoln & North to Manchester residence.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase and Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement.

**PC01347-2**

**Comment:**

Relative to the above matter and my opinion. The airport authority neglected to consider placing decibel monitoring equipment in our area for possible soundproofing of certain homes.

**Response:**

Please see Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4 for a description of monitoring methods used to validate the current 65 CNEL contour and Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.14 for a description of how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP, including a mitigation measure for expanding and upgrading the current monitoring system. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

**PC01347-3**

**Comment:**

It is absolutely redieulous to subject the will of the local area people to the LAX expansion. When we already have been created to additional noise, auto traffic, & grid lock.

**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. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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

---

**PC01347-4**

**Comment:**

The expansion will probably cause the loss of property value that give us great concern.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding the effects of LAX on property values.

**PC01347-5**

**Comment:**

What happened to the use of Palmdale Airport after the completion of the LAX - Palmdale Freeway?

**Response:**

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

**PC01347-6**

**Comment:**

What happened to the 25 year ago purposal to start using all area alternative airport to relief the LAX 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.

**PC01347-7**

**Comment:**

As information our neighborhood owners discussed of two items of interest - class action and remembering the names of the favored expansion promoters.

**Response:**

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

**PC01348**

**Butt, Vincent**

**None Provided**

**7/17/2001**

**PC01348-1**

**Comment:**

1. Don't take our parks!

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00264-2 regarding the expansion of parks and recreation areas. No parks are proposed to be taken, rather parks and recreation areas at LAX would be expanded.

**PC01348-2**

**Comment:**

2. How is traffic being handled?

**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 the proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

**PC01348-3**

**Comment:**

3. To reduce noise and cargo demand - have cargo delivered to the surrounding airports (e.g. Ontario & Palmdale). That should not disrupt commerce and still allow public use.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00599-54 for more information regarding cargo activity.

**PC01348-4**

**Comment:**

4. Develop & show complete master plan and EIS reports - make available to public.

**Response:**

The Master Plan is described in the draft master plan document (November 2000). The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR described, in Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures, the potential impacts associated with the Proposed Action and its Alternatives. Also, 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.

**PC01349**

**Hallock, Alice**

**None Provided**

**7/17/2001**

**PC01349-1**

**Comment:**

I oppose expansion of LAX airport. I think the quality of life in Westchester will be threatened & compromised. Expand elsewhere!

**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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01350      Eddington, Lyda      None Provided      7/17/2001**

**PC01350-1**

**Comment:**

**\*\* A RESOUNDING "NO" TO LAX 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.

**PC01350-2**

**Comment:**

The City of Los Angeles has two other key airports besides LAX - Ontario & Palmdale. These must be developed as opposed to LAX. El Toro in Orange County should also be developed instead of LAX. Expansion of LAX is a ridiculous and short term quick fix approach. It must be stopped.

**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.

**PC01350-3**

**Comment:**

Under the LAX expansion program, the noise pollution in our community would mean more soundproofing of homes - are our front and backyards also going to be soundproofed? Should those of us with young children keep them inside our "soundproofed" homes constantly?

**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 and how this would be revised under the LAX Master Plan.

**PC01350-4**

**Comment:**

What about the incredible increase in air pollution and traffic into the LAX area?



**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.

**PC01350-5**

**Comment:**

YOU MUST NOT implement the LAX expansion program. How many homes would be destroyed? How much of the Westchester Community would be torn apart? What happens when destroying Westchester isn't enough?

**Response:**

Acquisition was addressed in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As further described in these sections, Alternatives A, B, and C, would involve acquisition of 84 dwelling units. As stated in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA Staff's preferred alternative, Alternative D, does not propose residential acquisition.

Acquisition within Westchester would vary by alternative with most of the acreage to be acquired designated for and occupied by Light Industrial uses. Acquisition associated with the LAX Master Plan Alternatives within the Westchester-Playa del Rey Community Plan area would be as follows:

Alternative A, 250 acres or about 8 percent of the community plan area

Alternative B, 310 acres or about 10 percent of the community plan area

Alternative C, 179 acres or about 6 percent of the community plan area

Alternative D, 77 acres or about 2.5 percent of the community plan area

As described in Section 4.4.2, Acquisition of Residences or Businesses of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, acquisition would be addressed through Master Plan Commitment RBR-1, which would ensure that full relocation assistance and benefits would be provided in accordance with the Uniform Act. The Uniform Act requires that no resident be relocated until comparable, decent, safe and sanitary housing is made available.

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01350-6**

**Comment:**

I implore you - NO TO LAX 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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

<b>PC01351</b>	<b>Pool, Mr. &amp; Mrs. Charles</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/18/2001</b>
----------------	---	----------------------	------------------

#### **PC01351-1**

**Comment:**

It was brought to my attention, that there is talk about expanding LAX again. I have several questions for you to answer and I would like your honest opinion concerning this matter.

**Response:**

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.

#### **PC01351-2**

**Comment:**

Let's take a little time travel back to the 1960's when LAX had its last growing pains: Many beautiful homes in Westchester were bought up at a pittance of their worth. The people who owned them had to relocate as to no choice of their own and many of those people I once knew personally.

For many years after that, said homes just sat there and rotted before, finally, being torn down. For many years after the fact the land stood vacant. Finally approximately ten years ago, "Progress" went forward.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Section 3.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR identified the areas that would be acquired under each of the Master Plan alternatives. Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the impacts of such acquisition and identifies Master Plan commitments and recommended mitigation measures. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

#### **PC01351-3**

**Comment:**

Now you're talking about expanding LAX again!!!! Has it gotten to the point where you want ALL of Westchester? Where are we going to go from here? Where will our children play? Where will our children go to school? Where is the safety factor in this entire proposed plan? I have lived in this community all my life. My parents came here in 1947. Has it come to a point where people can't have a respectable community without some big shot telling the people where they should go?

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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. Safety was addressed in Section 4.24.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

#### **PC01351-4**

**Comment:**

Do you realize the danger that you are putting the people of Westchester through again??? Look at the crime factor, traffic, noise, air pollution "it is hard enough as it stands" and you want to add more to the problem?

**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; 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. Please see Section 4.26.2, Law Enforcement (CEQA) of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding crime.

**PC01351-5**

**Comment:**

It is extremely apparent that you and your family don't live in Westchester. We already have one project in full swing now "Playa Vista" and you want to expand more??? That's plain asinine for you to suggest such a project. Aren't you people putting the cart before the horse ? We have enough problems in this quiet community, why add more? Have you ever heard the expression: "If it ain't broke, don't fix it!" Well Westchester "ain't broke" so don't fix it. THERE'S NOTHING TO FIX. LEAVE US ALONE!!!!!!!

**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. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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 also see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01351-6**

**Comment:**

Here's another piece of history. Centinela Valley for instance: Centinela Adobe has been there before we were even thought of and LAX as well and you guys want to take a huge chunk of a historical area? That, too, is preposterous!!!! I bet that you people didn't even survey these areas before talking about the possibilities of expansion or do you guy even really care about the possible impact that will be if you expand.

**Response:**

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

**PC01351-7**

**Comment:**

There is also a Wildlife Sanctuary and Ballona Wetlands to consider. You would be driving what wildlife we have out and that's not the half of it. There is a rare butterfly preserve within the boundaries of LAX.

**Response:**

Sections 4.10, Biotic Communities, and 4.11, Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to Draft EIS/EIR discussed cumulative impacts to the Ballona Wetlands and the Ballona Bluffs and potential impacts to the El Segundo blue butterfly. Recommended mitigation measures would result in the no net loss of habitat value and would be adequate to reduce potential impacts of proposed Master Plan improvements to below the level of significance. The El Segundo Habitat Restoration Area is not defined as a Wildlife Refuge. FAA has taken a conservative approach regarding the Habitat Restoration Area in that it has evaluated the potential impacts as if the Habitat Restoration Area were considered to be protected by Department of Transportation Act, Section 4(f).

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

#### **PC01351-8**

**Comment:**

You guys bust your tails in preserving them, why not preserve what's left of Westchester and Playa Del Rey and parts of Marina Del Rey.

**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.

#### **PC01351-9**

**Comment:**

You see Mr. Ritchie, a lot of us who reside in Westchester are second, third generation & possibly fourth generations. Also there are many residents that have been here since before Westchester became Westchester. It was all bean fields back then. Here you are talking about kicking us all out, without so much as "By your leave" so you can have it all. You have Palmdale, Ontario, and El Toro, the high desert "Victorville & Apple Valley, & Hollywood/Burbank to consider. What is wrong with those cities??? Why pick on Westchester?

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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, Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale, 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.

#### **PC01351-10**

**Comment:**

Westchester has been a quiet community since W.W.II. Many veterans have resided here over the years and my father (Charles M. Pool) was one of them. He was also the designer of the heating and air conditioning systems at LAX also the hospitals & oils companies that he has dealt with. Is this your way of saying Thank You???? Get Real!!!! Granted my father was not the only one involved in LAX. Many other designers lived or do live in the Westchester community. Now this is your way of saying Thank you to all of these people who reside and their families in Westchester??? If it weren't for them paving their way, you wouldn't have a job, now would you? I understand the phrase of "Progress must progress" but this is ridiculous!!! For anyone such as yourself to sit behind a Cherrywood Desk and get fat off another person's labors. Is this your way of dealing with bureaucratic issues pertaining to a community such as zoning laws for expansion? If it was happening in your neighborhood, you would be fussing just as loudly as we are. Put yourself in our position Mr. Ritchie, what would you do? Would you stand by and do nothing or would you fight to keep your community, better yet, your home whole or intact. The answer is quite simple you would fight like any red-blooded homeowner or Westchester resident would do!!!!

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01351-11****Comment:**

Sir, I am but one voice, but I feel it is my responsibility to make this voice heard. I've lived in this community for fifty plus years. I was born here and I plan on dying here. I urge you strongly to reconsider the possibility of expansion. Just think, how many people gave to this community and are still giving to this date and time. Too many put blood, sweat, and tears into this community. Is this going to be the final legacy to leave to your children and to your children's children, for many years to come?? I feel very strongly that you are not a very popular man in this community right now. Leave well enough alone without another expansion taking place already.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts to the 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.

**PC01351-12****Comment:**

I must admit, there one bright side to all of this. As a young child growing up in Westchester, during the 1950's I remember when the planes would fly directly over my house. I remember them flying so low that it seemed as if I stood on my roof I could touch the wheels or the belly of the aircraft. Since then the flight path was changed much to the relief of those in my neighborhood. But, do to this change, other areas were affected. Many homes and school were severely affected. What happened to them you might ask? "PROGRESS" ate them alive!!!!!! Airport Junior High School, is now a Car rental agency. The homes that were there, and they were some nice ones, Airport parking. That, children, is what you call progress... I'm sorry folks that is not my idea of progress. What I call it, is the rape of a thriving community!!!!!! Many businesses have folded due to "progress." WHAT & WHO IS NEXT???????? It's your call, Mr. Ritchie. You are the "Man behind the smoking gun." The future of Westchester is in your hands.

**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. Section 3.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR identified the areas that would be acquired under each of the Master Plan alternatives. Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the impacts of such acquisition, Master Plan commitments, and recommended mitigation measures. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01352      Booher, Jeannine &      None Provided**  
**Norman**

**7/16/2001**

**PC01352-1****Comment:**

We are not in favor of LAX Expansion. We moved once because of the increased noise of the airport, the air pollution. Don't make us move again!!!

### 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 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.

**PC01352-2**

**Comment:**

Increase in traffic is already a big problem in Westchester and surrounding areas.

**Response:**

Traffic impacts were addressed in Section 4.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to Westchester.

**PC01352-3**

**Comment:**

We ask that you think long term when making decisions that affect the life and health of so many of us.

Please - no more band aid solutions.

**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, and air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4 and 14. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

**PC01353**

**Stump, Sarah**

**None Provided**

**7/18/2001**

**PC01353-1**

**Comment:**

Our family has lived for over 50 years in this area of Westchester.

We believe that there are other suitable places to enlarge the airport instead of this moving homes of people who have spent their lives here, help build schools, churches parks and public buildings.

I do not favor LAX Master plan.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester and 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. Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition.

**PC01354      Knuston, Elizabeth      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01354-1**

**Comment:**

The plan shows only Ontario, John Wayne, and Burbank as alternatives for future airport system scenarios. This isn't very thorough or objective at all. What about El Toro or a new airport East of LA in the Riverside area? Why isn't there a more regional approach considered?

The plan mentions that alternatives won't work because they're "restricted". LAX needs permission to grow to the huge size this plan proposes, too. What about an alternative to have ALL the regional airports grow to share in the anticipated increase demand.? Why is LAX expansion the only option really being considered? Why are all other options not considered viable? They are barely given lip service.

**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. 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.

**PC01355      Knuston, Elizabeth      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01355-1**

**Comment:**

COMMENTS: The plan states that LAX air cargo is forecast to increase 2.4 times the amount shipped in 1994. Also, that the biggest change in forecasted growth appears to be in the cargo & international areas. I live in Playa del Rey. To me, this means more night flights and more very large jets. They depart and land over water, sometimes at the same time.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding cargo forecast and demand. Cargo flights operate throughout the day and night. Tables IV-A.1 through IV-A.3 located in Chapter IV, Facility Requirements, Appendix A of the Draft LAX Master Plan provided hourly breakdowns for forecasted cargo operations. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-5.1 regarding over-ocean procedures.

**PC01355-2**

**Comment:**

The plan (elsewhere) talks about a new runway to the north as one of the options. I also read that center runways would be used to decrease the noise for communities near the airport like mine. I can't see these larger jets coming and going at the same time together on adjacent center runways.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

**Response:**

Alternative A of the LAX Master Plan includes a new 6,700 ft. runway north of existing Runway 6L/24R. The new north runway would have a runway to runway centerline separation of 800 feet to Runway 24C and 1,600 feet to Runway 24L. As depicted in Figure V-J.36 in Appendix J of the Draft Master Plan Chapter V, the new runway is proposed to accommodate arrival operations (not departures) and departing flights would use the existing runways. The proposed runway operating configurations are strictly based on the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) operation procedure standards and optimized runway use strategies. The 800 feet of runway to runway centerline separation would allow independent arrival and departure operations on the three parallel runways under visual conditions. When the weather conditions get worse, the runway operating configurations would change slightly to be compatible with the FAA's standards. Please see Appendix J of the Draft Master Plan Chapter V, Section 3.2.1 for a discussion of the runway operating configurations for Alternative A. Please also note that 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 alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to the No Action/No Project Alternative. Chapter 3 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.

**PC01355-3**

**Comment:**

This isn't thought out at all! They almost HAVE to use the outside runways (near where I live) if the predicted increase in traffic is to be accommodated. Also they almost HAVE to fly more night flights.

**Response:**

An element of the mitigation program at LAX is the continuation of current procedures that designate the inboard runways as preferred for use at night. Please see Section 3, Future Aircraft Operating Conditions, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for runway utilization percentages.

**PC01355-4**

**Comment:**

I live in Playa del Rey so I can enjoy the lovely temperature near the ocean. I don't want my windows shut at night and my air conditioner on so I can sleep at night. I don't want to pay higher electric bills when I could open a window instead. It's already too loud at night.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels. See Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding aircraft noise impacts on the Westchester-Playa del Rey communities. As indicated in TR-LU-2, although some areas would be newly exposed to high noise levels or substantial increases in existing noise levels, overall the number of units exposed to high noise levels would decrease compared to 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions. Participation in the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP) for eligible residential uses is voluntary. Residential sound insulation provided under the ANMP uses acoustically-rated doors and windows, which prevents cooling loss and therefore increases the effectiveness of the air conditioning system. Current participants have not expressed any concern to LAWA about increased electrical bills. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

**PC01355-5**

**Comment:**

I'm also worried about the chances for accidents with these planes flying in and out at the same time. I personally have driven to work in the morning along Pershing and have seen one airplane landing from the west and another one taking off toward the west at exactly the same time right above my car! They



were using outer runways, and it wasn't foggy that morning. I think there needs to be a lot more thought given to safety with more night traffic.

**Response:**

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

**PC01356      Knutson, Elizabeth      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01356-1**

**Comment:**

COMMENTS: This plan states that LAX domestic connecting passenger traffic is forecast to decline. I think this analysis doesn't account for the fact that if the number of flights at LAX increase, so will the connections to those flights. Something doesn't make sense here. It needs more study to convince me!

**Response:**

Alternatives A and B are not projected to have a loss in domestic connecting traffic. Alternative C would not be able to accommodate 100 percent of the 2015 forecast domestic connecting traffic due to the capacity constraints of the runway system. Alternative C commercial passenger operations are not projected to increase significantly from 1996 levels. Design day commercial operations totaled 2,055 in 1996. Alternative C design day commercial operations are expected to be 2,058 in 2015. (Please see Table V-3.35 in the Master Plan for a summary of the design day operational levels for the 2015 alternatives compared to 1996 levels.) The Master Plan projects that the airlines would focus on origin and destination (O&D) and profitable international traffic at LAX. It is assumed that the airlines would structure their networks to shift connecting passengers to other airports. The loss in connecting activity was taken into consideration in the development of the activity profiles for each alternative, and international activity was reduced from forecast levels as a result. Please see Chapter V, Section 3.3.2 for more information on the development of the activity profiles for each alternative. 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.

**PC01356-2**

**Comment:**

Assuming, however, that passenger connecting flights really would drop, and the number of flights at LAX increase as predicted, then there's an even worse nightmare - - the number of cars, busses, taxis, etc., on surface roads getting people to LAX for those flights will increase much more than predicted. I work at Los Angeles Air Force Base in El Segundo, and travel out of LAX all the time. Many of my co-workers travel just as frequently. They come from Orange County, the valley, and even as far as Riverside to take flights from LAX because the connections are so poor. If connecting flights don't increase, they will continue to drive to LAX along with all the other passengers taking those increased flights out of 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. Please also see Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts and Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

**PC01356-3**

**Comment:**

Isn't it time to have regional airports start growing, and originate flights from locations other than 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.

**PC01356-4**

**Comment:**

Much more study on the REAL impact of all this expansion must be done right now! I live in Playa del Rey, and drive to El Segundo to go to work every day. With all this extra traffic, and all the streets I currently drive changing to a ring road around LAX, I have no idea how I'll get to work! It's completely ridiculous to think that people from neighboring communities are all going to travel along the 2-lane road along the ocean (with all the crowds of tourists in the summer).

The impact of the tourist traffic at the beaches isn't considered at all - it should be!!! It's miserable already during summer months, without the ring roads and extra airport expansion and resulting 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. The increased traffic demand not affiliated with LAX, such as beach tourism in the summertime, is included in the traffic analyses as part of the Regional Transportation Plan. The proposed Ring Road would not impede access from Playa del Rey to El Segundo. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or the Ring Road.

<b>PC01357</b>	<b>Knutson, Elizabeth</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/16/2001</b>
----------------	---------------------------	----------------------	------------------

**PC01357-1**

**Comment:**

Every single alternative uses Pershing, Sepulveda, Westchester Parkway, and Imperial as a ring road. That's the proposed answer to all the traffic problems. From what I read there aren't any major problems with the other traffic outside these borders, such as freeway access and other surface roads. I DISAGREE! I live in Playa del Rey, and work in El Segundo. I drive these roads every day. If hundreds of more people, and more trucks hauling cargo descend on this area, especially during holidays, I'd like to know how I'm supposed to get to work - I need to get from one side of the airport to the other. The reason I moved here in 1994 was to be close to work. I also plan to retire where I'm living. Those four streets are my main way to get in and out of Playa del Rey. Many times already they are overcrowded - particularly during holidays when LAX is jammed. During those times, I avoid Sepulveda altogether and take Pershing. In the summer, Vista del Mar along the ocean isn't an option, particularly in the evening with tourists and other commuter traffic trying to avoid Sepulveda. Also, many times when I'm taking the 105 freeway toward the West, I've seen traffic lined up STOPPED on the freeway almost to the ramp from the northbound 405, all waiting to turn north on Sepulveda. I've narrowly missed accidents as people swerve to avoid the stopped cars.

**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. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts and Topical Response TR-ST-7 regarding Westchester Southside traffic. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road.

**PC01357-2**

**Comment:**

(LAX expansion) This alternative is unfair, unsafe, and not realistic. It's a dream to think that one ring road (especially involving Sepulveda) will answer all the traffic problems.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2, in particular Subtopical Response TR-ST-2.7 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 alleviate airport-related traffic in Westchester. There are a number of mitigations proposed, as outline in the Draft EIS/EIR. These mitigation are not intended to answer all of the traffic problems. They are successful at mitigating the impacts of the proposed plan. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC01357-3**

**Comment:**

And what about my quiet Playa del Rey community, where it's now safe to work, and we can park on the street in peace? You can't tell me that Falmouth and Manitoba traffic won't also increase?

**Response:**

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. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC01357-4**

**Comment:**

Also, how am I and my neighbors going to be able to get North toward Marina del Rey if Pershing is taken over an an alternative to Sepulveda? It's already a mess with rush hour and tourist traffic on a small two-lane road. where Pershing merges into Culver.

**Response:**

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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01358      Knutson, Elizabeth      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01358-1**

**Comment:**

COMMENTS: This paragraph lists intersections that weren't considered in analysis of traffic patterns. These intersections are every intersection on the proposed ring road around LAX. WHY WEREN'T THEY CONSIDERED or ANALYZED???? How can any analysis be considered thorough without considering the main intersections impacted by any expansion of LAX???? This is not only not thorough, it's ridiculous. Is the assumption that there won't be any problem? I have to cross from Playa del Rey to El Segundo to get to and from work every day. How is local traffic supposed to cross LAX without taking the ring road? This is a huge impact on all of us. I couldn't find anything that shows the plan even considered the impact of increased traffic on the ring road intersections - and that's the MAJOR impact, followed closely by the other nearby surface road impacts. It's a ridiculous, biased assumption to believe that all local traffic will just adjust and take the 2-lane road along the ocean! That would force us to all dump into the small traffic light in El Segundo or the vastly overcrowded light at Rosecrans to bypass the ring road if we're heading South. I used to go that way to work, but it took so long to turn East on Rosecrans from Vista Del Mar that I now take Sepulveda from Playa del Rey to El Segundo. MUCH MORE ANALYSIS NEEDS TO BE DONE TO REALLY DETERMINE THE IMPACT THIS RING ROAD WILL HAVE ON LOCAL TRAFFIC. THE ANALYSIS NEEDS TO INCLUDE THE IMPACT OF TRAFFIC INTO EL SEGUNDO FROM GRAND AS WELL. That road can't accommodate through traffic.

**Response:**

All major intersections in the vicinity of LAX were included in the Master Plan analyses. The Ring Road was designed with interchanges only, contrary to the commentor's assertion. The specific capacity requirements of the intersections formed by the new diamond interchanges would be analyzed in detail during the design phase of the project. Also, there would be several routes available to the commentor to travel between Playa del Rey and El Segundo, including Pershing/Sandpiper/Vista Del Mar, Lincoln/Sepulveda, or Pershing/Ring Road/Sepulveda. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the study areas. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC01359      Knutson, Elizabeth      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01359-1**

**Comment:**

COMMENTS: The noise abatement operating procedures discussed in this paragraph are NOT ADEQUATE. The idea of using inside runways between 2200 and 0700 is not realistic if airplanes of the future are much larger and much of it is cargo and international traffic that departs and arrives at night. I've seen planes taking off and landing at the same time, both over the ocean. They were dangerously close, and were not on adjacent runways. So it's much more realistic to assume they'll be using outer runways much more than this plan suggests, and that translates to more noise than predicted.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC01355-3. The noise abatement procedures delineating use of the inboard runways have been in effect at Los Angeles for more than thirty years. During the Over Ocean operations the FAA Airport Traffic Control Tower applies approved radar separation between easterly arrivals to the north runway (6R) and westerly departures from the south runway (25R). There is no consideration being given to changing these procedures. For further information regarding nighttime operations, please see Section 4.1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, as well as Topical Response TR-N-5.

**PC01359-2****Comment:**

Another inadequate aspect of the noise issue is that more planes = more noise! It's that simple. All the charts in the world showing the noise areas around the airport can't change the fact that each airplane that flies within the "noise area" adds more time that we in the local community are subjected to the sound. It's already bad where I live at night - I don't want it to get worse, and don't think the way it's addressed in this plan comes close to being thorough.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.2. Please see Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-2.1. 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.

**PC01360****Knutson, Elizabeth****None Provided****7/16/2001****PC01360-1****Comment:**

COMMENTS: The EIS says they don't expect construction of a ring road to affect communities. I live in Playa del Rey, and the majority of my driving and access to my home is on all four of the roads that would comprise the ring road, and I can tell you that THIS IS NOT TRUE! There will be a MAJOR impact on my and everyone I know in Playa del Rey. I commute every day to El Segundo. I don't take Vista del Mar because traffic is backed up to turn left at Rosecrans in Manhattan Beach. This is NOW - before any expansion of LAX. What will it be in a few years, let alone if a ring road is established and all of us wanting to go South have to use it? The idea of taking Sandpiper to Vista del Mar is ridiculous. There's no light onto Vista del Mar, and in the summer with all the beach tourist traffic, you can't turn onto Vista del Mar even NOW!

This analysis is biased, completely inadequate, and needs much more study of local traffic patterns at different times of the day and different times of the year. RE-DO this whole study! It's incomplete, and totally FALSE!

**Response:**

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. The Ring Road is designed to remove much of the airport traffic from the surrounding communities and focus it on the Ring Road. 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. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC01361****Knutson, Elizabeth****None Provided****7/16/2001****PC01361-1****Comment:**

COMMENTS: This human health risk assessment study by LAWA of air quality around LAX is supposed to be done around 2002! So how can cancer risks results be presented when the study isn't even done yet? I don't believe it! This EIS should be amended when the study is complete - - and the

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

public should be allowed to see and comment on it after it's done. The EIS can't make assumptions about what it thinks the study may show! I live in Playa del Rey where there's a high concentration of people in condos and apartments near LAX. This issue is more important to me than any other topic in the EIS, and it's being treated almost as if it's a side issue. Lately I've heard on the news of the affect of particles in the air on cancer risk. It scares me. Where I live, very near the existing north runway, my condo has constant dust and dirt on my porcelain sink and on my carpet along the walls where the vacuum won't reach. I've never had air this dirty anywhere else I've lived.

I love Playa del Rey, plan to retire here, and can't afford to move. I want the air quality to be BETTER in the future, not worse. And I don't want a sloppy, incomplete EIS analysis in this area. This is my health and quality of life - and it matters to me! COMPLETE THE STUDY, and resubmit it to the public for review and comment when it's done. Please don't rush this!

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-HRA-1 regarding the reevaluation of environmental baseline conditions and Topical Response TR-AQ-2 regarding LAX ambient air quality and source apportionment study.

A complete human health risk assessment for the LAX Master Plan has been performed and was presented in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Cancer risks were evaluated based on modeled emissions associated with proposed alternatives, and were calculated using conservative (protective) exposure assumptions. For example, when estimating exposure, residents were assumed to spend 70 years, 24 hours per day at the location of maximum impact. This approach is consistent with standard practice defined by regulatory agencies charged with protection of human health. A detailed discussion of the human health risk assessment process was provided in the Draft EIS/EIR in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and Technical Report 14a, Human Health Risk Assessment, and current estimates of possible risks and hazards were presented in Section 4.24 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The environmental baseline has also been reevaluated.

A Source Apportionment Study was and is still contemplated for the area near LAX. The study was significantly delayed by the events of September 11, 2001, and still has not begun. No date is available at this time as to when the study will start or when data will be available. As currently designed, the study will seek to assess the current contribution of airport-related emissions to total emissions from all sources, and has no health risk assessment component. The study, in its current form would not be able to predict the impacts of future changes to airport operations.

<b>PC01362</b>	<b>Knutson, Elizabeth</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/16/2001</b>
----------------	---------------------------	----------------------	------------------

**PC01362-1**

**Comment:**

COMMENTS: There's no master plan commitment to mitigate transportation off airport. Vehicle demand impact through intersections is called "significant and unavoidable". That's a summary of the analysis? It's completely inadequate. There's no valid mitigation plan for residents in the local area. I live in Playa del Rey, work in El Segundo, and drive all around the local area. How am I supposed to drive to and from Playa del Rey and not get involved in the ring road traffic? It impacts everything I do. I would expect the analysis of this area to be much more thorough.

**Response:**

There are a series of off-airport traffic mitigation measures proposed, as summarized in Section 4.3.2.9 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Except for nine intersections in Alternative C, six intersections in Alternatives A and B, and three intersections in Alternative D, these measures would fully mitigate the project impacts off-airport. Also, the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR were "program level" environmental documents intended to analyze the impacts of a Master Plan. It is acknowledged that further documentation may be required to address certain environmental issues in a more specific manner, as necessary and appropriate.

**PC01363      Knutson, Elizabeth      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01363-1**

**Comment:**

COMMENTS: The whole Air Quality evaluation is completely INADEQUATE from my point of view as a Playa del Rey resident who's lived here for 6 years, and plans to retire here! I disagree that air quality will be less than the current environmental baseline in 2015 if alternative A, B, or C is chosen. I don't believe this analysis is accurate. I've seen the air become dirtier just since I moved here in 1994.

**Response:**

The Draft EIS/EIR does not indicate that air quality in 2015 under Alternatives A, B, and C would be less than the current environmental baseline. Rather, the Draft EIS/EIR indicates that significant air quality impacts would occur when compared to baseline conditions. Please see Response to Comment PC00070-1 for a discussion of existing air quality and Response to Comment PC00045-3 for a discussion of the air quality impacts for the Master Plan build alternatives.

**PC01363-2**

**Comment:**

My carpets and furniture are covered with dirt and dust in less than a day after I dust. There are large particles of dust in my sink within a day of scouring it - it used to take a week. I don't see any summary of a study of air particles or airborne dirt/dust.

**Response:**

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

**PC01363-3**

**Comment:**

The only air quality study that might cover it isn't scheduled to be completed until 2002. That doesn't cut it! There are health issues, quality of life, etc. that aren't defined for local residents like me. I want to know what they are, and have some confidence that they are thorough. This EIS should wait for those results, present them to the public, and allow us to comment on them.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-2 regarding toxic air pollutants.

**PC01363-4**

**Comment:**

Also, I want to know if the increase in dirty/dusty air is due to the plane or to the local traffic around the airport. Analysis of where it's coming from might help determine what can be done to mitigate the problems. All of this should be addressed before any expansion is even discussed!

**Response:**

It is unclear to what increase the commentor is referring. Any current dirty/dusty air in and around the airport would be unrelated to the current LAX Master Plan. However, an analysis of fugitive dust from construction and operation of the proposed project has been conducted. An extensive list of fugitive dust-related mitigation measures will be included in the proposed project; many of which would prevent most of dust from the construction site ever reaching the local streets and highways (i.e., truck covers, watering, wheel washers, site paving, etc.).

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

Please see Response to Comment PC01196-12 regarding air quality impacts and further mitigation measures.

#### PC01363-5

##### Comment:

The answer isn't to get double windows, etc. Breathing air conditioned air isn't healthy either, and costs more in electricity bills!

##### Response:

The comment does not raise any specific environmental issues. Comment noted.

<b>PC01364</b>	<b>Knutson, Elizabeth</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/16/2001</b>
----------------	---------------------------	----------------------	------------------

#### PC01364-1

##### Comment:

COMMENTS: This chapter discussing mitigation measure for the airport noise is inadequate. It says in one part, that to reduce noise levels at the source, reduction of the sound emitted by aircraft is necessary. How does putting larger aircraft (the superjets of the future), adding more runways (as in the expansion alternatives), or adding more airplanes day and night contribute to this mitigation measure? Does this analysis mean that the expected increase in noise between now and 2015 would be less than without the expansion? The chapter seems to be purposefully vague in this area. It talks about the noise impact area around the airport potentially growing by 2015 without expansion. However, I live within the noise area in Playa del Rey. It is in the noise area now, and will be in the noise area with any expansion alternative. If there's a runway added to the north, you can't tell me that the noise where I live won't increase!!! The analysis does NOT show anything that might mitigate the noise WHERE I LIVE. It looks like a very arrogant assumption that those people in the noise area will still be in a noise area, so it's not worth much study. It doesn't support expansion to tell us how much the noise will increase.

Several noise monitors were set up in local areas around the airport. None of them were between condo buildings where airplane noise echoes between buildings. The monitoring effort is inadequate.

The chapter talks about capacity modification as a "questionable" risk mitigator, because it doesn't support expansion. But it WOULD reduce noise! It appears that any mitigation efforts that conflict with the purpose of the expansion plan were not addressed in the mitigation plan. I thought the EIS was supposed to be unbiased. At the minimum, it should be thorough, and it should explain what the impact of all this expansion really is to the nearby residents. This whole area should be redone.

##### Response:

The commentor accurately describes a portion of the forecasts provided in the Draft EIS/EIR. Aircraft noise can be addressed either at the source (noise abatement) or after the fact through noise mitigation (acoustical treatment). With the Phase-out of Stage 2 aircraft at the end of 1999 a large source of noise was reduced by getting rid of the older noisier aircraft. Larger aircraft, adding runways and additional aircraft operations are not considered as mitigation measures as described by the commentor. Mitigation measures 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 and the related appendices, Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, Land Use Technical Report, S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report and S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report. Larger aircraft does not necessarily mean a greater noise impact area. For more information regarding more traffic and larger aircraft please see Topical Response TR-N-6. Additional runways were looked at as a potential mitigation measure, however, due to the proximity of homes to LAX it was not feasible measure. Reasons for this decision are described in detail in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, Section 7.1.4.1 Runway Extensions and New Runways. The noise analysis does show that there will be an increase in population newly exposed to noise levels above 65 CNEL for all project alternatives (A-D). This was described in detail in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and the related appendices, Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, Land Use Technical Report, S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report and S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report.



The commentor's concern for noise increases in Playa Del Rey is acknowledged. For information regarding future noise increases and mitigation, please see Alternative-Specific Abatement Opportunities in Section 7.2 of Appendix D., Aircraft Noise Technical Report, and in particular Section 7.2.2, Alternative A. LAWA's current noise monitoring system has 26 noise microphones located throughout the surrounding communities, including three that are located within a half-mile radius of the commentor's location of Playa Del Rey. Noise monitor PL2 is the closest and it is located approximately 2000 feet west of the commentor's residence. LAWA acknowledges that there would be impacts associated with the project alternatives and these were thoroughly defined in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and the related appendices, Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, Land Use Technical Report, S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report and S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report. That is why mitigation measures were studied and some were discarded and others would be implemented. The commentor is correct in identifying that Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, Section 7, Noise Mitigation, identifies Capacity Limitations as a potential noise abatement measure however, it was discarded due to the restrictions contradicting the purpose of the project. Additionally, please see Topical Responses TR-N-1 regarding the noise modeling approach, TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation, and TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement. Please also see Response to Comment PC00499-1 regarding noise impacts in Playa Del Rey.

**PC01365      Knuston, Elizabeth      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01365-1**

**Comment:**

COMMENTS: The receptor sites for detecting noise don't adequately measure the noise where I live. In condo complexes in Playa del Rey, where I live, the aircraft noise echoes between buildings, making it louder - and longer - than it might sound on a street corner. Also, the analysis doesn't say when the samples were taken. At night, when there's a cloud cover, the noise is often unbearable. The whole noise analysis and mitigation plan is completely inadequate. Paragraph 4.1.6.1.1.2, says that even with the no-action alternative the noise will be larger in 2015. So why would adding more and larger airplanes, and a runway closer to the community result in few airplanes at night? It doesn't add up, and the analysis doesn't explain it, and in fact contradicts common sense! Please re-do this whole analysis, summarize it in clear terms, and let the whole community see the results. The whole paragraph appears designed to skirt around the real issue of whether the planned expansion will increase the noise in our area, and by how much.

**Response:**

The 25 noise monitoring sites that LAX currently operates 24-hours per day, 365 days per year, have been reviewed and approved by the State of California and are measuring noise levels to the state's requirements. Weather, at times, plays a role for a perceived increase in noise levels. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase. The No Action/No Project Alternative assumes that no new improvements would be implemented during the planning period with the exception of currently planned and programmed projects at the airport and related regional transportation infrastructure. The airlines are expected to change the air service provided at the airport as a result of the capacity limitations imposed by the continuation of the environmental baseline four system runway and airspace configuration and by environmental baseline terminal facility and aircraft gate limitations. The fleet of aircraft is expected to include a larger share of wide-body aircraft up to the capacity of the present terminals. Of all alternatives identified, the No Action/No Project Alternative shows the smallest increase in nighttime operations forecasted for 2015. Please see Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, Section 3.1, No Action/No Project Alternative Conditions in the Draft EIS/EIR for a detailed description of the No Action/No Project Alternative and the Land Use Technical Report for specific impacts to surrounding communities. 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

---

**PC01366**      **Enriquez, Edward & Jean**      **None Provided**      **7/17/2001**

**PC01366-1**

**Comment:**

We have lived in Playa del Rey since 1957 (first on Rindge Ave. midway between the Southern & Northern airport runways) and have endured increasing levels and frequency of airplane take-off noise in the last few years. Such noise, particularly when outdoors, is very disturbing and objectionable.

The expansion of LAX will definitely increase such noise levels in Playa del Rey as well as Westchester, El Segundo and Inglewood; accordingly the expansion elsewhere (Palmdale, Ontario etc) is the best and most considerate solution to airplane noise disturbance as well as air pollution and traffic congestion.

**Response:**

For information regarding increased noise levels see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.2. Depending on what alternative is implemented, the communities of Westchester, El Segundo or Inglewood may be impacted. For a more detailed description, refer to Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. 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. Additionally, please see Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, Appendix G, Air Quality Impact Analysis, and Topical Response TR-ST-4 for a more detailed analysis on noise, air pollution and traffic concerns. 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 Response to Comment PC00499-01 regarding noise impacts on Playa Del Rey.

**PC01367**      **Kennedy, Emma**      **None Provided**

**PC01367-1**

**Comment:**

1. KEEPING OUR COMMUNITY WHOLE - Bad for the community & neighborhood

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

**PC01367-2**

**Comment:**

2. "CARGO DEMAND" LAWA is focusing it's expansion to meet projected cargo demand. Areas of concern include large cargo aircraft, more flights, heavy aircraft operations, development of area surrounding the airport for distribution, heavy shipping, warehousing, high truck and cargo traffic.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00908-9 regarding cargo demand. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

**PC01367-3****Comment:**

3. SAFETY- Overcrowding of the air corridors may lead to likelihood of air disasters.

**Response:**

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

**PC01367-4****Comment:**

4. NOISE - FAA requires LAX to use a community noise equivalent level to measure noise impact. The CNEL is a weighted daily average, thereby discounted the loud single event noises.

**Response:**

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC00148-7; please refer to Response to Comment PC00148-7.

**PC01367-5****Comment:**

Homes in 65 CNEL are eligible for soundproofing. 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.

**PC01367-6****Comment:**

5. Air Pollution - Auto emission, emission from planes idling and jet fuel emissions. LAX is one of the regions single largest sources of NOx emissions - the primary precursor to ozone. 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. The EIR/EIS predicts that the increased emissions of all five 'criteria pollutants' (the five EPA- classified major air pollutants).

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00043-6 regarding LAX as a source of air pollution.

**PC01367-7****Comment:**

6. TRAFFIC - Increase in cargo volume will lead to thousands more trucks.

**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.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

#### **PC01367-8**

**Comment:**

Construction will bring more traffic, though it may be temporary.

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00908-4. Please see Response to Comment PC00908-4.

#### **PC01367-9**

**Comment:**

Expansion would add numerous cars to our already impacted surface streets and freeways. Local traffic will 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. 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.

#### **PC01367-10**

**Comment:**

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 Response to Comment PC00887-2.

#### **PC01367-11**

**Comment:**

7. The proposed LAX expansion is bad for the environment, including our already threatened coastal wetlands, increased and concentrated noise, air and water pollution.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed wetlands impacts in Section 4.12, Wetlands, noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.1, Land Use, air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and water quality impacts in Section 4.7, Hydrology and Water Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendices D, G, and J2 and Technical Reports 1, 4, and 7 of the Draft EIS/EIR, and Appendices S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-4, and S-5 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

#### **PC01367-12**

**Comment:**

8. REGIONAL SOLUTION - The Master Plan is a short term quick fix approach. Long term planning is needed. The city of Los Angeles owns two key airports in the heart of high growth areas of the region, Ontario and Palmdale. It would be more efficient to develop these airports as opposed 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.

**PC01367-13****Comment:**

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.

**Response:**

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

**PC01367-14****Comment:**

Why should the communities around LAX bare the burden of Orange Counties, need for air commerce.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

**PC01367-15****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.

**PC01368****Markovitch, Michael    None Provided****7/18/2001****PC01368-1****Comment:**

As a resident of Westchester, I am most concerned at the possible over expansion of LAX.

Although I realize that a city as vibrant as L.A. needsto improve its airport facilities to meet anticipated need, I believe that the citizens of Westchester and Inglewood haveborn their fair share of the burden of noise and pollution and that the expansion of the LAX facility should be kept to the bare minimum with appropriate facilities being developed in other areas of the county to fill the need.

I do think that the light rail should have been extended into the airport in order to relieve road traffic.

### 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.

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester and Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

**PC01369      Reilly, Theresa      None Provided      7/17/2001**

**PC01369-1**

**Comment:**

I feel strongly that the Orange County Residents should take responsibility for an airport at the El Toro location.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

**PC01369-2**

**Comment:**

How much more damage can the Westchester Area endure? We need to focus beautifying the areas directly adjacent to LAX rather than over expansion of it. (out of state visitors are shocked at the unattractiveness of Sepulv. Bl.)

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed aesthetics in Section 4.21, Design, Art and Architecture Application/Aesthetics. 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.

**PC01369-3**

**Comment:**

The population of Orange County has been booming for years - An airport of large proportions is definitely needed! They are delaying the inevitable.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

**PC01370      Lingenfelter, Steven      None Provided      7/18/2001**

**PC01370-1**

**Comment:**

I oppose the Los Angeles International Airports plans for expansion. There is too much airport noise and pollution already in this 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. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

**PC01370-2**

**Comment:**

The airport should transfer all (air cargo) shipping to the Palmdale Airport

**Response:**

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

**PC01370-3**

**Comment:**

The airport should extend the rapid transit (Blue Line) to the airport to help mitigate the horrible traffic and parking situation inside the airport. Airport vendors - parking and shuttles - both charge too much for their services -

**Response:**

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

**PC01370-4**

**Comment:**

there is too much development in and around the airport already - Polynesian Apt, Playa Vista, etc.

**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.

**PC01370-5**

**Comment:**

Traffic problems are not being addressed or mitigated at all -

**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 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.

#### PC01370-6

**Comment:**

with development and expansion of the airport just means more noise, more traffic more pollution, more people, more air traffic around my home -

**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; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and growth inducement in Section 4.5, Induced Socio-Economics (Growth Inducement). 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.

**PC01371      Avedesian, K. Starr      None Provided      7/16/2001**

#### PC01371-1

**Comment:**

I am writing this letter to document my opposition of various aspects of the LAX airport expansion.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment 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.

#### PC01371-2

**Comment:**

My unit is on the corner of Falmouth / Manitoba. We experience a great deal of traffic through this intersection. Often people demonstrate a complete lack of regard for traffic signs & posted speed limits. If the intersections of Falmouth / Westchester Pkwy and Loyola / Westchester Pkwy are closed, this condition will eventually worsen. It will become increasingly more dangerous to take a walk in the a.m. or have children ride their bikes on the sidewalk. The streets are not intended to be major thoroughfares, rather residential community access roads.

I hope that the city and LAX can consider the impact of closing the aforementioned intersections. I think that humanity should come before convenience & travel!

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00217-1. Please see Response to Comment PC00217-1. Please also see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

**PC01372      Jagow, Renee      None Provided      7/14/2001**

#### PC01372-1

**Comment:**

Being this close to LAX, we have serious concerns about NOISE, traffic, and air pollution.



**Response:**

Impacts associated with noise, traffic, and air quality were described in Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use, Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and Section 4.6, Air Quality of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01372-2**

**Comment:**

The soundproofing program does nothing to alleviate these issues. It is only tolerable now.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program, in particular TR-LU-3.6 regarding the effectiveness of the residential sound insulation. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

**PC01372-3**

**Comment:**

Expansion would make Westchester a bad place to live.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

<b>PC01373</b>	<b>Desrosiers, Albert</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/14/2001</b>
----------------	---------------------------	----------------------	------------------

**PC01373-1**

**Comment:**

Coordinated regional development including airports at Ontario and Palmdale and El Toro is essential.

Basic to this is a transportation system appropriate for the population and use.

**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-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

---

#### PC01373-2

**Comment:**

High-speed, off-the-surface rail is the basic solution. Population centers should be served as well as the airports and other foci of transportation. Rails should enter the airport and directly serve each terminal.

**Response:**

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

#### PC01373-3

**Comment:**

Surface streets and freeways should be renovated to overcome basic weaknesses of design. A case in point: exits from the 105 to northbound Sepulveda leading to the airport entry is permanently bottlenecked due to the inept design and ignorance of the volume of traffic using it.

**Response:**

The westbound off-ramp from I-105 to Sepulveda Boulevard is an existing facility under Caltrans responsibility. At the request of LAWA, Caltrans recently improved this off-ramp by adding a second lane. This has doubled capacity and helped to reduce operational problems associated with this off-ramp. Additional improvements are programmed for this off-ramp and will be implemented by Caltrans in the very near future. As shown in Technical Report 3b, Attachment D, traffic volumes on this ramp would continue to increase until they exceed the new capacity during the AM peak hour in 2015 if the LAX Master Plan is not implemented. With implementation of Master Plan Alternatives A, B, C, or D, the rate of traffic growth on this ramp would decrease, and its demand would stay below capacity through and beyond 2015. See also Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

**PC01374**

**McKenzie, Sybil**

**None Provided**

**7/16/2001**

#### PC01374-1

**Comment:**

Use your sense, do not destroy the city of Westchester - this will happen if you take away most of the business district.

**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, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative), does not include any acquisition within the Westchester Business District in contrast to the other build alternatives. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01374-2****Comment:**

Move air cargo from LAX to Palmdale.

**Response:**

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

**PC01374-3****Comment:**

In my building we already wear earplugs in order to sleep!

**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.

**PC01374-4****Comment:**

Most other cities (major ones) in other countries have had the sense to build airports miles from major population. Sydney Australia is a prime example, an airport to be proud of, built by order of people with common sense.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01375****Callahan, Vivian****None Provided****7/18/2001****PC01375-1****Comment:**

Please do not expand LAX. The traffic is already unbearable. Near-misses in the skies are a constant threat to those of us who live nearby. These threats will become realities with increased volume. NO! Don't expand LAX - move it!!! It's noisy, it pollutes, it crowds, it's dangerous - it doesn't belong where it is!!!

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, noise 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, 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

---

**PC01376      Truax, Susan      None Provided      7/15/2001**

**PC01376-1**

**Comment:**

I am writing to express my opposition to the Master Expansion Plan currently under consideration by LAWA. I have lived adjacent to LAX for the past 17 years, first in Playa del Rey, and for the past ten years in El Segundo. I enjoy our close proximity to a major airport, and I am willing to trade the occasional early turn for the convenience of being just minutes away for personal travel and when we have out of town visitors.

**Response:**

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

**PC01376-2**

**Comment:**

I think that a regional approach to airport expansion makes sense from so many angles, some of which I have enumerated below. But aside from LAX neighbors unfairly having to bear the additional pollution and traffic associated with your plan, I think it is quite arrogant for you to assume that residents of Los Angeles and Orange Counties are willing to drive several hours to reach LAX, which under your plan, will be the only airport that will be large enough to offer a variety of competitively priced flights to worldwide destinations. (How could any regional airport compete with the monstrosity you propose?) Shouldn't everyone have the same access to easy travel if we are truly planning for 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.

**PC01376-3**

**Comment:**

The proposed expansion of LAX will likely generate far more than the 89 to 98 million passengers the airport claims it will. The current airport was projected to handle 40 million passengers per year and now serves 67 million. The history of LAX suggests that the Master Plan could well result in volumes as high as 120 million annual passengers and the EIR should, but does not, analyze the impacts associated with this much higher volume. How could you let this happen?

**Response:**

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

**PC01376-4****Comment:**

An environmental impact report is supposed to consider a reasonable range of alternatives to the project. But, the EIR never seriously considers a truly regional airport solution.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to 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.

**PC01376-5****Comment:**

Nor does the EIR consider any alternative that would result in fewer adverse impacts than LAWA's preferred plan, Alternative C.

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC01094-4; please see Response to Comment PC01094-4.

**PC01376-6****Comment:**

LAWA says the plan represents an increase of only 44 takeoffs and landings per day. However, I believe these projections are held artificially low by favorable assumptions about fleet mix. These assumptions, what we call "fleet mix voodoo," are not justified and the impacts resulting from additional takeoffs and landings must be analyzed.

**Response:**

Please see Responses to Comments PC00599-7 and PC00593-1 for a discussion on the fleet mix assumptions and the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in evaluating different activity levels. Please also see Response to Comment PC00631-5. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

**PC01376-7****Comment:**

The I-405 is already averaging 18-23 mph during peak hour. Because of regional growth it will slow to 10-16 mph in twenty years. The LAX expansion will only make that worse. Oddly, impacts of the LAX expansion on the I-405 are hardly examined in the EIR. This omission is a glaring deficiency in the EIR.

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC01247-10. Please see Response to Comment PC01247-10.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01376-8

**Comment:**

LAX is already the region's largest single source of smog-forming NOx emissions. The expansion plan will as much as triple the NOx emissions from the airport. Yet, you plan to mitigate only about 30% of the new NOx emissions. Additional mitigation measures should be included in the EIR. Why has this not been done?

**Response:**

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included a revised air quality mitigation measure with many components, that describes in greater detail those efforts being carried forward and their associated emission reductions. LAWA intends to adopt and implement all feasible mitigation measures. It is important to note the mitigation measures for some types and sources of pollutants are more readily available than others. There are very few available and feasible mitigation measures to reduce NOx. Those measures which are currently available are insufficient to mitigate the NOx-related impacts of the project to below a level of significance.

#### PC01376-9

**Comment:**

All three scenarios for expansion propose to more than double cargo activity at LAX. That will double the truck traffic and diesel emissions LAX neighbors will have to breathe.

**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. 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.

#### PC01376-10

**Comment:**

Main arteries like Sepulveda Blvd. are already grid-locked at rush hour. The expansion of LAX will turn Sepulveda Blvd. into a parking lot.

**Response:**

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

#### PC01376-11

**Comment:**

I know the quality of life in El Segundo will be irreversibly damaged if the expansion of LAX is ever approved by the Los Angeles City Council. You must do your part to avoid severe expansion at LAX by seriously exploring a regional approach as an answer to LAX's overcrowding.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC01377      Schat, David      None Provided      7/5/2001**

**PC01377-1**

**Comment:**

I'm writing this letter to express my opposition to the proposed expansion of LAX. I am not opposed to progress but this expansion's benefits are outweighed by the negative impact on the surrounding communities. I believe that a regional airport expansion program would be a greater benefit to Airline travelers as well as freight companies.

**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-LU-1 regarding 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.

**PC01377-2**

**Comment:**

I would like you to address some questions I have regarding the plan and the Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

The current LAWA plan calls for the expansion to accommodate 89-98 million passengers. The current airport was projected to handle 40 million passengers but now handles 67 million or 67.5% over the projection. I am unaware of a limit placed on the airport that will not allow more than 89-98 million passengers. Why does the EIR not address the possibility of the airport handling as much as 120 million passengers or more? Will you include a limit in the LAWA plan of no more than 98 million passengers to conform to the EIR? Will you expand the EIR to include the possibility of the airport handling as much as 120 million passengers?

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00593-1 for a discussion on the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in evaluating different activity levels. Please also see Response to Comment PC00928-3 regarding the ability of airport operators or the Federal Aviation Administration to limit activity at an airport. Also please refer to Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected capacity levels at LAX.

**PC01377-3**

**Comment:**

Why did the EIR not consider a regional airport plan in more detail? Will you expand the EIR to include further examination of this alternate plan? If not, please comment on why you feel this is not necessary.

**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

---

#### PC01377-4

**Comment:**

Why did the EIR not consider any other plans other than the LAWA preferred plan "Alternative C"?

**Response:**

In addition to Alternative C, the Draft EIS/EIR considered two other build alternatives, Alternatives A and B, and the No Action/No Project Alternative. Moreover, subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option - Alternative D - was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. A Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR was prepared that provides a comprehensive description and analysis of this alternative and was circulated for public review and comment.

#### PC01377-5

**Comment:**

The LAWA plan indicates a projection for an increase of only 44 takeoffs and landings per day. I understand this projection is based on assumptions about fleet mix. Did you use assumptions that would keep this number (44) as a "best case" scenario? I would like a projection of the increase in takeoffs and landings using "worst case" scenarios? Will you expand the EIR to examine the impact of increased takeoffs and landings in the "worst case" scenario? If the EIR is based on an increase of 44 takeoffs and landings per day, will you place a limit in the LAWA plan to not exceed this number?

**Response:**

As discussed in Chapter V, Section 3.3.2, page V-3.183 of the Master Plan, the air service and activity levels assumed for Alternative C should be viewed as the maximum practical levels. Please see Response to Comment PC00593-1 for a discussion on the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in evaluating different activity levels. Please also see Response to Comment PC00928-3 regarding the ability of airport operators or the Federal Aviation Administration to limit activity at an airport. Please see Response to Comment PC00631-5. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

#### PC01377-6

**Comment:**

The EIR hardly addresses the impact of the expansion on the I-405 freeway. Why does the EIR not include more study on the impact of the I-405? This freeway is already very slow during rush hours. Will you expand the EIR to include more study of the impact on the I405 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-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

#### PC01377-7

**Comment:**

LAX is already the region's largest single source of smog-forming NOx emissions. The expansion plan will as much as triple the NOx emissions from the airport. Yet, LAWA plans to mitigate only about 30% of the new NOx emissions. Additional mitigation measures should be included in the EIR.



**Response:**

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included a revised air quality mitigation measure with many components, that describes in greater detail those efforts being carried forward and their associated emission reductions. LAWA intends to adopt and implement all feasible mitigation measures. It is important to note the mitigation measures for some types and sources of pollutants are more readily available than others. There are very few available and feasible mitigation measures to reduce NOx. Those measures which are currently available are insufficient to mitigate the NOx-related impacts of the project to below a level of significance.

**PC01377-8**

**Comment:**

All three LAWA expansion scenarios propose to double the cargo activity at LAX. This will double the truck traffic and deisel emmissions I will have to breath. This is unacceptable to me.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

**PC01377-9**

**Comment:**

The noise from the airport is already quite high and degrades the quality of life in El Segundo. This plan will increase that noise. What measures are proposed to mitigate the increased noise?

**Response:**

Noise-sensitive uses within the City of El Segundo exposed to the 65 CNEL under the 1996 baseline were described in Section 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 4.2.3 and shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As presented in Section 4.2.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, there is a reduction in noise-sensitive uses exposed to the 65 CNEL under Alternatives A, B, C, and D compared to both 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions and no noise-sensitive uses are newly exposed under these alternatives.

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, included an analysis of high single event noise levels that result in nighttime awakening. This area is defined by the 94 dBA SEL noise contour. The 94 dBA SEL contours for the 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions were shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As 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 is reduced from 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions in the City of El Segundo and no noise-sensitive uses are newly exposed under these alternatives.

Based on the above analysis, no areas within El Segundo would be newly exposed to significant high noise levels, and no mitigation measures would be required. Please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

**PC01378**

**Sims, Tom**

**None Provided**

**7/6/2001**

**PC01378-1**

**Comment:**

I suport a reginal plan insted of expanded LAX. Be Cous of the increect jet noise from SM airport I suport FOBs at LAX.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-4 regarding potential environmental impacts at surrounding other airports as a result of the LAX Master Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

**PC01379      Advincula, Cecilia      None Provided      7/3/2001**

**PC01379-1**

**Comment:**

I am a concerned Westchester resident. I graduated from Loyola Marymount University and have decided to make Westchester my home.

I am very much opposed to additional noise, traffic, crime and pollution that would result from the LAX expansion. LAX expansion would definitely cause an adverse quality of life for this place I now call home.

**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, social impacts in Section 4.4, Social Impacts, public services impacts in Section 4.26, Public Services, and air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality. 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts to quality of life and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts 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.

**PC01380      Green, Monica      Los Angeles Sheet Metal  
Workers' Local 108      7/10/2001**

**PC01380-1**

**Comment:**

Yes it's noisy. I can live with that. But the gridlock is unbearable. I support alternative "C". We need to make it better - and we can!

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01381      Kingwood, Ronald      Los Angeles Sheet Metal  
Workers' Local 108      7/9/2001**

**PC01381-1**

**Comment:**

I SUPPORT MASTER PLAN ALTERNATIVE "C"

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01381-2****Comment:**

LAX is overburdened. There have been 13 near collisions at LAX from January 2000 through May 2001.

**Response:**

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

**PC01381-3****Comment:**

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.

**PC01382****Dean, Michael****Los Angeles Sheet Metal  
Workers' Local 108****7/8/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00604; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00604.

**PC01383****Erland, Ann****Los Angeles Sheet Metal  
Workers' Local 108****7/10/2001****PC01383-1****Comment:**

I support Master Plan Alternative C which would ease the congestion that locks up the entire area. I live next to the 405 freeway but don't even try to use it from Friday afternoon through Sunday night because of the gridlock.

Please - let's not let it go another decade!

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01384****Weinstock, Joan****None Provided****PC01384-1****Comment:**

I would like to express my adamant opposition to the proposal for LAX expansion. The proposals as they stand - will not solve airport problems at all but only ruin neighborhoods -

### 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.

**PC01385**

**Sider, Scott**

**The Hertz Corporation**

**7/12/2001**

**PC01385-1**

**Comment:**

Please allow me to take a moment to express my thoughts on why the LAX expansion is positive and should go forward.

Based on passenger activity counts, the airport is already operating on levels in excess of its designed capacity. This excess of demand has resulted in additional traffic congestion on the 405 freeway, Sepulveda Boulevard, Pacific Coast Highway and surface streets in the surrounding communities. The high levels of passenger activity have also stressed airport infrastructure such as the central terminal roadways and curbs, passenger terminal facilities, cargo facilities, etc. The congestion at each of these facilities has added to existing air and noise pollution, and has served to diminish the quality of the travel experience for the passenger and the "quality of life" for the residents in the neighboring communities and for all the users of LAX.

The City of Los Angeles continues to market itself as a prime destination for tourists and as an attractive place to do business. The idea is that such efforts will draw additional tourists who will spend their money in the area and not only support, but also grow the well-established tourist industry. Outreach to the global business community is intended to promote existing Los Angeles businesses in the world market place, encourage the establishment of new competitive and supporting business and, indeed, establish new industries to diversify the economic base of Southern California. Each of these activities will only serve to increase the number of travelers to and from the Los Angeles area and using LAX. Local businesses having international contacts and international businesses with local contacts will continue to use LAX due to the critical mass of existing international flights and the governmental treaties covering international air travel rights.

Based on the above, it is easy to determine that airtravel to and from LAX will continue to increase with a resultant increase in the number of passengers, private vehicle trips, commercial vehicle trips, traffic congestion and pollution, regardless of whether the airport expands or not.

Moreover, we believe that the LAX expansion should go forward for the following reasons:

1. To accommodate the growth in air-travel, both passenger and freight, that will occur regardless of expansion.
2. To properly organize and manage the pedestrian, vehicle, and aircraft activity that will occur to provide for a safe, efficient, and cost-effective operation, while simultaneously relieving the burden on neighboring communities.
3. To provide a "best foot forward" to the traveling public that arrives at LAX, be they tourist, businessperson, or family visitor.
4. To accommodate growth in an environmentally friendly manner that flows vehicles expeditiously and reduces congestion and resultant pollution, that provides links to mass transit and encourages use of public transit to reduce traffic and emissions, and to provide efficient aircraft operations that reduce delays and resultant fuel waste and emissions.
5. To maintain the airport's position as an economic engine to Southern California by permitting the free flow of goods at competitive prices, expediting the movement of business people, and promoting and providing jobs to the community.

6. Under the current recommended option, the "expansion" focuses not on runways, but on collateral facilities that provide manage existing operations and provide a controlled environment for future activity.

This list provides a broad view of the factors and circumstances that LAX will be forced to address. If they, the airport and the city, choose to do nothing, then the airport could surely turn from an asset to a detriment with endless delays, increasing pollution, gridlock traffic, disgruntled travelers and surly employees.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01386          Pierson, Lynda          None Provided**

**PC01386-1**

**Comment:**

Read the Master Plan LAX brochure. Why cant Hawthorne Airport become part of LAX's future plans?

With it's history and location was sure it would be mentioned. If something doesn't happen soon it might become another mall [ something like the Hawthorne Piazza, closed empty ] as you probably already know about the battle over it staying.

It seems the perfect answer to a better flight future, it is after all, already here.

Helicopter port ? Leave it to the thinkers .....?

A voice. . . .that says it's here and worth saving !

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Master Plan has examined options from the beginning to redevelop Hawthorne Airport to provide runway capacity. It concluded that it is not practical because of strong opposition from the City of Hawthorne. In addition, excessive time would be required to implement the project since Hawthorne must approve LAX projects within their jurisdiction. Airline concerns about the operational impacts on flight schedules and longer connecting passenger processing time also contributed to the elimination of the options that include Hawthorne. For more information please see Chapter 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

**PC01387          Doeh, Giyora          West L.A. Realty, Inc.          7/4/2001**

**PC01387-1**

**Comment:**

I was unable to attend the hearings on June 9 due to a religious observance of mine. Instead here are my comments on the Draft LAX Master Plan and Draft EIS/EIR.

Firstly, let me congratulate you on the production of a comprehensive regional plan which addresses all the resources and activities in the region. Congratulations also on Alternative C, which proposes an improvement over current capacity of 10 MAP and 1.1 MAT of cargo with only a 21 daily flights increase.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01387-2

**Comment:**

The plan begins with a statement of purpose founded upon the "desire of the City of Los Angeles to maintain the airport's role as a global air transportation hub". I think there is ample evidence that this is not true. A fairer statement might be that the City desires to simply cope with the increasing air traffic as best it can with the least negative impact. If this is correct then the Plan is fatally flawed and needs to be revised accordingly.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

#### PC01387-3

**Comment:**

An alternative defined as "Action/No Project" is omitted and may well be the most preferable.

**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.

#### PC01387-4

**Comment:**

Its intent would be to define the actions that can be taken with no net negative/adverse impacts. Its features, derived from the list of common improvements could include:

-Construct a new west terminal and additional aircraft gates, rental car facilities and parking. These could use the existing roadways with appropriate intra-airport transportation modes. Additional new terminals could be located at the east end of the airport, accessible from Aviation Blvd.

-Construct a people mover connecting the new terminals to new concourses and all other terminals.

The above two improvements imply something important. It would shift the orientation from concentrating passengers coming off their transportation vehicles at the west of the airport to the east of the airport which is closest to their origination. It would not include a ring road. We currently have a ring road. It is much smaller than the one envisioned, but it is a significant contributor to smog and congestion as vehicles circle multiple times to find parking or space to transfer passengers. The proposed ring road would simply be a larger source of similar smog and congeestion. It would also increase the present very low rate of vehicle accidents.

-Having said that, a new LAX Espressway is not needed. Instead the existing off/on ramps could lead to passenger marshalling areas at Aviation Blvd, La Cienega Blvd. and, if the planned Arbor Vitae off/on ramps were completed, at Arbor Vitae. These marshalling or staging areas would be for the purpose of accepting and welcoming passengers into the airport, separating them from their vehicles and orienting them to rely on internal transportation modes, mainly people movers. These would be built to the east of the existing terminals.

-Extend the light rail Green Line directly into LAX. Consider whether this would be most feasible at the east end of the airport, without necessarily limiting the Line to only that route.

-Improve the taxisway/taxilane system of both the north and south airfields with no adverse impact

-Construct new internal roadways and cargo facilities with no adverse impact

**Response:**

This suggested concept is very similar to the new Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, Alternative D, which was analyzed in detail in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

**PC01387-5**

**Comment:**

-Build out the Westchester Southside with no adverse impact as a commercial improvement of benefit to the airport as well as the surrounding communities.

**Response:**

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC01298-5; please refer to Response to Comment PC01298-5.

**PC01387-6**

**Comment:**

-To accommodate the new larger aircraft, extend east the existing runway that abuts Aviation Blvd. This could be accomplished with a tunnel for Aviation similar to the one on Sepulveda. But a better, cheaper alternative would be to build up the airport property with fill to a high enough level to overpass Aviation. This might be a massive project but it would be literally dirt cheap. The higher elevation for landings would also offset the negative intrusion on the eastward community from airplanes landing further east.

**Response:**

The content of this comment is identical to the comment PC01298-6. Please see Response to Comment PC01298-6.

**PC01387-7**

**Comment:**

A general comment is offered in conclusion. This hemisphere and country were built by and large by pioneering-spirited people who seized the opportunities available to exploit free resources. Free in the sense that no one owned them. The conquistadores came for gold which they saw as free because they could discount the native population. The westward settlers, railroads, etc. found free land, water, timber and so on which they saw as free, again discounting the indigenous population as a simple annoyance. That era is over. It is over. And the air above us is no longer a free resource. Today's indigenous population of Los Angeles and its surrounding region owns the air and relies upon it for the very breath of life. That population must consider the value and the rental charge it must impose on the external users of its air, the airlines, when it gives up its air or its other environmental resources. The airlines bring economic benefit to us, but recognize also that none of them is based here and so their profits are exported from the region. An element of the plan to which the airlines might be invited would be a means for the airlines to contribute directly to the welfare of the community, for example by supporting medical facilities dealing with respiratory ailments.

**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-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01388      Witkowski, Marian      None Provided      7/13/2001**

**PC01388-1**

**Comment:**

1). The LAX expansion plan will effectively destroy a vital and important community.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01388-2**

**Comment:**

2) Traffic is already a serious problem in the area - expansion of airport will cause 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. 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.

**PC01388-3**

**Comment:**

3) Expanded cargo facility does not need to be located in this area - Surrounding facilities could be developed (Palmdale, Ontario, El Toro).

**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. 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.

**PC01389      Hoffman, Bonnie      None Provided      7/18/2001**

**PC01389-1**

**Comment:**

I am very opposed to the LAX 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.



**PC01389-2****Comment:**

I have lived in Inglewood for 27 years and have watched the pollution in the air increase with jet fuel emissions. I can wash my car and the next day it has a film of oil & dirt on it. It wasn't like that when we moved here. I don't even want to imagine how much worse it would be if the LAX expansion is OK'd.

**Response:**

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

**PC01389-3****Comment:**

Then there is the issue of increased traffic on all roads both freeway and surface streets. Why would you want to draw more traffic into an already overly congested area. This simply doesn't make sense and I think it would be a terrible mistake.

**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.

**PC01390****Carillo Kanfer, Gina      None Provided****7/20/2001****PC01390-1****Comment:**

My husband and I are raising a small child here in Playa Del Rey. Of course we do not want the LAX expansion because of the possible health effects it could have on our growing son and ourselves.

People live here! They want to stay healthy.

**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.

**PC01390-2****Comment:**

We have enough planes & traffic. We don't need any more.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01391      Green, Mr. & Mrs. Ed    None Provided**

**PC01391-1**

**Comment:**

We have been residents of Playa del Rey and Westchester for forty-five (45) years and the area surrounding LAX has become less desirable and less affordable during this time; when in fact, it should have increased in desirability. In our opinion these following points are our "bones of contention."

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

**PC01391-2**

**Comment:**

1. Traffic congestion in all directions around LAX. It is nearly intolerable now, and cannot help but worsen if LAX expands or even if it increases its passenger load.

**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.

**PC01391-3**

**Comment:**

2. Acquiring properties for expansion: Homeowner's who have the bulk of their assets in their home must relocate and not realize profit from this investment in the future.

**Response:**

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

**PC01391-4**

**Comment:**

3. Airport acquisition of property has robbed this area of much needed shopping, such as large malls, etc. (the nearest mall, Fox Hills, is becoming more difficult to reach due to airport 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 due to the LAX Expressway and ring road and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01391-5****Comment:**

4. Noise & air pollution is already at an unacceptable level.

**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.

**PC01391-6****Comment:**

5. It is now mandatory to be at least one or possibly two hours at LAX, prior to "take off", due to congestion.

**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.

**PC01391-7****Comment:**

6. Early on, LAX was a proud and clean, and efficient landmark, but sadly, it outgrew it's capabilities and the need for greater space for expansion is not available even if properties were acquired.

**Response:**

Please refer to Response to Comment PC00539-6 for more information on the land acquisition required for each alternative. Please also refer to Response to Comment PC00814-6 for information on the level of activity that could be accommodated by the alternatives.

**PC01391-8****Comment:**

7. We need to develop Palmdale, Ontario, El Toro to handle increased passenger & cargo growth, speaking of this, why is it necessary to bring freight into LAX? It puts such a burden on our streets with trucks.

**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. 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 also see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01391-9

**Comment:**

While on this tack let us ask why small private planes are allowed LAX airspace?? Why not mandate the small aircraft to small airports & reduce the safety hazard!

**Response:**

The airport is a public facility and so is the airspace. The accessibility to public facilities cannot be restricted in any discriminatory way. Therefore, LAWA does not have the legal authority to exclude small private aircraft (general aviation activity) at LAX. General aviation activity must be permitted to fly in and out of the LAX airspace in the future, as do commercial aircraft. FAA's mission is to ensure the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace in the United States. Please see Response to Comment PC00222-1 for more information on aircraft operations safety as well as Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. It is important to note that the unconstrained forecast projected minimal increase in general aviation activity (see Chapter III, Section 10.4 of the Master Plan). However, none of the alternatives predict that general aviation activity will increase in the future due to capacity constraints.

#### PC01391-10

**Comment:**

We were once very proud of this area, but now we have to defend our right to have a comfortable place to live.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

#### PC01391-11

**Comment:**

Is it all about money, politics or what?? Our votes will go to the people who espouse the expansion of outlying airports. so too, our friends & neighbors.

**Response:**

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

<b>PC01392</b>	<b>Tanner, Sydney</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/18/2001</b>
----------------	-----------------------	----------------------	------------------

#### PC01392-1

**Comment:**

I thinks it's outrageous that LAX plans to expand 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.

#### PC01392-2

**Comment:**

The traffic around the airport is already horrible - Forget about mitigating it for further developement.

**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.

**PC01392-3**

**Comment:**

I've heard each plane taking off dumps 100 lbs. of particles into our air - yuk! Let's have no more of that!

**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). The aircraft component of these emission inventories included emissions generated during the take-off, landing, and airborne modes and gave a comprehensive assessment of total particulate matter generated according to each Master Plan Alternative (i.e. No Action/No Project Alternative, Alternatives A, B, C and D). Detailed and updated information of aircraft-related emissions by individual mode are contained in Attachment N, Incremental Emissions by Alternative and Year, of Technical Report S4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Topical Response, TR-AQ-2 regarding toxic air pollutants.

**PC01392-4**

**Comment:**

Orange County, Palmdale & Ontario need to take responsibility for their own air traffic. We have no more room on our freeways or in the air we breath or the noise we tolerate for all their traffic too!

Communities such as Santa Maria, Orange County etc. are growing by leaps & bounds - so is LA (Playa Vista - 30,000 people!) LAX cannot be all things to all these people. IT SHOULD NOT EXPAND in the least 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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01393      Norlund, Pat      None Provided      7/17/2001**

**PC01393-1**

**Comment:**

As a resident of El Segundo, I am (needless to say) very concerned about the proposed Master Plan and especially as I live in the northwest corner of the city.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01393-2**

**Comment:**

During the 11 years that I have lived in El Segundo, the flights taking off from the south runway have increasingly flown further south over the northwest corner of the city, and in many instances, come directly over the buildings. I can look out my back window at the 747's taking off in the evening hours, and I swear the residents living in the buildings on the top of the hill at the end of Imperial Avenue could probably wave to passengers as the airplanes go by. They are so close and so low. If air traffic is increased to the extent that it sounds like it will be, the noise and pollution will be unbearable.

**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. The 747 is the largest US built aircraft and due to its size gives the impression of being much closer to the observer than it is. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Responses TR-N-3.3 and TR-N-3.2. Please also see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

**PC01393-3**

**Comment:**

And, it will be even more of a dangerous situation!

**Response:**

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

**PC01393-4**

**Comment:**

You can only put so much into one airport! It is hard to understand why with all the outlying airports, i.e. Ontario, John Wayne, and now El Toro as a good possibility, there can't be a regional solution. It is extremely unfair that those of us living in the surrounding communities of the LAX Airport would have to be the ones putting up with the additional noise, pollution, traffic, etc.

**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. 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.

#### **PC01393-5**

**Comment:**

Any quality of life that we have left in El Segundo will "go down the tubes" if this Master Plan goes through.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

#### **PC01393-6**

**Comment:**

The whole region of Los Angeles needs to share in any 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.

#### **PC01394      No Author Identified,    3rd Avenue United Neighbors      7/6/2001**

#### **PC01394-1**

**Comment:**

The members of the 3rd Avenue United Neighbors Block Club wish to express our extreme opposition to any expansion of the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). We appreciate LAWA's efforts to address current problems of access and traffic congestion as presented in the LAX Master Plan. However, we must vehemently oppose LAX expansion on the grounds that it would subject my family and my fellow Inglewood residents to additional (and excessive) nuisance and environmental and economic harm.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, access impacts in Section 4.4.4, Community Disruption and Alternation of Surface Transportation Patterns, and economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socioeconomics. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 2, 3, and 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2 and S-3 of the Supplement to the

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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.

#### PC01394-2

**Comment:**

It is true that LAX provides important transportation to the greater Los Angeles area. Yet it is unreasonable to further burden Inglewood residents with the additional environmental and economic detriment that will result from LAX expansion. Expansion will subject us to:

- Increased noise and pollution from additional automobile and airplane traffic
- Reduction in real estate values from additional noise, pollution and traffic congestion
- Increased health risks from prolonged exposure to airport related pollution
- Decreased quality of life from additional noise, pollution and traffic congestion

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socioeconomics, 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 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-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding 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.

#### PC01394-3

**Comment:**

The LAX Master Plan proposes that expansion will alleviate the current congestion problems. The plan does not explain how less traffic will result from a larger airport. It is more likely that a larger airport will simply be a busier airport with more flights, noise, pollution and traffic congestion.

**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.

#### PC01394-4

**Comment:**

In addition, the EIR/EIS falls seriously short in demonstrating that LAWA gave due consideration to the negative impacts LAX expansion will have on surrounding communities, specifically the City of Inglewood.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive analysis of the environmental impacts associated with expansion of LAX through Alternatives A, B, and C. 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 Environmental Superior alternative and would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region.

**PC01394-5**

**Comment:**

The baseline data used for much of the reported analysis does not provide accurate representation of the negative impacts of LAX current operations on Inglewood residents.

**Response:**

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

**PC01394-6**

**Comment:**

Further, it is disconcerting that LAWA's plans for mitigating the egregious harm that LAX expansion will inflict on Inglewood residents is not explicitly defined in the report.

**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

**PC01394-7**

**Comment:**

Lastly, the EIR/EIS fails in many respects to comply with the requirements of CEQA or NEPA.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01394-8**

**Comment:**

It is time to be fair in sharing the environmental and economic burdens of regional air transportation. I strongly urge LAWA to reconsider expanding LAX and instead urge them to seek more environmentally and economically fair alternatives to alleviate the current traffic congestion 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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding range of alternatives analyzed in 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.

**PC01395      Holloway, Steven      None Provided      7/6/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01107; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01107.

**PC01396      Holloway, Debra      None Provided      7/6/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01107; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01107.

**PC01397      Abdallah, Lamya      None Provided      7/18/2001**

**PC01397-1**

**Comment:**

MY CONCERN QUALITY OF LIFE TRAFFIC INCREASE

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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.

**PC01397-2**

**Comment:**

AIR POLLUTION THIS COULD AFFECT RESPIRATORY SYSTEMS OF PEOPLE THAT COULD CAUSE 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.

**PC01397-3**

**Comment:**

OUR SAFETY CONCERN OVERCROWDING OF AIR CORRIDORS MAY LEAD TO LIKEHOOD OF AIR DISASTERS

**Response:**

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

**PC01397-4****Comment:**

WILL INCREASE IN CARGO VOLUME WILL LEAD TO THOUSANDS MORE TRUCKS.

**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.

**PC01397-5****Comment:**

CONSTRUCTION WILL BRING MORE TRAFFIC.

**Response:**

Please see Sections 4.3.1.6.2 and 4.3.2.6.2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and 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 construction traffic.

**PC01397-6****Comment:**

OUR AIR POLLUTION AUTO EMISSION EMISSIONS FROM IDLING PLANES + JET FUEL EMISSIONS.

**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.

**PC01397-7****Comment:**

ONTARIO & PALMDALE WHICH SHOULD BE DEVELOPED AS OPPOSED TO LAX. EL TORO (ORANGE COUNTY SHOULD BE DEVELOP-

**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. 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.

**PC01397-8****Comment:**

WHY SHOULD THE COMMUNITIES AROUND LAX BEAR THE BURDEN OF ORANGE COUNTY NEED FOR AIR COMMERCE.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

**PC01398      Needham, Derek      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01398-1**

**Comment:**

I am opposed to LAX expansion due to the increase in noise and pollution and traffic that it will cause.

**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.

**PC01399      Nyquist, Gerhard      None Provided      7/17/2001**

**PC01399-1**

**Comment:**

Keep our community whole, in order to build LAX Expressway and the Ring Road - the LAWA will have to acquire one-third of the Central Business District on Sepulveda Blvd, homes near Nielson Field and part of Historic Centinela Adobe. What happens when this Expansion is not enough - whose home will be the next target?

**Response:**

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC00908-2; please refer to Response to Comment PC00908-2.

**PC01399-2**

**Comment:**

Increase in cargo volume will lead to thousands more trucks.

**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.

**PC01399-3**

**Comment:**

Construction will bring more traffic, though it may be temporary.

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00908-4. Please see Response to Comment PC00908-4.

**PC01399-4****Comment:**

Expansion would add numerous cars to our surface streets and 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.

**PC01399-5****Comment:**

There are no mitigation measures for handling the traffic on the freeways.

**Response:**

This comment is identical to comment PC00887-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00887-2.

**PC01399-6****Comment:**

Auto emission, emissions from idling planes and jet fuel emissions. LAX is already one of the regions single largest source of NOx emissions - the primary precursor to ozone. The EIR/EIS predicts that the increased ground and air traffic will result in increased emissions of all five EPA classified major air pollutants.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00043-6 regarding LAX as a source of air pollution.

**PC01399-7****Comment:**

This could affect the respiratory systems of some people and may cause cancer.

**Response:**

This comment is identical to comment PC00908-11. Please see Response to Comment PC00908-11.

**PC01399-8****Comment:**

overcrowding of the air corridors may lead to likelihood of air disasters.

**Response:**

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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01399-9

**Comment:**

The Master Plan is a short-term quick fix approach. Long term planning is needed. The City of Los Angeles owns two key airports - Ontario and Palmdale - which should be developed as opposed 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.

#### PC01399-10

**Comment:**

El Toro (Orange County) should also be developed. Why should the communities around LAX bear the burden of Orange County's need for air commerce?

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

#### PC01399-11

**Comment:**

The State of California has plans to build high-speed rail that would provide a direct link between Palmdale and Los Angeles.

**Response:**

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

**PC01400**

**Jackson, Nina**

**None Provided**

**7/19/2001**

#### PC01400-1

**Comment:**

In my view, LAX expansion is not the answer to the Southland's need for more airport facilities. No expansion will be enough to meet the demand for airport facilities; the demand will keep increasing to exceed whatever facilities we provide. As was said in Field of Dreams, "If you build it, they will come."

**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. It should also be noted that airports around the world have remained empty after construction because the passenger demand did not exist. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 which provides examples of such case.

**PC01400-2****Comment:**

The infrastructure is insufficient to accommodate expansion and increased usage. No matter how many roads are built around the airport, the 405 freeway still will be used for access to the area from the north and south. It is now constantly crowded around LAX, even during non-peak hours. It simply cannot accommodate the traffic an expanded LAX will bring to the area.

**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.

**PC01400-3****Comment:**

Sepulveda Boulevard, too, is often near gridlock. How will we provide more access to the area, short of destroying still more neighborhoods by building yet another freeway?

**Response:**

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

**PC01400-4****Comment:**

Additionally, expansion of LAX will destroy the surrounding areas, either physically or in terms of quality of life. The additional traffic, the additional pollution from more flights and more traffic, and the additional noise will have a detrimental effect on everyone who lives or works in the surrounding areas.

**Response:**

Impacts associated with noise, traffic, and air quality were described in Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use, Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01400-5****Comment:**

What is needed is a regional solution that spreads the burden of airport facilities throughout the entire Southland, which uses the facilities, rather than placing it all in one location so that the entire burden is borne by one area. Let the airport facilities in the Lancaster/Palmdale area be expanded to serve those in the north Los Angeles County area. Let facilities in Orange County be expanded-either John Wayne Airport or new facilities in El Toro to serve Orange County.

LAX simply cannot meet the region's demands for airport facilities, and those who live and work in the area cannot be expected to bear the burden of these demands. Expansion of LAX is a short-term answer for a long-term problem and thus is no solution to the problem.

**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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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, for information on El Toro, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario International Airport. 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.

**PC01401      Leahy, Sr., Donald      None Provided      7/18/2001**

**PC01401-1**

**Comment:**

EXPANSION OF THE AIRPORT WOULD CAUSE AN INCREASE IN TRAFFIC ON ALL STREETS 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. 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.

**PC01401-2**

**Comment:**

CAUSE THE LOSS OF A GOOD PORTION OF TH SHOPPING CENTER.

**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 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 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, 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. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 for further discussion of effects on the community of Westchester.



**PC01401-3****Comment:**

THE AIRPORT AT ONTARIO AND PALMDALE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED FOR EXPANSION. MOVING FREIGHT TO OTHER AIRPORTS.

**Response:**

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. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. See Response to Comment PC00922-1 for information on air cargo.

**PC01402****McTavish, Beatrice****None Provided****7/18/2001****PC01402-1****Comment:**

I'm a home owner who has lived here since 1950. It is a wonderful place to live. Air pollution has increased a lot since then. We are big enough now - Why not expand Ontario-Palmdale or El Toro where there is more space to grow without up-rooting so many families in Westchester.

**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 regarding potential effects of Master Plan alternatives on 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.

**PC01403****Lord, Marjorie****None Provided****PC01403-1****Comment:**

The airport has over the years already taken too many homes from Westchester. Build in Ontario and Palmdale this time. Those areas are growing and need their own airport. Westchester doesn't need any more traffic or noise.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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, Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, and Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation. 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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01404      Bender, Albert      None Provided      7/20/2001**

**PC01404-1**

**Comment:**

This whole idea of LAX expansion is just an example of how some people care little about what happens to homeowners as long as it doesn't effect them.

**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.

**PC01404-2**

**Comment:**

We are both 80 years old and have lived in our home on Airplane Ave. for 40 years. At our age we just cannot relocate.

All of our medical & dental are within walking distance.

**Response:**

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

**PC01404-3**

**Comment:**

It is a crime to rid us of our Westchester Shopping 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 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 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 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, note that 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. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 for further discussion of effects on the community of Westchester.

**PC01404-4**

**Comment:**

The world is no longer an understanding one as it seems money is what really talks these days.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01404-5****Comment:**

I do hope Mayor Hahn sticks by his word and lets us live off the rest of our years in peace.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00578-1 regarding the development of Alternative D-Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, which was developed at the direction of Mayor James Hahn.

**PC01405****Leas, William****None Provided****7/18/2001****PC01405-1****Comment:**

LAX expansion is not the answer to increasing passenger and cargo traffic. Auto traffic is now almost at grid lock. With jumbo apartments replacing homes and duplexes we don't need the airport adding to this problem.

**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, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, 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. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

**PC01405-2****Comment:**

LAX expansion should stop now or it will never stop. The location of LAX at the western edge of Los Angeles County is a poor location for all the increasing passenger and cargo traffic coming into Southern California.

The air traffic should be divided up among many 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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01406**      **Holyk, William & Kathleen**      **None Provided**

**PC01406-1**

**Comment:**

We cannot say that LAX has not tried to be a good neighbor. Yes, they did sound proof our home and yes they put a sound wall with a green belt across the street from us' in an effort to reduce some of the airport noise. However, with all these efforts, we still cannot enjoy our backyard when these jets thunder by.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

**PC01406-2**

**Comment:**

You can smell the foul air when the wind is blowing in the right direction and if you cannot, you know they are spewing pollutants into the air by the tons.

**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.

**PC01406-3**

**Comment:**

There has been an increase of fly-bys..(aborted flights, they were called once ). With an increase of air traffic, these aborted flights will also increase, which could be perilous.

**Response:**

Please refer to Response to Comment PHM00046-3 for a description of how the Federal Aviation Administration manages missed approaches and Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures. Also, none of the alternatives would disproportionately increase missed approaches.

**PC01406-4**

**Comment:**

Our Sepulveda business section has already been decimated once, as a result of airport expansion. With more acquisitions, what will we have left?

**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 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 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, note that 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. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 for further discussion of effects on the community of Westchester.

#### **PC01406-5**

##### **Comment:**

It certainly increase traffic on Sepulveda, which goes hand in hand with more air pollution. There was no mention of the tie up a few weeks ago when there was a serious accident where Sepulveda and Lincoln merge. How many people had difficulty getting to their flights? It was not even mentioned in the paper. Airport expansion will make this condition 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. 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.

#### **PC01406-6**

##### **Comment:**

The good neighbor policy of LAX seems to have been abandoned. There has to be other solutions to these problems. Could it be Palmdale or Ontario ?

Please think about us who are your neighbors.

##### **Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC01407**

**Leighn, Tambre**

**None Provided**

**7/18/2001**

#### **PC01407-1**

##### **Comment:**

I am writing to voice my vote against any further expansion of LAX and/or the LAX expressway 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. Also, Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01407-2

**Comment:**

NOISE, NOISE, NOISE...the noise level over the Westchester area where I live has increased hugely since I first bought my home here six years ago.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC01050-03

#### PC01407-3

**Comment:**

Soundproofing is not an acceptable answer as it makes us prisoners in our own homes, unable to enjoy our backyards and forcing us to live with the windows and doors shut tight. This impacts not only quality of life, but our health as well as it is important to breathe fresh air and spend time with growing green things.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program. Although the program includes the use of acoustically-rated windows to reduce interior noise levels and requires that windows and doors remain closed, the program also provides alterations to existing ventilation systems or a new system to maintain fresh air circulation. See also 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-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

#### PC01407-4

**Comment:**

More flights mean more chances of 'early turns' which causes excessive noise. Also, the noise scale used, because it is averaged and not based on the individual loud sounds, doesn't accurately reflect how much noise we have to endure, nor does it take into account the non-stop nature of that noise when plane after plane after plane soars overhead non-stop for up to an hour without any break.

**Response:**

The commentor resides approximately 1.5 miles north of the east end of the north runway complex. The location is frequently exposed to noise from landings approximately 8,000 feet away at an angle of about 10 degrees above the horizon, and to infrequent overflights by propeller aircraft departures from Runway 6R/L. Early turns have been a focus of public complaint for years. The airport has attempted to deal with the issue by posting signs at the end of each runway calling for westerly departures to fly to the coastline prior to turns, but occasional deviations from the procedure continue to occur. No such procedures are in place for easterly takeoffs, because there is no large compatible area east of the airport. Therefore, aircraft are turned on course when they have stabilized their easterly takeoffs. For further information about early turns, please see Topical Response TR-N-3, particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2 regarding early turns over areas north and south of LAX.

The CNEL metric takes into account every single event to which an area is exposed on a daily basis. For further information about the relationship between CNEL and single events, please see Topical Response TR-N-2, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-2.1. This Topical Response discusses the difference between cumulative averages and single event noise effects.

#### PC01407-5

**Comment:**

Expansion could also cause more late night and early morning flights which interfere with our ability to sleep due to plane noise.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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 4.1, 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.

**PC01407-6**

**Comment:**

Also, there is no satisfactory system in place with the current noise problems - so to add more planes and more noise with no recourse system for complaints that actually does something is unfair. As it is, you call in to the complaint number and eventually, maybe, they send a letter explaining that they didn't find any unusual activity and it was probably the cloud cover. But many times, there is no response at all - they just give you the weather report on the phone and say it's probably cloud cover or because it is summer and the windows are open. But I can hear with windows closed - even in summer. So the complaint system does nothing and there are no repercussions therefore it is a waste of time to call in - so don't increase the planes without putting into an effective consumer complaint line that has ramifications when they do early turns, test engines very late at night, etc.

**Response:**

LAX 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. Control over aircraft in flight is the responsibility of the FAA - local jurisdictions such as LAWA have no authority to control flight procedures, but may recommend modifications to procedures to the FAA or report on deviations from standard practice. 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. Airport restrictions have been enacted that prohibit ground run-up operations during the period between 11 p.m. and 6 a.m. without express approval by the Executive Director of the airport or a designee. The Airport Operations staff is authorized to shut down any run-ups that occur during these hours. Each future development alternative includes mitigation actions or master plan commitments that are intended to reduce early turns and to provide Ground Run-up Enclosures - facilities that substantially reduce the levels of run-up noise heard in the community.

**PC01407-7**

**Comment:**

HEALTH...additional flights mean more pollution and soot. Already there is a black greasy layer from airplane emissions that coats outdoor furniture, barbecues, cars, etc. This is not good for our health. More flights equals more pollution and lung damage. More traffic to the area means more automobile pollution as well.

**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, Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport traffic concerns.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01407-8

**Comment:**

NEIGHBORHOOD LIFE...I moved into the area because it was like a small town where I could easily run out for groceries, dry cleaning, gas, postal, etc. If you take away one-third of our business district as planned, there will be no heart left in the community. You have already carved a large enough path of destruction with LAX - no more expansion into our neighborhoods. Our local businesses provide employment as well as a place for the community to come together for coffee, lunch, etc. Taking away downtown Westchester turns our area into a big city instead of the small, close knit community that it currently is.

**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. 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 was described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6.5), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, note that 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 does not propose residential acquisition. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 for further discussion of effects on the community of Westchester.

#### PC01407-9

**Comment:**

REGIONAL ANSWERS...I have many friends in outlying areas who would love access to more flights out of their local areas. Why bring more flights here at a huge cost of safety, traffic, health, noise when increasing flights is welcome in another area and would add to their local economies as well as cutting down freeway traffic from people traveling hours from outlying areas to access 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.

#### PC01407-10

**Comment:**

LAX PARKING...already takes up so much space in our neighborhood and along Century Blvd./Aviation Blvd. etc. You will turn our neighborhood into a huge parking lot if you insist on increasing flights and traffic into the area.



### 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.

**PC01407-11**

**Comment:**

SAFETY...Less is more - fewer flights mean fewer chances of accidents.

**Response:**

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

**PC01407-12**

**Comment:**

I can't list one neighbor who is for the expansion. Drive down Ogelsby and almost every lawn has a no LAX expansion sign on it. Please believe that in all your reports there can't be even one good reason for the expansion and that the impact report doesn't truly reflect the reality of living in a flight zone area. STOP the expansion. No one wants it - only big business. Take the business to outlying areas where it is needed and wanted.

**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.

<b>PC01408</b>	<b>Mills, Gordon</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/18/2001</b>
----------------	----------------------	----------------------	------------------

**PC01408-1**

**Comment:**

No LAX Expansion Ruin Westchester community Resident for 40 years!

**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.

<b>PC01409</b>	<b>Riess, Constance</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/18/2001</b>
----------------	-------------------------	----------------------	------------------

**PC01409-1**

**Comment:**

LA already has far too few neighborhoods that give families quality of life. Westchester is one of the few family oriented communities to live in. We already sacrifice a lot to LAX, please let Ontario, Palmdale, OC and El Toro share the burden. Look at all the land they have! Thank you for taking a minute to consider quality of life over growth, expansion & profit. A concerned mother & grandmother.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester, Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts to quality of life, Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding the transfer of operations to Palmdale and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

**PC01410      George, Dwayne      None Provided**

**PC01410-1**

**Comment:**

MY WIFE DIANA AND I ARE VERY MUCH AGAINST 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.

**PC01410-2**

**Comment:**

NOISE POLLUTION WHICH IS BARELY TOLERABLE WILL ONLY GET WORSE

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding Noise Increase. Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided detailed 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.

**PC01410-3**

**Comment:**

THE TRAFFIC ALONG SEPULVEDA BLVD AND LINCOLN WILL GET WORSE DUE TO CONSTRUCTION AND THEN INCREASE IN EMPLOYEES AT 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, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

**PC01410-4**

**Comment:**

AIR POLLUTION CAN ONLY GET WORSE

**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 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.

**PC01410-5**

**Comment:**

THE EXPANSION OF LAX WILL SWALLOW UP MORE RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY.

**Response:**

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 regarding impacts to 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 preferred alternative), does not propose any residential acquisition. 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 will be provided to any person displaced from their home or business. Also please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

**PC01410-6**

**Comment:**

ADDITIONALLY THE OVERCROWDING OF THE AIR CORRIDORS MAY CAUSE A LIKELIHOOD OF FUTURE AIR DISASTERS.

**Response:**

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

**PC01410-7**

**Comment:**

ONTARIO AND PALMDALE AIRPORTS WHICH ARE OWNED BY LAX CAN BE EXPANDED TO DEAL WITH MORE AIR TRAVEL.

**Response:**

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. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

**PC01410-8**

**Comment:**

WE STRONGLY URGE YOU TO RECONSIDER THIS VERY UNWISE PLAN TO EXPAND 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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01411      Wolfenden, Agnes      None Provided      7/18/2001**

**PC01411-1**

**Comment:**

I have lived in Westchester for over fifty years. I think they should expand Palmdale and extend the Metro Rail. We already have too much traffic and smog.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan. 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.

**PC01412      Bulpitt, Thomas      None Provided      7/18/2001**

**PC01412-1**

**Comment:**

Our Objections to LAX Expansion:

**Response:**

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.

**PC01412-2**

**Comment:**

Noise levels are already such that conversations are interrupted in our backyard.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels.

**PC01412-3**

**Comment:**

Frequent odor of jet fuel - will it get worse?

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding the topic of odor.

**PC01412-4**

**Comment:**

Breaking up of our business and shopping 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 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. 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 was described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6.5), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, note that 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. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 for further discussion of effects on the community of Westchester.

**PC01412-5****Comment:**

Traffic congestion can only get worse on Sepulveda Blvd.

**Response:**

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

**PC01413****Gleinn, Ida****None Provided****7/18/2001****PC01413-1****Comment:**

The LAX Expansion will ruin our lovely community of Westchester.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01413-2****Comment:**

I'm in my home 53+ years and watched our community grow and then watched it as other developments occurred. Please, please, please do not let the politicians ignore the wishes of the local residents. This is one of the best communities in Los Angeles and do not want to see it deteriorate nor do I want to move. This is my home!

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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 to quality of life.

**PC01414****Calsbeek, Susan****None Provided****7/18/2001****PC01414-1****Comment:**

My concerns are as follows:

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

**Response:**

Please see Responses to Comments below.

**PC01414-2**

**Comment:**

AIR POLLUTION: From auto emissions, emissions from idling planes & jet fuel emissions. LAX is already one of the regions single largest source of NOx emissions. The EIR/EIS predicts increased emissions of all five EPA classified major air pollutants.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00043-6 regarding LAX as a source of air pollution.

**PC01414-3**

**Comment:**

This could affect the respiratory systems of some people (children & the elderly espically) and could cause 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. 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. Please also see Topical Response TR-EJ-1 regarding potential air quality and health risk impacts on low-income and minority communities.

**PC01414-4**

**Comment:**

SAFTY: Overcrowding of the air corridors may lead to likelihood of air disasters.

**Response:**

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

**PC01414-5**

**Comment:**

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

**Response:**

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC00148-7; please refer to Response to Comment PC00148-7.

**PC01414-6****Comment:**

Homes in the 65 CNEI are eligible for soundproofing. This is fine only if people wish to stay indoors with their doors & windows closed. For those of us who enjoy being outdoors & using our yards & pools, it is not a solution.

**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.

**PC01414-7****Comment:**

CARGO DEMAND: LAWA is focusing its expansion to meet projected cargo demand. Areas of concern include larger cargo aircraft, more flights, heavy aircraft operations, and traffic from thousands more trucks.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00908-9 regarding cargo demand. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

**PC01414-8****Comment:**

KEEP OUR COMMUNITY WHOLE!: In order to build the LAX Expressway & the Ring Road LAWA will have to acquire one-third of Westchester's Central Business District, homes near Nielsen Field, & part of Centinela Adobe, even though it was promised after the last expansion that no more of Westchester would be taken. We have already lost many wonderful neighborhoods, businesses, and friends due to Airport Expansion. What happens when this expansion isn't enough? Will more of Westchester disappear?

**Response:**

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. Potential impacts to cultural resources were discussed in Section 4.9.1, Historic Architecture and Archeological/Cultural Resources of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 concerning impacts within the Community of Westchester and Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding the Centinela Adobe. 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. Further, it does not include the LAX Expressway and therefore there it has no potential for impacts on the Centinela Adobe. 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. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01414-9

**Comment:**

REGIONAL SOLUTION: The Master Plan is a short term, quick fix approach. Long term planning is needed. The City of Los Angeles owns two key airports. Palmdale and Ontario - which should 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 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.

#### PC01414-10

**Comment:**

El Toro in Orange County should also be developed. Why should the communities around LAX continue to bear the burden of the region's need for air commerce?

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

<b>PC01415</b>	<b>Bush, Cynthia</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/18/2001</b>
----------------	----------------------	----------------------	------------------

#### PC01415-1

**Comment:**

I am of great concern for my neighborhood with the prospect of the airport expansion. I have been a homeowner for 20 years and it seems ludicrous that you would even consider the ruination of such a lovely 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-1 regarding impacts to quality of life.

#### PC01415-2

**Comment:**

If the decision is made to close the Falmouth and Westchester Parkway intersection this will create additional traffic from Manchester to Falmouth and on to St. Bernard High School. The students would have to use Falmouth or Manitoba. The results are obvious. It seems that it was not that long ago that an enormous amount of money was spent to open these roads!



**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00217-1. Please see Response to Comment PC00217-1. Also, see Topical Response TR-ST-4 which includes discussion of neighborhood traffic impacts and mitigation.

**PC01415-3****Comment:**

My biggest concerns are the noise, dust, and traffic not to mention the jet fuel that would be in our breathable air path. The outcome would be bad health and people with asthma will have difficult time breathing.

**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, Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding land use and noise mitigation and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. .

**PC01415-4****Comment:**

I have chosen to own property in this beach community for the lovely breeze and weather that we are fortunate to have. We should not have to live in a tomb in order to facilitate the many contracts that will be let on this project.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01415-5****Comment:**

PLEASE LEAVE THE INTERSECTIONS OF FALMOUTH AND WESTCHESTER PARKWAY AND LOYOLA AND WESTCHESTER PARKWAY OPEN TO THE CITIZENS IN THE COMMUNITY WHO USE IT.

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00217-1. Please see Response to Comment PC00217-1. Also, direct access to Westchester Parkway from Loyola Boulevard would be eliminated in Alternatives A, B, and C. Access would be provided from Loyola Boulevard to Westchester Parkway via Lincoln Boulevard. This access would not be altered in Alternative D.

**PC01416****Ferrero, Mauro****None Provided****7/16/2001****PC01416-1****Comment:**

My wife and I are very concerned for the impact the proposed LAX expansion will have on the community where we live. Besides the impact on traffic, noise, etc., we are very concerned about the turn for the worse of the already serious situation in terms of pollution. This expansion is a terrible idea

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

because the airport is already so close to several communities who have to suffer in terms of noise and 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. 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.

**PC01416-2**

**Comment:**

It would be different if the airport would be in a non-populated area like in Denver, outside the city. I heard about the plan for Palmdale Airport and high-speed rail. This seems such a much better idea for example.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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 high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

**PC01416-3**

**Comment:**

Please do not make an already difficult situation for thousands of residents even worse by expanding 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.

<b>PC01417</b>	<b>Zee, Gloria</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/18/2001</b>
----------------	--------------------	----------------------	------------------

**PC01417-1**

**Comment:**

Please don't destroy my Westchester community! Keep it the way it is by saying 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.

**PC01417-2**

**Comment:**

The city of Los Angeles owns two key airports: Ontario and Palmdale, why not develop them as opposed to LAX; what about El Toro (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, 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.

**PC01417-3****Comment:**

Please help us keep our community whole!

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01418      Hallstrom, Carl &      None Provided**  
**Kay**

**PC01418-1****Comment:**

As a resident of the Westchester community for the past 52 years, and with no intentions of moving from our home we want you to know that we strongly oppose the expansion of LAX. We do not want any more of our businesses or homes acquired by the airport we have sacrificed enough.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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 any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester business district.

**PC01418-2****Comment:**

Our streets and freeways are already over crowded. The noise is at such a level that if you want to talk at you must wait for planes to take off or land to continue your conversation. We have had many horrible accidents on our streets from speeding cars and reckless drivers, not to mention the noise from the cars too. Our streets, sidewalks and air are filthy from the airport and from the traffic. In the 52 years that I have lived Westchester, I have witnessed with my own eyes many near disasters airplanes flying off course barley missing businesses and homes. More airplanes, more cars, more pollution, more noise, more danger to our community is not what Westchester needs.

**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, Topical Response TR-LU-4

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

regarding outdoor noise levels, Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition, and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

#### PC01418-3

**Comment:**

As a concerned resident of the Westchester community we urge you take these developments to Ontario and Palmdale. Orange County should also carry its own burden and be developed to meet its own needs. LAX should not have carry the responsibility for surrounding areas.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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, Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale, and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01419**

**Wright, Zee**

**None Provided**

**7/19/2001**

#### PC01419-1

**Comment:**

I would like to register my opinion that I oppose the LAX expansion plan.

**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.

#### PC01419-2

**Comment:**

I am a resident of Westchester since 1997 and since then I have witnessed an increase in traffic related incidents.

**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.

#### PC01419-3

**Comment:**

I have spent thousands of dollars improving my property and I feel the LAX expansion will cause our property values to drop.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding the effects of LAX on property values.

**PC01419-4**

**Comment:**

As a health issues it will only continue to excessively pollute the air.

**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.

The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR evaluated the potential risk of adverse health effects for each of the Master Plan Alternatives based on the emissions associated with each of the alternatives. The No Project/No Action Alternative assumes that no substantial changes are made to current LAX facilities, and is based on projections of growth in airport activity between 1996 and horizon year 2015. Airport congestion during this time is expected to grow worse without additional capital improvement. In all cases, build alternatives are expected to relieve current and predicted future congestion by making airport operations, particularly aircraft operations, more efficient.

After implementation of mitigation measures, the build alternatives would reduce predicted impacts to human health compared with the No Project/No Action Alternative. Implementation of any of the build alternatives is therefore anticipated to reduce future health impacts for most people living, working or going to school near the airport. However, as was indicated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, predicted chronic non-cancer human health impacts for maximally exposed residents under Alternatives B and C are slightly higher for some areas than those predicted with the No Project/No Action Alternative.

**PC01420**

**Horton, Jerome**

**California State Assembly**

**7/17/2001**

**PC01420-1**

**Comment:**

I am writing to voice my concerns about the proposed expansion of the Los Angeles Airport and the environmental impact it will have on surrounding neighborhoods. The law requires the Airport to submit an Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report that describes the potential negative impact of their proposed expansion and provide a specific plan of action to mitigate such impacts.

Furthermore, the law requires public hearings and a reasonable public comment period before proceeding with any expansion effort. If the negative impacts are not accurately identified, and no remedial action plan is provided, the Airport should not be allowed to expand.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR were prepared in conformance with both NEPA and CEQA requirements, and an extended public comment period and public hearings were provided. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process. 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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01420-2

**Comment:**

For various reasons, I continue to be opposed to the proposed Airport Master Expansion Plan and the current draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report(dEIS/EIR). In my opinion, the current dEIS/EIR does not satisfy the legal requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) nor the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in numerous areas.

**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

#### PC01420-3

**Comment:**

Personally, I know that the proposed expansion will have numerous detrimental environmental impacts on the City of Inglewood, its surrounding neighborhoods and my family and friends. Specifically the expansion will cause:

- an increase in auto and air traffic;
- increased noise pollution;
- increased air pollution;
- increase and aggravate existing health effects, i.e., asthma, hearing loss, sleep deprivation, etc.; and
- a loss of personal comfort and property values due to the aggravation of existing nuisances.

**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 health and safety in 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendices D and G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendices S-C and 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-ES-1 regarding residential property values, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, and 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.

#### PC01420-4

**Comment:**

As you may recall, as an Inglewood City Councilman I authored an initiative to employ legal experts to provide the City with a detailed analysis of the EIS/EIR and advise the City on how to legally oppose the expansion of the Airport. In the midst of the shouting and accusations, I thought it prudent to plan for legal and political opposition. Well friends, the time has come for us to place our concerns about the expansion of the airport on record. This is an important step in the process.

This comment period is much like the lawsuit I filed against the Airport and United Airlines for incrementally trying to expand the Airport under the allusion of expanding Cargo storage space. Although we did not win this particular case, we were successful in legally stalling the construction and establishing that airlines share liability for negative environmental impacts. As far as I am concerned, this established an important precedence and will prove useful in future dealings with the Airport. In addition, the courts reaffirmed the need to exhaust all administrative procedures and remedies before suing. Thus, the reason we must share our concerns with the Los Angeles World Airport (LAWA), and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) via this formal public comment period and ask you to respond to our concerns within a reasonable period of time.

My experience with the Airport and its environmental issues has taught me the importance of legally crafting our statement. Many opponents to the expansion will have repeatedly expressed their opposition based on personal and business inconvenience and they are to be commended for their efforts. However, we must make sure that our positions have a sound legal basis and are properly noted and recorded. In this regard, I commend the city of Inglewood's mayor and city council members for continuing to pursue their legal options.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01420-5**

**Comment:**

Although the Airport Master Plan and the dEIS/EIR attempt to address these anticipated environmental impacts and personal inconveniences, they are insufficient and need to be revised to insure our neighborhoods stay safe and environmentally sound. In reviewing the dEIS/EIR the following is evident:

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01420-6**

**Comment:**

(1.) The dEIR/EIS fails to satisfy federal policy concerning environmental justice and state law because:

(a.) it does not consider alternatives and other locations that would shift or distribute burdens of expansion more equitably and reduce risks to human health.

**Response:**

All LAX Master Plan alternatives were selected in accordance with the requirements identified in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regulations, and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Please see Chapter 3, Alternatives of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a detailed discussion of the alternative selection process. 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.

Please see Topical Response TR-EJ-1 regarding potential air quality and health risk impacts on low-income and minority communities, Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits, and Topical Response TR-EJ-3 regarding environmental justice and regional context. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1, regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

See pages 1-3 of Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a discussion of regional environmental justice issues as analyzed in the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Regional Aviation Plan, including issues associated with airport improvement projects and LAX. These documents indicate that limiting expansion at LAX is the best possible outcome from an environmental justice perspective given the high concentration of

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

minority and low-income populations in the LAX vicinity. Alternative D was added to the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR as a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) activity comparable to the No Action/No Project Alternative. 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.

#### PC01420-7

**Comment:**

b) it unfairly and disproportionately burdens minority and low income communities that lie directly under the primary arrival flight path with significant impacts of noise and toxic air emissions. ( i.e. 25% of incoming flights occur directly over the city of Inglewood.)

**Response:**

Noise and air toxic effects on minority and low-income communities were addressed in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR and 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. The Environmental Justice Program outlined in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR recognized the potential disproportionate effects that the Master Plan would have on minority and low-income populations and goes beyond basic mitigation proposals to address the unique needs of these communities. With input gathered through environmental justice workshops and an extensive public outreach effort, the Environmental Justice Program provided in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Final EIS/EIR, represents a full and good faith effort to identify all possible means for avoiding, reducing or off-setting the impacts of the Master Plan in a manner that addresses the needs and preferences of affected minority and/or low-income communities in accordance with NEPA and CEQA requirements. Regarding fairness, with the orientation of the runways at LAX, it is inevitable that increases in aircraft activity will have a greater burden on communities to the east of LAX than those to the north and south. It should be noted however, that LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative, Alternative D, has the least impact of the Master Plan build alternatives and would limit future (2015) operations at LAX to levels that would be similar to what would occur with existing facilities if the Master Plan were not approved. Please also see Section 4.1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding noise impacts and Section 4.6 regarding air quality, with supporting data and analyses provided in Appendices D and G. Regarding toxic air emissions see Topical Response TR-EJ-1.

#### PC01420-8

**Comment:**

(2.) The dEIS/EIR fails to satisfy state and federal law because:

a.) it fails to disclose the economic gain of the Airport as a result of the expansion at the expense of the surrounding low income populations;

**Response:**

LAX is a public use airport. Rates and charges are imposed to cover the cost of maintaining and upgrading the facility for public use. LAX is a public entity not a "for profit" entity. It is an agency of the City and any "economic gain" in the form of increased revenue must be utilized for airport purposes.

Although benefits may be taken into account in making findings regarding a projects potential for disproportionately high and adverse environmental and health effects pursuant to U.S. Department of Transportation Order 5610.2, there is no legal requirement under NEPA or CEQA for economic benefits, or for benefits to be proportionate to environmental burdens. The primary focus of the EIS/EIR under NEPA and CEQA is to disclose and mitigate physical impacts on the environment.



**PC01420-9****Comment:**

b.) it fails to create jobs in a manner beneficial to the impacted neighborhoods; and

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding a detailed description of employment benefits and business opportunities for low income and/or minority communities.

**PC01420-10****Comment:**

c.) if fails to balance the economic benefits with the negative impact on surrounding neighborhoods.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC01420-8.

**PC01420-11****Comment:**

(3.) The dEIS/EIR fails to satisfy existing law because alternatives to expansion have not been adequately explored or considered.

**Response:**

The Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive analysis of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Under this alternative, there would be no expansion of facilities at LAX beyond minor projects that would be reasonably foreseeable in the absence of the 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 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. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive analysis of Alternative D and was circulated for public review and comment.

**PC01420-12****Comment:**

(4.) The dEIS/EIR does not measure environmental impacts properly because it fails to use the current negative impact as a starting point.

**Response:**

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

**PC01420-13****Comment:**

(5.) The dEIS/EIR fails to comply with Federal air quality regulations because it does not properly measure nor study toxic air pollutants or air emissions as required by law.

**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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

and addressed the human health risk impacts in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of each document.

#### PC01420-14

**Comment:**

(6.) The dEIS/EIR does not consider or factor time as a variable when assessing the added health risks which result from increased passenger travel and traffic patterns.

(7.) The dEIS/EIR fails to have specific criteria when determining the specific health risks involved in the expansion.

**Response:**

The Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health risks in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety (CEQA), and Technical Report 14a, Health Risk Assessment. Exposure factors involving time, such as exposure frequency (days exposed per year) and exposure duration (years of exposure), are factored into the risk equations. Assumptions used for these variables are presented in Table 4 of Technical Report 14a of the Draft EIS/EIR. The risk assessment characterized risks for adult and child residents, school children, and on-airport workers. For example, risk calculations were based on the assumption that adult residents were exposed to the maximum estimated chemical concentrations in air for the year 2015 for a subsequent exposure duration of 30 years or 70 years. The longer exposure duration was used in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR in response to comments from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). School children and child residents were assumed to be exposed to the maximum chemical concentrations in air estimated for the year 2015 for an exposure duration of 6 years.

The criteria used to evaluate the impacts of health risks for each of the alternatives were discussed in Section 4.24.1 (subsection 4.24.1.4, Thresholds of Significance) of the Draft EIS/EIR. These thresholds are based on South Coast Air Quality Management District policies.

#### PC01420-15

**Comment:**

(8.) The dEIS/EIR fails to assess and consider the impact of air and noise emissions mitigation measures on surrounding neighborhoods.

**Response:**

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.

#### PC01420-16

**Comment:**

(9.) The dEIS/EIR fails to address the negative impact of current air traffic and the recurring damages caused by the Airport's failure to expeditiously mitigate the current negative impacts. With this in mind, I believe that the dEIR/EIS should have taken into consideration the cumulative affect of increasing existing negative impacts.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The environmental conditions considered in the analysis of cumulative impacts included the effects of existing airport operations.

**PC01420-17****Comment:**

(10.) The dEIS/EIR fails to properly analyze the traffic impact and propose an adequate mitigation plan, e.g., standing traffic on the surrounding 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 and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

**PC01420-18****Comment:**

(11.) The dEIS/EIR fails to consider the economic impact on property and housing values as a result of the added noise; especially, the decrease in recreational value of local parks and residential back yards; plus the reluctance of certain businesses to locate within the flight pattern. It should be noted that while property values of homes under the flight path have increased, arguably, the marginal increase of home values in this area continue to suffer.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding the effects of LAX on property values.

**PC01420-19****Comment:**

This has a negative impact of construction of additional housing stock within the area and accordingly limits the growth of these communities. Additionally, the negative impact of the Airport limits the type, quantity and quality of homes that can be built in the area. This will serve to impede local communities' ability to comply with Federal Housing Regulations that require replacing housing.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation issues, including affordable housing. Also see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding the effects of LAX on property values and TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

**PC01420-20****Comment:**

(12.) Finally, the dEIS/EIR fails to consider the negative impact of increased noise and flights over local schools under the flight path, including interruptions of instructional and recreational periods.

**Response:**

Sections 4.1.6 and 4.2.6 and Technical Report 1, Land Use Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR, identified noise-sensitive uses, including schools, that are newly exposed to high noise levels (defined by the 65 CNEL noise contour) or to a significant noise increase (defined as an increase of 1.5 CNEL or greater within the 65 CNEL or greater). Since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR has been prepared that provided additional analysis of single event and cumulative 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). Section 4.2.6 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included a listing of all schools

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

that would be newly exposed to single event or cumulative noise levels that result in classroom disruption.

Schools without aviation easements that are determined to be newly exposed to significant aircraft noise levels are eligible for mitigation. Mitigation measure MM-LU-1 provides mitigation for schools determined to be significantly impacted by aircraft noise, excluding schools with aviation easements. Mitigation may take the form of sound insulation or relocation. Further mitigation is provided under mitigation measures MM-LU-3 and MM-LU-4 in the form of study of aircraft noise levels that result in classroom disruption and sound insulation for schools determined by the study or interim noise measurements to be significantly impacted. See Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding aviation easements, prior noise mitigation payments, and other provisions of the "Settlement Agreement" that resolve land use compatibility and aircraft noise mitigation issues between affected schools and airport operations. As concluded in Section 4.2.9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, noise levels would remain significant after mitigation for schools exposed to significant single event noise impacts where classroom activities take place outdoors.

#### PC01420-21

**Comment:**

In closing, I would encourage all of us to work together to present a unified front. I am pleased that the California League of Cities, Congresswoman Jane Harman and 12 Southern California Members of Congress have joined together to support an adequately developed plan. They are to be commended for their commitment to fairness in this process. I remain confident that, whereas, members of various communities have sought to protect their residents in different ways, with sometime competing agendas, they all share a common goal of opposing the proposed expansion. To that end, I strongly believe that working intelligently and collectively will yield positive results.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

<b>PC01421</b>	<b>Labrie, Michele</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/17/2001</b>
----------------	------------------------	----------------------	------------------

#### PC01421-1

**Comment:**

I recently heard Los Angeles has the worst pollution in the United States. Much more pollution will be generated by airport expansion.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00070-1 regarding existing air quality. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution.

#### PC01421-2

**Comment:**

I have owned a home in Westchester for 11 years. I'm a taxpayer and good neighbor. If expansion goes thru, I have no choice but to sell my home & move.

**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.

**PC01422      Mertens, Michael      None Provided      7/17/2001**

**PC01422-1**

**Comment:**

We feel there is no logical reason to create all the negative problems airport expansion brings when there are available alternatives. Ontario has the space, can use the jobs and increased business expansion would bring.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC01422-2**

**Comment:**

It would be detrimental to all local citizens on the Westside of LA to increase 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.

**PC01422-3**

**Comment:**

Do not ruin our living environment. If you lived here - would you be in favor of this kind of 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-1 regarding impacts to quality of life.

**PC01423      Turner, Clay & Lisa      None Provided      7/17/2001**

**PC01423-1**

**Comment:**

The LAX / Marina del Rey corridor (LINCOLN BOULEVARD) and the LAX / Westchester Corridor (Sepulveda Boulevard) are already experiencing significant traffic problems.

**Response:**

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

**PC01423-2**

**Comment:**

The only logical solution is to develop the Ontario & Palmdale facilities.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

**Response:**

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. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

**PC01423-3**

**Comment:**

Mayor Hahn vowed to support the LAX - No expansion initiative.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00578-1 regarding the development of Alternative D-Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, which was developed at the direction of Mayor James Hahn.

**PC01423-4**

**Comment:**

When are we going to put this issue to rest and start working on the logical expansion of the El Toro, Palmdale, and Ontario facilities?

**Response:**

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. 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.

**PC01424**

**Ter Veen, Janet**

**None Provided**

**7/18/2001**

**PC01424-1**

**Comment:**

I urge you to stop the expansion of LAX. The airports of Palmdale & Ontario & the possible airport at El Toro would better serve this area as they would be closer to people who live some distance from LAX. LAX area already bears the burden of noise, pollution & traffic generated by LAX and expansion would increase the 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, 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 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.

**PC01425      Smith, Dorothy      None Provided      7/15/2001**

**PC01425-1**

**Comment:**

I have lived in Westchester 57 years, yes I knew the airport (which was Mines Field then) was there and knew it would grow. We had no idea it would become what it is today.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

**PC01425-2**

**Comment:**

There was noise then (which we got used to), but gosh nothing like it is today.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase. Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided detailed 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.

**PC01425-3**

**Comment:**

I have to close the sliding glass doors & turn the volume way up on the TV in order to hear in the evenings especially.

**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.

**PC01425-4**

**Comment:**

The grime (oil mostly) is all over - on the swimming pool, lawn furniture and cars

**Response:**

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

**PC01425-5**

**Comment:**

the traffic is out of sight. No, No on the 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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

**PC01426      Kobylasz, Gertrude      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01426-1**

**Comment:**

I've lived in Westchester (in the same home) since June, 1955 (46 years)! Over the years, the airport has added runways, more people are flying, much more traffic on Sepulveda, more grime on plants, shrubs, windows, cars and even indoors! Years ago dirt and dust were brown when floors, windows, furniture, etc., needed cleaning, and now . . . it is BLACK!

**Response:**

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

**PC01426-2**

**Comment:**

I haven't mentioned noise - that's another very sore subject which I won't go into at this time. A big "NO" on 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. 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.

**PC01427      Scianna, Edward      None Provided      7/18/2001**

**PC01427-1**

**Comment:**

Everyone I spoke with that lives in the neighborhood are adamantly opposed to any type of LAX expansion. It is an obvious fact that this would disrupt the neighborhood in many ways.

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

**PC01427-2**

**Comment:**

As for starters an increase in noise level, increase in traffic on residential streets

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, Section 1. 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.



**PC01427-3****Comment:**

as well as traffic congestion impacts on the 405,

**Response:**

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

**PC01427-4****Comment:**

as well as significant traffic delays and problems during construction, however temporary (14 years) they may be.

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00908-4. Please see Response to Comment PC00908-4.

**PC01427-5****Comment:**

Diesel-engine construction equipment will also be a significant source of NO<sub>x</sub> and particulates during the construction period. No<sub>x</sub> is a main component of smog, and SO<sub>2</sub> is a potent air pollutant.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed diesel engine construction equipment and fugitive dust air pollution in Section 4.6.6, Air Quality Environmental Consequences, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G.

**PC01427-6****Comment:**

Both of these compounds will affect respiratory system of children and the elderly.

**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.

**PC01427-7****Comment:**

An action like this by the LAX would be absolutely inconsiderate to human life in the area, a crime against humanity for an increase in flights, pollution and noise. I oppose any sort of expansion for the LAX.

### 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-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase, Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding 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.

**PC01428      Davis, Christina      None Provided      7/18/2001**

**PC01428-1**

**Comment:**

With every new development project, our (surrounding community residents) quality of life deteriorates more and more. How long will our communities have to bear these inconveniences? After development we are left with a new burden - traffic and more traffic!

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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, 3, S-2a, and S-2b.

**PC01429      Costello, M. Rita      None Provided      7/18/2001**

**PC01429-1**

**Comment:**

NO TO LAX 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.

**PC01429-2**

**Comment:**

ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC - INCREASE IN USERS OF LAX AFTER 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 and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

**PC01429-3**

**Comment:**

I SEE NO PLANS FOR TRAFFIC MITIGATION.

**Response:**

The traffic 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. There are a series of off-airport traffic mitigation measures proposed, as summarized in Section 4.3.2.9 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Except for nine intersections in Alternative C, six intersections in Alternatives A and B, and three intersection in Alternative D, these measures would fully mitigate the project impacts off-airport.

**PC01429-4**

**Comment:**

CONSTRUCTION BRINGS ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC.

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00908-4. Please see Response to Comment PC00908-4.

**PC01429-5**

**Comment:**

BOTH OF WHICH ARE COMPOUNDED BY THE VERY SAME PROBLEMS WESTCHESTER NOW EXPERIENCES WITH PLAYA VISTA DEVELOPMENT. NO TO TRAFFIC!

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00148-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00148-2.

**PC01429-6**

**Comment:**

AIR/NOISE POLLUTION - FROM INCREASED LAX TRAFFIC LAX JETS & LAX SERVICE VEHICLES - AGAIN ALL COMPOUNDED BY PLAYA VISTA DEVELOPMENT TO THE IMMEDIATE SOUTH NO TO YET MORE NOISE/AIR POLLUTION!

**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 noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, 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 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendices S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-2 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC01429-7**

**Comment:**

CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT (CBD) - WILL BE ACQUIRED FOR ACCESS ROADS ALONG WITH HOMES. SUCH BUSINESS SERVICES ARE REQUIRED BY COMMUNITY RESIDENTS FOR THEIR QUALITY OF LIFE - WHO WANTS TO DRIVE OUT OF THE AREA FOR BASIC SERVICES? NO TO ACQUISITION OF HOMES AND CBD!

**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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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 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 remain available through other similar businesses located in close proximity within the Westchester Business District.

Regarding acquisition of homes under Alternatives A, B, and C, please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1.

Also, as was described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6.5), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, note that 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 does not propose residential acquisition. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 for further discussion of effects on the community of Westchester.

#### PC01429-8

**Comment:**

PUBLIC SAFETY - LAX HAS ALREADY ACQUIRED A REPUTATION FOR THE AIRPORT WHERE OTHER PLANES COULD WELL LAND ON YOUR PLANE - IT HAS ALREADY HAPPENED AND IS NOT SOME SCI-FI POSSIBILITY. THE FLYING PUBLIC WANTS TO BE SAFE BOTH IN THE AIR AS WELL AS ON THE GROUND AND THEY WANT TO MOVE ON TIME. THESE NEEDS OUTWEIGH THE CONVENIENCE FACTOR. NO TO PLANS TO DIMINISH PUBLIC SAFETY!

**Response:**

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

#### PC01429-9

**Comment:**

DEVLEOP ONTARIO / PALMDALE AIRPORTS - THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES HAS OTHER OPTIONS IN LIEU OF EXPANDING LAX - OPTIONS WHERE LAND & SPACE ARE IN GREATER ABUNDANCE THAN IN WESTCHESTER.

**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.

**PC01429-10****Comment:**

THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA PLANS A HIGH SPEED RAIL TO CONNECT PALMDALE AND LOS ANGELES.

**Response:**

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

**PC01429-11****Comment:**

THE GREEN LINE WAS UNSUCCESSFUL TO GO DIRECTLY TO LAX TERMINALS AND THIS IS ANOTHER MAJOR OBSTACLE TO EFFICIENT TRANSPORTATION IN & OUT OF LAX - CAN WE TOLERATE ADDITIONAL INEFFICIENCIES? NO TO LAX EXPANSION; YES TO CONSIDERING ONLY LOS ANGELES' OTHER OPTIONS

**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-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand.

**PC01429-12****Comment:**

AS A WESTCHESTER RESIDENT I VIGOROUSLY OPPOSE LAX EXPANSION AND CHOSE TO VOICE MY OPPOSITION TO LAWA COMMISSIONERS. I AM ONE OF THE WESTCHESTER HOME OWNERS REMAINING SILENT UP TO NOW - WELL NO MORE. LAX EXPANSION IS NOT WANTED; LAX EXPANSION IS NOT NEEDED AND LAX EXPANSION IS NOT GOOD FOR THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES. STOP LAX EXPANSION NOW !!!!!

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of the 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.

**PC01430****Kenney, Pat****None Provided****7/12/2001****PC01430-1****Comment:**

Opposed to airport expansion

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**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.

**PC01431      Newton, Laura &      None Provided      7/18/2001**  
**Miles**

**PC01431-1**

**Comment:**

LAX expansion causes problems with Keeping our community whole. In order to do this expansion, LAWA will have to destroy 1/3 of homes and businesses in the Central Business District & homes near Nielsen Field.

**Response:**

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 regarding impacts to 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 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 will be provided to any person displaced from their home or business. Also please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

**PC01431-2**

**Comment:**

The traffic increase in cargo volume will be thousands more trucks,

**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 (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.

**PC01431-3**

**Comment:**

not even counting the traffic of the construction itself.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-3 regarding construction traffic.

**PC01431-4**

**Comment:**

This expansion is not to meet the cargo or passenger needs of this community, nor of the surrounding communities but rather the needs of communities in the outlying areas of Los Angeles. Why should this

community bear the burden of growth in other areas? The airports in those areas (that are not already overcrowded)-like Burbank, Ontario, Palmdale and El Toro should bear the cost of their expansion and growth. This area has minimal growth, yet those outlying areas have very high 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 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. 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.

**PC01431-5**

**Comment:**

The increased noise of this expansion will result in more money spent on sound proofing and more people staying in their houses with their windows closed - again this community bearing the environmental costs of other communities growth.

**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, including thresholds used to identify significant noise levels.

**PC01431-6**

**Comment:**

Air pollution (auto emissions, emissions from idling planes and jet fuel emissions) will very likely increase the respiratory systems illnesses and cancer rate for the people of this community. Again, a cost this community bears for the growth and expansion of other areas.

**Response:**

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR address 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 G, and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, 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, Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01431-7

**Comment:**

The hidden / secretive way the full plan of this expansion from the community that it would effect the most. The LAWA has not informed residents of its plan nor the impact of its plan on this community.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process. LAWA has conducted extensive community and media outreach and maintains a web site at [www.laxmasterplan.org](http://www.laxmasterplan.org).

#### PC01431-8

**Comment:**

If Orange County and Palmdale and others want to expand, grow and enjoy the prosperity of that growth, then they must also bear the costs of that growth. If those communities are not willing to have their own airports expanded because of the effects on their communities, they should not be allowed to force our community to be torn appart (literally!) for their 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 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.

**PC01432**

**Lyon, Robert**

**None Provided**

**7/17/2001**

#### PC01432-1

**Comment:**

We have lived in Westchester for 38 years. Over those year we have noticed an increase of dirt on car and home. I know that the increase is caused by an increase of air traffic.

**Response:**

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

#### PC01432-2

**Comment:**

Air pollution increase is enough to stop the expansion.

**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



### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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.

#### PC01432-3

**Comment:**

Add traffic, destroying Westchester downtown, and the Westchester neighborhood as a community is now overloaded with a no expansion vote.

**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.

#### PC01432-4

**Comment:**

Other communities need to take their share of the problem - this includes 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.

**PC01433**

**Calder, Alyce**

**None Provided**

**7/18/2001**

#### PC01433-1

**Comment:**

1.) We are very concerned about the noise from LAX for all of Westchester.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 for noise increase. For more information on noise impacts on Westchester, see Topical Response TR-LU-2. 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.

#### PC01433-2

**Comment:**

2). The streets are overcrowded all around LAX already, especially on high volume holiday weekends.

**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.

#### PC01433-3

**Comment:**

3) Very concerned about air quality for young and old - alike

**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 and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

#### PC01433-4

**Comment:**

4) Westchester receives no financial benefit from LAX-that's rotten -

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

**PC01434**

**Carver, Lauretta**

**None Provided**

**7/17/2001**

#### PC01434-1

**Comment:**

I AM VERY CONCERNED & DISPLEASED WITH THE PROPOSED AIRPORT EXPANSION OF LAX.

AS A HOMEOWNER, I'VE PARTICIPATED IN THE SOUNDPROOFING & SIGNED PAPERS REGARDING NO SUIT IF NOISE LEVELS STAY BELOW THE OUTRAGEOUS LEVELS OF 1996. FALSELY, BELIEVING ALL WAS WELL & TRUSTING THE LAX COMMISSION. I DID HAVE THE SOUNDPROOFING INSTALLED.

NOW LAX WANTS TO EXPAND - WHAT ABOUT AGREED SOUND LEVELS? WHAT ABOUT INCREASED TRAFFIC? WHAT ABOUT POLLUTION?

I AM GRATEFUL FOR THE SOUNDPROOFING, BUT HAD I KNOWN WHAT WAS TO FOLLOW, I'D NOT HAVE AGREED.

MORE JET FUEL, NOISE, TRAFFIC BOTH AIR & GROUND WERE NOT PART OF THE BARGAIN.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendices D, G, S-C and S-E, and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4, S-2 and S-4. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition. It should be noticed that under Alternative D, which is LAWA staff's currently preferred alternative, future noise, air quality and traffic impacts would generally be less (i.e., better conditions) than would occur in 2015 under the No Action/No Project Alternative. In some cases, future conditions with Alternative D would be better than existing conditions.

**PC01434-2****Comment:**

I URGE YOU TO RECONSIDER & FIND A MORE REMOTE, LESS POPULATED AREA FOR AN ALTERNATIVE & SHARED AIR TRAFFIC BURDEN.

LOS ANGELES & SO. CAL ARE VERY LARGE, SURELY AN ALTERNATIVE CHOICE IS AVAILABLE FOR CONSIDERATION.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC01434-3****Comment:**

WHAT WILL THIS DO TO THE QUALITY OF LIVING IN THE WESTCHESTER AREA? WHAT WILL IT DO TO PROPERTY VALUES? WE NEED ANSWERS & ALTERNATIVES!

**Response:**

Comment noted. Land use impacts were addressed in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting documentation provided in Technical Reports 1 and S-1. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts to quality of life, Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester, and Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding residential property values.

**PC01435****Allen, Lorraine****None Provided****7/19/2001****PC01435-1****Comment:**

We are very much opposed to LAX expansion, for numerous reasons.

1. Keeping our homes! and community whole.
2. Traffic
3. Noise
4. Cargo demand
5. Air pollution
6. Safety, overcrowding of the air corridors may lead to the likelihood of air disasters!

**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, Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential business acquisition, Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand, 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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01435-2

**Comment:**

Regional solutions: Ontario & Palmdale which should be developed as opposed to LAX. El Toro, Orange County should also be developed. Why should the communities around LAX bear the burden of Orange County's need for 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.

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. 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.

#### PC01435-3

**Comment:**

The state of Calif has plans to build high-speed rail, that would provide a direct link between Palmdale and Los Angeles.

**Response:**

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

<b>PC01436</b>	<b>Mispagel, Margaret</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/17/2001</b>
----------------	---------------------------	----------------------	------------------

#### PC01436-1

**Comment:**

I have lived in Westchester for 52 yrs. We had to sell our 1st home on 89th Street because of airport noise and moved 1 1/2 miles North to the Kentwood area. Now the noise from planes may force me to move elsewhere. I am 84 years old & love Westchester. It is my "hometown"!

**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-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

**PC01436-2****Comment:**

LAX is already unsafe with so many plans / I suggest you develop Palmdale or Ontario airports so people from East & North communities would not have to drive so far for planes.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

**PC01436-3****Comment:**

The extra planes you want & cars is impossible to live with. Please keep Westchester the quiet & happy community it is. Thank 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. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. 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. 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.

**PC01437****McCole, Christina****None Provided****7/12/2001****PC01437-1****Comment:**

My concerns are as follows regarding the LAX expansion:

**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.

**PC01437-2****Comment:**

1) Keeping our community whole and not tearing down additional homes and businesses.

**Response:**

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 regarding impacts to 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 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

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

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 will be provided to any person displaced from their home or business. Also please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

#### **PC01437-3**

**Comment:**

2) Traffic is a concern as the area around LAX is already very congested.

**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.

#### **PC01437-4**

**Comment:**

3) Air disasters / near misses are already up 80%. What will more flights bring?

**Response:**

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

#### **PC01437-5**

**Comment:**

4) Air pollution - we already have soot on our cars,

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding soot.

#### **PC01437-6**

**Comment:**

what about people's health when pollution grows by a reported 1400% according to the LA. times.

**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 and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

**PC01438      Yamamoto, Sachiye      None Provided**

#### **PC01438-1**

**Comment:**

I DO NOT WANT THE ADDED NOISE OR TRAFFIC. I AM OPPOSED TO THIS 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 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.

**PC01439      Needles, A.      None Provided      7/19/2001**

**PC01439-1****Comment:**

The Westchester community has borne its fair share of traffic, congestion and noise. Please keep your election promises to seek a regional solution to Air Cargo and Traffic expansions. Don't take our community away from us and ruin a wonderful area on the Westside. As a voting member of this community, your actions will greatly influence my choices at the voting booth in future elections. Expand to 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, Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale, 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 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.

**PC01440      Wright, Barry      None Provided      7/18/2001**

**PC01440-1****Comment:**

I oppose the LAX expansion. It will ruin our neighborhood, reduce our property values, and contaminate the air within which our children breath.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and health impacts in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report 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-LU-1 regarding impacts to quality of life, and 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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01440-2

**Comment:**

Any spare land in the Westchester area should be developed for future generations to play safely in. Our streets are not safe with excessive traffic problems and the LAX expansion will only create more.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and safety impacts in Section 4.24.3, Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 2, 3, and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2 and S-9 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.

<b>PC01441</b>	<b>Midgley, Timothy</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/17/2001</b>
----------------	-------------------------	----------------------	------------------

#### PC01441-1

**Comment:**

Since the 105 Freeway opened, the 405 between Long Beach and the 10 Freeway has been severely crowded with substantially reduced speeds for much of each day.

**Response:**

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

#### PC01441-2

**Comment:**

Surface streets are becoming increasingly crowded and slow. Any increase in traffic will make the problem impossible without very much better traffic management.

**Response:**

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

#### PC01441-3

**Comment:**

1. The 405 needs at least one extra lane in each direction.

**Response:**

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

#### PC01441-4

**Comment:**

2. The green line MUST go to the airport (Who were the people who stopped it short? Who bribed them).



**Response:**

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

**PC01441-5**

**Comment:**

This will help the current problem. There is no more room for growth in this community.

**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).

**PC01442**

**Fields, Annetta**

**None Provided**

**7/19/2001**

**PC01442-1**

**Comment:**

The idea of the LAX Expansion is ludicrous. It is already too big. The noise, congestion on the 405 and surface streets and the air pollution is enough to say "No 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.

**PC01442-2**

**Comment:**

Lets develope our airports in Ontario and Palmdale, and El Toro in Orange County. Why does LAX think it has to absorb all the air traffic in So. California. Most of the commuters come from Orange County and the way Palmdale is growing they need to develope 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. 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. 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

---

#### PC01442-3

**Comment:**

I am an 85+ widow. I have lived in Westchester, same home, for 59 years. Our little tract of homes; more or less was the pioneers of Westchester and we watched it grow into a thriving town. Its heart breaking to see LAX taking more and more of our community. It is time to say "No", "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. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester.

**PC01443**

**Heuer, Elke**

**None Provided**

**7/18/2001**

#### PC01443-1

**Comment:**

The pollution & noise, an expansion of LAX will bring to this neighborhood must not be allowed!!!

Stop LAX Expansion 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 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 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.

**PC01444**

**Vezzetti, Joe**

**None Provided**

**7/16/2001**

#### PC01444-1

**Comment:**

It appears to me that the LAX has greatly harmed the environment. The airplanes exhaust ect has killed the bees. The bees are required for the polination of flowers ect. The Blue El Segundo Butterfly killed the proposed golf course west of the airport. Let us do something for the environment and stop killing bees.

**Response:**

Section 4.10, Biotic Communities, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a discussion of potential indirect impacts to sensitive biotic communities and sensitive floral and faunal species from air emissions. This section did not contain a discussion of potential indirect impacts to bees because there are no sensitive species of bees present within the biotic communities of the Master Plan study area. In addition, studies conducted at LAX and other airports have reported that aircraft emissions do not contribute substantially to background levels of particulate emissions in the vicinity of airports. Aircraft

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

emissions as a result of the proposed Master Plan improvements are not expected to adversely affect floral or faunal species in the Master Plan study area, including bees.

**PC01445      Ziff, Stuart & Betty      None Provided      7/15/2001**

**PC01445-1**

**Comment:**

I feel it will increase an already over budget traffic problem. We don't need more cars congesting this area. We love our neighborhood just the way it is.

**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-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

**PC01446      Travi, Sally      None Provided      7/15/2001**

**PC01446-1**

**Comment:**

We have lived in Westchester since 1985 and have been in favor of the development of the Howard Hughes Center and other well-planned improvements of the area. On the face of it, we were not immediately opposed to the expansion of LAX, realizing that there may be a way to increase the ability to service the needs of the LA area without great harm to the neighborhood. At this point, however, we are stating our opposition to the expansion plan.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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.

**PC01446-2**

**Comment:**

Not only does it remove existing business and services, it makes no provision to alleviate additional traffic congestion, or address air pollution & noise pollution to the residents.

**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, 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, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendices D and G, and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendices S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-2, S-3, 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. As indicated in TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not include any acquisition within the Westchester business district.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01446-3

**Comment:**

Ours is one of the more affordable, family-friendly neighborhoods on the Westside. We don't believe that the residents of Westchester/Playa del Rey should pay the price for meeting the needs of the rest of Southern California. Other airports will have to be developed to meet future demands; the maiming of Westchester/PDR area is only a temporary measure at best. Please develop airports in other areas with room to expand without loss of businesses, homes and quality of life for existing (and well-loved by its inhabitants) 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, Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, and Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

<b>PC01447</b>	<b>Ullman, Barbara</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/18/2001</b>
----------------	------------------------	----------------------	------------------

#### PC01447-1

**Comment:**

Our cars are already coated with black soot from aircraft pollution,

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding soot.

#### PC01447-2

**Comment:**

we do not need an expanded LAX and more aircraft every day.

**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.

#### PC01447-3

**Comment:**

Let's expand Ontario and Palmdale airports, and send some passengers and cargo there.

**Response:**

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.

#### PC01447-4

**Comment:**

Soon we won't have homes and stores in Westchester, only LAX and traffic lanes.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and residential and business relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses. Supporting technical data and analyses are 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. As discussed in TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester business district.

**PC01448****Ullman, Thomas****None Provided****7/18/2001****PC01448-1****Comment:**

FURTHER EXPANSION OF LAX IS RIDICULOUS! TRAFFIC ON SURFACE STREETS AND THE 405 FREEWAY IS ALREADY CLOGGED.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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. 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.

**PC01448-2****Comment:**

EXPANSION IS NIBBLING AWAY AT OUR COMMUNITY. WHY MUST SO MUCH OF THE AREA'S PASSENGER AND CARGO TRAFFIC GO THROUGH LAX? IT'S TIME TO EXPAND ONTARIO AND PALMDALE AIRPORTS AND DEVELOP EL TORO. ONLY SO MANY AIRCRAFT CAN LAND SAFELY ON LAX'S 4 RUNWAYS PER MINUTE.

**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. 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

---

**PC01449      Rigole, Rod Anthony    None Provided**

**7/15/2001**

**PC01449-1**

**Comment:**

I am an attorney with Vivendi Universal, and both live and work in Westchester. I am very concerned about the proposed expansion of LAX. My concerns are as follows:

**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.

**PC01449-2**

**Comment:**

(1) traffic - the expansion of the airport will bring significant increases of commercial and non-commercial traffic to already over congested streets. Overflow traffic will also flow into nearby neighborhoods, including my own.

**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.

**PC01449-3**

**Comment:**

(2) noise - the expansion will increase the level of noise in the surrounding areas. Soundproofing similar to that already orchestrated by the Dept. of airports will force people to remain indoors in an attempt to avoid the noise, thus depriving them the enjoyment of their homes.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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.

**PC01449-4**

**Comment:**

(3) air pollution - the expansion will significantly increase the amount of toxins/pollution released into air thus posing significant health risks

**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.

The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR evaluated the potential risk of adverse health effects for each of the Master Plan Alternatives based on the emissions associated with each of the alternatives. The No Project/No Action Alternative assumes that no substantial changes are made to current LAX facilities, and is based on projections of growth in airport activity between 1996 and horizon year 2015. Airport congestion during this time is expected to grow worse without additional capital improvement. In all cases, build alternatives are expected to relieve current and predicted future congestion by making airport operations, particularly aircraft operations, more efficient.

After implementation of mitigation measures, the build alternatives would reduce predicted impacts to human health compared with the No Project/No Action Alternative. Implementation of any of the build alternatives is therefore anticipated to reduce future health impacts for most people living, working or going to school near the airport. However, as was indicated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, predicted chronic non-cancer human health impacts for maximally exposed residents under Alternatives B and C are slightly higher for some areas than those predicted with the No Project/No Action Alternative.

**PC01449-5**

**Comment:**

I will fight the expansion at all costs!

**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.

**PC01450**

**Deakin, Robert**

**None Provided**

**7/17/2001**

**PC01450-1**

**Comment:**

I would like to take this opportunity to voice my opinion on the LAX expansion 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.

**PC01450-2**

**Comment:**

From what information has been disseminated to me, the existing "Master Plan" appears to be very much a short-term quick fix. As a frequent traveler, I experience the existing congestion from many levels: excruciating and frustrating traffic to and from the airport, dangerous level of flights, inadequate parking/transportation services, and overcrowded, inconvenient and dilapidated terminals. These issues need to be resolved with a well-constructed, fiscally responsible long-term plan.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR were program level environmental documents intended to analyze the impacts of the master plan. It is acknowledged that further documentation may be required to address certain issues in a more specific manner as necessary and appropriate.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01450-3

**Comment:**

This plan should include possible rerouting of cargo traffic and/or passenger traffic to optimize the other airports owned by the LAWA.

**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 Response to Comment PC00599-54 for more information about cargo activity.

#### PC01450-4

**Comment:**

The plan should also be reverent of the homes and communities that currently bear the ill effect of the existing problems without positive economic impact. Many of these communities have been in existence since the 40's.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

#### PC01450-5

**Comment:**

As a resident of the Westchester area myself, I purposely chose to move there for the cool breezes and the established feel of the area. If noise is allowed to continue to increase, as would be the case in the existing short-term plan, then the houses would have to be soundproofed and the breezes will suddenly disappear.

**Response:**

Please see to Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding the effect of aircraft noise on the Westchester resulting from development of the Master Plan alternatives. As stated in TR-LU-2, there would be a reduction in the number of dwelling units exposed to high noise levels under Alternatives A, B, C, and D compared to 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program.

#### PC01450-6

**Comment:**

It would also create a negative impact on the valuation of the real estate.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding the effects of LAX on property values.



**PC01450-7****Comment:**

This can be avoided by creating a comprehensive longer-term approach and by utilizing airports such as Ontario and Palmdale. Furthermore, Orange County should have to bear more responsibility for their air travel 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.

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.

**PC01450-8****Comment:**

I would like to close by saying I am very pro-growth, and I understand that an expansion of some sort is long overdue. But I'm also infuriated that millions and millions of dollars have been squandered on ridiculous transparent columns and other minor "aesthetic improvements" that did absolutely NOTHING to ease current congestion. Please do not go forward with any further expansion plans without devising a fiscally responsible, long-term comprehensive plan.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01451****Waddell, Fern****None Provided****7/16/2001****PC01451-1****Comment:**

I am a 56-year resident of Westchester, and I have seen the growth of this area - almost to the extreme! The congestion has become severe - & to add to the existing airport would make it unbearable.

**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 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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01451-2

**Comment:**

By all means, make it more efficient & safer - but do it without expansion.

**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. 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 Reports 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

**PC01452**

**Siebuhr, Jack**

**None Provided**

**7/18/2001**

#### PC01452-1

**Comment:**

LIKE MANY THOUSANDS OF OTHER HOME OWNERS AROUND LAX, THE NOISE, TRAFFIC AND SMELL IS OUT OF CONTROL NOW. IT IS A MAJOR PROJECT TO EGRESS OR AGRESS OUR LOVELY AND BEAUTIFUL NIEGHBORHOOD.

**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. Please see Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding odors.

#### PC01452-2

**Comment:**

THEREFORE WE ARE DEFINITELY OPPOSED TO LAX EXPANTION.

**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.

**PC01453**

**St. John, Jane &  
Donald**

**None Provided**

**7/19/2001**

#### PC01453-1

**Comment:**

We have been homeowners in Playa del Rey since 1982. We love the Westchester and Playa del Rey communities. We bought here knowing that LAX was our neighbor. We've had our condo soundproofed - but this won't even help if the expansion as proposed goes forward!

**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-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester 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.

#### **PC01453-2**

**Comment:**

There must be a regional approach to airport travel - we should not have to absorb all the noise and traffic for all of the areas 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. 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.

#### **PC01453-3**

**Comment:**

Please do not block off Pershing Drive or put an extra terminal at World Way West!

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please refer to Response to Comment AL00018-30 for a discussion of Pershing Drive. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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 would not alter the existing Pershing Drive or include a new West Terminal.

**PC01454      Salmonson, Arthur      Salmonson & Associates      7/12/2001**

#### **PC01454-1**

**Comment:**

I AM FORMER COMMERCIAL AIRLINE PILOT FOR 15 YEARS AND I JUST RECOMMEND ONLY THE FOLLOWING IMPROVEMENTS WHICH ARE FAR LESS COSTLY AND DISRUPTIVE TO COMMUNITY.

1. ONLY ADD AN ARBOR VITAE OFF RAMP TO 405 FREEWAY - EXTEND AND WIDEN WESTCHESTER PARKWAY FROM 405 FREEWAY TO NEW WEST TERMINAL.

2. BRING IN LIGHT RAIL STATION. THAT IS OK.

3. EXTEND 24L & 24R ACROSS PERSHING DRIVE THROUGH SAND DUNES EXTEND RUNWAYS TO THE WEST - NOT EAST. REMOVE SAND DUNES. TUNNEL PERSHING DRIVE UNDER EXTENDED 24L & 24R.

4. DO NOT BUILD FREEWAY LOOP ROAD OR DISPLACE ANY WESTCHESTER BUSINESSES.

PLEASE!

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**Response:**

The proposed access plan was designed to address the future needs of the airport without causing significant impacts to the surrounding street network or communities. Each component of the plan is important to serve these functions. It was determined that a plan that does not include all of the proposed components would either not satisfy the future demand at an acceptable level of service, or it would cause significant environmental impacts. The process of making this determination was documented in the LAX Master Plan, Draft EIS/EIR, and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR documents.

The alternatives avoid disturbing the sand dunes in order to avoid or minimize the potential for impact to the El Segundo Blue Butterfly, an endangered species. Therefore, no alternatives are being analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR or in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR that would disturb the dunes. Please see Response to Comment AL00008-8 for more information regarding the status of the Arbor Vitae/I-405 ramps. Also, subsequent to the publication of the 2001 Draft EIS/EIR, the FHWA withdrew its support for a half interchange at Arbor Vitae, and the proposed half interchange is not part of the LAX Master Plan. FHWA policy is to only consider full potential interchanges, not partial ones. See also Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the Arbor Vitae interchange, the Ring Road, and light rail options. Also see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding Westchester.

**PC01455      Smith, James T. &      None Provided      7/17/2001**  
**Marilyn L.**

**PC01455-1**

**Comment:**

We oppose expansion of LAX. We cannot handle more TRAFFIC. TRAFFIC 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. 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.

**PC01455-2**

**Comment:**

1) AUTO TRAFFIC. There are no plans for the expansion of 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 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.

**PC01455-3**

**Comment:**

With the addition of the Howard Hughes Center and the Playa Vista Development, we are already in TROUBLE.

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00148-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00148-2.

**PC01455-4****Comment:**

The 405 is impossible NOW, with no relief in sight.

**Response:**

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

**PC01455-5****Comment:**

Parking at International is impossible!!

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01455-6****Comment:**

2) AIR TRAFFIC. What's it going to take before the need to divert LAX flights to other airports

**Response:**

An airline's decision to use an alternative airport to LAX is based on many factors. Alternatives C & D and the No Action/No Project Alternative would not be able to accommodate all of the forecast demand in 2015. Therefore, some traffic is assumed to be served by other airports outside the region. Chapter 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided discussions on the other regional airports. See TR-RC-1 concerning a regional approach to airports.

**PC01455-7****Comment:**

3) Human Traffic - The lines for check-in are horrendous. Pick pockets & thieves are in heaven at LAX. I've been a victim and it's something not to be relived.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01456****Hall, J.Tillman****None Provided****7/12/2001****PC01456-1****Comment:**

Palmdale is the logical place for an airport. Don't disrupt the whole community of Westchester

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01457**      **Troy, Marie**      **None Provided**      **7/18/2001**

**PC01457-1**

**Comment:**

As homeowners in Westchester, we are very concerned about the expansion plan for 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.

**PC01457-2**

**Comment:**

Our single biggest objection to the current plan is that it does not do nearly enough to disperse the burden of air traffic to surrounding airports, like Orange County and Palmdale. With the concentration of homes and businesses around LAX, and the potential for their displacement, the current expansion plan is not a prudent step in dealing with increasing air traffic in Southern California. A more equitable plan ought to be established, one that takes into account how air traffic can be mitigated throughout the entire Southern California region, and not just over LAX. A longer-term, inter-county solution is needed, and it is wrong to expect one community - that surrounding LAX - to shoulder the bulk of increased air traffic with its resultant consequences: pollution, noise 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.

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.

**PC01457-3**

**Comment:**

We hope you will take our comments here into account and seriously reconsider the current expansion plan.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01458      Hankins, Richard      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC01458-1**

**Comment:**

I AM CONCERNED ABOUT:

(A) EXCESS TRAFFIC THRU THE NEIGHBORHOOD AND SURFACE STREETS/AVES.

(B) EXCESS SOUND OF JETS TAKING OFF, LANDING, ETC.

(C) LARGER, LOUDER PLANES

(D) POLLUTION FROM PLANES, SMELL OF AVIATION FUEL, AUTO EXHAUST ECT.

(E) AIR SAFETY -

**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 Safety in 4.24.3, Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 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, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety, Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts, Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise levels of larger aircraft, and Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding odors.

**PC01458-2**

**Comment:**

MY MAIN QUESTION IS WHY DOESN'T LA DEVELOP SOME OF IT'S OTHER AIRPORTS TO REFLECT THE GROWING POPULATION & NEED FOR AIRPORTS IN THOSE EXISTING 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.

**PC01459      Mardesich, Kevin      None Provided      7/19/2001**

**PC01459-1**

**Comment:**

Please consider the lives you will negatively affect in the South Bay by expanding LAX. Greed and commerce over quality of life is an inhuman existence.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**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.

**PC01459-2**

**Comment:**

The are both alternative and/or less populated airports which should be evaluated, including: Ontario, Palmdale, El Toro, Burbank, etc.

**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. 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.

**PC01459-3**

**Comment:**

The is a way to remain economically competitive without ruining lives. Have you done all the research possible re: LAX? Perhaps its efficiency could be improved vs. expanded.

**Response:**

An exhaustive amount of research has been conducted by LAWA. The Executive Summary in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provides a detailed description of the research that has been conducted prior to developing LAX Master Plan Alternative D.

**PC01460**

**Stumpell, Kent**

**None Provided**

**7/17/2001**

**PC01460-1**

**Comment:**

I strongly object to the findings of the LAX Masterplan EIR 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.



#### PC01460-2

**Comment:**

The EIR does not consider the benefits of reducing operations at LAX from existing levels. LAX already places an inordinate burden on communities surrounding it. The EIR must examine alternatives that are designed to mitigate the already-excessive negative impacts of LAX operations, not just options that will only worsen existing impacts. The benefits and value that could result from implementing alternatives to expansion must be fully analyzed. Improvements in quality of life, increased property values, improvements in mobility, enhanced value of commercial areas and outdoor resources, plus public health improvements are too valuable to ignore.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00033-315 and Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding the range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Due to the deregulation of the aviation industry, LAWA does not have the ability to directly control the number of aircraft operations at LAX or the number of passengers flying into and out of LAX. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, and Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding property values. Impacts associated with traffic and human health, including improvements compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative, were identified in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, respectively. It should be noted that, subsequent to publication of 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. Alternative D would make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient, and would have the fewest negative impacts to the local communities and the region.

#### PC01460-3

**Comment:**

The EIR fails to adequately assess the impact that ground traffic expansion plans, required to support air traffic expansion, would have on surrounding communities. For years, the communities surrounding LAX have experienced severe traffic congestion largely due to airport-related ground traffic. Arterials that could comfortably handle regional travel patterns are overwhelmed by traffic bound for LAX. Numerous intersections are already at level of service E and F during peak hours. It will not be possible to accommodate the substantial addition of ground traffic caused by LAX expansion without road improvement on a scale that would bring severe degradation to already-impacted streetscapes.

**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.

#### PC01460-4

**Comment:**

Additional ground traffic created by the proposed expansion would create substantial negative impacts on surrounding communities, including:

- Road widening projects that would necessitate the loss of sidewalk space and the removal of street trees and landscaped medians.
- Degradation of the vitality of several commercial/retail districts located on key arterials.
- Negatively impact the viability of existing businesses.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

- Discourage the establishment of needed new businesses.
- Degradation of retail areas would force residents, employees and visitors to drive outside of the community for many of their needs, further aggravating traffic congestion.

The EIR fails to adequately consider these impacts.

**Response:**

Effects on businesses due to acquisition were addressed in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences and Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Impacts on visual quality were addressed in Section 4.21, Design, Art, and Architecture Application/Aesthetics, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Effects on land use and community serving uses were addressed in Section 4.2, Land Use and Section 4.4.4, Community Disruption and Alteration of Surface Transportation Patterns, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Effects on Traffic were evaluated in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation (subsection 4.3.2), of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01460-5**

**Comment:**

The EIR fails to adequately assess the full cost of degraded property values. Prevailing property values in Westchester, El Segundo, Inglewood and other communities surrounding LAX are already closely related to the degree that they are impacted by airport operations. Basically, the closer real estate is to the airport, a flight path or a congested road, the less value that property enjoys compared to similar parcels that are impacted less. Additional flights and ground traffic would directly result in further loss of property value. The cumulative losses would be huge. Homeowners and businesses have invested in the area based on existing conditions, not anticipating an expanded airport. To fairly compensate them for losses directly related to airport expansion would require the acquisition of property on a scale that is unheard of and clearly uneconomical when compared to shifting air traffic growth to outlying airports. The EIR does not address these issues.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values. 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 Chapter 1, Regional Context, and Chapter 3 (subsection 3.1.1.2), Alternatives, 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 and evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Implementation of Alternative D would be consistent with a decentralized regional commercial airport system (i.e., by constraining growth at LAX and thereby promoting growth at former military and other underutilized airports outside of the region's urban core).

**PC01460-6**

**Comment:**

The plan fails to adequately examine alternatives for regional travel. The scenarios proposed by LAWA do not adequately consider alternative travel modes for meeting regional high speed travel needs. Much like Southern California's over-dependence on private automobiles for local travel, providing only one travel choice for high-speed regional travel - commercial airlines - gives travelers no options, creates severe environmental impacts, has inherent safety challenges and leaves the region vulnerable to problems caused by service disruptions.

The EIR's determination that alternate modes of transportation, including high speed rail, are not considered feasible or practical and were thus rejected from consideration is based on insufficient study of the impacts, benefits and trade-offs that should be addressed.

The plan fails to compare the environmental impacts of expanded air traffic to those of other high-speed travel alternatives, such as high-speed rail. The expansion of air traffic operations at LAX cannot be

fairly considered without a much more thorough examination of all options for meeting our long-term, regional high-speed travel needs. The role of various forms of rail transportation must be compared and considered for their ability to support regional travel needs. Rail has a much different set of land use and environmental impacts, quite possibly with far less impact than aviation.

While non-regional long-distance travel - over 500 miles or so - may be best served by aviation, high-speed rail has the ability, amply demonstrated in other countries, to provide transport to many California and Southwestern cities that is sufficiently rapid and possibly more convenient than air travel.

Advantages of high-speed rail (HSR) over aviation for regional rapid transit include:

- Rail access is decentralized so that multiple stations, rather than one very large airport, provide dispersed places for passengers to access the carrier. This reduces the need and concentration of ground traffic for rail stations compared to airports.

- The land use impact of rail consumes far less area than a large central airport. The "footprint" of impacted land surrounding a major airport is far in excess of that for rail, even considering the entire track length adjacent to urban areas.

- Energy consumed, per passenger, for HSR is less than for air travel.

- High speed rail is powered by electricity, which has no air emissions at the train and can be generated from a variety of energy sources. Aviation is totally dependent on a single, pollution-prone, non-renewable energy source: jet fuel.

- High speed rail has fewer safety challenges when compared to aviation. Due to the severe safety concerns of being airborne, air travel must always incorporate elaborate safety precautions and procedures. These include: time-consuming boarding protocols, safety instruction for passengers, limitations on baggage, restrictions on in-flight passenger movement and activities, multiple backups of key equipment, extremely costly air control systems and expensive insurance costs.

By contrast, rail operations allow much faster multiple-entrance boarding, the ability to carry more luggage, freedom of passengers to move within the entire train at all times, and much simpler control and safety equipment. When a loss of propulsion does not imply imminent disaster, as it does for aviation, comparative safety is enhanced.

NONE of the above advantages are evaluated in the EIR for their comparative benefits over aviation in meeting our regional transportation needs.

The Master Plan briefly examines high-speed rail in Ch. 1 section 4.3.4, noting several significant benefits, which it ultimately dismisses. It finds that travel to several regional cities could be served by HSR competitively to air travel. Indeed, five cities, San Francisco, Sacramento, Oakland, San Jose and Las Vegas alone currently comprise over 31% of the domestic air traffic volume at LAX, or approx. 15 MAP. According to the California High Speed Rail Authority, HSR is expected to be competitive with air travel for these markets. Travel cost for HSR is predicted to be 40% that of air travel. And travel time is expected to take one hour between LA and San Diego, and two and a half hours between LA and SF, door to door.

In considering the viability of high speed rail, the EIR observes that its development is many years off and then goes on to say that aviation is the fastest growing mode of travel. This is an inadequate basis for rejecting the many benefits of HSR.

When planning for long-term transportation needs, we cannot simply acquiesce to trends. Merely because a mode of travel is growing fast does not mean that this will result in a desirable outcome for our society. The many negative impacts associated with aviation travel require that we aggressively explore alternatives for high-speed regional travel. When all the negative impacts associated with aviation are factored in, there could be clear advantages to alternatives. The final EIR must fully explore these in order to provide the information needed to make a sound decision.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand. Also, LAWA's ability to influence the modes of regional transportation are limited to the operations at LAX, Ontario Airport, Palmdale Airport and Van Nuys Airport. LAWA is not responsible for the development of high-speed rail systems in the region. In addition, a Los Angeles to Lax Vegas high speed rail system has been discussed by some policymakers for many years; however, there is currently no responsible government agency for planning and reviewing such a project. Further, studies

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

have not shown such a system to be feasible, nor has any type of funding sources been designated. If such a system were to be developed, it would not be operational until beyond the 2015 planning horizon of the LAX Master Plan. Therefore, the purpose and need for the LAX Master Plan still exists.

**PC01461      Ogren, John      None Provided      7/20/2001**

**PC01461-1**

**Comment:**

I support expansion of the airport.

I always support industrial and "business expansion" because it is for the "greater good".

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01462      Winn, Boyd      None Provided      7/17/2001**

**PC01462-1**

**Comment:**

I have two basic concerns about the proposed airport expansion, namely, it would displace a lot of people and businesses, and it wouldn't solve the basic problem in the long term. The population will continue to grow, and along with that natural phenomena, the need for additional expansion will always be with us until, in the limit, the only entities in the entire valley will be downtown LA, LAX, with small remnants of Santa Monica and Long Beach!

**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.

**PC01462-2**

**Comment:**

I think that the long-term best solution would be to locate LAX in the desert where expansion could be carried out ad infinitum,

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01462-3**

**Comment:**

and, concurrently, to develop high-speed transportation between the new LAX and selected major communities.

**Response:**

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

**PC01463      Benning, Sandra      None Provided      7/15/2001**

**PC01463-1**

**Comment:**

I am against the LAX expansion mainly due to congestion on Sepulveda/Lincoln and the area now...

**Response:**

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

**PC01463-2**

**Comment:**

with Howard Hughes Complex still expanding & Playa Vista Project being developed where's the room?

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00148-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00148-2.

**PC01463-3**

**Comment:**

Anyone who drives these streets, especially on week-ends or work traffic time knows how bad we need no more cars or trucks. I have a friend who visited; she came from West LA down Sepulveda - 15 miles - it took her almost an hour on Saturday - no accidents! Forget the 405. almost always backed up to a crawl.

**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.

**PC01463-4**

**Comment:**

I don't understand why Ontario or John Wayne can't handle some of the load. Friends & relatives come to LAX to travel out of state when they live near these other airports.

**Response:**

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.

**PC01463-5**

**Comment:**

The noise has increased over the years. It use to be quiet from 9:00 pm to about 7:00 am. Not any more!

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

**Response:**

Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided detailed 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, especially with regard to noise impacts on nighttime awakenings and mitigation for nighttime awakenings.

**PC01463-6**

**Comment:**

Try having a yard party or BarBQ...always airplane noise.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels.

**PC01463-7**

**Comment:**

Noise means more pollution. We might have cleaner air but we have more lung problems and asthma, especially for children.

**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-3 regarding air pollution increase and Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding land use and noise mitigation.

**PC01463-8**

**Comment:**

Other areas need to help take the demands, they enjoy the benefit of LAX without paying the price... traffic, noise, pollution, and safety standard lowered.

**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. Also, please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

**PC01463-9****Comment:**

Westchester has just started to really develop back into a community of life and services. I believe it will go back to a near dead community if the expansion occurs.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01463-10****Comment:**

What is so wrong to use areas where space is still available? People will go where they need to.

**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.

**PC01463-11****Comment:**

I wished that I could have attended the meeting that was held. I know others agree but have not written.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01463-12****Comment:**

What happened to the mayor's promise of no expansion?

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00578-1 regarding the development of Alternative D-Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, which was developed at the direction of Mayor James Hahn.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01464**      **Cavallaro, Jason**      **None Provided**      **7/12/2001**  
**Charles**

**PC01464-1**

**Comment:**

Why are you so determined to expand L.A.X.? Other metropolitan cities have "timely" drives to their airports. It is understandable to most people. Why must you "plunder" us with more traffic, more noise, more pollution - when you have other alternatives? Why isn't it prudent to move all cargo to Palmdale or Ontario? This plan only benefits L.A.X. & those being "paid off"

**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.

**PC01465**      **Banhagels, The**      **None Provided**      **7/18/2001**

**PC01465-1**

**Comment:**

We have lived here since 1964. Westchester it was a very nice quiet commutiny.  
Now every day, we hear noise from the airport Pollution and traffic to and from the airport.  
We do not need any expansion. It's already expanded to the limit.  
89 million passenger by 2015 will be a complete disaster for for the whole area & People will be leaving the area there fore no more Westchester, and other close area -

**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.

**PC01465-2**

**Comment:**

Expand the Palmdale and Ontario airport  
They can share some of the traffic and will bring work in their 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.

**PC01465-3****Comment:**

No Expansion and NO on whatever is on Those 12,000 pages. NO - NO - NO - Happy in Westchester as it is now.

**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.

**PC01466****Kunz, Lorene****None Provided****7/19/2001****PC01466-1****Comment:**

We do not want a larger airport. It has been expanded once or twice already. The noise is already ear-splitting. The smell from the airplane engines is very bad some days. It is getting to be unhealthy to live in the area. We don't need any more traffic in this area.

Go someplace else and build another one.

**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 Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding odors 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.

**PC01467****Peterson, Linda****None Provided****7/18/2001****PC01467-1****Comment:**

Our numerous concerns about the proposed expansion of LAX are for the most part being addressed by other persons. However, there is one aspect of the Draft EIR/EIS that is of significant concern to us and has not been adequately addressed by the Draft EIR/EIS, namely, the creation of a ring road that would interrupt the flow of commuter traffic on Pershing Drive.

Figure 3-15, a map of the airport assuming Alternative C is adopted, shows that the route from Imperial Highway to Culver Boulevard using Pershing Drive would be interrupted. The Figure 3-15 map suggests that commuters who now use that route would no longer be able to do so. Presumably those

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

cars would be diverted to either Vista del Mar or Sepulveda. We strenuously object to this proposal. We similarly would object to Alternatives A and B, which would cause the same interruption.

We purchased our house four years ago on Vista del Mar Lane. Our lot backs onto Vista del Mar. We recognized that the airport was a substantial and noisy neighbor when we moved in, and we realized that airport traffic might increase. We took this into account when we purchased our home. What we did not take into account was the prospect of the airport unnecessarily rerouting substantial amounts of street traffic past our home, thereby substantially increasing the noise and air pollution to which we are subjected. We see nothing in the Draft EIR/EIS that indicates why it is necessary to interrupt current traffic patterns as proposed in Figure 3-15, and we see nothing in the Draft EIR/EIS that would attempt to mitigate the effects of this increased traffic on surrounding streets.

At the risk of being characterized as a "NIMBY," we point out that this would substantially diminish our quality of life and that of our neighbors, without any particular compelling reason for making the change. Please explain why this Pershing Drive interruption is necessary and what LAWA can do to mitigate its effect on the existing traffic. Alternatively, please develop an option that would allow the existing commuter traffic to continue to travel from Culver Boulevard to Imperial Highway via Pershing Drive.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00018-30. Alternative D would not alter the existing Pershing Drive, as discussed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC01468      Burton, Norman      None Provided      7/15/2001**

**PC01468-1**

**Comment:**

PLEASE STOP ALL GROWTH.  
SAFETY IS SEPARATE FROM GROWTH.

**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.

**PC01468-2**

**Comment:**

I WOULD PREFER IF ALL FLIGHTS BETWEEN 10:00 PM & 6:00 AM WERE STOPPED.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00689-1 regarding the difficulty of implementing a curfew at LAX. Also please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

**PC01468-3**

**Comment:**

PLEASE FOCUS YOUR ATTENTION ON PALMDALE AND ONTARIO.

**Response:**

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. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

**PC01469                      Soria,                      None Provided**

**PC01469-1**

**Comment:**

THE LAX EXPAND IS MAKING OUR PROPERTY GO DOWN ON PRICE. THAT NOT RIGHT. FOR US TO LOSE BY SIDE THAT IT'S NOT NOISING I HAVING TROUBLE HEAR BECAUSE OF THIS.

**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-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.

**PC01470                      Hooper, Donna                      None Provided                      7/19/2001**

**PC01470-1**

**Comment:**

I would like to express my great displeasure with the LAX Master Plan. These are my 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.

**PC01470-2**

**Comment:**

1. There is already a great amount of traffic around LAX. The north Sepulveda Blvd. off ramp of the 105 Freeway is often backed up to the 405 Freeway. North bound Sepulveda Blvd. is often in gridlock between El Segundo Blvd. and LAX. On Thursday morning, June 29, 2000 it took me one hour to drive from Sepulveda Blvd. and Grand Ave. in El Segundo to LAX to pick up my brother and sister-in-law. Making LAX even larger will only make this problem unbearable.

**Response:**

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

**PC01470-3**

**Comment:**

2. The traffic from outlying areas to the LAX area is horrific. Everyone I know in Southern California who does not live near LAX HATES to come there because of the traffic. Those who live in the San Gabriel Valley try their best to fly in and out of Burbank. Those who live in the San Fernando Valley and Ventura also would rather fly out of Burbank and they would go to Palmdale if it were available. Those who live in Riverside or the Inland Empire would much prefer to fly out of Ontario and do so when they can. Those who live in Orange County would love to fly out of John Wayne if they can. They would certainly fly from El Toro if it were available. Have you ever been on the west 91 or 10 or 60 Freeways in the morning? Have you ever been on the north or south 405 Freeway in the early morning or late afternoon? If you have you know the horrid traffic problem that already exists. Every day the

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

traffic report on the radio tells of the traffic problems around LAX. The proposed LAX Master Plan only will make an awful problem 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. 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. Please also see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

**PC01470-4**

**Comment:**

3. At my home in El Segundo we already have black windows and corroded screens on the north (airport) side of the house that are impossible to keep clean. This is in a large part from the noxious emissions from the airplanes.

**Response:**

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

**PC01470-5**

**Comment:**

Six dogs on our block, that I know of, have died from cancer. The noxious emissions from LAX might have been a factor. Several of our neighbors along with my husband and myself have cancer. The noxious emissions from LAX might be a factor. More flights could make this worse. I don't think you have taken these health problems into consideration.

**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.

**PC01470-6**

**Comment:**

4. It goes without saying, but I still am going to say it, that the noise is already bad at my home. More flights will bring more noise. When the cloud level is low the airplanes turn early and fly over our house, knowing that we can't identify them. With all the additional flights that you propose in the Master Plan, this will only accelerate.

**Response:**

Weather conditions at times play a role in a perceived increase in noise levels. However, even in clear weather conditions pilots cannot see specific houses below them during departure due to the climb profile of the aircraft. LAWA has recently installed a PASSUR system to assist the community in tracking aircraft operations. By going to the LAWA website [www.lawa.org](http://www.lawa.org) and entering the Noise Management section, community members can specifically identify LAX operations that cross their community. For additional information on noise increases and aircraft flight procedures please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase. Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the

Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided detailed 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.

**PC01470-7**

**Comment:**

Thank you for considering these objections to the LAX Master Plan. I hope you will decide to use the regional airport plan.

**Response:**

Please see Responses to Comments PC01470-2 through PC01470-6 above and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

**PC01471      Wendling, Diana      None Provided      7/16/2001**

**PC01471-1**

**Comment:**

While we have only recently moved to Westchester we are both long time residents of LA's Westside and we both adamantly 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.

**PC01471-2**

**Comment:**

We strongly urge Mayor Hahn (for whom we voted) to do everything in his power to honor his campaign promise and appoint commissioners who will block the implementation of the LAWA-authored Master Plan.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00578-1 regarding the development of Alternative D-Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, which was developed at the direction of Mayor James Hahn.

**PC01471-3**

**Comment:**

Our days and evenings are already adversely impacted by the noise levels of LAX departure flights - particularly those that head due north rather than west.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2 regarding early turns over areas north and south of the LAX, and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 regarding existing and future noise levels.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01471-4

**Comment:**

Additionally, there are already traceable levels of kerosene in the air.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00088-2.

#### PC01471-5

**Comment:**

Should the noise and pollution increase to greater levels of discomfort, the city and its governing officials will be in breach of their contract to best serve its tax paying citizens.

**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 impacts 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.

**PC01472**

**Gayton, Sharon**

**None Provided**

**7/15/2001**

#### PC01472-1

**Comment:**

PLEASE, PLEASE: KEEP OUR COMMUNITY FROM BEING IMPACTED BY MORE NOISE - TRAFFIC - RECONSTRUCTION.

**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 construction impacts in Section 4.20, Construction Impacts. 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.

#### PC01472-2

**Comment:**

I HAVE LIVED IN MY HOUSE SINCE APRIL OF 1956! WE IMPROVED OUR PROPERTY SEVERAL TIMES BECAUSE WE LOVED THE NEIGHBORHOOD & DIDN'T WANT TO MOVE AWAY.

OVER THE YEARS WE HAVE WATCHED OUR FRIENDLY, COHESIVE NEIGHBORHOOD GRADUALLY SLIP AWAY - NOISE, DIRT FROM THE AIRPLANES, TRAFFIC, ETC, HAVE IMPACTED US TO MAKE US WONDER IF WE MADE A GOOD DECISION TO STAY!

NO MORE AIRPORT EXPANSION - NO MORE FREEWAY DEVELOPMENT/ACCESS RAMPS, POSSIBILITY OF AIR DISASTERS!!

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

**PC01472-3**

**Comment:**

USE OTHER AIRPORT FACILITIES & LEAVE US AS WE ARE!

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC01473**

**Weinstock, Arnold**

**None Provided**

**7/18/2001**

**PC01473-1**

**Comment:**

In addition to the attached, there are other issues.

**Response:**

Please see Responses to Comments below.

**PC01473-2**

**Comment:**

1. Traffic is often too heavy at the airport causing near 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. 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.

**PC01473-3**

**Comment:**

2. Parking at the airport is often difficult as there are no spaces available including handicap spaces which I need.

Increasing capacity will worsen these problems.

**Response:**

The Draft EIS/EIR is a program-level document intended to address the impacts of a Master Plan. More detailed plans may be developed prior to actual construction of any structures. If the LAX Master Plan is approved and additional parking structures are built, the system will comply with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Requirements addressed as part of the design.

**PC01473-4**

**Comment:**

KEEPING OUR COMMUNITY WHOLE - In order to build LAX Expressway and the Ring Road - the LAWA will have to acquire one-third of the Central Business District on Sepulveda Blvd., homes near

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

Nielsen Field and part of historic Centinela Adobe. What happens when this Expansion isn't enough - Whose home will be the next target?

**Response:**

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC00908-2; please refer to Response to Comment PC00908-2.

**PC01473-5**

**Comment:**

TRAFFIC - Increase in cargo volume will lead to thousands more trucks.

**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.

**PC01473-6**

**Comment:**

Construction will bring more traffic, though it may be temporary.

**Response:**

This comment is similar to comment PC00908-4. Please see Response to Comment PC00908-4.

**PC01473-7**

**Comment:**

Expansion would add numerous cars to our surface streets and 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.

**PC01473-8**

**Comment:**

There are no mitigation measures for handling the traffic on the freeways.

**Response:**

This comment is identical to comment PC00887-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00887-2.

**PC01473-9**

**Comment:**

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



**Response:**

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC00148-7; please refer to Response to Comment PC00148-7.

**PC01473-10**

**Comment:**

Homes in the 65 CNEL are eligible for soundproofing. More noise and soundproofing may mean that people will have to remain indoors with their doors and windows closed!

**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.

**PC01473-11**

**Comment:**

CARGO DEMAND - The LAWA is focusing its expansion to meet projected cargo demand. Areas of concern include larger cargo aircraft, more flights, and heavy aircraft operations.

**Response:**

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC00908-9; please refer to Response to Comment PC00908-9 regarding cargo demand.

**PC01473-12**

**Comment:**

AIR POLLUTION - Auto emission, emissions from idling planes and jet fuel emissions. LAX is already one of the region's single largest source of NOx emissions - the primary precursor to ozone. The EIR/EIS predicts that the increased ground and air traffic will result in increased emissions of all five EPA classified major air pollutants.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00043-6 regarding LAX as a source of air pollution.

**PC01473-13**

**Comment:**

This could affect the respiratory systems of some people and may cause cancer.

**Response:**

This comment is identical to comment PC00908-11. Please see Response to Comment PC00908-11.

**PC01473-14**

**Comment:**

SAFETY - Overcrowding of the air corridors may lead to likelihood of air disasters.

**Response:**

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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01473-15

**Comment:**

REGIONAL SOLUTION - The Master Plan is a short-term quick fix approach. Long term planning is needed. The City of Los Angeles owns two key airports - Ontario and Palmdale - which should be developed as opposed 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.

#### PC01473-16

**Comment:**

El Toro (Orange County) should also be developed. Why should the communities around LAX bear the burden of Orange County's need for air commerce?

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

#### PC01473-17

**Comment:**

The State of California has plans to build high-speed rail that would provide a direct link between Palmdale and Los Angeles.

**Response:**

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

<b>PC01474</b>	<b>Basso, Catherine</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/18/2001</b>
----------------	-------------------------	----------------------	------------------

#### PC01474-1

**Comment:**

No to LAX Expansion!  
No to increase traffic!  
No to increase in noise!  
No to an increase in air pollution!  
No to destroying our community!  
It is ridiculous that LAX is becoming Westchester & not a part!

**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 and 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.

**PC01474-2**

**Comment:**

Palmdale & ontario should 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 and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

**PC01474-3**

**Comment:**

A historic site is priceless it is history of our past yet you aim to destroy it! Preserve the community as it is. Preserve the historic site!

NO, NO, 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. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed historic resources in Section 4.9, Historic/Architectural and Archaeological/Cultural and Paleontological Resources, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 11. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding potential impacts to the Centinela Adobe.

**PC01475**

**Cain, Patrick**

**None Provided**

**7/16/2001**

**PC01475-1**

**Comment:**

LAX already is crowded and hazardous. Expansion will only make it more so.

**Response:**

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

**PC01475-2**

**Comment:**

Expansion also will increase congestion on the 405 freeway, which already is intolerable.

**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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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.

#### **PC01475-3**

**Comment:**

Expansion will degrade the quality of life for those who live and work in the area.

**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.

**PC01476      Hathaway, Dorothy      None Provided      7/19/2001**

#### **PC01476-1**

**Comment:**

I have been a Westchester resident for nearly 40 years. We old timers have watched LAX gobble up Westchester steadily over that time. Please - let it STOP!

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC01160-1.

#### **PC01476-2**

**Comment:**

Why oh why can't Palmdale be used? They NEED the revenue such would bring -

**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.

#### **PC01476-3**

**Comment:**

& building a fast-line to LA & other points would give so many people jobs!

**Response:**

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

#### **PC01476-4**

**Comment:**

I'm so tired of scrubbing the pollution off the windows & its ledges! It's gummy & gritty.

**Response:**

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

**PC01476-5****Comment:**

When I moved here, I had no mortal clue as to how things would grow! But now I see - & it scares me to think the "giant" may eat me, too!

Save a lovely neighborhood - Stop the expansion into Westchester.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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 potential effects of Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester. As indicated in TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester business district.

**PC01477****Johnson, Elizabeth****None Provided****7/19/2001****PC01477-1****Comment:**

I object to this project 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.

**PC01477-2****Comment:**

1. By extending the 405/H. Hughes exit ramp through to Airport Blvd, the plan will dramatically increase not only passenger traffic but commercial traffic as well.

**Response:**

It is unclear what component of the plan the commentor is referring to, since an extension of the I-405/Howard Hughes exit ramp to Airport Boulevard is not part of the project. Perhaps the commentor is referring to the proposed LAX Expressway. The Expressway would link I-405 to the Ring Road, which would pass Airport Boulevard. The impacts of the Expressway are fully analyzed and mitigated, as summarized in Appendix K. 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.

**PC01477-3****Comment:**

There will be more taxis, limo, vans & trucks speeding through a residential area.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The primary surface transportation components of Alternatives A, B, and C, such as the Ring Road and LAX Expressway, would benefit commercial vehicles as well, 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

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

adjacent surface streets. See also Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding impacts on local streets and efforts to protect neighborhood streets.

#### **PC01477-4**

**Comment:**

2. Easier access in and out of neighbor is likely to encourage more criminal activity.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00378-2 regarding crime impacts. Also note that the principles for ground access used in the design of the Master Plan build alternatives include priorities for protecting neighborhoods and minimizing impacts to local streets.

#### **PC01477-5**

**Comment:**

3. There are a lot of children in the neighborhood who play outside & the neighborhood will not be as safe w/ all the traffic.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

#### **PC01477-6**

**Comment:**

3. The property values in the Westport Hgts area has been steadily increasing. By expanding the Airport Blvd. area, the neighborhood will be cut in half & it will lose the residential feeling. Property values will go down.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding the effects of LAX on property values. Community disruption was addressed in Section 4.4.4, Community Disruption and Alteration of Surface Transportation Patterns, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

#### **PC01477-7**

**Comment:**

4. It is already noisy enough w/ the freeway so close, additional traffic noise & airport noise will negatively impact our quality of life.

**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 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.

#### **PC01477-8**

**Comment:**

5. Taxis, limos & van drivers will be encouraged to hang out in their parked cars in between calls on the residential streets because of easier access to the airport through the Airport Blvd. expansion.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The primary surface transportation components of Alternatives A, B, and C, such as the Ring Road and LAX Expressway, would benefit commercial vehicles as well, 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. Also, see Response to Comment PC00934-6 regarding Airport Boulevard. See also Response to Comment PC10477-3 regarding impacts on residential streets.

**PC01478      Crist, Kathleen F. & Peter R.      None Provided      7/15/2001**

**PC01478-1****Comment:**

The odor from the jets sitting on the runway warming up is terrible and very unhealthy. We invite you and/or anyone on your LAX Master Plan team to spend just a half hour in our backyard to understand what we put up with.

This is a neighborhood of mostly older people - with several schools in the landing path, this pollution should not be allowed.

**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.

**PC01478-2**

The remainder of this comment letter is identical to form letter PFE; please refer to the responses to form letter PFE.

**PC01479      Barondess, Paula      None Provided      7/19/2001**

**PC01479-1****Comment:**

None of the proposed MASTER PLANS is acceptable to this resident of 25 yrs who lives parallel with the north runway.

**Response:**

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

**PC01479-2****Comment:**

There is no way that the neighbors of LAX should be asked (or imposed upon) to accept the travel plans of the entire southland.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

Shared Regional Plan is the only reasonable fair alternative

**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.

**PC01480      Wyche, Mary-Louise      None Provided      7/19/2001**

**PC01480-1**

**Comment:**

At present LAWA seems to excel in rhetoric and spending on promotion of LAX expansion ie: brochure "Environmental Justice", etc. etc.

You talk about justice. Where is 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. Environmental justice was addressed in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR and 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.

**PC01480-2**

**Comment:**

Indoor pollution is an established fact, usually exceeding outdoor pollution. It is recommended to leave windows open; yet in the noisiest airport areas you offer soundproof windows as mitigation.

Where is there justice in subjecting people to increased indoor pollution, plus the already existing heavy outdoor pollution, which is bound to increase with airport expansion?

**Response:**

Please see Section 4.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided detailed information regarding air quality impacts, and Section 4.1 of both documents for more information regarding noise impacts.

**PC01480-3**

**Comment:**

Where is there justice in contributing to pollution-related health problems for people of all ages?

**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.

**PC01480-4**

**Comment:**

Where is there justice in depriving people of their rights to the use and enjoyment of their homes which they have worked hard for? They deserve rest and relaxation at home. Where is there justice in "shoe-horning" an airport expansion into too little ground space and too little air space; thereby putting residents of these densely populated communities at great risk day and night?

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed land use impacts in Section 4.2, Land Use, environmental justice impacts in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, and health and safety impacts in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 1, 5, and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-1, S-D, and S-9 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.

**PC01480-5**

**Comment:**

Justice has to do with people and their basic needs and rights. The word you have used and over-used is mitigation. It is not appropriate in this situation. Mitigation is a band-aid; you don't apply a band-aid when a transplant is needed.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 for a discussion regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits.

<b>PC01481</b>	<b>Wald, Kirsten</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/19/2001</b>
----------------	----------------------	----------------------	------------------

**PC01481-1**

**Comment:**

There seems to be many comments that I could make, here are the highlights:

1) LAX is not the only possibility for expansion to handle increased passengers into this area (as well as cargo increase). I travel frequently for my work, and a choice of various airports for frequent travelers is a major advantage of an area of this size. Why concentrate expansion and attention in one area? According to the report that I read, Palmdale is ready and willing for expansion. This would be a worthy addition to a "regional plan" rather than focusing attention on just one area.

**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. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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

---

#### PC01481-2

**Comment:**

2) As a frequent traveler, I also place great emphasis on safety. I am not impressed with what I read in the reports about number of passengers vs. the actual size of the airport. There is a community surrounding the airport that also needs to be taken into consideration

To expand LAX to the size necessary to safely handle an increase in traffic for the long term, that community will be greatly affected. There are other less costly & safer alternatives.

**Response:**

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

#### PC01481-3

**Comment:**

3) For a city that is focused on decrease of pollution I am greatly surprised that expansion is concentrated on one specific area that will greatly add to the problem. Spreading that out into various areas is the only intelligent plan.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the role of the LAX Master Plan in a regional approach to meeting aviation demand.

#### PC01481-4

**Comment:**

4) LAX as a city needs to plan for the long term. This master plan doesn't go far enough out and big enough in scope. As a taxpayer in the area with plans to stay here, I prefer a more comprehensive, long term plan, looking at airport possibilities all around the region, not just at 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.

**PC01482**

**Shymanski, Adolph      None Provided  
A. & Emelie C.**

**7/20/2001**

#### PC01482-1

**Comment:**

We would like to register our strong opposition to the LAX Master Plan.

LAX expansion would definitely impact our daily lives with added noise and air pollution and worsening of traffic congestion. The addition of new flight paths and increased numbers of daily flights would seriously affect our neighborhood and our way of life.

We also object to acquisitions of additional areas of our residential and commercial community.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and in Section 4.2, Land Use, air quality impacts 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 Appendices D and G, and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendices S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-2, S-3, 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-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative

**PC01483      Roberts, Michael      None Provided      7/12/2001**

**PC01483-1**

**Comment:**

It is obvious to users of LAX that there is a need for improvement of the facility. The terminals are crowded and traffic chokes at the exit. Improvements are needed whether or not the airport is expanded. The runways are dangerous and some work on the taxiways is necessary.

**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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding runway incursions at LAX. As indicated in Topical Response TR-SAF-1, the primary purpose for modifying the airfield under each of the Master Plan build alternatives is to develop a physical solution that will greatly reduce the risk of runway incursions. 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.

**PC01483-2**

**Comment:**

Unfortunately the Master Plan is badly flawed, uses out of date or incorrect data and is focused once again on doing whatever it pleases with regard only for the business community.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01483-3**

**Comment:**

It provides no or incorrect data on impacts on minority community and business. Minority communities like Lennox and Inglewood will be heavily impacted by increased flights.

**Response:**

Disproportionate effects on areas within Lennox and Inglewood related to increases in flight activity were addressed in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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. 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.

#### PC01483-4

**Comment:**

The focus of the plan is to confine all growth in international air and cargo traffic in the basin to Los Angeles International Airport. This flies in the face of the reality that the area is nearly built out and any growth in the region will come in Orange County, The Inland Empire and the Lancaster Palmdale area. Instead of bringing more traffic to Los Angeles International Airport, we should be growing airports like Palmdale and Ontario and pushing for regional development of an airport at 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-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.

#### PC01483-5

**Comment:**

Nothing in this plan prevents LAX from absorbing all of the region's passenger growth. Nothing in the plan reflects the build out potential of the airport. In theory, the plant could extend from the 105 Freeway on the south, 405 Freeway on the east where it forms the border with Inglewood, the Pacific Ocean on the West and the bluffs on the North. This would affect 45,000 residents in Westchester, plug the 405 solid most times of the day and create noise and pollution problems with no end.

**Response:**

None of the build alternatives include the level of activity needed to serve all of the regional aviation demand nor the level of property acquisition addressed in this comment. Acquisition beyond that addressed in the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR would not be permitted under federal or state law.

#### PC01483-6

**Comment:**

The plan states that only 49,000 residents would be affected by the noise, while it's 1996 study shows that 85,907 residents would be affected by the noise.

**Response:**

This difference is acknowledged and described in Topical Response TR-N-1 and in detail in Section 2.2, Comparison of Environmental Baseline Noise to Quarterly Noise Report, in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Draft EIS/EIR. Also, please see Response to Comment PC00109-5.

**PC01483-7****Comment:**

Statistics used to decide how expansion would impact traffic and aircraft noise are also outdated.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology and results, in particular Subtopical Response TR-ST-2.2 regarding the definition of baseline scenarios and incorporation of local/regional plans and programs. 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.

**PC01483-8****Comment:**

Further, the report does not explain how the 22 million additional passengers would affect the traffic at intersections in neighboring communities such as Inglewood, El Segundo, Culver City and Lennox.

**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-2.1 for a discussion of the study area and facilities analyzed.

**PC01483-9****Comment:**

Chapter Three of the report rejects as impractical many of the regionalization options. High-speed rail is deemed too expensive or too many years away. Dispersal to other airports is rejected due to market forces. Demand management would not work due to limited impact. Once again the data is "bent: to prove the plan, whether or not the data is accurate or applied correctly. In this case, high-speed rail is not the only option. Rail exists as an option between Lancaster and Downtown. Capacity improvements on that line and connections between Los Angeles Union Station and the airport could substitute for high-speed rail, using today technology. Market forces can be influenced many ways, forcing carriers to move to other airports whether by legislation, capacity control regulations or economic incentive. Demand management can force carriers to use alternate departure times, spreading loads over the clock. Why do cargo carriers have to have access to LAX rather than George AFB or Norton?

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the Master Plan role in regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-2 regarding the role of deregulation in aviation planning, and Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding rail transit plan.

**PC01483-10****Comment:**

Chapter Four lists the boundaries of the affected environment. These boundaries are erroneous for the following reasons:

1. Overflight is not addressed. The boundary ends at the extremes of the construction or project area.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

2. Noise impacts are based on the FAA CENL standards while noise still impacts the neighborhoods over and above that level and are outside that boundary.

**Response:**

Section 4.1, Noise, and Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 4.1, Noise, and Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR disclosed the presence of and impacts associated with aircraft overflight throughout the area. The only boundary presented in the sections is the Airport Noise Mitigation Boundary, which generally extends beyond the area exposed to significant levels of aircraft noise. The CNEL contour discloses the areas of significant noise exposure, as defined by federal and state standards. For additional information about the relationship between CNEL and single event aircraft noise levels beyond the 65 CNEL contour, please see Topical Response TR-N-2, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-2.3. Additionally, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included an analysis of single event noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Appendix SC-1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report.

**PC01483-11**

**Comment:**

COMMUNITY: Any of the options except the recommended no expansion-no changes option will severely impact the community, reducing the Central Business District, taking homes near Nielsen Field and a portion of Centinela Adobe, one of the most historically significant homes in the Los Angeles basin. This is a Community Life issue. Is the plan to plow Westchester under and pave it with Runways?

**Response:**

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. Potential impacts to cultural resources were discussed in Section 4.9.1, Historic Architecture and Archeological/Cultural Resources of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 concerning impacts within the Community of Westchester and Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding the Centinela Adobe. 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. Further, it does not include the LAX Expressway and therefore there it has no potential for impacts on the Centinela Adobe. 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. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

**PC01483-12**

**Comment:**

Over flights over many neighborhoods are not included in the report. Many flights approaching from the east fly over communities that are impacted by the noise, pollution of jet exhaust and potential for accidents. Communities of Montebello, Pico Rivera and Downey are not mentioned.

**Response:**

All overflights with potentially significant noise impact were shown in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For information about overflights over communities east of LAX, please see Response to Comment AL00051-3. For information related to air quality and the potential for accidents, please see Section 4.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR with additional technical analysis in Appendix G, Air Quality Impact Analysis, and Section 4.24.3, Safety.

#### PC01483-13

**Comment:**

The proposed ring road will improve traffic access to an expanded airport but only in that area from the freeway to the terminal area and back. No improvement to traffic flow on the 405 freeway is possible.

**Response:**

Please see Subtopical Response TR-ST-2.7, regarding the Ring Road, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding I-405, and Topical Response TR-ST-7 regarding Westchester Southside. 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 alleviate airport-related traffic in Westchester. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

#### PC01483-14

**Comment:**

In the bargain, the central business district is destroyed so the airport owned Northside project can go forward.

**Response:**

Acquisition within the Westchester Business District under Alternatives A, B, and C is related to a proposed ring-road and landscape buffer areas, it is not caused by development of the Northside Property.

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. 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 was 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. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 for further discussion of effects on the community of Westchester.

#### PC01483-15

**Comment:**

TRAFFIC IMPACTS: The increase and concentration of ground traffic around LAX will negatively impact visitors and passengers to LAX and jam the already crowded streets of Westchester, Playa Del Rey, El Segundo and Inglewood.

The majority of traffic on Sepulveda, Century, La Tijera and Manchester Boulevards consists of traffic going to and from the airport complex. Additional ramps and the LAX expressway will do little to reduced impact of expansion. People will still choose what they perceive to be the shortest route.

### **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, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

**PC01483-16**

**Comment:**

The only mention of mass transit is the extension of the Green Line into the non-existent west terminal.

**Response:**

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

**PC01483-17**

**Comment:**

Many European countries provide transportation from the inner city to the airport. This reduces the footprint of the airport, mitigates the traffic impact and allows placing the facility away from population centers. We could do the same or similar here by forcing passengers out of their cars and into mass transit. Sometimes we need to be dragged, kicking and screaming, into reality.

**Response:**

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

**PC01483-18**

**Comment:**

Any increase in air traffic at LAX will involve an increase in surface traffic.

**Response:**

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

**PC01483-19**

**Comment:**

The major thrust of expansion, cargo operations, will increase the number of trucks on the streets and highways.

**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.



**PC01483-20****Comment:**

The San Diego Freeway and other arterials are frequently at capacity during peak traffic periods with traffic stalled from the South Bay curve, north to Van Nuys. Additional airport traffic, especially heavy trucks and vans for the expected airfreight business increase, with attendant accidents and 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. 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. Regarding traffic concerns pertaining to the cargo truck traffic plan and neighborhood impacts from trucks, please see Topical Response TR-ST-1.

**PC01483-21****Comment:**

No traffic studies south of Rosecrans

**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-2 for a discussion of the study area and facilities analyzed.

**PC01483-22****Comment:**

NOISE: The Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) is an arbitrary method used to eliminate the costs of mitigating sound pollution in the community. A Single Noise Event Level (SNEL) is reasonable and would reflect, accurately the incursion on the community. One very loud jet landing in the middle of the night would easily exceed the SNEL without exceeding the CNEL for that area. Clearly, additional traffic will increase the level and frequency of noise levels, which are already high.

**Response:**

Using the CNEL metric is not arbitrary and does not eliminate the cost of mitigating noise impacts. Single event metrics have limited use in determining long-term noise impacts. Single event metrics can supplement CNEL, not replace it. Please see Topical Responses TR-N-2 and TR-N-6 for additional information. Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR analyzed single event noise impacts, and discussed such impacts on nighttime awakenings.

**PC01483-23****Comment:**

Noise impacts the health of individuals, shortening life, increasing stress and stress related disease. It makes it difficult for students to study and concentrate. The increased noise levels can result in hearing problems and safety issues. If a person cannot hear cautionary instructions due to excess noise impacts,

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**Response:**

Please see Responses to Comments AL00017-52 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise and 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. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to 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.

**PC01483-24**

**Comment:**

**CARGO OPERATIONS:** The airport's plan for expansion is focused on an increase in cargo operations. There is no advantage to passenger traffic from this expansion. The increased traffic could best be handled on a regional basis. Not every package coming in to LAX is bound for Los Angeles addresses. It makes sense to distribute the load to where the facilities are located and where the customers are.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 for more information about regional airports, airport system scenarios, airport governance, and the role of local and regional agencies in meeting regional aviation demand. Please see Response to Comment PC00599-54 for more information regarding cargo activity

**PC01483-25**

**Comment:**

**POLLUTION:** LAX is already one of the regions major polluters. It is one of the regions largest sources of NOx emissions, the precursor to Ozone. Any increase of any of the five major air pollutants generated at the airport is not acceptable. Already we can smell the unburned kerosene from takeoffs on some days. These pollutants sear the lungs of children and infants, ruin paint on cars, homes and businesses, and damage plants and trees. The proposed expansion would increase levels of some pollutants 1,000%. This is wholly unacceptable.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comments AL00043-6 regarding LAX as a source of air pollution. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution.

**PC01483-26**

**Comment:**

**SAFETY:** Additional air traffic concentrated in this area will only result in more incursions on the ground and the possibility for collision in the air over the crowded Los Angeles basin. Currently, approaches to LAX are made directly over three schools in the Lennox School District. I have stood in the schoolyard and been able to read tail numbers on aircraft with the unaided eye. Increased traffic will only increase the danger of an incident with a tremendous loss of life. There is no doubt that improvements need to be made in the taxiways for safety but expansion is not the only solution to this problem.

**Response:**

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

**PC01483-27**

**Comment:**

**Conclusions:**  
The best solution for a regional air traffic problem is a regional approach. There is only one International airport in the region. San Francisco has three, Washington, DC has two, and New York

has two. We need to develop the property we have at Palmdale, for both passenger and cargo traffic. We need to develop the Ontario regional airport for passenger and cargo traffic and we need to develop an international facility in Orange County. Space is available at El Toro and it is undeveloped 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.

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.

**PC01483-28**

**Comment:**

We need to develop high-speed mass transit between the Palmdale, Ontario and Los Angeles Airports so that all can be used as a unified system.

**Response:**

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

**PC01483-29**

**Comment:**

Regional development would spread the impacts of pollution, noise and traffic over the region and bring travel and job opportunities where they are needed. Runway capacity exists at most of the airport facilities. We simply need to convince or force the Federal Aviation Administration and the airline industry to use and develop existing facilities. Since federal law restricts the ability of LAX to control or restrict aircraft activity at the airport, the only way we have of increasing regional participation is to not develop or expand the airport and force the carriers to use other facilities.

**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-2 regarding the role of deregulation in aviation planning, and Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan. Please also see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding the role of airline economics in shifting operations to regional airports.

**PC01484**

**Corbin, Diane**

**None Provided**

**7/12/2001**

**PC01484-1**

**Comment:**

If LAX expands, the Westchester area will be seriously impacted by noise, traffic and pollution. It will make a pleasant area into an area where I would no longer choose to live.

### 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; 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-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.

**PC01484-2**

**Comment:**

I have taught 24 years in Inglewood and I see how being close to the airport has made Inglewood into a noisy and dirty city.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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. 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.

**PC01484-3**

**Comment:**

Please don't expand LAX! It will be a detriment to everyone!

**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.

**PC01485      O'Connor, John J. &      None Provided**  
**Thelma M.**

**7/20/2001**

**PC01485-1**

**Comment:**

My wife and I, long time Westchester - Playa Del Rey residents oppose the airport expansion because:

**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.

**PC01485-2**

**Comment:**

- The solution is a band-aid to hold together for awhile a very dangerous operation.
- The area for runways is like a minature golf course when compared to airports in other cities. If a safety inspection (a true one) was performed the airport would be condemned for safety.

**Response:**

Comment noted. The proposed Master Plan improvements are not a quick-fix, but a long term solution to addressing safety and efficiency. Safety inspections of air carrier airports are conducted by the FAA under the authority of Federal Air Regulation 139, Certification and Operations: Land Airports Serving Certain Air Carriers. A copy of the Certification is available through LAWA. Please see Response to Comment AL00040-152 for more information on FAA operating restriction and airport safety certification. Finally, please note that 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. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

**PC01485-3**

**Comment:**

Hopefully none of the near misses will result in loss of life. If so you are and will be held accountable.

**Response:**

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

**PC01485-4**

**Comment:**

- We travel alot and LAX is the saddest in area of takeoffs & landings. All the recent efforts have gone into beautifying the interiors of terminals.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01485-5**

**Comment:**

If you do not build a new airport (which you will eventually do), STOP expansion at LAX and run excess operations at other areas in 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.

**PC01485-6**

**Comment:**

a large reduction in fares from these other airports vs LAX would be a first step. (START NOW)

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**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 for a discussion of multi-airport markets, airline economics, and passenger choice.

**PC01486**

**Simpson, Clyde**

**None Provided**

**7/20/2001**

**PC01486-1**

**Comment:**

We have lived in Westchester since 1948. Our four children attended the excellent schools here.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01486-2**

**Comment:**

Only a few years ago the Central Business District was much improved with the addition of various shops that we visit weekly and now we are told, it will all be destroyed for the sake of LAX 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 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. 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 was described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6.5), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, note that 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. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 for further discussion of effects on the community of Westchester.

**PC01486-3**

**Comment:**

Traffic on our surface streets is increasing, air pollution is reaching an unacceptable level.

**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.

**PC01486-4**

**Comment:**

Why should the communities around LAX bear the burden when the City of Los Angeles owns two other airports which should be developed? We urge you to consider other alternatives 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-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.

**PC01487      Andreadis, Irene      None Provided      7/20/2001**

**PC01487-1****Comment:**

Re: NO-LAX MASTERPLAN Expansion

I have lived in Westchester for over 47 years and my parents had also lived in Westchester for over 45 years. The purpose of this letter is to state that I strongly oppose the LAX Expansion and ARBOR VITAE INTERCHANGE ROAD and RING ROAD and ask for your support to reject the LAX MasterPlan Expansion because it will:

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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. Alternative D does not include the Ring Road. The proposed Arbor Vitae interchange is not a part of the LAX Master Plan and has had the federal funding withdrawn.

**PC01487-2****Comment:**

- Increase air safety risks with more planes operating in close quarters.

**Response:**

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

**PC01487-3****Comment:**

- Dramatically worsen traffic congestion on I-405, I-105 and local arterials from thousands of passenger cars, vans and cargo-carrying trucks.

**Response:**

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

**PC01487-4****Comment:**

- Result in greater air pollution, damaging local residents' 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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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.

The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR evaluated the potential risk of adverse health effects for each of the Master Plan Alternatives based on the emissions associated with each of the alternatives. The No Project/No Action Alternative assumes that no substantial changes are made to current LAX facilities, and is based on projections of growth in airport activity between 1996 and horizon year 2015. Airport congestion during this time is expected to grow worse without additional capital improvement. In all cases, build alternatives are expected to relieve current and predicted future congestion by making airport operations, particularly aircraft operations, more efficient.

After implementation of mitigation measures, the build alternatives would reduce predicted impacts to human health compared with the No Project/No Action Alternative. Implementation of any of the build alternatives is therefore anticipated to reduce future health impacts for most people living, working or going to school near the airport. However, as was indicated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, predicted chronic non-cancer human health impacts for maximally exposed residents under Alternatives B and C are slightly higher for some areas than those predicted with the No Project/No Action Alternative.

#### PC01487-5

**Comment:**

- Create more airport noise; impact a larger population, causing stress and illness and reduction of children's learning ability and degradation of property values.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding the health effects 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, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to 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. Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

#### PC01487-6

**Comment:**

- Aggravate environmental justice issues. A disproportionate share of low income and minority populations are subjected to increased health and safety impacts and/or displaced from their homes.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-190.

#### PC01487-7

**Comment:**

- Destroy local homes, schools, libraries, parks and businesses to provide room for more airport support facilities.

**Response:**

The Draft EIS/EIR and the 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 was 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,



### 3. Comments and Responses

---

Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative), does not include any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester Business District. As described in Sections 4.26.3, Parks and Recreation, 4.26.4, Libraries, and 4.27, Schools, there would be no significant impacts due to acquisition on parks, libraries, or public schools under the proposed Master Plan alternatives. As was stated in Section 4.26.3, Parks and Recreation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, parkland would be increased under all of the alternatives. As was presented in Section 4.26.4, Libraries, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the Westchester Branch Library has been acquired and relocated under a separate program. As was described in Section 4.27, Schools, of the Draft EIS/EIR, acquisition of the 98th Street school within Manchester Square would also occur under a separate program and independent of the LAX Master Plan. Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences and Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed LAWA's programs for the acquisition and relocation of residences and business properties. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

#### PC01487-8

**Comment:**

- Divert attention and funds from the expansion of other airport facilities where future population growth is located.

**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.

#### PC01487-9

**Comment:**

Please help us ! We, the residents of Westchester, need your support to REJECT the 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. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester.

**PC01488**

**Cox, Ph.D., P.E.,  
Donald**

**None Provided**

**7/20/2001**

#### PC01488-1

**Comment:**

I have reviewed a portion of the ERI related to the LAX expansion, and followed media reports related to LAX expansion and development/expansion of regional airports in the Southern California area (i.e. El Toro, Palmdale, Long Beach, Ontario, etc). There is no doubt that handling additional air traffic in the Southern California area with a plan than relies on regional airports is best for the people of Southern California, and is the only long-term solution. Expansion of LAX is not a solution, will decrease the

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

quality of life for the people of Southern California, and only benefit the major airlines and other companies that want a centralized system of 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.

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.

**PC01488-2**

**Comment:**

Expansion of LAX will exasperate the horrific traffic congestion that already exists (from Santa Clarita to north San Diego County) along the 405 Freeway and those that feed it. It's not just the air travelers or cargo handling companies trying to reach LAX that will suffer from this increase in freeway traffic; all people that use and/or live near the freeway system will suffer.

**Response:**

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

**PC01488-3**

**Comment:**

It makes no sense at all to have people (or cargo) traveling all the way to LAX from Santa Clarita, north San Diego County or areas east of L.A. County, when there is the option of developing airports in El Toro and Palmdale or expanding the existing regional airports to handle this traffic. Wasted time, fuel consumption and pollution would all be less with a regional plan that decreases the travel distance required for people (or cargo) to get to a plane.

It makes no sense at all to decrease the quality of life for a large number of people around LAX (resulting from increased traffic, noise, pollution, etc.) when development or expansion of regional airports will affect many less people.

It makes no sense at all to close or relocate businesses and households that already exist around LAX, and at the same time, allow developers to build houses on vacant land surrounding an existing airport (El Toro) or in an area where the people want an airport (Palmdale.)

All politicians and government officials must view the increase in air traffic as a regional issue, involving all of Southern California. More importantly, they must do what is best for the people of Southern California, not what best serves the interests of the major airlines and other entities promoting expansion of LAX and restriction of regional airports. Development and/or expansion of regional airports will best serve all the people of Southern California and is the only viable long-term solution to increased air traffic.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC01488-1 above.

**PC01489      Stoller, Colleen      None Provided**

**PC01489-1**

**Comment:**

NO ON LAX 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.

**PC01489-2**

**Comment:**

I have lived in Westchester for 6 years and I have seen a big problem in safety. Lincoln Blvd. has increased in the last few years. I have seen a numerous of accidents, some have been fatal. Safety is a big problem for those who live near LAX. To me the traffic has increased considerably. We need to concentrate on the traffic as it is right 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-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

**PC01489-3**

**Comment:**

The demand of air travel has increased to the point where safety has not been an issue. If they expand LAX we will have double the problem as it is now. LAX has had close calls on the runway & in the air. Why can't they concentrate on what is going on now! There is a problem of safety. What makes them think it's going to get better. . . Please consider us who live near LAX.

**Response:**

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

**PC01490      Altchuler, Sam      None Provided**

**PC01490-1**

**Comment:**

Sorry to hear LAX breaks its promise again. We have lived in Westchester since the fifties and have heard LAX promise no more expansion, but seen more and more of Westchester disappear. Our buisness are gone movies gone. You took homes and much down town Westchester looks like a ghost town. Why don't you take all of Westchester and be done with it. My whole family loves it here. So keep your promises and go some where else.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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 potential effects of Master Plan

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

alternatives on the community of Westchester. As indicated in TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester business district.

**PC01491      Taylor, Grace      None Provided      7/21/2001**

**PC01491-1**

**Comment:**

Please add my name to those who oppose 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.

**PC01491-2**

**Comment:**

The existing area does not provide space for SAFE expansion.

The incoming planes (including the large commercial passenger planes) almost touch the roofs of, e.g., the U.S. World Airport Post Office at Airport Parkway and Westchester Parkway and also the In-n-Out Burger facility on Sepulveda Blvd.

Though much planning was attempted, the basic premise is that there is no really SAFE means for expanding LAX.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00543-1.

**PC01492      Winfrey, Virginia      None Provided      7/20/2001**

**PC01492-1**

**Comment:**

I have been a resident of Westchester since 1972. I believe it is the best place to live in the L.A. area. If the airport expansion is allowed it would ruin this community.

**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.

**PC01492-2**

**Comment:**

The central business district has been improving over the past few years; the expansion would curtail this.

**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. 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 was described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6.5), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, note that 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. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 for further discussion of effects on the community of Westchester.

#### **PC01492-3**

##### **Comment:**

It would add increased traffic congestion, air pollution, noise, etc.

##### **Response:**

Comment noted. Impacts associated with noise, traffic and air quality were described in Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use, Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

#### **PC01492-4**

##### **Comment:**

There are other locations which could be developed for 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.

**PC01493**

**Tellez, Robert**

**None Provided**

**7/18/2001**

#### **PC01493-1**

##### **Comment:**

LAX should not be expanded. The addition of the North Runway violated Westchester. Increase traffic, noise, and pollution, not to mention sleep deprivation, associated with any LAX expansion will put the health of the community at risk. LAX/City of Los Angeles will be liable.

##### **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, 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

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. 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-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

#### PC01493-2

**Comment:**

Other plans offer better overall solutions to safety, noise, pollution, traffic, etc.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC01493-1 above.

<b>PC01494</b>	<b>McCall, Robert</b>	<b>None Provided</b>	<b>7/20/2001</b>
----------------	-----------------------	----------------------	------------------

#### PC01494-1

**Comment:**

Residents of Westchester have been subjected to much inconvenience thru the years from airport noise and other operation.

**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.

#### PC01494-2

**Comment:**

Now they want to deprive us of loss of major shopping and other conveniences.

**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. 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 was described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6.5), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, note that 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. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 for further discussion of effects on the community of Westchester.

#### PC01494-3

**Comment:**

There has to be a better way to change the airport access.

**Response:**

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed surface transportation impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. See also Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding airport access.

**PC01494-4****Comment:**

Redirecting cargo & other terminals to areas more remote should be considered.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan Role in regional approach to meeting demand, that discusses the roles and responsibilities of LAWA, the City of Los Angeles, SCAG, and SCRAA in meeting regional demand. Please see Response to Comment PC00599-54 for more information regarding cargo activity.

**PC01495****Thal, Mr. & Mrs.  
Russell****None Provided****7/20/2001****PC01495-1****Comment:**

I understand with the new expansion - the planes will go directly over my house and the Central Business district. It looks as if they are landing on the roofs of these buildings. There will only be more noise, air pollution, traffic & safety in 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, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and safety in Section 4.24.3, Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses 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-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

**PC01495-2****Comment:**

After living in Westchester for 50 yrs, airport promises had gone down the drain.

**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.

**PC01495-3****Comment:**

It is not a "good neighborhood" now - too congested.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01495-4**

**Comment:**

I believe a new airport should be built in El Torro, where there plenty of space & also near an ocean.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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.

**PC01496**

**Fabro, Carol A. &  
Leo A.**

**None Provided**

**7/21/2001**

**PC01496-1**

**Comment:**

We are against any plan or plans to end or educe services for General Aviation at Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). LAX must continue to provide runways, terminals and services to support all small aircraft, both small jets and propeller planes. To reduce these services, which are currently available at LAX, will put an unfair burden upon all the communities which border other smaller airports in the greater Los Angeles area.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC01391-9 for more discussion on the accessibility of the airport. Responses to the comments regarding general aviation facility development are provided below. The unconstrained forecast projected minimal increases in general aviation activity (see Chapter III, Section 10.4 of the Draft LAX Master Plan). Due to the runway constraints, even this minimal growth in general aviation activity is not expected to materialize. All of the alternatives project that general aviation activity would maintain current operations levels. This assumption reflects that as a busy air carrier airport, such as LAX, becomes more congested, general aviation activity tends to use other, less congested local airports. The facility requirements analysis determined that no additional general aviation facilities were needed through 2015 due to the insignificant increase in projected activity and comparisons of similar facilities at other airports (see Chapter IV, Section 6.2.1 of the Draft LAX Master Plan). All of the build alternatives would provide modern and efficient facilities to accommodate forecast general aviation operations. Alternative A would provide 219,000 square feet of general aviation facilities, Alternative B would provide 172,000 square feet of general aviation facilities, Alternative C would provide 244,000 square feet of general aviation facilities, and Alternative D would provide 265,000 square feet of general aviation facilities. The No Action/No Project Alternative envisions no changes to the existing facilities. The runway system in each alternative would be sufficient to accommodate the projected general aviation activity.

**PC01496-2**

**Comment:**

Forcing General Aviation to use other airports than LAX will impact the surrounding communities with excesses of noise and pollution, threatening residents' health and safety. Increased air traffic will adversely effect automobile traffic in these areas as well. The noise and sight of the jets roaring low overhead will impair the learning of children in schools near these airports. The natural environments of these communities must be protected too. We as property owners are very concerned about how the value of our home will decrease due to the factors listed here. Shifting any LAX air traffic to neighboring Los Angeles airports is disruptive and is not an acceptable alternative of the Plan.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-4 regarding potential environmental impacts at surrounding other airports as a result of the LAX Master Plan.



**PC01496-3****Comment:**

LAX should remain the central point for ALL TYPES of air traffic in the Los Angeles area. We believe that three or more Fixed Base Operator (FBO) facilities at LAX, to service non-commercial small private and business jets, as well as propeller planes, are necessary to support General Aviation at LAX.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC01496-1 regarding general aviation activity and facilities at LAX. Currently there are two FBOs at LAX and it is the decision of individual FBO companies to initiate service at LAX. LAWA does not have control over the addition of another FBO.

**PC01496-4****Comment:**

We believe LAX is the logical central focal point to support large commercial jets and we are hereby expressing our dissatisfaction at any concept which would go against this idea.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see PC00281-17 for an explanation on small aircraft operations at LAX.

**PC01496-5****Comment:**

We want to see LAX expanded and/or improved as necessary to accommodate increased traffic demands.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01496-6****Comment:**

We believe too that there are airports just outside of the city limits, such as Ontario, Palmdale and El Toro which can also be utilized and expanded to efficiently spread the air traffic around Southern California. These other airports can be operational in ways which will enhance the lives, environment and economies of these other communities.

**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. In spring 2002, the voters

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

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.

#### PC01496-7

**Comment:**

Since we live directly in the path of the planes landing at Santa Monica Airport, we are constantly bombarded with the effects of low flying jets. We have two family members who have cancer. We cannot verify that the low flying airplanes cause these cancers, but we would certainly not want to be exposed to any additional carcinogenic materials.

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-4 regarding potential environmental impacts at surrounding other airports as a result of the LAX Master Plan.

**PC01497      Walmsley, Hazel      None Provided      7/16/2001**

#### PC01497-1

**Comment:**

I have lived in Westchester since 1965. To start destroying the area for LAX is insane. There is plenty of land in North Orange County (Toro AFB for one) to start another commercial airbase - or were Long Beach airbase should be widened.

Why doesn't someone review England's airport problems. Heath Row is so small & unsafe many of the flights land & take off at Gatvich the newer airport 25 or 30 miles outside the city & passengers bused in or can elect to take the train of course.

**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.

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.

#### PC01497-2

**Comment:**

If fare worked into flight ticket passengers, customers would not object.

**Response:**

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

**PC01497-3****Comment:**

Palmdale needs business for tax income & not that far away. Why isn't the south side of airport used by Federal Expressed, etc. moved elsewhere. If Los Angeles City would stop supporting illegal aliens they would have plenty of revenue.

**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.

**PC01498****Perez, Pio****None Provided****7/20/2001****PC01498-1****Comment:**

Why keep depriving homeowners their peace & quiet living? If you need more space, go to Lancaster - you can have all the space you need in there.

Please do not expand the airport anymore.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

**PC01499****Tiddle, Martha****None Provided****7/19/2001****PC01499-1****Comment:**

The Draft LAX Master Plan and Draft EIS/EIR Report for expansion of LAX present the same concerns.

**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.

**PC01499-2****Comment:**

I . The Draft EIS/EIR does not satisfy Environmental Justice requirements.

**Response:**

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 environmental justice analysis was prepared pursuant to federal and state regulations, policies, and guidance pertaining to environmental justice, specifically Executive Order 12898, U.S. Department of Transportation Order 5610.1, California Public Resources Code Section 72000-72001, and California Environmental Protection Agency policy as more fully described in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01499-3

**Comment:**

A. It does not consider alternatives and other locations that would shift or distribute burdens of expansion more equitable and reduce risks to human health.

**Response:**

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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding the range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR.

#### PC01499-4

**Comment:**

B. It unfairly and disproportionately burdens minority and low income communities that lie under the primary arrival flight path with significant impacts of noise and toxic air emission.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC01420-7 and Topical Response TR-EJ-1 regarding potential air quality and health risk impacts on low-income and minority communities.

#### PC01499-5

**Comment:**

II. The Draft EIS/EIR fails to satisfy existing law because alternatives to LAX expansion have not been adequately explored or considered.

**Response:**

The Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive analysis of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Under this alternative, there would be no expansion of facilities at LAX beyond minor projects that would be reasonably foreseeable in the absence of the 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 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. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive analysis of Alternative D and was circulated for public review and comment.

#### PC01499-6

**Comment:**

III. The Draft EIS/EIR improperly measure human health risks.

**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. The human health risk assessments presented in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR were based on standard regulatory guidelines, approved scientific methods, and computer models consistent with the protective recommendations of federal and state health agencies. As required by CEQA, the human health risk assessments calculated health risks and hazards for people living in areas where impacts might be highest. The human health risk assessments also

assessed risks and hazards for locations throughout a large geographic area that extended into communities adjacent to, and north, east, and south of the airport. 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

**PC01499-7**

**Comment:**

IV. The Draft EIS/EIR improperly measures/noise increases.

**Response:**

The EIS/EIR uses standard methods and practices appropriate for the project. Please see Subtopical Response TR-N-1.3 regarding use of 1996 baseline noise levels from which to measure increases associated with proposed alternatives.

**PC01499-8**

**Comment:**

A. LAWA's noise exposure contours are understated.

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00033-87.

**PC01499-9**

**Comment:**

B. It fails to consider the economic impact of the LAX Master Plan on continuous suffering of housing value due to the aggravation of existing and future noise;

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding the effects of LAX on property values.

**PC01499-10**

**Comment:**

the decrease in recreational value of local parks and residential back yards.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels and the effect on local parks. 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.

**PC01499-11**

**Comment:**

C. LAWA's assertions regarding nighttime "over-ocean" operations are wrong!

**Response:**

LAWA's night over-ocean operating procedures are used whenever practicable. An automated system in place at the airport provides detailed records of each operation that occurs at the airport, including runway, type of operation (takeoff or landing), aircraft type, and time of day. During a recent 18-month period, only 82 takeoffs were made to the east while over-ocean procedures were in effect. Nighttime

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

over-ocean procedures are in effect between midnight and 6:30 a.m. Additionally, when the winds are from the east at more than ten knots velocity, east flow operations are used, resulting in all operations being made to the east. Further, when winds are from the west at more than 10 knots velocity, all arrivals are made from the west. In these two cases, over-ocean procedures are not used. For information on these procedures and circumstances in which they are not practicable, please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations and Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement.

#### PC01499-12

**Comment:**

V. The Draft EIS/EIR improperly analyzes the health effect of aircraft noise on human health.

A. It must consider the health effects of aircraft noise.

B . It needs to address aircraft noise interference and interruptions on human sleep.

C. It needs to address the negative impact on schools under the flight paths.

**Response:**

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 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

#### PC01499-13

**Comment:**

The Draft LAX Master Plan and Draft EIS/EIR Report make it clear that the expansion of LAX would unjustly, unfairly and unmercifully magnify the already over burdened/conditions that have been imposed on Inglewood, and surrounding communities over the last eight years because of the excessive increase in passenger and cargo air traffic.

Air crafts are presently disproportionally flying over Inglewood neighborhoods, overly exposing its residents to noise and jet fuel that contains the carcinogen benzene, among other chemicals, resulting in undue health risk in these minority and low-income communities.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding the increase in pollutants and the comparison between the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternatives A, B, C, and D. Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of this Final EIS/EIR also lists mitigation measures that would be implemented to offset the adverse health impact from the different alternatives proposed for the LAX Master Plan. Please see Topical Response TR-EJ-1 regarding environmental justice with regards to health risk and cumulative health risk as it applies to minority and low-income populations. Please also see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 for a description of the Environmental Justice Program and Benefits. Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment (CEQA), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a detailed analysis of toxic air pollutants and health risk impacts on individuals residing and working near the LAX.

#### PC01499-14

**Comment:**

In regards to "over-ocean" operation; Mrs. Kennord stated, "Airplane engines run quieter now and we have directed that all take offs between midnight and 6 AM "must" be over the ocean to the west. The

above is only true on paper. "Over the ocean" night time operation curfew, is frequently - almost none existing.

In the last four months there have not been more than ten nights when "over-ocean" night time curfew was observed. Most nights cargo planes start flying over around 2 or 3 AM. This is what a typical night for us is like: July 3, 01 - cargo planes started flying over-2; 44--- 4:17, 4:19, 4:27,, 4:37,4:43, 4:48, 4:50, 5:02, 5:09, 5:11, 5:17, 5:20, 5:29, 5:31, 5:35---on. It is impossible to sleep under these conditions. The noise hotline number has become a joke! The phone is usually off the hook, there is no answer or like this AM 7/19/01, 3:20 I called. The phone was answered. I was immediately put on hold. I was treated as if "I am the problem!" Jason, was very/curt--I was told, "Yes, planes are coming in, and this is normal operation, nothing out of the ordinary." After being on the phone for almost 20 minutes, I hung up the fourth time I was put on hold because I could feel my blood pressure rising.

**Response:**

Aircraft are not prohibited from operating at LAX at any time of the night or day. Over-ocean procedures are suspended when adverse wind and weather conditions require. Additionally, when aircraft cannot operate with the tail winds normally used by most aircraft during over-ocean procedures, heavy aircraft may occasionally take off against the normal late night flow of traffic. 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 her area during the late night hours to those necessary for weather or wind conditions. For further information on this topic, please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures and TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations. LAX 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. 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 and Appendices S-C, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, and S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC01499-15**

**Comment:**

Quieter engines? These aircraft engines are quieter only if one does not live under these conditions twentyfour/seven. Over the last eight years these airplanes are sometimes three levels deep, therefore, are flying lower, noiser, (you can hear every one) closer together, lined up coming in. They are flying in all directions, in other than designated flight paths. I am supposedly not in a flight path, however, more and more planes are flying directly over my home. In addition to over head noise, more and more there are days and nights when we get this continuous unbearable deep roaring, rumbling, vibrating noise shaking windows, that is coming from the airport.

**Response:**

The location of this residence is approximately three blocks south of the primary approach to the south runways. Consequently, the growth of operations at the airport and the nearly constant presence of arrival noise during the daytime hours, as well as the occasional nighttime departures to the east during over-ocean procedures can be noticed. By the time aircraft pass by this residence on approach, they should be aligned for final touchdown, being only about two miles east of the east end of the runway. As a result of the Airport Noise and Capacity Act of 1990, aircraft over 75,000 pounds (virtually all air carrier airplanes) have been required to meet the most stringent noise level standards set by the federal government. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase and Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

#### **PC01499-16**

**Comment:**

This is already a very stressful and troubling situation, very deteriorating to the body, mind and spirit - more than anyone should have to try to cope with. Where is there justice in all of this?

**Response:**

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise.

#### **PC01499-17**

**Comment:**

In regards to regional expansion. "Our decisions about whether LAX should be expanded or whether air traffic should be based on environmental and transportation congestion impacts rather than the future economic impacts." City Councilwoman Ruth Galanter

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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 and other environmental impacts in Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures.

#### **PC01499-18**

**Comment:**

"The economic benefits to Southern CA are pretty much the same, no/matter where in the region airport demand is met." R. Galanter

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment AL00033-113 regarding changed circumstances in the region's system of airports since SCAG's 2001 Regional Transportation Plan was adopted.

#### **PC01499-19**

**Comment:**

"LAX cannot stand alone, every airport in the region, both existing and planned must do their fair share." Mrs. Kennard

**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.



**PC01499-20****Comment:**

"LAX is already one of the top three worst airports in the state of CA when it comes to air pollution and noise."

**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.

**PC01499-21****Comment:**

"Expanding LAX would pound surrounding neighborhoods with pollution, noise and traffic gridlock."

**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.

**PC01499-22****Comment:**

"Constructing new cargo facilities, adding to the already "cargo cult inland around the airport would increase traffic congestion and new cargo flights over the already overburdened city of Inglewood and exposing the residents to increased air pollution including toxic diesel emissions."

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comments AL00017-190 and AL00017-194. Also, please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

**PC01499-23****Comment:**

"LAX isn't critical to the health of the regional economy. Rather, the region should look to expand airports in other areas, such as Orange County's El Toro site." The Wall Street Journal

El Toro still has one of the largest no housing noise buffer zones in Southern CA. Yet El Toro airport opponents said that their neighborhood would be ruined by an airport at El Toro. And a "Great Park" is needed to keep a regional airport out of their back yards. "The average person here makes \$90,000 a year and lives in a \$400,000/home." Gordon

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, for a discussion of the El Toro conversion, constraints at John Wayne Airport, and the Ontario Master Plan.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

#### PC01499-24

**Comment:**

I say to you; It is all too sad that Gordon and those with like consciousness just don't get it. You need to go much deeper and know that the journey is truly about more than, "me, myself and I", and getting and having "material stuff." Even though it is not clear to you that one life (your's) is no more special or valuable, in the scheme of things, than another (mine). And whether you can believe it or not, we in Inglewood too, enjoy, desire and are just as deserving of peace, beauty, quality of life and being as anyone of you in Orange County in your \$400,000 homes and \$90,000 annual salaries.

I ask this question in all sincerity; Would this issue, LAX expansion, be on the table at this time if we of color in Inglewood were living in El Toro and "they" were living here in Inglewood?----- I feel very strongly that if this was the case, LAX would have been constrained in its then current footprint years ago and El Toro would now be developed and thriving.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

#### PC01499-25

**Comment:**

Then, Mayor Riordan states; "It all comes down to if you want LAX to be competitive. If you want LAX to be the leader of the trade in the next century, then you have to do it." He also said, that the region would lose the opportunity for business growth. The region? Regional expansion immediately comes to mind.

**Response:**

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

#### PC01499-26

**Comment:**

What I find missing here is compassion, sensitivity and care about other human beings and the very environment that sustains us all, his one concern is economic success. Did anyone ask the question;

**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.

#### PC01499-27

**Comment:**

- could no longer sit on your patio and enjoy the simple pleasure of reading the newspaper with a cup of tea
- could no longer enjoy an outing in your large, beautiful back yard with family and friends
- could no longer walk daily in your neighborhood park because of the excessive increase in aircraft noise over the last eight years (there are two flight paths over the park)

- no longer could open your windows and doors and enjoy the wonderful breeze because of the excessive increased aircraft noise over the last eight years.

- were no longer able to sleep nights with your bedroom window open because of the excessive increased aircraft noise

**Response:**

Please refer to Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels and its effect on backyard areas and local parks. Also, see Subtopical Response TR-N-6.3 regarding present and future noise levels and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. 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 a discussion of noise levels under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions and projected noise increases under the Master Plan alternatives.

**PC01499-28**

**Comment:**

- had the exterior of your home painted and four months later it is blacken with aircraft fall-out

**Response:**

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

**PC01499-29**

**Comment:**

- have to continually turn the volume of the television and radio up and because of aircraft noise

**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.

**PC01499-30**

**Comment:**

Do you think that you would mind living under these conditions 24 hours a day seven days a week? YES, you would mind and so do we! We don't need one more aircraft flying over Inglewood, nor do we need one more cargo facility added to the already "cargo - cult" in and around Inglewood. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH! Our communities are overburdened and is already carrying more than any community should be burdened with. What is going on here is unconscionable! This is environmental injustice to the hilt! And it is asked; Why are we, people of color, angry?

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01500**

**Biffar, Helen**

**None Provided**

**PC01500-1**

**Comment:**

We live on Airport blvd. which you want to open from the freeway to form the expressway that would destroy this section of Westchester. Heavy traffic, noise pollution and large trucks 24 hrs a day within 30 ft of our bedroom, the area would be unlivable.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

**Response:**

Impacts to residents and businesses are discussed in their respective sections in Appendix K of the Draft EIS/EIR (i.e., noise, air quality, land use). To reduce such impacts, mitigation measures are recommended upon implementation of the proposed improvements. LAX Master Plan commitments and Mitigation Measures related to the LAX Master Plan are summarized in Chapter 5, Environmental Action Plan, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 for a discussion of potential effects of the LAX Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester. Also see Topical Response TR-ST-6 for a discussion of neighborhood traffic impacts and issues. Please note that Alternative D, now the preferred alternative, does not include the proposed LAX Expressway as a project component.

**PC01500-2**

**Comment:**

The money being spent to make LAX a world airport could be used to expand Palmdale and Ontario airports and El Toro. There are several vacant air bases that could be used for cargo and keep traffic off L.A. streets and freeways.

**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.

**PC01500-3**

**Comment:**

Improve and upgrade our present airport. If it is expanded now? What happens 20 years from now?

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00883-1 regarding upgrading existing facilities. Please see Response to Comment PC00287-3 regarding the need for expansion 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.

**PC01500-4**

**Comment:**

Westchester has been destroyed enough. We do not want any more destruction, noise, pollution and traffic jams.

Please 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.

**PC01501      Ashworth, James &      None Provided      7/19/2001**  
**Rosemarie**

**PC01501-1****Comment:**

Being residents of Westchester we are opposed to and urge you stop 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. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

**PC01501-2****Comment:**

- The increased noise, traffic and pollution are obvious reasons, but has everyone forgotten that fresh air, sunshine and necessity to be outside at times are a crucial part of health and living? The offer to soundproof the homes sounds (no pun) nice, but it only reduces the effect of noise when indoors. Expansion will condemn residents to a life indoors with all windows and doors shut, since at present noise levels there is already a need for earplugs!

**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; traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; and pollution in Section 4.6, Air Quality and 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment. Please see Topical Response Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program and TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels, including thresholds used to identify significant noise levels.

**PC01501-3****Comment:**

- The property values in the area will decline which will undoubtedly lead to a lowering of socio-economic levels, leading to a loss of revenue for the city and county, and increase in crime and deterioration of the community.

**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. As was discussed 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, a loss in property and business tax revenue would occur immediately following property acquisition. In the long term, the extent to which tax revenues associated with acquired businesses with no identifiable relocation opportunity might be lost to the City of Los Angeles would depend on the relocation choices of affected property owners. However, under each of the build alternatives new tax revenues generated over the life of the Master Plan (2015) would more than compensate for those lost. Property and business taxes would be quickly recouped as LAWA collateral development proceeds and acquired businesses move to airport-owned property.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

#### **PC01501-4**

**Comment:**

- The safety of LAX with expansion and increased air traffic is extremely questionable, since LAX is already among the worse on record with "near misses". The computer systems are archaic and seriously in doubt of being able to handle any increase.

**Response:**

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

#### **PC01501-5**

**Comment:**

- Class action law suits which will undoubtedly arise with expansion will cost heavily and off-set any revenue gained.

**Response:**

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

#### **PC01501-6**

**Comment:**

What is troubling is that other realistic solutions are not on any drawing board or seemingly even being considered.

Palmdale and Lancaster welcome an airport. All of the valley would be served, as well as greater Los Angeles, depending on where one is coming from. At present, already, it takes just as long to drive to Palmdale as it does to get into LAX.

Orange county residents have successfully defeated expansion at John Wayne. An orange county resident was asked why LAX should expand when orange county voted against expansion. Her answer was. "Who cares? Inglewood is a sewer anyway!"

Why does Los Angeles have to accept the inherent problems of expansion, since there is an alternative - Palmdale.

**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. 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.

#### **PC01501-7**

**Comment:**

Of you, Mayor Hahn, we would ask that you honor your campaign pledge - No Expansion of LAX!

**Response:**

Please see Response to Comment PC00578-1 regarding the development of Alternative D-Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, which was developed at the direction of Mayor James Hahn.

**PC01502      Henderson, Ann      None Provided      7/18/2001**

**PC01502-1**

**Comment:**

Permit me to voice my strong opposition to 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 the of the No Action/No Project Alternative

**PC01502-2**

**Comment:**

Altho I live close to the Airport, it is not the increased noise that concerns me, but the increased traffic the plan will generate.

Doubling cargo activity as well as passenger capacity will most certainly impact congestion on our roads, particularly Sepulveda Blvd and the I-405, which already are at intolerable levels even in non-peak hours.

**Response:**

Comment noted. 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 traffic improvements to off-airport roadways. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

**PC01502-3**

**Comment:**

A regional airport system is the only possible solution to our traffic nightmares.

**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.

**PC01503      Stanley, Penelope      None Provided      7/21/2001**

**PC01503-1**

**Comment:**

1 This will add too much traffic, especially heavy truck traffic, to the I-405 & I-105 freeways, which are already near gridlock.

### **3. Comments and Responses**

---

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, in particular Subtopical Response TR-ST-4.1 and Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

**PC01503-2**

**Comment:**

2 More maintenance facilities, particularly near the east end, will greatly increase the noise (engine run-ups all the time), and it's already too loud.

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increases. As a relief measure for a portion of the ground noise effects normally attenuated by barriers, each Master Plan alternative incorporates the construction of Ground Run-up Enclosures. These are facilities that substantially mitigate the noise levels by aircraft that undergo maintenance run-ups on the airfield. Please see Topical Response TR-N-4, regarding noise mitigation, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-4.2, regarding berms, barriers, urban forest, and walls proposed to interrupt ground noise. For a more detailed description see Section 7, Noise Mitigation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5, regarding nighttime aircraft operations, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-5.3, regarding night run-up activity. 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 regarding noise-related mitigation.

**PC01503-3**

**Comment:**

Even with home sound-proofing, which would mean we could never sit in our gardens,

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program, Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels, and Topical Response TR-LU-5 for a discussion of thresholds used to identify significant noise levels. 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 a discussion of noise levels under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions and projected noise increases under the Master Plan alternatives.

**PC01503-4**

**Comment:**

the vibrations and loud episodes intrude on our lives.

**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. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 regarding noise increase. Please also see Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration.

**PC01503-5**

**Comment:**

3 There isn't enough space to develop all the ancillary & support businesses, whereas there is ample space at Palmdale, at Ontario, and at El Toro. March is also available. It is short-sighted to jam these facilities in here rather than place them out where they are wanted.



**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.

**PC01503-6**

**Comment:**

4 There is no way to mitigate the dangers from pollutants, especially Benzene, NOX, & PM10

**Response:**

Please see Topical Response TR-HRA-4 regarding human health mitigation strategies. Please refer to Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment (subsection 4.24.1.9, Level of Significance After Mitigation), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for an analysis of the level of significance associated with the four build alternatives after mitigation measures are implemented.

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 EIS/EIR to reduce impacts from airport operations and construction as well as from regional vehicular traffic under Alternatives A, B, C, and D. 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.

Mitigation measure AQ-1 incorporates mitigation measures to address aircraft emissions such as development of methods and/or incentives to encourage and promote reduced-engine taxiing by aircraft moving between runways and terminal gates. Design features incorporated into the alternatives also reduce air quality impacts. For example, runway and taxiway additions and/or modifications variously incorporated into the designs for each of the build alternatives will reduce airfield delay and congestion, thereby improving efficiency of aircraft movement on the airfield and decreasing aircraft taxiing and idling times and emissions. Installation of pre-conditioned air and electrical power hookups at terminal gates would allow airlines to minimize the use of auxiliary power units (on-board turbines).

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 volatile organic compounds such as benzene for on-airport sources by 8 percent in the Interim Year and by 54 percent in the Horizon Year. These post-mitigation reductions in toxic air pollutant concentrations result in decreases in human health risks as discussed in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment (subsection 4.24.1.9), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

### 3. Comments and Responses

---

**PC01504      Hodgin, Emmalie      None Provided      7/18/2001**

**PC01504-1**

**Comment:**

We will not let up until this is resolved. We must have a more effective noise ordinance. Safety is a top priority.

**Response:**

Comment noted.

**PC01504-2**

The remainder of this comment letter is identical to form letter PFF; please refer to the responses to form letter PFF.

**PC01505      Cochran, Carole      None Provided      7/20/2001**

**PC01505-1**

**Comment:**

As a resident of the airport neighborhood, whose daily life is impacted by the increased noise, traffic, air pollution, I urge you to reconsider the LAX expansion plan.

**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-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.

**PC01505-2**

**Comment:**

It is a short term solution which will not solve the problem of increased demand. A regional solution which would include Ontario, Orange County & Palmdale will eventually have to be considered - why not 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-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

#### **PC01505-3**

**Comment:**

Traffic congestion at & around the airport is already extremely high - the ring road traffic plan would not eliminate this.

**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. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. Alternative D has been added to 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 Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or the ring road.

#### **PC01505-4**

**Comment:**

Also, I am concerned about issues of safety with overcrowding the jet corridors yet further. Looking east on a clear night I often count 17-20 planes lined up to land. What safety precautions can be made to increase this by the proposed increase in flights.

**Response:**

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

#### **PC01505-5**

**Comment:**

Please have the courage and vision to consider a regional solution rather than a stop gap, bandaid solution which has so many inherent 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.

### ***3. Comments and Responses***

---

This page intentionally left blank.