

PC01506 Heller, Jeanne None Provided 7/20/2001

PC01506-1

Comment:

I'm writing this as an input to public comment regarding the LAX Master Plan. I and my neighbors in the 90064 ZIP code ask that General Aviation services remain at LAX, a well-equipped site. Any plans to curtail services for General Aviation at LAX will adversely affect and place an unfair burden upon the other, smaller airport communities in the greater Los Angeles area (including Santa Monica).

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC01496-1 for a discussion on the development of general aviation facilities for all alternatives.

PC01506-2

Comment:

Our local airports will then have to bear the stress and danger of increased jet traffic in our residential communities. These airports were not designed for large amounts of jet traffic.

Those of us living near small airports have already experienced a large increase in jet traffic over our homes. There is too much noise, damage to homes from vibration and engine rev-up, pollution that affects our children (indeed, all our health), and fuel by-products that land on our homes and gardens.

If fixed-base operator facilities that service noncommercial jet traffic (large executive and small business jets) are not included in the LAX Master Plan, an unsafe and environmentally unsound increase in corporate and commuter aircraft traffic is expected to converge on small local airfields that were never meant for such aircraft. We who live in neighborhoods near such small airports are already suffering the effects of increased jet fume pollution and noise that shakes the frames of our houses and drowns out all other sound.

As a homeowner near Santa Monica airport, I have a 25-year investment in the area. I knew I'd be living near a small airport when I bought my property, but I did not expect that the airport policy would be expanded to allow jets, run-up services, and low-flying jets that literally shake the putty from my windows.

Increased jet traffic will further degrade the quality of life and lower the value of taxpayers' properties. There have also been more crashes, some of them fatal.

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.

PC01506-3

Comment:

LAX should remain the central point for all types of air traffic in the LA area. At least three fixed-base operator facilities are needed at LAX to service noncommercial private and business jets and prop planes. We need to continue to support General Aviation at LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC01496-3 for a discussion on general aviation activity.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01506-4

Comment:

Our wish is that the Master Plan improve or expand LAX to accommodate increased traffic in today's international world. Ontario, Palmdale, and El Toro airports can be used to dilute the burden 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.

PC01507

O'Leary, Maureen

None Provided

7/18/2001

PC01507-1

Comment:

Having read the newspapers & listened to my neighbors I cannot help but come to the conclusion that this proposed expansion is wrong.

Response:

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

PC01507-2

Comment:

The amount of car and truck traffic in Westchester is currently too much. Even w/a ring road to divert some of it, people will use surface/residential streets if they think it will be quicker.

Response:

The Master Plan would help to separate regional airport traffic from local traffic, and satisfy future airport traffic demand while mitigating impacts to the surrounding street system. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or the ring road.

PC01507-3**Comment:**

My biggest concern is air quality. I have 2 seven year old boys with asthma. More air, car & truck traffic brings in more exhaust pollution and sicker children.

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.

PC01508 McLaughlin, Patricia None Provided

7/21/2001

PC01508-1**Comment:**

It is lamentable when a government places hubris and greed above the needs of its citizens - as is what has happened with LAX. LAX - through its periodic expansions has gobbled up much of Westchester and Playa del Rey. And, given LAX's history of making promises that it can't or won't keep, the community is at the point where we can not allow one more improvement, not one more toilet, nothing at LAX. Not even "safety" reasons are acceptable for improving or expanding LAX because the City cannot be believed that any improvement will not be used to increase passenger services.

Response:

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

PC01508-2**Comment:**

The City must do the right thing - and that is exploit its alternative airport sites. This is not a situation where Los Angeles has no choices. Los Angeles has choices but for convenience has chosen to ignore the wishes of the Citizens of Inglewood, El Segundo and Manhattan Beach - who can't vote in Los Angeles anyway. Los Angeles has also chosen to ignore the needs of its own citizens - on a repeated basis and then seems mystified by the movements of various parts of the City to break away.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to 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.

PC01508-3**Comment:**

The people of Westchester and Playa del Rey have no choices. We must fight the expansion of LAX because if we don't our homes, the homes of our friends and neighbors, our quality of life are faced with the extinction.

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. 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 propose residential acquisition.

PC01508-4

Comment:

Stop Expanding LAX. Air transportation must be handled on a Regional basis. This is a battle cry!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to 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.

PC01509

Melinz, Elisabeth

None Provided

7/19/2001

PC01509-1

Comment:

Please do not expand the LAX Airport because it would add to a great gridlock and pollution problem that would be extremely damaging to our environment.

Response:

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

PC01509-2

Comment:

The environmental impact studies should be done through a few independent sources to avoid any biases in this process.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01509-3

Comment:

Please use other remote locations for airport expansions.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with

3. Comments and Responses

the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC01510 Kahn, Cecily None Provided 7/19/2001

PC01510-1

Comment:

The goal of city planning should be to ease the difficulties of urban living, not increase them. Certainly LAX expansion exemplifies the latter. The airport is barely accessible now due to traffic. Flights arriving are often delayed due to air traffic. It makes no sense to increase safety risk, traffic congestion, noise, levels in residential areas & pollution (when we're finally making progress against it) when there are viable alternatives. The residential & business populations of LA have become markedly more regional & it does make sense to be consistent with this trend in air travel. Regional airports can easily address increasing air travel & cargo demands.

Response:

The 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-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology, Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program, 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-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC01511 Gasperi, Charles & Marjorie None Provided 7/21/2001

PC01511-1

Comment:

WE ARE AGAINST 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.

PC01511-2

Comment:

The Master Plan to expand the LAX airport will further congest all the streets in the surrounding areas of Westchester, Playa Del Rey, El Segundo Marina del Rey and Mar Vista.

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 also see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-7 regarding Westchester Southside traffic.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01511-3

Comment:

The increase in air traffic noise will be intolerable to any one living in the area. We are already uncomfortable with these constant airport noises from LAX.

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.

PC01511-4

Comment:

Your expansion of the airport is too much for the area. We have many people living in the area that will be affected by the loss of their homes and businesses.

Response:

Comment noted. The acquisition and relocation impacts associated with the various Master Plan Alternatives were addressed in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses (subsection 4.4.2.6), of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment PC00035-2 regarding residential acquisition; and Response to Comment PC00013-5 regarding business acquisition and relocation impacts, proposed collateral development at LAX Northside/Westchester Southside, and the proposed Preliminary Property Acquisition and Relocation Plan. 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.

PC01511-5

Comment:

The Ontario and Palmdale airports should be strongly considered.

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.

PC01512

Topper, Betsy

None Provided

7/16/2001

PC01512-1

Comment:

THE TRAFFIC IS ALREADY SO BAD ON THE 405 FWY FROM THE SOUTH BAY NORTH THROUGH THE MULHOLLAND PASS ALMOST ALL THE TIME. IF EXECUTED, LAX EXPANSION WILL CAUSE GRIDLOCK ALONG THE WESTSIDE THAT WILL AFFECT THE WHOLE STATE & TOURISM.

PLEASE, LET'S REDUCE TRAFFIC, NOT INCREASE IT ALONG OUR STREETS AND FREEWAYS.

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

3. Comments and Responses

EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways.

PC01513 Topper, Elizabeth None Provided 7/20/2001

PC01513-1

Comment:

ALL COMMUNITIES MUST SHARE BURDEN OF AIRPORT EXPANSION. LAX IS ALREADY TOO BUSY!

THINK OF THE FUTURE OF THE WHOLE WORLD (AND THIS IS A GLOBAL ISSUE) NOT JUST YOUR OWN EGO.

DON'T EXPAND!!!

Response:

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

PC01514 Topper, Elizabeth None Provided 7/20/2001

PC01514-1

Comment:

DON'T MAKE A LIFELONG DECISION THAT YOU WILL REGRET. DON'T COMPROMISE OUR FUTURE GENERATIONS.

DON'T MAKE CAR TRAFFIC WORSE. DON'T MAKE OUR CITY INTO MEXICO CITY OR TOKYO OR HONG KONG.

PLEASE CARE!!!

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.

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.

PC01515 Klein, Kathy None Provided 7/20/2001

PC01515-1

Comment:

I have lived in Westchester for over 18 years. I love our community. It's like a small town in the middle of the big city. You will ruin our community if you continue to push to add runways to LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. In addition, Alternative D, the LAWA staff preferred alternative, would not include construction of any additional runways.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01515-2

Comment:

I favor the regional approach to future air travel. As I write this letter, our friend's car sits in front of our house. They are in Australia and they live in Fallbrook. I have 2 sets of friends who live in Laguna Nigel who use my street in front of the house at least twice a year. I have another friend from Pasadena who is "reserving" my street for next month. I think you get the picture - my O.C. friends are a lot closer to El Toro than LAX!

Response:

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

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.

PC01515-3

Comment:

Sometimes its not that the flight they want isn't available from O.C. John Wayne, its just that its so much more expensive. Check the L.A. Times Sunday Travel Section for its least expensive chart. O.C. is usually about 1/3 - 1/2 more expensive. If you have a family, this is really prohibitive.

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 that discusses multi-airport markets, airline economics, and passenger choice.

PC01515-4

Comment:

There is no more land (after Playa Vista is finished) to grow in Los Angeles. The growth in So. Calif. will be in other developments - that's where you should put your airport - not making them travel up the 405 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.

PC01516 Tanner, William None Provided 7/19/2001

PC01516-1

Comment:

Expansion of LAX combined with Playa Vista will be a nightmare for Westchester/El Segundo/Playa Del Rey. El Segundo's office expansion has already had an impact as the most recent traffic generator and it is insignificant compared to LAX Expansion and Playa Vista.

Response:

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

PC01516-2

Comment:

This is a regional issue which should be addressed regionally. There are other alternatives to expanding LAX and choking traffic on the Westside.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01517 Roozen, Lee None Provided 7/20/2001

PC01517-1

Comment:

We have lived in Westchester for 30 years. Our neighborhood "hometown" feel is greatly eroding over the years due largely to LAX expansion and other developments such as Hughes Place & Playa Vista.

Response:

Comment noted. 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-ST-2 for details on how the future traffic demand from the Playa Vista development was incorporated in the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00018-19 for a discussion of the cumulative impacts analysis included in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01517-2

Comment:

We live 2 miles north of LAX and we can't keep our windows open on hot summer nights due to the increased noise pollution.

3. Comments and Responses

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.

PC01517-3

Comment:

I have developed chronic obstructive pulmonary disease that forced me to quit working from all the greatly increase road traffic and LAX expansion over the years.

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.

PC01517-4

Comment:

Several studies have shown increased cancer incidents of people who live within 2 - 4 miles of LAX.

Response:

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

PC01517-5

Comment:

Other airports and communities should bare the burden of their of their own noise, traffic, crime and pollution.

Response:

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

PC01517-6**Comment:**

Please do not approve of anymore LAX Expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. 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.

PC01518**Holland, Gladys****None Provided****7/18/2001****PC01518-1****Comment:**

Air Pollution - my white deck furniture is quite often black from the oil from the planes - consider our lungs.

Response:

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

PC01518-2**Comment:**

The noise is increasing constantly.

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.

PC01518-3**Comment:**

The traffic would be less if we used Ontario and Palmdale airports.

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. Also, 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.

PC01518-4**Comment:**

There are times where there are many planes going in different directions over my house - more planes means there will be major accidents if this traffic increases.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC01519 Beals, Michael None Provided 7/19/2001

PC01519-1

Comment:

As the Rabbi of B'nai Tikvah Congregation in the Westchester neighborhood of Los Angeles, let me first thank you for the opportunity to comment on the LAX Master Plan. Allow me to introduce my congregation to you, B'nai Tikvah Congregation has been in Westchester, serving the needs of the Jewish community for more than fifty years. We are located one block east of Airport Blvd., at 5820 W. Manchester Ave.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01519-2

Comment:

Second, let me tell you that as the airport has expanded throughout the years, our synagogue has been hurt, both in terms of finances and membership. Homes of our congregants have been destroyed in order to make room for the expanding airport.

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to the 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 - 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 and identifies Master Plan commitments and recommended mitigation measures.

PC01519-3

Comment:

As of now, it is impossible for me to hold evening services in our synagogue courtyard as I cannot be heard over the din of the airplanes.

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.

PC01519-4

Comment:

Our synagogue is also home to a non-sectarian nursery school and kindergarten for children between the ages of 2-6. We currently have an enrollment hovering around 100 children. We also have a religious school which meets Tuesday evenings from 4-6 p.m., as well as on Saturday and Sunday mornings, from 9 a.m. - 12: 15 p.m.

I am concerned that your expansion of the airport will increase noise pollution and physical pollution from jet fuel to such high levels as to severely impact on the health of our children, as well as the congregants who attend services in our sanctuary.

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.

PC01519-5

Comment:

Would the expansion plan replace the windows of our buildings to seal them off from the increased noise? As the children take their breaks out in our courtyard, they would still be exposed to the added noise from the planes.

Response:

The commentor's property appears to be located outside the boundary of noise-sensitive parcels eligible for sound insulation. The noise impact area which determines properties eligible for noise insulation under the ANMP is described in Topical Response TR-LU-3, in particular 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 was 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 was shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As was shown on these respective figures, under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions the area within the 65 CNEL noise contour has decreased compared to the ANMP contour, which continues to define the area of eligibility for sound insulation. Although this is a comment on existing noise levels and conditions, the general focus of the document, pursuant to NEPA and CEQA, is to evaluate the potential future environmental effects of the project and to provide feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts. See Topical Response TR-LU-3, in particular Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4 regarding how eligibility for soundproofing is determined and Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.14 for a description of how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP. See Topical Response TR-LU-4, regarding significant outdoor noise levels. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

PC01519-6

Comment:

Would your expansion force us to move from our site to a new location, and if so would you be assessing the value of our property for us? What would be the time frame.

Response:

Relocation 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. The B'nai Tikvah Temple, located at 5820 W. Manchester Avenue, is not proposed for acquisition under any of the Master Plan alternatives. Properties proposed for acquisition under Alternatives A, B, and C are listed in Appendix P of the Draft Master Plan, and properties proposed for acquisition under Alternative D are listed in Table 2.7-2 of the Draft Master Plan Addendum.

PC01519-7

Comment:

Have you thought any of these things through? I am most concerned that your expansion plans will make it impossible to teach and practice Judaism at our current location.

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

PC01520 Miller, Marjorie None Provided 7/17/2001

PC01520-1

Comment:

I studied the proposals for increasing traffic at LAX at a recent public presentation. I agree something must be done to improve safety at LAX.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01520-2

Comment:

I firmly believe it is important to move a great deal of air traffic through El Toro and Palmdale. It really is time for other areas to 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. Also, 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.

PC01520-3

Comment:

and time for rail traffic to Palmdale.

Response:

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

PC01520-4

Comment:

The west end entrance would help at LAX and the ring road would improve traffic flow to help solve problems existing with traffic already.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01520-5

Comment:

I fear we will have a great deal more aircraft noise in Westchester and much less recreational space - a shame!

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding aircraft noise and recreational impacts on the community of Westchester. As stated in TR-LU-2, the number of dwelling units exposed to high noise levels would decrease under all the build alternatives compared to 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions. Additionally, no parks would be acquired under any of the build alternatives and recreational space would increase under the LAX Master Plan.

PC01521	Yockey, Mrs. Frances	None Provided	7/20/2001
----------------	---------------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01521-1**Comment:**

Air Pollution -
Noise Pollution -
Traffic Pollution -

That's the legacy Mr. Riordan and a few of his selected politicians will be leaving to Los Angeles. The safety issue doesn't seem to enter into their planning at all.

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

PC01521-2**Comment:**

As you can see from my above comments, I support the Regional Airports 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.

PC01521-3**Comment:**

We don't need the increasing traffic and noise and particularly the 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01521-4

Comment:

I support the REGIONAL AIRPORT PLAN. I feel that LAX has been pushed to the limit.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to 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.

PC01521-5

Comment:

I wonder why all the objecting voices against having an airport in their backyard are the voices against having an airport in their backyard are the voices that are being heard. We have been residents since 1952 (49 years in the same house-now right along side of the NORTH RUWAY) and we would like our voices HEARD.

Response:

Comment noted. Following input from the public on the Draft EIS/EIR, and the events of September 11, 2001, Alternative D was added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01521-6

Comment:

I was at the Fuyama (sp?) Hotel meeting in June and was very pleased to see your huge wall poster that pledged "No Expansion." I'm sure you will take steps to appoint LAWA Commissioners to carry out your 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.

PC01522

Vandeman, Craig & Leane

None Provided

7/15/2001

PC01522-1

Comment:

I am a concerned citizen living in the Westdale Neighborhood directly east of the Santa Monica airport. In addition to the statements made on the attached letter, I am especially concerned about the impact that increased jet activity into Santa Monica Airport would cause on surrounding homes and schools. Some homes are only 200-300 feet from the end of the runway.

I strongly urge that LAX EIS/EIR do a comprehensive study into the increased noise and air pollution that would inevitably be caused by forcing more jets to use Santa Monica Airport instead of LAX. I am strongly against any plans to end or curtail services for General Aviation at LAX. It just doesn't make sense!

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.

PC01522-2**Comment:**

In addition, I strongly believe that other airports needs to be considered in more of a regional airport plan. We do have too many people commuting into LAX instead of using their local airports in Palmdale, Ontario and El Toro. These airports needs to be developed appropriately. The residents of West Los Angeles should not be forced to take all of the burden for air transportation 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.

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.

PC01522-3

The remainder of this comment letter is identical to form letter PFE; please refer to the responses to form letter PFE.

PC01523**Stodder, Joseph****None Provided****7/19/2001****PC01523-1****Comment:**

I want to respond here to the LAWA Environmental Impact Report.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC01523-2**Comment:**

I was shocked to hear that the new plan called for more demolition of Westchester residences. I live one block from the border of the area that was massively demolished years ago. Many of our friends and neighbors were forcibly displaced in that action. The continuing erosion of our residential area is a frightening prospect indeed. Along with the trauma of displacement comes the degradation of the community caused by the fenced off, deserted fields, which collect trash, increase the likelihood of criminal activity, etc.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

As was described in Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, Alternatives A, B, and C, would involve acquisition of 84 dwelling units, along the northern edge of the airport east of Sepulveda Boulevard. As was stated in Chapter 3, Alternatives of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative, Alternative D, does not propose residential acquisition.

Regarding the reference to deserted fields, it appears that the area in question is the LAX Northside/Westchester Southside property. As was described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6), of the Draft EIS/EIR, under Alternatives A, B, C, and D, this area would be developed with a mix of uses, including business park/light industrial, hotel/recreational and a pedestrian oriented community commercial area to serve the residents of Westchester and provide relocation sites for a number of businesses displaced by land acquisition. Conditions included in Ordinance 159,526 would be incorporated into the LAX Zone/LAX Plan to restrict building heights, setbacks, and landscape buffers in order to ensure compatibility with adjacent residential uses.

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

PC01523-3

Comment:

Another aspect of the community erosion is the increase in vehicle traffic. Emerson Avenue, which once was a quiet residential street, is becoming a heavily traveled artery, bringing noise and heightened danger to our neighborhood. Traffic on Sepulveda, through the runway viaduct, has become impossibly snarled. With the planned expansion, even taking into account plans to relieve traffic with the ring road, these conditions will certainly worsen.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4, in particular Subtopical Response TR-ST-4.1 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PC01523-4

Comment:

Vehicular exhaust already combines with jet fuel residues to endanger the welfare of our community, and this problem will only be exacerbated by expansion.

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. 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.

PC01523-5

Comment:

The soundproofing that has taken place in Westchester is only a partial solution to the noise problem. One of the obvious problems is that it only lessens sound within the house. Many of us Californians spend much of our time outside, where excessively loud jet noise is a continuing serious problem. (Please see additional attached remarks.)

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. Also, please see Responses to Comments PC01523-6 through PC01523-8 below for a response to the additional attached remarks.

PC01523-6

Comment:

One of the greatest, and most realistic, fears is the one that planners avoid addressing--that of flight safety, which expansion would heighten in what is an already overcrowded airspace. Those responsible for controlling this space have offered, during this period of relative accident-free air (but not ground) operation, only flimsy responses to safety questions raised in hearings. One might wonder how they would respond in the aftermath of a major disaster.

Response:

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

PC01523-7

Comment:

The sanest solution, in the minds of many who have searched these issues, is development of existing facilities in our region--at Palmdale, at Ontario, at El Monte, at Victorville, San Bernardino, etc. Passengers who now travel from the Antelope and San Fernando Valleys to LAX would have a commuting time no longer, and in many cases shorter, if Palmdale were available. Freight traffic that now clogs our neighborhood streets would be much more wisely handled at Palmdale (from the north and east) or at El Monte (from the south, southeast). Development of these regional alternatives would require large near-term as well as long-term money expenditures (evidently the essential sticking point), but we must consider the alternative expenditures of human welfare resulting from illness or loss of life (whether through illness or aircraft collision).

Response:

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

PC01523-8

Comment:

These are only a few of the questions, problems, and fears that pervade the larger LAX community and trouble, as well, many thinking, concerned citizens outside of it. We appeal to the Commissioners to step back from the immediate issues that dominate the expansion thinking, and to consider the larger perspectives which, when properly considered, will surely prove more sensible, and ultimately more realistic.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01524

Burns, Barbara

None Provided

7/19/2001

PC01524-1

Comment:

The LAX master plan does not address the real issue of too many aircraft crowding into a finite airspace. Any increase to MAP and/or MAT at LAX is out-of-control growth, with serious, even dangerous, impacts, on aircraft safety, air pollution, and surface traffic.

A chart of the master plan proposals on the LAX website starts with a baseline in year 1996 of 58 MAP and 1.9 MAT. LAX claims current MAP is 65, equal to a 12% increase, and MAT is 2.1, an 11% increase over the past five years. The No Action Before 2015 column gives 79 MAP, an increase of 36%, and 3.1 MAT, an increase of 63%. The estimated capacity of LAX's current facilities is 78 MAP.

Alternate A and Alternate B with 98 MAP, an increase of 69%, and MAT of 4.2, an increase of 121%, are so extreme and impossible that they should not even be considered.

LAX has a history of making misleading predictions and false promises. When the plan for the existing LAX was approved, capacity was set at 40 MAP. LAX exceeds that now by 62%. In 1988, LAX officials promised the public not to exceed 65 MAP, admitting that at 65 MAP the airspace would reach its maximum capacity. Now LAX is threatening the community that even without approval or permission they will expand to 79 MAP and increase MAT by approximately 75%. This is not rational. This is not safe,

Response:

Issues related to aviation safety, air pollution, and surface traffic were addressed in Sections 4.24, 4.6, and 4.3, respectively, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety and Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels.

PC01524-2

Comment:

There are more airports in Southern California than in any other region in the world, according to Los Angeles City Councilwoman Ruth Galanter. More development at LAX is not cost-effective. There are ten other commercial airports ready to be used. Why spend \$12 billion on a small, squeezed-in parcel at LAX when existing runway systems are available at no extra cost at ten other locations in the vicinity? While the LAX expansion plan is pending, other airports in the region cannot get commitments from airline operators, who are waiting to see what is decided regarding LAX. The proposed expansion of LAX is preventing other communities from having fully utilized airports and the accompanying economic 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.

PC01524-3

Comment:

A SCAG study shows that more than 60% of cargo now arrives in freighter airplanes. This will increase to 80% in twenty years. Three former air force bases: March, George and Norton, are ideal locations for air cargo centers. LAX has deviously pursued "operations creep" by adding certain facilities that do not require a master plan or an EIR. LAX should be prevented from adding any facilities without an approval process. LAX should reduce the volume of cargo, moving to a goal of eliminating all dedicated cargo carriers.

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 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. The express all-cargo carriers, mostly notably FedEx and United Parcel Service (UPS), argue that relative proximity to population/commercial density is critical to achieve the overnight promise to deliver, the hallmark service of express carriers. For these reasons, among others, it is not feasible to eliminate cargo traffic from LAX. The 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 facilities at March, Norton, or George. The other regional airports are controlled by other jurisdictions that are responsible for their respective operation and expansion.

PC01524-4

Comment:

LAX operations should be limited to the size of the current facilities and to the current volume of 65 MAP and 2.1 MAT, or less. As cargo volume is reduced, passenger volume could be correspondingly increased to keep the total traffic at the existing level.

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, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient. Variations in the volume of cargo handled at the airport would have virtually no impact on the volume of passengers served.

PC01524-5

Comment:

A regional plan should be designed to distribute aviation traffic throughout the region. LAWA already owns airports at Palmdale and Ontario, both of which could handle much more volume. Various communities in the counties of San Bernardino, Riverside, and Orange have underutilized viable commercial airports. Former military bases Norton, March, George, and El Toro are ideal sites for airports.

LAX has tunnel vision. LAX can see only one thing: expansion. The Southern California region needs a wider view - we need a well thought-out regional air traffic system.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

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

PC01525 Weaver, Elizabeth None Provided 7/21/2001

PC01525-1

Comment:

I am opposed to the LAX expansion project. The impact that the increase in airport size will have on air quality (already poor), traffic, and sound levels are of great concern.

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.

PC01525-2

Comment:

Because I live and work in the area near LAX, the impact on the value of property is also a major concern.

Response:

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

PC01525-3

Comment:

There are other airports which can, and should perhaps, be expanded to accommodate passengers from the areas closer to them than to LAX. Why should LAX and the surrounding neighborhoods be more infringed on and put upon? We have enough already; let them 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.

PC01526 Smith, Charlene None Provided 7/14/2001

PC01526-1

Comment:

I am concerned with your plan for LAX and its expansion. I have watched it grow over the years. I have also watched the congestion grow as it and industry have increased.

Response:

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

PC01526-2

Comment:

Where will we put the people? I have seen backups on the 405 Freeway that started on the freeway and went down Century in a solid jam. The 105 is so crowded at the airport off ramps that it backs onto the 405 transition, Have you tried to get from there over to the left hand land where through traffic needs to get? It is extremely dangerous. If more traffic is added to these already busy arteries, we will end up with "parking lots". Today I came down Sepulveda. It was very crowded. Cars from the airport were jamming their way into a lane. Regular traffic was trying to set themselves up for the freeway. And this was not at rush hour! How do you plan on alleviating these problems?

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.

PC01526-3

Comment:

Los Angeles Airport is already considered dangerous in takeoffs, landings, and taxiing. More airplane traffic will not solve these problems. There will just be more airplanes circling overhead and sitting waiting for takeoff. Passengers are getting angrier and angrier at these kinds of problem. It has been shown that high density always increases problems.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00543-1.

PC01526-4

Comment:

Spread out the airports. Build a new one. We are a sprawling metropolis. We need airports in other areas. Of course, people want to come to LAX. It is a familiar habit. Given time, people will get used to another system. We grumble when we have to change old habits. Don't be locked in just because there is already a fuel line from the refinery to 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

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.

PC01526-5

Comment:

If we increase the number of people, we also increase pollution from cars and airplanes. Is this fair to the children who are having ever increasing lung problems and asthma? How will the airport affect them? How will you insure no increase in pollution? We need a decrease, not an increase in 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, Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC01526-6

Comment:

In the path of incoming planes, there is low-income housing. Will this expansion affect people's homes? It is much easier for the affluent to move than the others. And almost none of us want to move. We love our communities.

Response:

Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR discussed acquisition related impacts on housing. Increases in noise and effects on residential properties were addressed in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Mitigation proposed to address noise effects sets a priority for sound insulation rather than relocation. Subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Under Alternative D, no acquisition of housing is proposed.

PC01526-7

Comment:

This increase in size, affects the quality of life. The noise is getting worse. How will the noise be decreased? It is spreading so that more communities are affected than used to be.

Response:

Impacts associated with aircraft noise were addressed in Section 4.2, Land Use, 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, Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1, and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding quality of life.

PC01526-8**Comment:**

If you expand the airport, you will be accountable for the new problems. Think carefully, get good impact surveys, and build a new airport in another part of LA County. Do not gridlock this area for convenience.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01527 Haythorn, J. Denny None Provided 7/21/2001

PC01527-1**Comment:**

I have been a resident of Westchester and Playa del Rey for the past twenty-five years and the history of Los Angeles World Airports in working with the neighborhoods has not been one based upon trust or honest dealings. The current proposals continue this tradition. The plan does not deal with several issues which are fatal to its approval.

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.

PC01527-2**Comment:**

- The congestion on the freeways and roads which bring people and freight to LAX will be worsened with any development, but the impact upon the neighbors, users of LAX or anyone traveling on the Westside of the Los Angeles basin is not addressed in a meaningful way.

Response:

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

PC01527-3**Comment:**

- The congestion in the airways leading to and from LAX are not addressed. In addition to the obvious travel delays the safety implications will lead to liability for the airport and the City of Los Angeles when the imminent accident occurs.

Response:

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

PC01527-4**Comment:**

- The needs of individuals living in the San Fernando Valley, on the Eastside of Los Angeles, in the Long Beach area are not served by a mega-airport in the difficult to reach far-western area of the City.

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.

PC01527-5

Comment:

- Perhaps the worst aspect of the plans is that they do not actually address the real problem faced by the LAWA, that of continuing growth to accommodate the future, even short range, demands for travel.

Response:

Each of the Master Plan alternatives is considered constrained because none have sufficient capacity to meet forecast demand in 2015 without changes in the activity profiles. The constrained alternatives place a higher priority on environmental and community objectives over economic and air service objectives. The Master Plan alternatives, thus, were designed to maximize the amount of traffic that could be served in the limited space available. Please see Response to Comment PC00260-1 regarding the level of activity that could be served at LAX under the three alternatives and Response to Comment PC01790-3 regarding the amount of land acquisition required. 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.

PC01527-6

Comment:

There are only two possible solutions for the future travel needs for the people living in the Los Angeles Metropolitan Statistical Area. The first is to create a true mega-airport in the same manner as Denver has recently done. Such an airport can be located at the present site by taking the land to the edge of the bluffs overlooking Playa Vista, though the land and air approach problems would still exist. While that would obviously destroy the Westchester, Playa del Rey, Inglewood areas of Los Angeles, but at least it would honestly address the ongoing noise and traffic issues for those individuals living in the area.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01527-7

Comment:

An alternative would be to build such an airport far from the City in Palmdale and convert LAX to a regional airport.

Response:

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

PC01527-8**Comment:**

This solution would require high-speed rail to connect it with the existing city infrastructures. The large, remotely sited airports at Chicago, Washington, Dallas and London have been successful for many years. Chicago, London and Washington (nearly) are connected via fast rail to the city.

Response:

O'Hare is about the same distance from downtown Chicago as LAX is from downtown Los Angeles. The rail link for O'Hare and Heathrow in London is traditional mass transit, like the Green Line, not high-speed rail. Dallas-Fort Worth (DFW) and Dulles do not have rail links to their respective downtowns. DFW, Dulles and Heathrow are much closer to their respective downtowns than Palmdale is to downtown Los Angeles. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand.

PC01527-9**Comment:**

At least in Chicago however, the planners are exploring building a group of airports to meet the areas future needs rather than building another, next generation O'Hare further from the City.

The Chicago plan brings up the second solution to the proposed development at LAX. The LAWA should develop a plan to utilize the resources of the existing airport facilities at LAX and Ontario while developing a large airport Palmdale. At the same time relationships would be developed with Long Beach and Burbank Airport authorities for coordinated planning. This organization would be more in keeping with current planning in other metropolitan areas. This plan would require the construction of rail connections among the airports and strategic centers in the metro area. Development in Orange and Ventura Counties could be included in the project to further spread the costs of growth.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01527-4 above.

PC01527-10**Comment:**

- With a series of related airports the traffic on the freeways and roads around each would be better distributed. With rail connections among the airports and other centers this passenger and freight traffic on the roads would be further mitigated.

Response:

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

PC01527-11**Comment:**

- A comprehensive air traffic pattern would alleviate congestion in the airways leading to and from the various airports addressing the problems of traffic delays and safety.

Response:

The FAA continually reviews airspace utilization, how routes to and from the multiple Los Angeles basin airports and efficiency can be improved. The FAA has a nationwide airspace redesign initiative underway to meet this goal.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01527-12

Comment:

- The needs of individuals living in the San Fernando Valley, on the Eastside of Los Angeles, in the Long Beach area would be addressed. People could more easily reach airports and connections between airports would be possible through rail connections.

Response:

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

PC01527-13

Comment:

- The best aspect using multiple airports is that it allows for future development in a planned manner bringing benefits to everyone in the Los Angeles Metro area and spreading the costs widely. Los Angeles would be adopting growth initiatives which have been under development in other major metropolitan centers and not continue down a path of a single resource.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01527-4 above.

PC01527-14

Comment:

I trust that your group will reconsider and establish a plan for developing several airports rather than just LAX. In any case I expect that you will begin to treat the neighbors of LAX and the people of Los Angeles with respect and honesty in your process.

Response:

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

PC01528

Reese, James

None Provided

7/18/2001

PC01528-1

Comment:

If you lived in this neighborhood you would also sense the day in and day out horror of loud and obnoxious sounds from the sky. Not only this - it seems it's only a matter of time before some accident happens due to the increase of air traffic - who'll be to blame then?

Response:

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

PC01528-2

The remainder of this comment letter is identical to form letter PFF; please refer to the responses to form letter PFF.

PC01529 Galen, Dana & Ron None Provided 7/19/2001

PC01529-1

Comment:

We do not want this expansion.

Response:

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

PC01529-2

Comment:

At this time we must close our windows to cut back on the loud noises of the low flying planes.

We choose to keep our neighborhood as quiet as possible & an expansion will not insure this!

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 Topical Response TR-N-6, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1, regarding noise increase.

PC01530 Sischo, Dick & Catherine None Provided 7/19/2001

PC01530-1

Comment:

We have owned a home at 7319 W 91st street for approximately 40 years. Over this period of time LAX has added 4 runways. 24 R is really too close to the single family homes from the standpoint of noise and safety, from our home it is only 1500 feet. The neighborhood is called West Westchester it can't stand more noise from more aircraft landings and takeoffs.

Response:

Living in Westchester the commentor has seen many changes at LAX, especially the addition of the north parallel complex in the late 1950's/early 1960's. However, the south parallel complex was already in place albeit the runways were shorter prior to the commentor moving into his residence. For information regarding future noise increases, please see the Draft EIS/EIR Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, in particular Section 7.2.2, Alternative A, and Topical Response TR-N-6 for more information. 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. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of master plan alternatives on the Community of Westchester.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01530-2

Comment:

It is time to consider other options such as relocation of LAX airport expansion or complete buyout of West-W estchester, which would be heavily damaged by 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.

PC01531	Wyche, Jennifer	None Provided	7/19/2001
----------------	------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01531-1

Comment:

I am opposed to the proposed expansion of LAX and I'll tell you why.

Response:

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

PC01531-2

Comment:

As a Westchester resident of over 40 yrs. it is an upsetting as well as unrealistic notion that ours and adjacent communities could remain intact amidst the kind of changes that are included in this LAX expansion. Forcing people out of their homes as well as forcing businesses in Westchester to close or relocate can not be seen as a positive.

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.

PC01531-3**Comment:**

This proposed expansion is one that we were promised would never happen, therefore trusting Westchester residents and merchants have built their lives in part around that promise.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC01160-1. Also, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the Community of Westchester and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC01531-4**Comment:**

We do deal with added noise, traffic, and pollution, both from automobiles as well as aircraft on a daily basis ---365 days a year. However the proposed expansion with its increase in noise, traffic; air, freeway, and surface streets, along with more pollution---is not in any way a "just" solution to this ongoing problem. I refuse to accept this proposed expansion as a solution of any kind. And it is wrong for LAVA to, in essence make Westchester part of LAX and in doing so minimize the importance of quality of life in our as well as surrounding communities.

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-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01531-5**Comment:**

Please consider the alternatives and ideas of regional solutions as if YOUR life and health depended on it!

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, and 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 is 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. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC01531-6**Comment:**

**Please see attachments

The language used throughout the attached pamphlet: is obscure and misleading, and clearly gives false hope to the citizens it claims to protect. Most thinking people would call that Pure Propaganda.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01532

Galen, Pamela

None Provided

7/18/2001

PC01532-1

Comment:

My husband developed cancer in 1999 and passed away 4/25/01. I believe the pollutants in the air from the proximity of LAX was a contributing factor to his demise. Also our 17 year old son must take daily allergy medication due to the irritants in the air around Westchester especially at Westchester High School where he has been a student for the last two years. Please No LAX expansion which would negatively impact our health even more

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.

PC01533

Lininger, John

None Provided

7/20/2001

PC01533-1

Comment:

THIS AIRPORT IS NOT LARGE ENOUGH TO HANDLE ANY MORE AIR OR AUTO TRAFFIC.

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01533-2

Comment:

AS IT IS NOW WE HEAR THE NOISE DAY AND NIGHT AND HAVE TO DEAL WITH ALL THE AIRPLANE AND AUTO POLLUTION.

Response:

Comment noted. Impacts related to noise, traffic, and air pollution were addressed in Sections 4.1, 4.3, and 4.6, respectively, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01533-3

Comment:

I AM SICK FORTHE LACK OF CONCERN FOR US NEIGHBORS WHO LIVE NEAR LAX. I THOUGHT THAT IS WHY THE CITY BOUGHT ALL THE LAND OUT IN PALMDALE !!!!

3. Comments and Responses

WESTCHESTER IS A GREAT LITTLE AREA AND I WON'T SIT AROUND AND WATCH BIG BUSINESS RUN ALL OVER US !!!

OUR OWN CITY GOVERNMENT SHOULD BE DOING THIS FOR US, BUT THEIR NOT !! AND THAT IS PRETTY SICKENING !! OUR OWN MAYOR IS SELLING US OUT ! AND IF HE'S NOT, WHERE IS HIS VOICE !!

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC01534 Pereira, Cecile None Provided 7/12/2001

PC01534-1

Comment:

As a fifty year resident at above address; I have seen the changes in the community (mostly unfavorable); all due to airport expansion. Enough is enough! Therefore I agree with all the issues raised, LAX no expansion;

Response:

Comment noted. Please see 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.

PC01534-2

Comment:

Major Hahn was reminded of his promise of no expansion; also to appoint LAWA Commissioners with the same 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.

PC01535 Johnson, Nancy None Provided 6/9/2001

PC01535-1

Comment:

Do you know what it is like to hear the roaring sound of an airplane awaken you at 12:30-1:00 A.M., in the morning - and then to endure 20 plus years of airplanes flying over your house every three to five seconds all day long? I do.

Response:

Comment noted. The noise impacts associated with existing and future airport operations included with each of the Master Plan Alternatives 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-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01535-2

Comment:

I think it is time to further develop and utilize the airports in Palmdale, Ontario, the Inland Empire, and other places. Approximately 90% of the people who use the airport (LAX) do not live in the area. They don't really want to come into this area, but are willing to make the sacrifice to avoid the erosion of their environments, the noise, air pollution, traffic congestion, property devaluations, drug trafficking, transiency, prostitution, smuggling, and any number of other negatives.

The neighborhoods within the perimeters of LAX have suffered long enough. And now you want to rub our noses in it by expanding the place! Please! Give others, including yourselves a turn. Instead of expanding LAX, establish airports closer to where you live (Like the Staples Center was developed-closer to home, instead of going "way away" to the LA Forum). There are plenty of jobs around. If our communities need airport employment, we will gladly go somewhere, anywhere, other than LAX.

Response:

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

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.

PC01535-3

Comment:

I am surprised, that because of the prime location of the LAX property, it hasn't been abandoned as an airport and taken over for businesses, housing, large apartment developments, or even a West Coast Washington D.C. It would bring in far more revenue for the city of LA, than a bloated, ruptured LAX.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01535-4

Comment:

The expansion of LAX would be an environmental disaster. Any new jobs that might be created, would be of short duration. More air traffic, our already polluted environment, lung cancer, stress, and other illnesses would severely limit the capacity of the labor force.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and health and safety impacts in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 5 and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-3, S-4, and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see also Response to Comment PC01045 regarding projected job growth. It should be noted that Alternative D

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

PC01535-5

Comment:

We do not need more LAX-WE NEED LESS. Better yet, NONE! We do not use it that much. You do (those outside the immediate communities). It's time you had an airport closer to home and all the new jobs that go with 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.

PC01536 No Author Identified, None Provided

7/20/2001

PC01536-1

Comment:

DEFINITELY 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.

PC01536-2

Comment:

We first moved to Westchester over 40 years ago and lived on 92nd Street.

When the airport took over that area, we bought a larger house further back to house our little family. Lovely surroundings, nice neighbors, and near to schools and shopping areas. Ideal !

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01536-3

Comment:

Things change over the years, but Westchester still retains that special atmosphere and community friendliness. The Airport Expansion will spoil all that in order to build LAX Expressway and the Ring Road. One third of the Central business district on Sepulveda, and homes near Nielsen Field and part of historic Centinela Adobe will be affected. Who will be next ?

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

3. Comments and Responses

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.

PC01536-4

Comment:

Traffic will increase tremendously. It's bad enough now ! Air pollution 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC01536-5

Comment:

Also, overcrowding of the air corridors may lead to air disasters. So safety is also a factor.

Response:

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

PC01536-6

Comment:

Ontario and Palmdale airports could be expanded and El Toro could be developed. Why should the communities around LAX bear the burden for all this contemplated expansion ? It's not fair.

Response:

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

PC01536-7**Comment:**

Let Westchester and surrounding areas remain the way they are for our children and grandchildren.

Thank you for letting me air my mind.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01537**Bicarme, Rupert****None Provided****7/20/2001****PC01537-1****Comment:**

Please develop/expand the other airports instead of expanding the already massive 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.

PC01537-2**Comment:**

The added burden imposed on the adjacent communities like ours is unfair that it would surely start chipping away at the desirable aspects of the region. Even with all the proposed mitigation measures, the impacts would be just too severe to the "small community" feel we are so proud of because it's a rarity these days. Please don't tip the first domino which will trigger the decline of the LAX region.

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 include any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester Business District. 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.

PC01537-3**Comment:**

Let's be fair and reasonable by distributing the load, burden and accessibility with the other regions like Ontario & Palmdale. It's far too obvious that the master plan one-sidedly benefits the airlines and not the people it's supposed to serve. Having one central airport is senseless as it will clearly result in unbearable traffic, noise and pollution in the area. Furthermore, the already overburdened sky traffic will be even more unsafe for the planes and the public below. Expansion of the other airports will

3. Comments and Responses

provide better access for the other counties instead of having to put up with the long and painful commute 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.

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.

PC01537-4

Comment:

As with many expansion projects occurring lately, the total impacts are only fully realized/recognized by all when its too late. Let's not proceed with the master plan because our kids will surely hate the negative consequences they will be forced to live with if the plan becomes a reality.

Response:

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

PC01537-5

Comment:

Let's be sensible and logical - an evenly distributed airport system plan should be the way to go. LAX is already big enough!!!

Response:

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

PC01538

**Terry, Robert &
Rosie**

None Provided

7/18/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01030; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01030.

PC01539 Anderson, David & Carol None Provided 7/12/2001

PC01539-1

Comment:

We do not want LAX expansion! Traffic, noise, pollution - we have enough of that now!

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.

PC01539-2

Comment:

Our community will be hurt considerably and we want Westchester to remain a whole and intact community. It seems to us, that LAX expansion means the destruction of Westchester and our life as we know it.

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 include any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester Business District. 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.

PC01539-3

Comment:

Please - there are other airports that are not even near residential areas. There are other viable solutions.

Response:

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

PC01540 Bobrow, Warren None Provided 6/13/2001

PC01540-1

Comment:

I am writing this in response to the draft environmental impact statement/ environmental impact report (EIR/EIS) regarding the expansion of Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). I believe that the needs of the airlines and not those of the people in Los Angeles are driving the entire project. The report is based on many rosy and faulty assumptions that will lead to more noise and traffic in the local area than the EIR/EIS admits to. Finally, the plans outlined do nothing to address the regional travel issues in Southern California. Rather, it represents a band-aid approach. In sum, I strongly urge you to reject the LAX expansion plans outright and choose the No Action/No Project Alternative.

Response:

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

PC01540-2

Comment:

In reading the EIS/EIR one thing becomes clear: LAWA and the FAA are more concerned about airlines profits than the quality of life of people in Los Angeles. Just because the airlines want to fly more into LAX does not mean that they have the right to. The airlines' legitimate desire and ability to make a profit must be balanced with the rights of the people who live in the LAX area. We have a free-market economy of supply and demand. If LAX demand exceeds the projected supply then the airlines can make their money at the under utilized airports in the region, such as Ontario and Palmdale. The citizens of Los Angeles should not have to sacrifice their quality of life to expand LAX when the airlines have existing alternatives. If LAWA and the FAA were truly concerned about the citizens of Los Angeles (note that all of the supporters of the expansion plan listed on the LAWA only includes groups that will profit from the plan and not any citizen groups) they would have supported the No Action/No Project Alternative that tells the airlines that LAX is "full" and the airlines will have to change their schedules (e.g., more flights in/out of Ontario, Long Beach, Palmdale, SFO, etc.). Table 1-10 in the report shows that the percentage of airport use will go down in LA County, but rise in Orange and Riverside counties. Doesn't it make sense (for the City and the airlines) to increase capacity where the demand is rather than at LAX?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00298-2 regarding airline market demand and deregulation.

PC01540-3

Comment:

The report seems to think that if LAX doesn't expand that the Southern California economy will wilt away. This is clearly preposterous. However, after this assumption is accepted, then it is easy for the FAA and LAWA to insist that the airlines have the right to use LAX to meet their needs, then the expansion plan becomes a fait accompli. All LAWA has done in this document is provide a set of false choices as to how the people living near LAX have to take their medicine.

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. This new option - Alternative D-Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, which calls for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifts the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive analysis of Alternative D and was circulated for public review and comment.

Although the conclusion of the Draft EIS/EIR was that Alternative C would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region, that conclusion has been superseded by the conclusion of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D is now considered to be the Environmentally Superior alternative and would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region.

PC01540-4

Comment:

Of these false choices the report suggests that Alternative C is the best one. However, it is based on the overly optimistic projection that only 5% more aircraft will be needed to service 40% more passengers. One example of how this assumption is clearly absurd when one considers how many 737 aircraft are used by Southwest and Shuttle by United. Their business models (quick turnarounds, standard maintenance, etc.) rest on being able to use an entire fleet these (or similar) aircraft. I doubt that they will replace so many aircraft with larger ones in such a short period of time to handle more passengers with the same number of planes. The reality is that they will fly more of the same sized planes if given the gate space, hence increasing the number of takeoffs and landings. Basic algebra and economics tells you that the percentage of new generation planes designed for transcontinental flight will not be enough to offset the increase in passengers LAWA wants to fit into the airport. A more than 5% increase will be required.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC00298-4.

PC01540-5

Comment:

Even if we take LAWA's recommendation, the EIR/EIS says, "However, by 2015, the lowest total exposure levels would be achieved by the No Action/No Project Alternative followed by either Alternative A or C." So, even by LAWA's estimates, even the "best" alternative will have negative effects on the surrounding areas. Imagine the negative effects if the projections of the number of flights are wrong! It is not as if the airport will be contracted to fit the noise and pollution estimates. Once the expansion is built those in the LAX area will have to live with the consequences. Why do these need to have their quality of life compromised so the airlines can make more money?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00298-8.

PC01540-6

Comment:

Also, many of the supposed noise reductions are based on the phasing out of noisier jets. What's the point of making planes quieter if LAWA wants to add flights and more noise?

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC00298-6; please see Response to Comment PC00298-6.

PC01540-7

Comment:

It is important to consider that LAX does not need these changes to improve safety. Rather, the EIR/EIS states, "... these [current] conditions do not create an unsafe environment." Additionally, the FAA resources allocated to improved air traffic control systems will improve the efficiency of the airport without the proposed changes. These improved efficiencies will also reduce the pollution generated at

3. Comments and Responses

the airport (unlike Alternative C, which the report says will lead to significant emissions of CO, VOC, NOx, SO2 and PM10 in 2015.).

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00298-7.

PC01540-8

Comment:

I would also like to respond to two of the issues presented by those who support the expansion:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments PC01540-9 and PC01540-10 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.

PC01540-9

Comment:

1. The region needs to expand the airport to maintain the economy. If passenger traffic is spread among the region's airports there will be no effect on the economy. In fact, given more choices people may find it more convenient to come to Southern California. Spreading more traffic to Ontario, Palmdale and Riverside airports will help those regions develop...that's why they want their airports to expand rather than LAX. The unions and construction companies will get their jobs no matter where airport construction occurs.

Response:

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

PC01540-10

Comment:

2. The Green Line extension and other highway improvements will mitigate the increased traffic near LAX. When you consider this argument think about how much traffic on the Harbor Freeway has improved since the introduction of the Blue Line and carpool lanes. While the number of Blue Lines riders is significant it is only a drop in the bucket compared the number of people who drive so the traffic is just as bad. There's no possible way that the extension of the Green Line and/or building the airport ring will handle the additional number of LAX users proposed in the EIS/EIR. The report claims a traffic reduction based on the expansion alternatives and traffic mitigation efforts unrelated to the expansion. Why not just implement the non-expansion related improvements (e.g., expand the Green Line, reduce Century Boulevard closures, etc.) to help reduce pollution and noise in the LAX area?

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. The airport would continue to increase activity under the No Action/No Project Alternative, regardless of whether facilities are built to accommodate the growth. While the non-expansion related improvements referred to by the commentor may provide a very small relief for existing congestion, they would not address the large increase in activity that is expected at the airport through the next 15 years. The Master Plan would control the increased activity, rather than allowing the activity to continue to increase unabated.

PC01540-11**Comment:**

In sum, I strongly recommend that the proposed LAX plans be rejected in favor the No Action/No Project Alternative. Doing so will protect the quality of life in Los Angeles without having a significant impact on the economy. So doing will also force the FAA and the airlines to consider regional solutions to Southern California's transportation needs.

Response:

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

PC01541	Ouzounian, Brian	None Provided	7/21/2001
----------------	-------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01541-1**Comment:**

I support expansion West, over the highway and into the ocean for all turbo aircraft.

SMO neighbors are in the danger zone and we are on borrowed time w/ a pending disaster.

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.

PC01541-2

The remainder of this comment letter is identical to form letter PFF; please refer to the responses to form letter PFF.

PC01542	Holmes, Roger	None Provided	7/23/2001
----------------	----------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01542-1**Comment:**

No commercial project should be undertaken unless it benefits society. The proposed LAX expansion would be extremely harmful to a great segment of our society. Construction of the proposed access roads and rapid transit would bring noise, dirt, air pollution and traffic disruptions for years. Homes and businesses would be lost.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, community disruption impacts in Section 4.4.4, Community Disruption and Alteration of Surface Transportation Patterns, relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, and construction impacts in Section 4.20, Construction Impacts. 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.

PC01542-2

Comment:

The airport expansion would bring traffic, air pollution, noise and perils to the area forever.

On the other hand, the Palmdale area would be helped by construction and operation of a major airport.

Earlier city leaders had the vision to buy land in Palmdale because they foresaw that our needs would outgrow Mines Field. Let's reactivate that window.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to 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 in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01543

**Kisvarday, Mr. &
Mrs. Tibor**

None Provided

7/20/2001

PC01543-1

Comment:

We are amazed at the unfairness that 15 jets a day are allowed to ruin the sleep, the enjoyment of sitting outdoors and the simple enjoyment of thousands of people who do not want jet noise. Since when are so few people allowed to ruin the peace and health of so many who are homeowners!!

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01543-2

The remainder of this comment letter is identical to form letter PFF; please refer to the responses to form letter PFF.

PC01544	Santos-DeCure, Cynthia	None Provided	7/20/2001
----------------	-----------------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01544-1

Comment:

The LAX expansion plan will ruin Westchester! Playa Vista will already bring thousands of vehicles to an already crowded volatile 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. 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, 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-LU-2 regarding impacts to the Community of Westchester.

PC01544-2

Comment:

This means more pollution. The airport expansion will create a severe health hazard to area. This community is currently highly populated by seniors and families with school aged children. Two age groups highly vulnerable to pollution in the environment. Respiratory illnesses due to the effects of pollution have increased in school aged children in the area.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, 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.

PC01544-3

Comment:

An increase in the current pollution level would create such an environmental hazard that would result in litigation to likes of other serious high profile EPA cases.

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

3. Comments and Responses

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.

PC01544-4

Comment:

Another point is cargo volume. The chief reason for this expansion appears to be to Accommodate more air cargo. This signifies more semi-trucks through the area, more traffic and again more pollution. This is cargo for large corporations and business which can be routed to other less crowded airports such as Ontario or El Toro, which handle a great deal of this already. LAX is a central hub for passenger traffic and should remain as such. There are already plenty of air cargo business flying out of LAX. We don't need any more.

Response:

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

PC01544-5

Comment:

Lastly, this proposal would destroy a community. Westchester is one of the last westside communities that is affordable and tightly knit. The area is highly populated by World War II veterans and new middle income families. There are a great number of families with children. We care about our neighborhood. We don't anyone to be displaced. We don't want it to be destroyed.

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 include any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester Business District. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC01544-6

Comment:

Take your project elsewhere. We will fight this every way we can!

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.

PC01545	Mudrick, Harvey & Lois K.	None Provided	7/21/2001
----------------	--	----------------------	------------------

PC01545-1

Comment:

We would like to express our opposition to the Draft Master Plan for 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.

PC01545-2

Comment:

As long-time residents and taxpayers, we believe our city is courting disaster by trying to squeeze more air traffic into already congested air space over densely populated communities.

Response:

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

PC01545-3

Comment:

We also firmly believe regional airports, already in place, should be developed instead of LAX. Travelers to and from the Valleys, the Inland Empire and Orange County should bear the burdens and reap the benefits from an airport within their own 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01545-4

Comment:

It is our hope that you will communicate our opposition to the Draft Master Plan to the Board of Airport Commissioners and the Los Angeles Angeles City Council.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01546

Fife, Jenny

None Provided

7/20/2001

PC01546-1

Comment:

(1) Westchester is a very nice community that has already been butchered w/homes being torn down to accommodate LAX, will this ever stop? Or will Westchester become a dinosaur town?

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.

PC01546-2

Comment:

(2) How will the traffic be handled with regard to the added cargo volume & air passengers traveling to and from LAX? There is already severe traffic problems on surface streets & the 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 and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC01546-3

Comment:

(3) There is too much noise from LAX now.

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.

PC01546-4**Comment:**

Why should residents be forced to keep all windows and doors closed?

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels and thresholds used to identify significant noise levels and 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.

PC01546-5**Comment:**

(4) The air pollution in Westchester from LAX and autos traveling to & from LAX is severe. I have to wipe down my window sills and surrounding furniture when my windows are open. There is a black soot that comes in.

Response:

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

PC01546-6**Comment:**

(5) Why can't the City of LA use/expand other airports i.e. Palmdale or Ontario?

Response:

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

PC01547**Biren, Eric****None Provided****7/20/2001****PC01547-1****Comment:**

The Santa Monica Airport was built before jet aircraft were invented!!! Jet aircraft are unsuited to the airport & community in Santa Monica for numerous reasons.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01547-2

The remainder of this comment letter is identical to form letter PFF; please refer to the responses to form letter PFF.

PC01548	Arciniega, Daniel & Virginia	None Provided	7/20/2001
----------------	---	----------------------	------------------

PC01548-1

Comment:

When we moved to this neighborhood we acknowledged the existence of LAX. Despite their constant violation of limitations of nighttime noise, we will enjoy living next door to one of the largest airports in the country.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC01548-2

Comment:

However, LAX has proven over and over again that they have very little regard for the safety and well-being of their neighbors.

Our neighborhoods are slowly becoming victim to the greed of those who run LAX. Already we see the average speed of taxis and airport-related vehicles increasing at a frightening rate. We fear that our children will never be able to walk to school safely or ride their bikes because people are racing to "beat the clock" to LAX. We already made sacrifices upfront when we moved here, but the aggressive expansion proposed by LAX shows very little concern for the quality of life we currently have here in Westchester. It's easy to support an expansion of a place that isn't your neighbor. Those of you in office don't live here. You don't wipe black dust off your windows and cars. You don't wake at 2:00 A.M. from loud airplane engine noises. You don't panic when you cross Sepulveda to go the grocery store for fear of that next traveler who is late for their flight so they'll just run this red light.

And this is how it is now...the expansion can only make things worse.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 2, 3, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. 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.

3. Comments and Responses

In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts, 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-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01548-3

Comment:

Stop being greedy and move/expand the Palmdale Airport. Stop squeezing what life we have here right out of us.

Or, just buy a home here and live here for a while. Then tell us how you feel.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC01549

**Frichtel, Joanna &
James**

None Provided

7/21/2001

PC01549-1

Comment:

I am very concerned about the expansion of LAX. Yes - this would appear to benefit travelers. Let's stop & think. Many, many people will suffer because of this decision. The traffic is bad enough in Southern California (we are world reknown for this). We need neighborhoods - neighbors & friends. NOT an increase of jet fuel, environmental contamination & road rage. This is an era of convenience. We need to stop this & think about quality of life, not quantity of air space! Please - 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. 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. 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-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding jet fuel dumping.

PC01550

Merritt, Vera

None Provided

7/22/2001

PC01550-1

Comment:

I would like to share personal experiences that make me say NO! to LAX expansion.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC01550-2

Comment:

In my back yard is a lemon tree. I pick the fresh lemons and have to spend the next 5 minutes scrubbing them to remove the black film/spots made by airborne soot - dirt. The trim on my house is medium blue but at least twice a year I need to scrub it to remove a chalky film. My white patio cover also needs treatment from the same black film that invades my lemons.

Response:

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

PC01550-3

Comment:

We don't need any more LAX traffic to further pollute our air. We don't need the street traffic nor the noise.

Response:

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

PC01550-4

Comment:

Jet fuel emissions already are marring our property and providing a health challenge to the young, old, and us in between.

Response:

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

PC01550-5

Comment:

Say NO! to LAX expansion, please!

Response:

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

PC01551 Garrett, Phyllis None Provided 7/19/2001

PC01551-1

Comment:

I have lived in Westchester since July 1946, before LAX "invaded" our peaceful neighborhood.

I am opposed to the L.A.X. expansion because of the increased noise, traffic, street congestion and the air pollution. Many summer days and nights we must keep our windows closed due to the noise and smell of the jet motors.

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, Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels, and Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding odors. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01552 Lacasse, Eileen None Provided 7/18/2001

PC01552-1

Comment:

If LAX Expansion goes through our beautiful little Westchester will become a "Ghost Town". We do not need more traffic, more congestion, more pollution, the streets are crowded enough.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. As indicated in TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition or 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.

PC01552-2

Comment:

We certainly don't need to lose any more of our business district - in fact our business district needs to be upgraded -

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

3. Comments and Responses

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 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.

PC01553 Roberts, George E. None Provided 7/18/2001
& Audrey L.

PC01553-1

Comment:

Please consider the residents who will be affected by the increase of noise, traffic and air pollution.

As a resident of Marina del Rey for 26 years, we are fully aware of what this airport expansion will create for all of our population.

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.

PC01553-2

Comment:

As the population of So. Calif. is expected to increase over the next few years, a better plan would be to expand the Palmdale airport

Response:

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

PC01553-3

Comment:

and build a high speed rail system to accomodate all.

Response:

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

PC01554 Zoll, Gloria None Provided 7/15/2001

PC01554-1

Comment:

Would not like the noise and also the air pollution. The traffic would be a lot more than now. Hope they change their minds.

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.

PC01555 Green, Betty & Bruce None Provided 7/15/2001

PC01555-1

Comment:

Our family has lived in this house for over 30 years - However jet operations have become unbearably loud and the increase of air jet traffic is a great disturbance all day & late into the night. We are angry, frustrated and hope you will reduce noise & traffic out of this small airport!

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01555-2

The remainder of this comment letter is identical to form letter PFF; please refer to the responses to form letter PFF.

PC01556 Weldon, William None Provided 7/23/2001

PC01556-1

Comment:

Can you not use the land over by Playa Del Rey!!

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00022-52 regarding expanding the airport to the west.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01557 Plueger, Ruth None Provided 7/21/2001

PC01557-1

Comment:

I am adamantly opposed to 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.

PC01557-2

Comment:

I live near Sepulveda and right now the traffic is terrific. We have a hard time now getting on to Sepulveda because of the traffic.

Response:

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

PC01557-3

Comment:

Also, if the expansion of an offramp on to Airport is unbelievable. We could never get out either at Airport or Sepulveda.

Response:

Alternative A includes a Ring Road interchange at Airport Boulevard, while Alternative C includes right-in-right-out access only to Airport Boulevard. Alternative D does not substantially change the Airport Boulevard intersection with Arbor Vitae. The environmental impacts of these access plans were included in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PC01557-4

Comment:

Also the noise and air pollution is unthinkable.

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.

PC01557-5

Comment:

I have bronchial asthma and more pollution would put me over the edge.

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.

PC01557-6**Comment:**

Westchester has always been a wonderful community. We have raised 4 children who still live in Westchester and all our families would be affected - We have lived here over 50 yrs. Please do not expand 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC01557-7**Comment:**

Its been suggested that a tax be added to non-residents of the L.A.X. area who use our L.A.X. facilities.

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.

PC01557-8**Comment:**

Approx. 30% of the airport traffic comes from Orange County. Let them develop facilities at El Toro Air Base.

Response:

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

PC01558	Haramura, Kumiko	None Provided	7/22/2001
----------------	-------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01558-1**Comment:**

Because of the heavier 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01559 Mosinskis, Angela None Provided

PC01559-1

Comment:

I am very against expansion of LAX. I have lived for 35 years and love Westchester. Who wants more air traffic, congestion, air & car pollution?

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and 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.

PC01559-2

Comment:

Playa Vista is already expanding on North.

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.

PC01559-3

Comment:

The air space is already so congestion - Why puts people's safety at risk even more.

Response:

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

PC01559-4

Comment:

No LAX expansion, please!

Response:

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

PC01560 Royer, Judith None Provided 7/20/2001

PC01560-1

Comment:

Please add my concerns to those already expressed by my neighbors here in Westchester. The LAX Expansion is not in the best interests of the people who live in this community. This area is already

impacted with traffic, repetitive commerce, noise and air pollution, and the last vestiges of a good, healthy community are trying to survive in spite of all this. Enough is more than enough in this case. Where does it 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. 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.

PC01560-2

Comment:

Westchester finally has some shopping areas that are attracting business which services the area. My understanding is that the LAX plan will eliminate more than half of these, forcing us again to have to leave the area for our daily needs, adding to traffic in local communities and taking away commerce from our own. Let our city survive. Don't make it another by-product of the 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 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 acquired uses (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, Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, (LAWA Staff's 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.

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 Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Furthermore, please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic, Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology, Topical Response TR-ST-3 regarding construction traffic, 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.

PC01560-3

Comment:

The historic Centinela Adobe is also threatened, as well as many homes in the area effected by this plan. This is a good community, one of the few good communities left in the West Side Area. Let it be.

3. Comments and Responses

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. Further, it does not include the LAX Expressway and therefore there it has no potential for impacts on the Centinela Adobe. Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

PC01560-4

Comment:

Why are we, with an airport already impacted, taking on the cargo needs of Orange County? There are a number of other airports in communities which actually want the added commerce and need it for the health of their regions. Ontario and Palmdale, especially the latter, can help with the burden 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.

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.

PC01560-5

Comment:

There are already State Plans to help with rapid transit to Palmdale. Let's use it.

Response:

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

PC01560-6

Comment:

In addition, maybe Orange County should take care of its own commercial traffic and use El Toro.

Response:

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

PC01560-7**Comment:**

I am alarmed at the dangers presented by the additional air traffic and heavier planes needed for cargo shipment. This adds to the danger of air disasters at an airport that can not really handle what it has. I understand that LAX has become a dangerous airport, according to pilots and investigators. Let's clean up what we have before we expand it and add more problems we can't handle.

Response:

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

PC01560-8**Comment:**

In short, lets stop this short-term plan and look at long-range plans that really service the people who live and work in various areas of Southern California, not at the needs of a few commercial venture dealers and politicians who benefit from them. This is about us, not 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.

PC01561	Pollock, Fauna	None Provided	7/22/2001
----------------	-----------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01561-1**Comment:**

I am concerned about our Environmental that is getting so bad.

We do not need to enlarge 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. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01562	Williams, Abe	None Provided	7/22/2001
----------------	----------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01562-1**Comment:**

To whom it concern. I live between the North and South runways of (LAX AIRPORT) Any evening I can see 8 - 10 airplane simultaneous flying over our homes when they are landing. And they are extremely noises. The noise is the same when taking off in land.

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

3. Comments and Responses

Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 regarding noise increase and Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

PC01563 Bobak, Esq., Martin None Provided

PC01563-1

Comment:

I writing you regarding the LAX Draft Master Plan and Draft EIR. My family and I oppose all currently proposed concepts.

Response:

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

PC01563-2

Comment:

The LAX Master Plan EIR does not state an alternative for a regional air traffic solution, Bringing the entire sprawling Los Angeles community into a densely populated area with only one international airport is irresponsible. With the size of the Southern California region, there should be 3 or more international airports to meet demand as there are in other large cities.

Response:

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

PC01563-3

Comment:

The Westside is already solidly built with no room for future growth or expansion.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00539-6 for an explanation of the land acquisition required for each alternative.

PC01563-4

Comment:

The cost to remove existing properties in order to temporarily meet air demand will cost billions of dollars more than building a new airport where there is room for future growth and expansion. The expansion of LAX will only be a temporary fix, and will lower the quality of life for thousands of Los Angeles residents.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding quality of life. Also, please note that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

PC01563-5

Comment:

The projected cost for expansion does not include the mass lawsuits that will be filed by surrounding residents due to decreased quality of life and loss in property values.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

PC01563-6

Comment:

The LAX Master Plan EIR notes that the air pollution in the area will increase by over 1300% due to the increase in auto emissions, and airplane emissions. The EIR predicts that with expansion there will be an increase of all five EPA classified major air pollutants. This increase will be felt in an area with a dense population. Airport growth should take place in an area with much more land and a less densely populated area for the health and safety of Los Angeles residents.

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 refer to Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a discussion of air modeling. The source of the commentor's reference to a 1300 percent increase in emissions due to the Master Plan is unclear. This increase is not based on the information in, or calculations for, the air quality analysis completed for the Draft EIS/EIR. Since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, all pollutant emission values were revised. Please see Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR concerning the calculation of air pollutant emissions and a discussion of results. In addition, please refer to Technical Report 14a, Attachment D, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-9a of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a presentation of maximum exposure point concentrations for each of the alternatives modeled in the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC01563-7

Comment:

LAX holds the record for airport near misses. Flights should be decreased in the LAX area to increase safety and expansion should take place with a regional plan in areas where there is more space for the increase of flights. The actual acreage of LAX is only 3425 acres and is densely surrounded by homes, businesses and schools, where as the new Denver airport has 34,000 acres!

Response:

Please see TR-SAF-1 for a discussion regarding aviation safety. Airport layout and design play a contributory role in runway incursions where there is minimal runway spacing between parallel runways or multiple exits from runways in areas of complex ground operations. The Master Plan build alternatives propose airfield improvements to bring the airfield to meet FAA's design standards; therefore, operations efficiency would be increased and safety would be enhanced. Please see

3. Comments and Responses

Response to Comment AL00025-66 for a more detailed explanation. LAX has been, and will continue to be, the primary airport in the Los Angeles basin. Though it is the primary airport, its percentage of regional passengers served has declined steadily over recent year from 88 percent in 1960 to 74.5 percent in 1997. Market forces and the regulatory structure of the commercial air transportation industry favors and promotes the continued use of primary airports such as LAX. The airlines, not government, dictate where air service will be provided and the airlines tend to select airports convenient to their customers.

Please see Response to Comment AL00043-4 for a discussion of the amount of land necessary to serve a given number of passengers and operations. Finally, please note that Alternative D, the Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, has been added and is 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.

PC01563-8

Comment:

With the expansion of LAX, close to 100,000 Los Angeles residents will be subjected to over 65 decibels of noise from the airport. This compares to 0 residents who are subjected to noise at the new Denver International Airport.

Response:

It is not clear from the comment where the reference to 100,000 residents subjected to over 65 decibels of noise from the airport was obtained. As presented in Table S4.1-30 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the population that would be exposed to noise levels of 65 decibels (CNEL) or greater under Alternatives A through D would range from 42,980 residents under Alternative D to 60,830 residents under Alternative B. Also refer to Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program. Regarding the comment that 0 residents are subject to noise from the Denver International Airport, this is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01563-9

Comment:

Sound proofing homes can not mitigate the noise for residents. Family outdoor playtime, picnics and barbecues will be destroyed with the noise increases.

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 that would result from development of the build alternatives and mitigation measures that would reduce exposure of noise-sensitive uses to high noise levels, and Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

PC01563-10

Comment:

The Los Angeles Freeways are the slowest in the entire nation. Bringing the entire Los Angeles population to one international airport on the extreme westside is inexcusable. The traffic on the 405 is already grid-locked, with no room for increased 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.

PC01563-11**Comment:**

The master plan shows no mitigation measures at all for handling the traffic on the freeways.

Response:

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

PC01563-12**Comment:**

Air Cargo will be landing on the Westside and will then be trucked out via the 405 and adjacent freeways to all of the outlying areas of Los Angeles. Air Cargo must not be increased at LAX but should be increased at regional airports where the population is growing.

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.

PC01563-13**Comment:**

The Master Plan EIR does not take into account other developments in the area that will be increasing traffic on the freeways and major arteries such as the huge Playa Vista Development and the dense growth that will be taking place in the Marina area. The statements made in the EIR are incorrect without projections for these projects in addition to the expansion of LAX.

Response:

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

PC01563-14**Comment:**

Los Angeles communities such as Palmdale and Ontario want airports in their areas. These areas are growing and will be the source for increased air traffic demand. There is very little growth on the Westside. Logically, airports should be built where populations are continually growing.

Response:

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

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.

PC01563-15

Comment:

On a last note, I have witnessed at least two additional alternatives for LAX modernization presented by local businessmen to community groups. These alternatives include newly designed mass transportation alternatives mixed with beautification measures at a fraction of the cost of the current plans you have presented. They do not include the destruction of homes or businesses.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition/relocation. Also please see Response to Comment SPC00035-4 regarding the residents' concept, Alternative E, and Response to Comment SPC00298-27 regarding the L.A. Airline Airport Affairs Committee plan.

PC01564 Narcise, John Paul None Provided 7/12/2001

PC01564-1

Comment:

I solemnly believe the LAX expansion will negatively disturb the quiet and charming neighborhood of Westchester. Although the expansion may alleviate the influx of traffic into & out of the airport, the effects on the local populace would be disastrous. Among the most dire include the increase in noise pollution, smog, and potential vandalism from passing motorists.

Response:

Traffic impacts 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 residential neighborhoods in Westchester are not expected to be significantly affected by traffic or by vandalism from passing motorists. Impacts associated with noise and air pollution were described in Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use, and Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and 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 that was presented in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, 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. Also, see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC01564-2

Comment:

Our neighborhoods must be protected from the vested interests of city officials whose concern rests more on commercial matters than the peace and safety of Westchester residents.

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

PC01564-3**Comment:**

Westchester represents one of the last remaining neighborhoods in Los Angeles where our children, seniors and ourselves can play, jog & stroll quietly in a mostly untainted suburban atmosphere. The expansion will ruin this and end a presently perfect 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 include any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester Business District. 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.

PC01565**Guerena, Marina****None Provided****7/12/2001****PC01565-1****Comment:**

all the issues, such as:
-keeping our community whole -
-the traffic -
-the noise -
-the cargo demand -
-the air pollution -
-the safety -
mean a lot to us in Westchester that is why I am so apposed to LAX expansion

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, 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 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-LU-2 regarding impacts to 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.

PC01566**Bobak, Juliet****None Provided****PC01566-1****Comment:**

I strongly oppose all currently proposed concepts of the proposed LAX Master Plan-Draft EIR.

The Westside and South Bay communities are already dense, completely built-out areas with thriving communities. They are a choice of residence for many because of the cool temperatures in the

3. Comments and Responses

summers and the expansive beaches and scenic views. These communities can not be duplicated elsewhere. Quality of life for surrounding residents can not be replaced.

Response:

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

PC01566-2

Comment:

It is absurd to bring the entire, sprawling Los Angeles region into this already jam-packed area on the far westside, an area without any room for future growth.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, is designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport capacity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. Alternative D would make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient, and would have the fewest negative impacts to local communities and the region. Analysis of Alternative D is contained in the Draft Master Plan addendum and in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The No Action/No Project Alternative examined the capacity of all of the airport components and defined the maximum level of activity (approximately 78.9 MAP) that could be accommodated at LAX without improvements. See Chapter V, Concept Development, Section 3.3.2 of the Draft LAX Master Plan and Chapter 3, Alternative D Constrained Activity, Section 3.1 of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum for more information on the activity and constraints associated with each alternative. Please see Response to Comment PC00539-6 for a description of the land acquisition that is proposed for Alternatives A, B, C, and D.

PC01566-3

Comment:

The cost to tear up existing properties to temporarily meet air demand will cost billions of dollars more than to build something new and state-of-the-art where there is room for future expansion, and where the current population is growing and expanding. The expansion of LAX will only be a short-term fix for a continuing growing demand for air travel, and will lower the quality of life for thousands of Los Angeles residents.

Response:

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.

PC01566-4

Comment:

Over one hundred thousand adults and children who reside in the area will be subjected to decreased safety and incomprehensible increases in noise, traffic, and air pollution, all for what can only benefit a small number of businessmen.

Response:

Impacts associated with noise, traffic, air quality, and safety were described in Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use, Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, Section 4.6, Air Quality, and 4.24.3, Safety of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of the Master Plan Alternatives on the community of Westchester.

PC01566-5

Comment:

LAWA claims that there will be an increase of jobs with the expansion, however it will bring these jobs along with the destruction of existing businesses and homes. A regional expansion plan will bring this same increase of jobs into growing areas who welcome rather than oppose airport expansion into their communities.

Response:

Please refer to Response to Comment PC00157-8 regarding the number of businesses to be acquired under the Master Plan, the associated level of employment that may be displaced, and the overall net change in employment expected under each of the alternatives. The relocation of residential properties 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 discussed therein, the number of residences requiring relocation would vary depending on the alternative, and a Residential and Business Relocation Plan would be formulated to ensure that comparable replacement housing resources are available and that relocation payments are made in accordance with federal relocation regulations. Relative to suggested growth at other regional airports, please see Response to Comment PC02664-11 as well as Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for further discussion.

PC01566-6

Comment:

As a Westchester resident, I oppose the proposed Master Plan because of the decrease in the quality of life it will bring to my family and neighbors with increases of traffic, smog, and noise.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; air quality 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 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. As indicated in TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester Business District. 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.

PC01566-7

Comment:

I oppose the proposed Master plan because of the destruction that will befall the Westchester business district, a district which is only now starting to come back after the last Airport expansion in the 1970's.

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, 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.

PC01566-8

Comment:

I oppose the proposed master plan because of the destruction that will take place to our community as a whole, and the eminent decrease in 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.

PC01566-9

Comment:

Comments of Proposed EIR:
NO REGIONAL MASTER PLAN ALTERNATIVE INCLUDED:

The LAX Master Plan EIR does not state an alternative for a regional air traffic solution. The alternatives presented seem to be unrealistic plans submitted only to make the preferred plan "C" seem more attractive. Bringing a sprawling Los Angeles community into a densely populated area with only one international airport is irresponsible, it can not be rationalized. It is not in the best interest of Los Angeles residents to have to drive hours through gridlocked traffic, to only once international airport in the area. It is not in the best interest of residents and work commuters to have to share the already overcrowded freeways with trucks carrying cargo to the outer edges of the City. It is not in the best interest of the residents living around the airport to have to carry the burden of the entire Southern California regions air traffic demand. Other large city's not only have better over all city traffic mitigation, they also have numerous international airports to meet the demand for air travel. The fact that a regional solution was not included in the LAX Master Plan is more than just an over-site.

Response:

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

PC01566-10

Comment:

INCREASE IN AIR POLLUTION IN A DENSELY POPULATED AREA:

The LAX Master Plan EIR notes that the air pollution in the area will increase by over 1300% due to the increase in auto emissions, and airplane emissions. The EIR predicts that with expansion there will be an increase of all five EPA classified major air pollutants. This increase will be felt in an area with a dense population. Fruit trees and homes are already covered with a black dust from airplane fuel, and there seems to be an increase in cancer rates to residents in the airport area. Airport growth should

take place in an area with much more land and a less densely populated area for the health and safety of Los Angeles Residents.

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 refer to Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a discussion of air modeling. The source of the commentor's reference to a 1300 percent increase in emissions due to the Master Plan is unclear. This increase is not based on the information in, or calculations for, the air quality analysis completed for the Draft EIS/EIR. Since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, all pollutant emission values were revised. Please see Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR concerning the calculation of air pollutant emissions and a discussion of results. In addition, please refer to Technical Report 14a, Attachment D, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-9a of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a presentation of maximum exposure point concentrations for each of the alternatives modeled in the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC01566-11

Comment:

DECREASE IN AIR SAFETY IN A DENSELY POPULATED AREA:

LAX holds the record for airport near misses. Increasing the number of flights in an already densely populated area will not increase air safety. Flights should be decreased in the LAX area to increase safety and expansion should take place in a regional plan and in areas where there is more space for the increase of flights. The actual acreage of LAX is only 3425 acres and is densely surrounded by homes, businesses and schools, where as the new Denver airport has 34,000 acres!

Response:

The content of this comment is similar to comment PC001563-7. Please refer to Response to Comment PC001563-7.

PC01566-12

Comment:

INCREASE IN NOISE ABOVE THE 65 DECIBEL BOUNDARY IN A DENSELY POPULATED AREA:

14 years ago, we regularly enjoyed neighborhood barbecues and outdoor activities. Already we have noticed an increase in airplane noise which has decreased our quality of outdoor summertime activities. We reside in the North Kentwood area of Westchester, which is the area furthest from the airport! With the expansion of LAX, close to 100,000 Los Angeles residents will be subjected to over 65 decibels of noise from the airport. This compares to 0 residents who are subjected to noise from the new Denver International Airport. Sound proofing homes can not mitigate the noise for residents. Family outdoor playtime, picnics and barbecues will be destroyed with the noise increases.

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. As shown on Figure S4.2-2, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the 65 CNEL noise contour (used to identify areas exposed to high noise levels) does not extend north of Manchester Boulevard and Kentwood Avenue under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions. As shown on Figure S4.2-3, under 1996 baseline conditions high single event noise levels extend north to approximately 83rd Street and Kentwood Avenue. As presented in Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.6.1.6), Table S4.1-30 of the

3. Comments and Responses

Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the population that would be exposed to noise levels of 65 decibels (CNEL) or greater under Alternatives A, B, C, and D would range from 42,980 residents under Alternative D to 60,830 residents under Alternative B. Also, refer to Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program. 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. Please see Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 regarding present and future noise levels.

PC01566-13

Comment:

INCREASE IN TRAFFIC/GRIDLOCK IN A DENSELY POPULATED AREA:

The Los Angeles Freeways are the slowest in the entire nation, with no solution in site. Bringing the entire Los Angeles Region to one international airport on the densely populated Westside is inexcusable. The traffic on the 405 and major arteries such as Sepulveda and Lincoln is already gridlocked, with no room for increased 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.

PC01566-14

Comment:

The master plan shows no mitigation measures at all for handling the traffic on the freeways.

Response:

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

PC01566-15

Comment:

Air Cargo will be landing on the Westside and will then be trucked out via the 405 and adjacent freeways to all of the outlying areas of Los Angeles. Air Cargo must not be increased at LAX but should be increased at regional airports where the population is growing and where traffic problems are not as dense.

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.

PC01566-16

Comment:

The Master Plan EIR does not take into account other developments in the area that will be increasing traffic on the freeways and major arteries such as the huge Playa Vista Development and the dense growth that will be taking place in the Marina area. The statements made in the EIR are incorrect without projections for these projects in addition to the expansion of LAX.

Response:

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

PC01566-17

Comment:

COST: WASTE OF BILLIONS IF DOLLARS FOR A SHORT TERM SOLUTION:

Tearing up the surrounding area of the airport to expand LAX will cost BILLIONS of more dollars than to build a brand new, state-of-the art facility in an area where there is more room and where future expansion can be handled. The projected cost for the LAX Master Plan is 12 billion dollars (which in the end will probably be more), whereas the price for a brand-new facility at the Denver International Airport was only 4.2 billion dollars!

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, that discusses the roles and responsibilities of LAWA, the City, SCAG, and SCRAA in meeting regional demand.

PC01566-18

Comment:

The Valley areas and eastside will find travel to Palmdale much easier than fighting the 405 gridlock. The communities surrounding LAX have handled the burden long enough and DO NOT want expansion. Other communities such as Palmdale and Ontario WANT airports and these areas are growing with increased traffic demand.

Response:

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

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.

PC01566-19

Comment:

OTHER ALTERNATIVES, MORE BEAUTIFUL, MORE STATE OF THE ART WITHOUT DESTRUCTION OF SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES:

Los Angeles is known throughout the world to be a decaying, concrete jungle, a city that does not spend money wisely or in a way to improve life for its residents. Airport Expansion should be done right the first time around, in an area where there is space and where the population growth is taking place, in an area where future expansions can be done state-of-the-art, cost effectively and beautifully.

Alternatives have been presented to the El Segundo and Westchester/LAX Marina del Rey Chambers of Commerce and Westchester Vitalization Corporation that have demonstrated ways that the airport can be modernized without destroying the outlying communities in a beautiful, state of the art concept with a cost billions of dollars less than that of the current Master Plan. The LAX Master plan should be scrapped, new regional plans should be proposed and a new alternative for modernization should begin

3. Comments and Responses

from the drawing board, one that will not increase the passengers to LAX but that will in stead help the airport run more safely, smoothly, and effectively.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the roles and responsibilities of LAWA, the City of Los Angeles, SCAG, and SCRAA in meeting regional demand. 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, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

PC01566-20

Comment:

LAX IS A BAD NEIGHBOR!

LAX causes pollution, noise, traffic, safety concerns, increased trash thrown by travelers throughout the Westchester community, etc. yet the airport does nothing positive for the community it resides in. Whatever the reasons or restrictions, the truth is that, LAWA does not contribute to Westchester Schools, Youth, community organizations, community events and does nothing to help in community beautification efforts outside their own property line to help make up for the many negative impacts it has on our community.

Response:

Comment noted. Impacts related to air pollution, noise, traffic, safety, schools, and aesthetics were addressed in Sections 4.6, 4.1, 4.3, and 4.24, 4.27, and 4.21, respectively, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01566-21

Comment:

REGARDING WESTCHESTER:

In the center of the Westside, stands a rare jewel, an old-time community. Located on the Westside where the weather remains cool in the hot months of summer, the Westchester community is still abundant with residents who are the original owners from the 1940's and 1950's These residents worked hard to build up a wonderful, kindred-spirited community. Recently, many new young families have moved to the area. It has an unpretentious small-town feel, where residents seem to know everyone. With a small Von's market located in the center of the Kentwood neighborhood, a wonderful and active YMCA and many children's sport programs, parents are continually bumping into one another and feeling the strong local bond. Block parties and a festive community 4th of July parade help to celebrate this special community. You can never duplicate such a place, and there is no longer anywhere like it on the Westside.

In the 1970's the airport had it's first major expansion which devastated the area. Promising to stop at 40 million annual passengers, the expansion tore apart entire neighborhoods. The airport also promised many mitigation measures that still have not been fulfilled to this day. Westchester Vitalization Corporation was formed under special charter by the mayor to try to bring life back into the floundering business district.

Despite the devastation, the Westchester community held on. Many of those who lost their houses chose to remain in the area that they called home. Unbelievably, these residents still reside here, and unlike almost anywhere else in Los Angeles, their children have grown, married and chosen to reside here also. Many grandparents, aunts, uncles and cousins are just a few blocks away from one each other. The city is willing to work to save land for endangered wildlife, yet unbelievably the elderly and children who live here and have found happiness quality of life are so carelessly pushed aside.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-121 and Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding opportunities to alleviate impacts associated with past or present airport activities at LAX. Please also 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.

PC01566-22**Comment:**

Airport expansion is not the only solution, and it is definitely not the best solution. The expansion does not make sense in any way that you look at it. Is expansion in the best interest of the communities surrounding the airport? Is it in the best interest to those who must travel for hours on a grid-locked freeway, with only one international airport to choose from? Is it best to increase the air traffic where there are already record numbers of near misses, and dispose of great communities for the wishes of wealthy businessmen? It is not a solution. Too much money has already been wasted in the plans, PR, and EIR. Stop this foolishness now, and plan for LA's Future-the right way.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed 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 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-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 quality of life.

PC01567**Smith, Mary****None Provided****7/22/2001****PC01567-1****Comment:**

I grew up in Westchester, on 88th St. My father still lives there, facing "the wall" that was built after homes were taken away to expand the airport. I've seen Westchester grow from a nice neighborhood to the congested "grocery stop" & fast food mecca it now is. There is no sense of "community" any more, & traffic on Sepulveda between LAX & the freeway access is terrible.

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.

PC01567-2**Comment:**

I am so opposed to expanding LAX, it is difficult to express myself in a logical manner. It is so STUPID to make people drive from outlying areas to LAX to fly out. The only sensible way to accomodate these flyers is to expand existing airports in their locale. We must NOT do anything that will increase traffic, pollution, take away land use to provide parking ,etc. DO NOT EXPAND LAX. PROMOTE THE PALMDALE & ONTARIO 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

3. Comments and Responses

Palmdale. 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.

PC01568 Evans, Betty None Provided 7/18/2001

PC01568-1

Comment:

There is too much air pollution, noise from airplanes coming over my house waking me up every morning from 3 - 5 a.m.

Response:

The commentor is affected by easterly takeoffs at night. An analysis of nighttime single event noise awakenings was provided in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. LAWA will be pursuing Federal approval of a restriction to alleviate that situation by making over-ocean procedures mandatory when they are in effect between midnight and 6:30 a.m. During a recent 18 month period, 82 jets departed to the east when over-ocean procedures were in effect, an average of about one per week. When over-ocean procedures are not practicable for reasons of adverse weather or winds, aircraft will continue to depart to the east between midnight and 6:30 a.m. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC01568-2

Comment:

These large cargo planes fly too low.

Response:

Cargo planes often appear to be low because they are larger than most passenger aircraft. During approach operations, they are typically at the same altitude as all other aircraft. During takeoff, large cargo aircraft may be heavily loaded with fuel and cargo to reach Asian destinations and consequently may actually be lower than smaller aircraft that do not weigh as much. The combination of size and slower climbs for the large cargo aircraft makes them appear to be (and actually may be) lower than other airplanes. However, they all operate within safe procedures, regardless of their altitude.

PC01568-3

Comment:

The present traffic in the city of Inglewood & airport area is too congested. If the airport enlarges, you won't be able to move.

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

PC01568-4

Comment:

Plus the traffic noise on Century Blvd. is too noisy. More cargo trucks will make it worse.

Response:

Traffic noise was discussed in detail in Section 4.1, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Specifically, Site RD7 in the noise analysis is the Sheraton Hotel on Century Boulevard. That provides the analysis of Century Boulevard that the commentor is concerned about. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PC01568-5

Comment:

I worry most of all about an air disaster. More planes, you have a greater chance of an air crash. L.A. is #1 in near misses in the nation.

Response:

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

PC01568-6

Comment:

Let other communities share the responsibility of air flight.

Response:

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

PC01569 Morrow, Catherine None Provided

PC01569-1

Comment:

I oppose Airport Expansion Because is Inagfh Palutiacin Two much Trafic Too much noise and it will Ruing aure Beatiful comunity it will bee no shafs to sheap please go to el Taro or ontario

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, 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 transportation demand.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01570 **Sasa, Kayoko** **None Provided** **7/20/2001**

PC01570-1

Comment:

I writing you regarding the LAX Draft Master Plan and Draft EIR. I oppose all currently proposed concepts.

Response:

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

PC01570-2

Comment:

As a Westchester Resident, I have concerns for my families health and safety, as well as our quality of life with the proposed increases in local pollution, noise, and traffic.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in 4.24, Human Health and Safety, traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and 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, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. As indicated in TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester Business District. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC01570-3

Comment:

I commute on the 405 freeway on a daily basis and fight gridlock each day on my way to and from Santa Monica.

Response:

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

PC01570-4

Comment:

The Draft EIR shows no mitigation for the 405 freeway, yet expansion will add to the traffic of this already over-burdened freeway.

Response:

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

PC01570-5

Comment:

A regional airport solution should be found to help defuse the amount of traffic throughout the Los Angeles Community. The Los Angeles Freeways are already the slowest in the entire nation.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01570-6

Comment:

The Westside/South Bay areas are already solidly built without room for future growth or expansion.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00539-6.

PC01570-7

Comment:

The LAX Master Plan EIR does not give an alternative for a regional air traffic solution. Bringing the entire sprawling Los Angeles community into a densely populated area with only one international airport is less than inadequate. With the size of the Southern California region, there should be 3 or more international airports to meet demand as there are in many other large cities.

Response:

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

PC01570-8

Comment:

LAX holds the record for airport "near misses". Flights should be decreased in the LAX area to increase safety. Expansion should take place with a regional plan in areas where there is more space for the increase of flights. The actual acreage of LAX is only 3425 acres and is densely surrounded by homes, businesses and schools, where as the new Denver airport has 34,000 acres of it's own!

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC001563-7. Please refer to Response to Comment PC001563-7.

PC01570-9

Comment:

The Master Plan EIR does not take into account other developments in the area that will be increasing traffic on the freeways and major arteries such as the huge Playa Vista Development and the dense growth that will soon be taking place in the Marina del Rey area. The statements made in the EIR are incorrect without projections for these projects in addition to the expansion of LAX.

Response:

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

PC01570-10

Comment:

Los Angeles communities such as Palmdale and Ontario want airports in their areas. These areas are growing and will be the source for increased air traffic demand. There is very little growth on the Westside. Logically, airports should be built where populations are continually growing.

Response:

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

PC01571	Erickson, Esther	None Provided	8/14/2001
----------------	-------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01571-1

Comment:

I do not want to have the airport enlarged cause we have enough noise for the county and the traffic would be really bad. I have lived here over 50 years and seen enough expansion of the airport already.

Consider the people that live here for the 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.

PC01572 Briggs, Pamela None Provided
Beere

PC01572-1

Comment:

An ad in the Los Angeles Times Classified section dated Monday, August 28, 2000 reads: Request for Qualification (RFQ) City of Los Angeles Department of Airports For Demolition of Residential Buildings

The Department of Airports is inviting all qualified C-21 contractors to respond to the RFQ for the purpose of establishing a pre-qualified list of on-call demolition contractors for building demolition.. "

Details about where to acquire the necessary application forms follow. The ad left us with a sense of foreboding, for it revealed the intent of airport expansion proponents: to wipe out existing residential areas to make room for a larger airport. It also revealed their optimism that they would be allowed to proceed without any obstacles.

What the ad does not say is, "You will be helping to destroy one of Los Angeles' important assets and investments in its future, a healthy neighborhood." And what those who placed the ad did not anticipate was the growing level of opposition by not only all communities surrounding LAX, but by all those who have an interest in a healthy Los Angeles, a city that needs its neighborhoods to survive into the future.

One year later, we are relieved to find that the opponents to LAX expansion are getting at least as much attention as the proponents.

We write to add our voices to the many who have spoken out against LAX expansion and in support of regional and alternate solutions to increased air and road traffic. It is time for other communities to contribute their fair share and for Los Angeles to challenge itself to find more creative, more environmental, long-term solutions to road traffic in and out of LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, 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 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation, 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.

PC01572-2

Comment:

We moved to the Westchester neighborhood four years ago and found one of Los Angeles' hidden treasures: a neighborhood that offers grocery shopping, children's music, art and dance classes,

3. Comments and Responses

childcare, and five different church communities all within walking distance. It is a walking neighborhood, where neighbors recognize and greet each other. It is a multi-generational community, where grown children return to raise their children. In other words, it is a true neighborhood, in which the community has recognized the importance of providing services close to home. Moving to this neighborhood made us feel proud to live in Los Angeles. It reminded us that we have chosen to live here, not just work here. It would be such a tragedy to destroy one of Los Angeles' treasures, a neighborhood that promises to still be healthy and strong 100 years from now, as long as LAX does not kill it.

Response:

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

PC01572-3

Comment:

Historically, the neighborhood has already done its fair share in support of the airport. During a previous expansion, entire streets were wiped out. As evidence, if one drives along Pershing Drive, on the west side of the airport, one glimpses sections of street and sidewalk, remnants of previously sacrificed homes. As air traffic has increased, the neighborhood has paid a high price: increased noise and air pollution (which would increase by 1,302% with the proposed expansion!). In fact, about a year ago, LAX installed a noise-monitoring device at the end of our driveway, affixed to the top of a chopped off telephone pole. I wonder if the device can hear the sound of children turning the corner riding bikes and roller-skates, or the conversation of the elderly father and his grown son out on their daily walk, or our 83-year-old (original Westchester homeowner) talking to our four-year-old daughter about her vegetable garden.

If LAX is allowed to expand, I am afraid that the device will only hear the sound of jets entering and exiting Los Angeles, taking people and cargo to other neighborhoods in other cities. Would this cylindrical device be able to speak five or ten or twenty years from now about the neighborhood that once was? Can Los Angeles really afford to kill another of its neighborhoods?

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC00164-1. 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. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand. The noise monitoring stations installed by LAWA on rare occasion are used to listen to aircraft and community noise in real time as it's happening; however, their primary use is to record only the magnitude of aircraft and community sounds.

PC01573

**Chambers, Gregory
P. & Marie A.**

None Provided

7/21/2001

PC01573-1

Comment:

We are 20 year residents of Westchester and we vehemently oppose the 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.

PC01573-2

Comment:

For several decades our community has been doing more than its share for the surrounding neighborhoods in terms of air and ground traffic. It is not our responsibility to care for the air traffic needs of the Inland Empire and Orange County. Ontario needs to be further developed in order to care for community needs. El Toro must be developed for the needs of 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. 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.

PC01573-3

Comment:

Palmdale must be developed as a reasonable alternative to uncontrolled expansion at LAX. If Palmdale is built and LAX is not expanded, airlines will go there or will give up the greater Los Angeles market - not likely. By expanding LAX you will be displacing thousands of people from their homes and businesses.

Response:

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

PC01573-4

Comment:

By developing El Toro the travel and cargo needs of Orange County will be addressed without disturbing families and businesses. It is insulting to hear propaganda talks about the future plans of El Toro when everyone knows that the voters of Orange County do not want it, and when the City of Irvine is quickly approving sites for new homes in the flight path of the proposed El Toro airport in an attempt to make us destroy our community for their needs.

Response:

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

PC01573-5

Comment:

People complain about the lack of responsibility and the lack of ethical behavior on the part of our youth today. If the leaders of our communities cannot act responsibly and ethically, how can we expect anything better from our children. It is the responsibility of each community to care for their own needs and to lend a helping hand to others who are truly in need of help due to a lack of resources. Orange

3. Comments and Responses

County and the Inland Empire are not lacking resources, but they are lacking a sense of responsibility. They have the means to develop and meet their community needs without disturbing families and businesses, but they would rather displace families and businesses in a neighboring community in order to satisfy their travel needs. It is unconscionable to allow such behavior. Where are our priorities? We expect more responsible behavior from our leaders. We expect a no vote 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. Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester business district. 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 environmental justice impacts in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. .

PC01574 Dibabu, Susan None Provided 7/12/2001

PC01574-1

Comment:

I oppose the LAX expansion due to the fact that it is going to ruin a great neighborhood along Airport Blvd. Find another way to expand the airport w/o destroying good people's neighborhood.

No to LAX expansion along Airport 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. Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition.

PC01575 Zvanovec, Edwin None Provided 7/19/2001

PC01575-1

Comment:

I am opposed to expansion of LAX. The airport should be used by residents of Los Angeles county. Residents of surrounding counties should be compelled to develop airports in their own areas. It is criminal action by our politicians to force more of our neighbors out of their homes and businesses. Keep Westchester intact.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed residential and business relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses. 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. 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. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government.

PC01575-2**Comment:**

I cannot condone increase in traffic volume into LAX. There is too much smog generated by vehicles stuck on the freeways. We do not need 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 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.

PC01575-3**Comment:**

Surrounding counties are growing in population faster than Los Angeles and should use Palmdale and Ontario airports to serve their 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-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC01576**Torres, John****None Provided****7/12/2001****PC01576-1****Comment:**

I am opposed to the expansion of LAX along Airport Blvd because it will bring about the ultimate destruction of one of the more quiet cities in Los Angeles, Westchester.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the Community of Westchester.

PC01576-2**Comment:**

I have lived in Westchester for eight years now and feel very safe about the neighborhood.

The expansion would bring unwanted noise and pollution to an otherwise quiet 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 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. 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01576-3

Comment:

The expansion can do without the traffic flow through Airport 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.

PC01577

**Shilling, Mona &
Gaylord**

None Provided

7/20/2001

PC01577-1

Comment:

We are against any LAX expansion efforts. We live in a great community that has been compromised by the airport operations.

When reviewing the plan, we see no positive impacts outlined to the surrounding communities. All the alternatives explored have negative impacts including: increased traffic, increased noise duration levels, and increased air pollution.

We enjoy the community of El Segundo, the town is unique in a big city environment. The airport negatively impacts the residents by polluting the environment with emissions and consistent incompatible noise levels.

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.

PC01577-2

Comment:

We both commute to work and rely on the I-405 and I-105. These freeways are already too congested, more expansion at LAX will only worsen the situation. The plan does not adequately address the traffic congestion issues. Regardless of how many paths are made, the fact that the airport has limited space and is located in the center of heavily populated areas, will result in the funnel effect. We need to distribute the traffic more regionally to reduce the burden on LA.

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 proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Please also see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in regional approach to meeting demand.

PC01577-3**Comment:**

Although, we are fortunate to live on the East side of El Segundo, the aircraft noise levels are still an issue. Noise levels and noise duration need to be reduced and we do not see this as an alternative in the plan.

Response:

Comment noted. Actions to address the reduction of noise levels or the limitation of times during which they could occur are addressed in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR and in Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Technical Report of Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR under the mitigation section. Without the completion of a substantial study of the costs and benefits of such restrictive actions on the airport, its users, and its environs under FAR Part 161, such restrictions cannot be enacted. Given the preeminent role of the airport in the region's economy, it is unlikely that enough benefit could be proven to outweigh the costs of any restrictions that would substantially reduce the noise levels at the airport. For additional information on the mitigation actions evaluated by the study, please see Topical Response TR-N-4 and Section 7.2, Alternative-Specific Abatement Opportunities, in Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01577-4**Comment:**

Air safety has become an issue at LAX, why wouldn't the plan include an alternative that reduced or sustained traffic levels while providing for operating enhancements. Define what the safety levels would be if the airport were running at the proposed 40 million passengers and identify who is responsible for compromising safety by authorizing growth?

Response:

LAX has been, and will continue to be, the primary airport in the Los Angeles basin. Though it is the primary airport, its percentage of regional passengers served has declined steadily over recent year from 88 percent in 1960 to 74.5 percent in 1997. Market forces and the regulatory structure of the commercial air transportation industry favors and promotes the continued use of primary airports such as LAX. The airlines, not government, dictate where air service will be provided and the airlines tend to select airports convenient to their customers. The Master Plan is a long range planning document that envisions improvements necessary at LAX to accommodate the region's need for international air service while the other airports in the region accommodate a larger share of domestic service. Existing conditions at LAX do not create an unsafe environment. However, since FAA airport design standards have changed over time, certain features of the existing airfield do not meet current standards. While these conditions do not create an unsafe environment they do add to airfield congestion and create delay. Without the improvements at LAX, safety will not be enhanced and efficiency of the airfield will not be increased. Please see TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. Please note that Alternative D, the Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, has been added and is 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.

PC01577-5**Comment:**

How has the airport affected surrounding community property values? What is the impact of expansion to the property values surrounding LAX? Will the residents obtain compensation?

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC01577-6

Comment:

We are opposed to any LAX expansion 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.

PC01578

Levine, Shirley

None Provided

7/20/2001

PC01578-1

Comment:

Although I lived in Westchester, I voted for the first airport expansion, which was "sold to residents" as a one-time expansion. Many homes in the area known as "east" Westchester were purchased by the airport and those remaining homes were considered by owners to be "safe" and the neighborhood developed into a viable community. Destroying this community in order to temporarily take care of the airport's needs is "wasteful".

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC01160-1. 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 identified Master Plan commitments and recommended mitigation measures. 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, 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. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC01578-2

Comment:

By 2025-2030, the airport will be too small and then it will realize that regional airports plan is the only long-term solution and this takes into account "bullet trains" going from north to south & south to north,

Temporary measures to meet needs of public for 20 - 25 years is a waste!!

Please take a "long - term view" and do not fear decentralization.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to 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.

PC01579 Ward, Claude H. & None Provided 7/23/2001
Virginia M.

PC01579-1

Comment:

I HAVE MARKED MY CONCERNS ON THE ENCLOSED SHEETS

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments PC00908-2 through PC00908-6 and PC00908-13 through PC00908-15.

PC01580 Wise, LaDonna None Provided 7/21/2001

PC01580-1

Comment:

I am apposed to the LAX Expansion. I live in Westchester. We do not need more traffic and noice from the airport. Also, we do not want more air pollution from increased auto & jet fuel emissions.

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.

PC01580-2

Comment:

It would make a lot more sense to develop the Ontario & Palmdale & 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.

PC01581 Marroquin, Jose None Provided 7/14/2001

PC01581-1

Comment:

I oppose the LAX expansion because it will increase traffic and pollution

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, 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. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01582 Peterson, D. None Provided 7/20/2001

PC01582-1

Comment:

AS AN 80+ YEAR OLD NATIVE ANGELENO I HAVE WITNESSED THE CHANGES TO OUR CITY, (MINES FIELD TO LAX) FOR INSTANCE. I SEE NO REASON FOR LAX TO BECOME THE LARGEST AIRPORT IN THE WORLD. JUST MOVE THE CARGO INSTALLATION TO PALMDALE AND LEAVE LAX STATUS QUO.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to 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 Response to Comment PC00281-19 regarding relocating cargo operations.

PC01582-2

Comment:

LAX EXPANSION PLUS PLAYA VISTA WILL MAKE THE WESTSIDE A TRAFFIC NIGHTMARE. IT'S VERGING ON THE INTOLERABLE 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. 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, 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.

PC01583 Schaffer, Karen None Provided 7/16/2001

PC01583-1

Comment:

Freeway congestion

The draft environmental impact report does not adequately address the large negative impact to air quality in the neighborhoods along the 405 freeway south of the Santa Monica freeway to approximately the Rosecrans Blvd. due to the increased traffic for all alternative plans.

Response:

Since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, additional intersections were included in the local CO hotspot analysis. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the selection and analysis of additional intersections in Section 4.6, Air Quality, with supporting technical data and analyses in Appendix S-E

and Technical Report S-4. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PC01583-2

Comment:

Any increase in LAX passengers adds to the congestion along the 405 freeway. As stated in the EIR "even plans by Caltrans to install additional car pool lanes on the 405 freeway will not provide adequate relief for the inevitable population-driven traffic levels projected for the year 2015." The EIR also states "The San Diego Freeway is the most consistently and severely congested freeway in the region." DO NOT ENLARGE LAX AND ADD TO THE ALREADY SEVERE FREEWAY CONGESTION.

Response:

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

PC01583-3

Comment:

Surface street congestion

Even if a direct connection between the 405 freeway and LAX is built, the increased passengers and cargo as well as new cargo facilities and the proposed business/industrial area will greatly increase surface street congestion. These businesses brings more traffic and larger vehicles than the current situation.

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 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. Note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or the Ring Road.

PC01583-4

Comment:

Increasing LAX passenger & cargo transportation unfairly burdens the community around LAX. This community has already suffered the loss of schools and residential neighborhoods in previous expansions of LAX as well as the increase in freeway and surface street congestion and increased air pollution.

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-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand, Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic, and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Please also see Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, and Appendix S-D, Supplemental Environmental Justice Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01583-5

Comment:

Noise and air pollution

All alternatives will cause additional noise and air pollution. Our community is being asked to unfairly shoulder too much burden.

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

PC01583-6

Comment:

Current LAX property purchases for redevelopment

This EIR does not address the current LAX property purchases for cargo facilities. A large area is going to be developed for cargo facilities which will add to our freeway and surface street congestion and noise and air pollution.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed changes in cargo facilities occurring between baseline (1996) conditions and future (2015) conditions for each of the Master Plan alternatives. Included in the analyses were the impacts associated with changes in cargo truck traffic, as related to impacts on surface transportation facilities, air quality, and noise. Specifically, 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.

PC01583-7

Comment:

Population growth

This report fails to indicate that the population growth is not in the area around LAX but inland, north and south. The L.A. World Airports planning staff should develop their other two airports. Since the inland area is having tremendous growth in population and industry it would be logical to develop the Ontario airport.

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.

PC01583-8

Comment:

"No Project alternative " IS a realistic option

When the airlines and freight shippers cannot add additional flights, market demand will force them to look to other area airports to service their needs. When additional cargo terminal facilities are not available around LAX, the cargo could go to another L.A. World Airports owned airport. The Los Angeles World Airports planning staff should develop their other two airports.

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.

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. Please also see Response to Comment PC00599-54 for more information regarding cargo activity.

PC01583-9

Comment:

Cargo

More cargo should be shipped to an area that is in a better central location relative to its use. This report states that there is no legal mechanism to mandate against airlines, passengers and freight shippers deciding to use Lax over alternatives. Putting a cap on flights or structuring airport fees to encourage the use of Ontario over LAX would discourage the increased demand on LAX.

Response:

Even if the other airports in the region were to start assuming a greater role in accommodating the region's aviation demand, LAX would likely continue to serve as the region's predominant airport for international passenger and cargo activity in the short-term. This is a result of the specialized facilities and services that have developed around LAX over time to serve the needs of international customers. Despite being one of the busiest airports in the country in terms of cargo tonnage, much of the cargo handled at LAX is flown on passenger flights. Moving this segment of the region's cargo is not feasible.

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding 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 also Response to Comment PC00599-54 for more information about cargo activity.

PC01583-10

Comment:

Airline pricing structure

The airlines' pricing structure of offering much cheaper flights into LAX than to neighboring airports and the San Diego airport forces many people to use LAX instead of their closest airport.

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 that discusses multi-airport markets, airline economics, and passenger choice.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01583-11

Comment:

The increased noise, air pollution, surface and freeway congestion which all LAX master plan alternatives are forcing on the community around LAX is an unfair burden for our community. The Los Angeles World Airports should cap future growth at LAX and develop their other airports.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01018-29 regarding the authority of the FAA and LAWA to limit future activity at airports. Subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, Mayor James Hahn directed the Los Angeles Board of Airport Directors to develop a new LAX Master Plan alternative that, consistent with public comment calling for a regional approach alternative, would be designed to accommodate passenger and cargo activity levels at LAX that would approximate those of the No Action/No Project Alternative, have fewer environmental impacts than the No Action/No Project Alternative and, in light of the events of September 11, 2001, would be designed to enhance airport safety and security. This new alternative - Alternative D-Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, which calls for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifts the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive analysis of Alternative D and was circulated for public review and comment. Although the conclusion of the Draft EIS/EIR was that Alternative C would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region, that conclusion has been superseded by the conclusion of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D is now considered to be the Environmental Superior alternative and would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region.

PC01584	Krekeler, Katherine	None Provided	7/23/2001
----------------	----------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01584-1

Comment:

My concerns regarding the proposed LAX expansion include the following:

Response:

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

PC01584-2

Comment:

traffic - surface streets near LAX are already busy.

Response:

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

PC01584-3

Comment:

The 405 is always congested near the off-ramps for Century Manchester, La Tijera & Howard Hughes. How will this be addressed?

Response:

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

PC01584-4

Comment:

noise - At my house, esp. during summer when the windows are open, LAX noise is noticeable & annoying. How will this be addressed?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels, and Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding thresholds used to identify significant noise 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.

PC01584-5

Comment:

downtown Westchester & Nielsen Field - Will these areas be removed for LAX expansion? These areas are vital to this community. How will this be addressed?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the Community of Westchester. As stated therein, under Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred) no acquisition is proposed within the Westchester Business District. As discussed in Section 4.26.3, Parks and Recreation, of the Draft EIS/EIR, under Alternatives A, B, and C the Carl E. Nielson Youth Park would retain its current use and would be expanded by five acres. As described in Section 4.26.3, Parks and Recreation, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, under Alternative D, no acquisition of Nielson Park would occur.

PC01584-6

Comment:

Regional solution - Why not develop Ontario, Palmdale, El Toro? Why LAX when the population here has remained stable?

Response:

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

PC01585 Marroquin, Omar None Provided 7/14/2001

PC01585-1

Comment:

I oppose the LAX expansion plan because it would cause an increase in pollution and traffic.

Response:

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

PC01586 Kohly, Peter None Provided 7/23/2001

PC01586-1

Comment:

I OPPOSE LAX EXPANSION BECAUSE THE TRAFFIC IS GOING TO BE HORRIBLE & THE NOISE WILL PREVENT US ALL FROM ENJOYING OUR PARKS & BACK YARDS.

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-4 regarding outdoor 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.

PC01587 Kohly, Margarita None Provided 7/23/2001

PC01587-1

Comment:

I am opposed to the LAX expansion because of safety, traffic congestion and destruction of our community.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 2, 3, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-2, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC01588 Kohly, Jose J. & Eva None Provided 7/23/2001
A.

PC01588-1

Comment:

I AM AGAINST THE LAX EXPANSION BECAUSE I FEEL IT WILL ENDANGER OUR SAFETY POLLUTE OUR NEIGHBORHOOD EVEN MORE THAN NOW & DESTROY THE QUAINTESS OF WESTCHESTER.

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 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts 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.

PC01589 Castro, Margot None Provided 7/12/2001

PC01589-1

Comment:

I have resided in Westchester since 1949 and never had the desire to move out of the area. It is a wonderful place to live and raise families. We enjoy a good climate, good air and we are close to almost everything. It is hard to understand why there are people who want to destroy such a nice neighborhood when there are other airports like Ontario, Palmdale and El Toro that should be used to relieve the congestion at Los Angeles International 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, 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.

PC01589-2

Comment:

I am 86 years old and don't want to leave my house. Here is hoping that the people bent on destroying Westchester will listen to their common sense and their conscience and leave us alone.

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 include any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester business district.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01590 Bodok, Alexandra None Provided 7/23/2001

PC01590-1

Comment:

I OPPOSE LAX EXPANSION BECAUSE I FEEL IT WILL ENDANGER THE SAFETY OF OUR COMMUNITY.

Response:

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

PC01591 Roos, Sara None Provided 7/22/2001

PC01591-1

Comment:

My husband and I bought our house in Mar Vista five years ago in large part because it was so quiet. We both value the tranquility of our back yard. Soon after moving in we recognized a high-pitched, far-away whine from jets passing high overhead as they started the landing procedure by heading inland to approach LAX from the east. The jets appeared very tiny way up in the sky and as we grew accustomed to the background noise it ceased to trouble us any longer.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01591-2

Comment:

Since then we have augmented our home with two small daughters. We have adopted a nighttime routine with the eldest that includes listening to recorded lullabies set at precisely the same volume night after night. Around the beginning of the year 2000 I realized that I was no longer able to hear the lullabies due to the constant scream of jet noise. I would focus on one flight's progress, eagerly awaiting it's retreat only to suffer the immediate intrusion of another. Upon inspection of the planes overhead, I realized they were no longer small specks way up high in the sky, they were now conspicuously and audibly closer than before, filling our backyard vista with their looming bulk. This controlled household lullaby-experiment thus demonstrates objectively what is evidently true: that airport noise has already increased significantly, degrading the quality of our life here substantially. In my opinion this degree of deterioration is already unacceptable.

And yet the intrusion is destined to grow larger and ever more onerous with the proposal to expand LAX still further.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. However, please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. Regarding increase in noise levels at the commentor's property (located at 3748 Mountain View in the community of Mar Vista), to qualify for soundproofing, properties must be exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels. As shown on Figure S1 in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, and Figure S4.2-2 in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, this property is located outside the 1992 fourth quarter, 1996 baseline, and Year 2000 65 CNEL contour. Also relative to single event noise levels that result in nighttime awakening (as established by the 94 dBA SEL noise contour), this property is located outside the 94 dBA SEL contour under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions, as was shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As was also analyzed in Sections 4.1.6 and 4.2.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, no areas within Mar

Vista would be newly exposed to significant noise levels within the 65 CNEL or 94 dBA SEL as a result of developing any of the LAX Master Plan alternative.

See also Topical Responses TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels, and TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

PC01591-3

Comment:

I strenuously object to these plans to expand traffic in our vicinity without accommodating passengers and traffic at our other regional airports. There is no good reason that LAX should bear the brunt of expansion at the expense of Palmdale and Ontario airports, which are situated on huge plots of land, close to large populations of travelers and expressways. They can accommodate an increase in passenger and cargo traffic far more readily than LAX.

Response:

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

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.

PC01591-4

Comment:

Noise and air pollution on the Westside of Los Angeles is already unbearable and these plans would increase the pollution still further. The EIR demonstrates that these impacts cannot be mitigated.

Response:

Comment noted. Proposed measures to mitigate significant air quality and noise impacts were identified in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and Section 4.1, Noise, 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. However, as described in the aforementioned sections, some of air quality and noise impacts would remain significant and unavoidable after the application of proposed mitigation measures.

PC01591-5

Comment:

Expanding LAX is a just plain terrible idea. For every conceivable problem addressed by expanding LAX there is a better solution elsewhere - e.g., expanding Palmdale and Ontario, encouraging the building and use of public ground-transportation.

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. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the

3. Comments and Responses

Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding 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, Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale, and Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand.

PC01591-6

Comment:

The quality of life here in West L.A. is frankly rather poor already. It behooves none of the ordinary citizens of Los Angeles to adopt any of the alternatives in this proposed "Master Plan". I beseech the FAA and LAWA to consider the needs of plain-old residents and not just developers. We will not make any money from these schemes; we will not benefit in any way. We will be forced to accommodate a myriad of adverse consequences for the enrichment of distant non-residents.

PLEASE DO NOT FORCE FURTHER EXPANSION UPON LAX. CONSIDER THE LONG TERM NEEDS OF OUR ENTIRE REGION FIRST!!!!

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-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.

PC01591-7

Comment:

p.s. I understand that in particular departure track D6RW is slated to pass directly over our house. I was under the impression that ALL FLIGHTS WERE FORCED TO DEPART LAX OVER THE OCEAN EXPRESSLY TO MITIGATE DEPARTURE NOISE LEVELS?! Isn't that why there is such a waste-land between LAX and the ocean in Playa Del Rey? This problem has already been addressed; why is the solution being countermanded?

Response:

The commentor has misinterpreted the flight track exhibit. The noise abatement procedures call for all departures from Runways 24R/L and 25 R/L to fly to the ocean before initiating turns. Flight track D6RW is a departure track to the east from Runway 6R that would potentially be used by turboprop aircraft. However, because of strong winds from the east, some departures must take off to the east. For further information, please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2 regarding early turn over areas north and south of airport, and Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-7.1 enforcement of noise rules, and Mitigation Measure N-5.

PC01592

Hatton, William

None Provided

7/23/2001

PC01592-1

Comment:

Environmental Impact

3. Comments and Responses

One of the major impacts of the airline passengers on the environment is their commute to the airport. This impact is a function of the distance of the commute, which in turn determines the fuel used and the resulting pollutants.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC01592-2 below.

PC01592-2

Comment:

The growth in the Southern California region is all taking place many miles from LAX. It would appear that using regional airports to handle the increase in passengers would significantly reduce the average commute distance. A simple study could produce quantitative values. It would appear that the average commute distance could be cut at least in half. This is millions of gallons of fuel not burned and the pollutants not produced.

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.

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 for more information regarding air quality, including regional sources related to airport travel demand.

PC01593	McCarthy, Justin	None Provided	7/22/2001
----------------	-------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01593-1

Comment:

This letter is to voice my opposition to the LAX expansion plan. Anyone that has tried to travel north or south on Sepulveda, Lincoln, La Tijera, La Cienega and east and west on Century, Imperial, Manchester, Centinela or the freeway from 7-10am or 4-7 pm knows that it is pure gridlock.

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 proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC01593-2

Comment:

And this is before the 200,000-ft of office space at Sepulveda and Centinela and the thousands of more feet at Play Vista is completed. To think of pouring more traffic into the area is ridiculous. Those making the decision should be forced to drive these streets during these times for 2 weeks.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC01594 Kurzyniec, Marian None Provided 7/17/2001
Lucile

PC01594-1

Comment:

I will have to re-locate if this goes through. I am 83 yr. of age, and have lived on Arbor Vitae St. for 36 yrs, it will be such a tremendous job for me to move, I much prefer to remain at this address.

Response:

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

PC01595 Shannon, Melvin R. None Provided 7/20/2001
& Sherry

PC01595-1

Comment:

We say NO to LAX expansion some of reasons
Traffic
Noise
Air pollution
This is a great location for family if expansion goes thru, our home value will go down!!!

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; 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 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.

PC01595-2

Comment:

Ontario or Palmdale has room for expansion or even 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.

PC01596 Jones, Phyllis None Provided

PC01596-1

Comment:

Ontario and Palmdale airports should be expanded. Not LAX.

Response:

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

PC01596-2

Comment:

The pollution factor is increasing here. Those of us with respiratory illnesses are suffering more each day.

Traffic on the freeways is already congested. An expansion of LAX would exasarbate this problem.

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 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-E, and Technical Reports 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.

PC01597 Baumgartner, Ruth None Provided

PC01597-1

Comment:

AS A WESTCHER RESIDENT SINCE 1953 - PLEASE - USE THE ALTERNATIVE LIKE PALMDALE FOR THE INCREASED AIR TRAFFIC. THE AIR TRAFFIC IS DANGEROUS AROUND LAX - IT'S AT ITS PEAK ALREADY WITHOUT THE ADDITIONAL LOAD FOR MORE CARGO PLANES - LET WESTCHER HAVE A LITTLE MORE PEACE OF MIND THINK SAFETY IN THE AIR & THE TAKEOFFS & LANDING - IT'S OVER CROWDED ALREADY. CHECK WITH THE PILOTS & THEY AGREE PLEASE CONSIDER THE SAFETY INVOLVED - USE YOUR HEADS.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01598 Marroquin, Maricela None Provided 7/14/2001

PC01598-1

Comment:

Please do not allow for the LAX expansion to go through. The expansion would change the character of this community. It is unfair to the homeowners of the area whose property would be stolen from them or be altered by the noise and 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, 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 Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, and Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation. As indicated in TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition or 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.

PC01599 Mechoso, Maria None Provided 7/20/2001

PC01599-1

Comment:

I am a concern citizen who strongly oppose the so call master plan to LAX Expansion.

The expansion only will bring more traffic, more pollution and more noise and no Real solution.

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.

PC01599-2

Comment:

Los Angeles have another places like Ontario and 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

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.

PC01599-3

Comment:

The people of Orange County have El Toro, that place is ideal for an airport, among another reasons people in Orange County won't have to come to LAX to travel, which is ideal for the people who live in Orange county the most populated place in Southern California.

Response:

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

PC01599-4

Comment:

This expansion will heart too many people especially older people for who is almost impossible to relocate.

Response:

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

PC01599-5

Comment:

For this reasons and hundreds more I hope this expansion is never taking 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.

PC01600	Sanchez, Wendy	None Provided	7/12/2001
----------------	-----------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01600-1

Comment:

I disaprove of the LAX expansion along Airport blvd. because, I think the neighbors should have some peace at their homes as well their privacy. This expansion will become noisy and very uncomfortable to everyone. Also, my biggest concern is for kids to have their freedom to be outside of their home and not to have any worries for them to be in danger or discomfort.

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 and Appendix S-C. In addition, the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed compatibility with surrounding uses in Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting data and technical analyses provided in Technical Report 1 and Technical Report S-1. Also, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01601 Gamica, Richard None Provided 7/12/2001

PC01601-1

Comment:

It is not beneficial to the residents who will be subjected to, not only the long and arduous task of finding more room and the countless construction equipment that will be outside their front doors, but the lack of sufficient space any or all construction will have in the given future as we are faced with today. There must be other alternatives to such a proposal.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed construction impacts in Section 4.20, Construction Impacts. In addition, 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.

PC01602 Markowitz, Soryl None Provided 7/17/2001

PC01602-1

Comment:

This is to protest the current expansion plan. The current plan will increase traffic in our neighborhood by bringing thousands more trucks & cars. This expansion is a short term, quick fix approach to a transportation problem.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01602-2

Comment:

The city of Los Angeles owns 2 key airports, each of which could be developed to handle the expected increase in traffic.

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.

PC01602-3

Comment:

In addition, El Toro could be developed to meet the needs of Orange County residents. It does not make sense to force the Westchester/Playa del Rey, El Segundo communities to 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 for a discussion of the El Toro conversion, constraints at John Wayne Airport, and the Ontario Master Plan.

PC01602-4**Comment:**

Auto pollution, emissions from idling planes & jet fuel emission will increase significantly. Increased emissions of all 5 EPA classified major pollutants will significantly impact our health and the health of our children.

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. 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-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC01602-5**Comment:**

Please, consider focusing on development of alternative sites so that the impact of increased traffic can be shared by all who benefit from it instead of focusing all the damage in a small 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. 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.

PC01603**Bertolet, Sam****None Provided****7/21/2001****PC01603-1****Comment:**

Stop diverting aircraft, especially jets, to Santa Monica Airport, the noise is deafening, disturbing and ruining our neighborhoods.

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.

PC01603-2

The remainder of this comment letter is identical to form letter PFF; please refer to the responses to form letter PFF.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01604 Jacobson, Chizuko None Provided 7/21/2001

PC01604-1

Comment:

1 . Currently airport capacity is 40 MAP yet 65 MAP go through. That is 63% over capacity. Therefore using that logic, it means that a new capacity of 90 MAP really would turn out to be 146 MAP. There is no way all the problems (traffic & pollution, etc.) that will be caused by LAX expansion will not be mitigated as planned.

2 . With the current MAP of 65 I have seen air congestion. Now with LAWA's proposal, it is likely that that will more than double. I just don't see how this area can have that much air traffic in such a small congested area.

3. You can nly put so much air in a balloon until it explodes. Judging from the current air space traffic, the street and freeway traffic around LAX it seems that the balloon is almost full.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00008-12 for a discussion on growth beyond the identified capacity for Alternative C. Please see Response to Comment PC00656-2 regarding airspace capacity. The commentor is correct in asserting that LAX is congested. Please see Responses to Comments PC00260-1 and PC00814-6 for a discussion on the capacity of LAX with and without expansion. 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.

PC01604-2

Comment:

4. Common sense also says that you don't build the area's largest and the only international airport in a highly populated area of prime Westside land. The San Francisco area has 3 international airports, the largest not being in the city. Tokyo has their main airport far out side of the side. These other cities and countries seem to get it, why doesn't LAX?

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01604-3

Comment:

5. The environmental report seem to be unclear as to the effect of these planes landing and taking out of our community and the pollution they cause. All I can see is that anyone willing to take the time to sit on Aviation Blvd. and watch the planes land could see the gray exost released into the air as they prepare to set down. This is when they are landing I can only imagine how much worse take off is when they are burning that much more jet fuel.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed mitigated air quality impacts, including those from aircraft operations, in Section 4.6, Air Quality.

PC01604-4**Comment:**

6. LAWA's plan basically takes us through 2015, well then what are you going to do, start the new LAX expansion plan or are you going to break down and build elsewhere. Why not do it right the first time instead of this extremely expensive bandaid to the problem.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00287-3 regarding the need for expansion beyond 2015. Please refer to Response to Comment PC00297-9 regarding the development of other airports as an alternative to development at LAX. 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.

PC01605**Golden, Hal****None Provided****7/23/2001****PC01605-1****Comment:**

Orange Co. has El Toro as a potential airport. It is not L.A. Co.'s responsibility to support O.C. smog congestion & noise at LAX must be decreased - & as residents, we will enforce this.

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-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.

PC01605-2

The remainder of this comment letter is identical to form letter PFF; please refer to the responses to form letter PFF.

PC01606**Kahan, Arlin****None Provided****7/22/2001****PC01606-1****Comment:**

It's no secret as time goes by the population in Los Angeles will undoubtedly increase; therefore, making our roadways, railways and airways congested. For those of us who live in Los Angeles are very much use to being inconvenienced with things we want and places to go because of the surround area. We must remember this is a privalege not a right.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC01606-2

Comment:

- We may want to consider upgrading and utilizing surrounding airports. (Ontario, Burbank, Palmdale, etc.)
- We may want to consider relocating air cargo companies to other airports.

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. Please see also Response to Comment PC00599-54 for more information about cargo activity.

PC01606-3

Comment:

- We may want to consider upgrading existing runways at LAX.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00883-1 regarding the need to upgrade and expand existing facilities.

PC01606-4

Comment:

These are just a few of many points. Lets face it Los Angeles is only so big and especially LAX. Let's not try to fit ten pounds of crap in a five pound bag.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01607

Josephs, Zina

None Provided

7/21/2001

PC01607-1

Comment:

When my husband and I purchased our home in 1972, Santa Monica Airport had a large, permanent sign on the east end of the runway saying "No Jets!"

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01607-2

The remainder of this comment letter is identical to form letter PFF; please refer to the responses to form letter PFF.

PC01608 Cusack, Breeda None Provided 7/20/2001

PC01608-1

Comment:

The further expansion of LAX is totally unacceptable. One cannot hold a conversation outside the house, or, indeed, inside if the windows are open, due to the noise of the aircraft, which are too numerous at the moment.

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 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.

PC01608-2

Comment:

Just think what this would do to the value of our home, our retirement investment.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding the effects of LAX on property values.

PC01608-3

Comment:

As if the noise pollution weren't bad enough, there's the regular pollution - black dust, particles and soot which descend on us and which we breathe. It blackens the leaves of plants.

Response:

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

PC01608-4

Comment:

The traffic on Arbor Vitae, at the moment, is hazardous. That it should get worse is criminal.

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

PC01608-5

Comment:

The most aggravating aspect of it all is that it is not necessary. There are Regional Airports, under used, that should carry their fair share. The expansion would be an imposition on the people of Inglewood and smacks of arrogance.

Response:

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

PC01609

Geddes, Grace

None Provided

7/22/2001

PC01609-1

Comment:

I have lived in Westchester 35 years, and have seen the airport grow! We do not need any more traffic to and from the airport, nor the noise and pollution involved. Since the city has alternatives - Ontario and Palmdale, which can be developed, there is 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-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; 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.

PC01610

**Shamey, Lorraine,
Katherine, & Annette**

None Provided

7/21/2001

PC01610-1

Comment:

The airport should broaden take-off intervals. There are stretches of time on the weekends when planes are taking off every minute. The noise is too intense!

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.

PC01610-2

The remainder of this comment letter is identical to form letter PFF; please refer to the responses to form letter PFF.

PC01611 Kennedy, Patricia None Provided 7/23/2001

PC01611-1**Comment:**

I am writing to voice my 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 that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01611-2**Comment:**

Expansion of LAX would definitely lead to more pollution in the area. According to the pamphlet produced in part by Councilwoman Galanter's office, LAX is one of the largest sources of smog pollution in the Los Angeles Basin. We certainly do not need to expand the airport and increase its pollution making capabilities.

The pamphlet also states that the "EIR/EIS predicts that the increased ground and air traffic will result in increased emissions of all five 'criteria pollutants' ". As it is now, I personally smell the pollution emitted by the aircraft. I enjoy being outdoors and having my windows open. I do not want the pollution to increase. It can only have detrimental effects on our health, the health of our children, and the quality of life.

The effect of the additional pollution created by the expansion of LAX must be fully studied and the results must be published and disseminated in a way that all people can understand and respond to.

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.

PC01612 Kennedy, Patricia None Provided 7/23/2001

PC01612-1**Comment:**

I am writing to voice my 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 that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01612-2

Comment:

Expansion of LAX would only lead to more traffic in the area. This is intolerable.

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.

PC01612-3

Comment:

It has been stated in the pamphlet produced in part by Councilwoman Galanter's office, that with expansion there would be an additional 6.5 trucks per every hour of the day in addition to current traffic.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic for more information. 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.

PC01612-4

Comment:

It has also been stated that, even with mitigations, there will be six major intersections in the area that will be "significantly impacted" and there will be significant traffic delays during the ten year construction period. In addition, it has been stated that "construction-specific traffic will add another 25 truck trips per hour in 2004 - considered in the EIR/EIS as 'significant and unavoidable'."

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 Response TR-ST-3 regarding construction traffic.

PC01612-5

Comment:

We all deal with enough traffic and delays as it is. The expansion of LAX would only compound this and add to pollution. The airport and our elected officials should be working to make the quality life better for Angelenos not worse.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01613 Zvanovel, T. None Provided 7/19/2001

PC01613-1

Comment:

NO TO EXPANSION OF LAX. EXPAND THE PALMDALE AND ONTARIO 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.

PC01613-2

Comment:

HOMEOWNERS AND BUSINESSES IN THE WESTCHESTER AREA SHOULD NOT BE FORCED TO MOVE.

Response:

Comment noted. Under Alternative D, no residential acquisition in Westchester is proposed and business acquisition is substantially less than under the other build alternatives. It should also be noted that Alternative D has been designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01614 Wu, M.D., Joseph None Provided 7/20/2001

PC01614-1

Comment:

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

PC01614-2

Comment:

More importantly, it is a quick fix solution and does not offer long-term solution to the problem. Increasing the LAX size will only temporarize the matter for another 10 years or so. By the time any resolution is passed, you'll have to start all over again for a bigger LAX.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01527-5 for a discussion on why more extensive expansion is not proposed for LAX. Also, please note that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative

3. Comments and Responses

designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

PC01614-3

Comment:

Instead, one should look at spreading the demand around other available airports in Orange County or the Inland Empire region that currently has less volume.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in regional approach to meeting demand, for more information about regional airports, airport system scenarios, airport governance, and the role of local and regional agencies in meeting regional aviation demand. The 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.

PC01615

Hatton, William

None Provided

7/23/2001

PC01615-1

Comment:

One of the major variable determining the probability of an unsafe condition in the air space around LAX is the density of aircraft in that space. The density of aircraft in the air space is related to the number of flights in and out of LAX. As you increase the number of flights you increase the density and you increase the probability of an unsafe condition in the air space. At some point as the density is increased, the density will start to approach saturation and the probability of an unsafe flight condition will rapidly approach one.

It would appear prudent that the increased flights should be spread out to other regional airports that have lower densities, rather than continue to increase the density in the LAX air space.

Response:

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

PC01615-2

Comment:

The FAA should be ask to quantify the increase in the probability of an unsafe flight condition in the LAX airspace and on the ground as a result of the master plan. They should also quantify from a safety stand point different scenarios of spreading the future increase in air traffic over the regional airports.

Response:

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

PC01616 Schaffer, Frank None Provided 7/20/2001

PC01616-1

Comment:

The LAX master plan EIR does not include the impact of the cargo facilities currently being developed by LAX. Property is being redeveloped that is going to add air pollution, add noise pollution, as well as freeway and street congestion. This was not considered when estimating the additional impact made by the master plan alternatives.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed changes in cargo facilities occurring between baseline (1996) conditions and future (2015) conditions for each of the Master Plan alternatives. Included in the analyses were the impacts associated with changes in cargo truck traffic, as related to impacts on surface transportation facilities, air quality, and noise. 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. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

PC01616-2

Comment:

The 405 freeway is already consistently and severely congested. Any of the alternatives offered will make this congested freeway even 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.

PC01616-3

Comment:

The additional cargo facilities and business/industrial buildings will bring much more traffic to our surface streets than we currently have. This will bring many more large trucks on these surface streets. This additional traffic will significantly increase both noise and air pollution.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic, Subtopical Response TR-ST-1.1, for more information. Alternative D, which is 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 Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendices D and G and Technical Reports 2, 3 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendices S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-2 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01616-4

Comment:

With the increase in passenger and cargo transportation traffic, the proposed direct connection from the freeway to the airport will not reduce surface street congestion.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic, and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the Congestion Management Program.

PC01616-5

Comment:

The extreme negative impact to air and noise pollution and freeway and surface street congestion overrides the needs for expanding LAX. This will put an unfair burden on the surrounding community.

Response:

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

PC01616-6

Comment:

The Los Angeles World Airports should develop the Ontario airport as an international gateway. When airlines and cargo shippers cannot be accommodated at LAX, they will go to Ontario to service southern California.

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. 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 is evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D is provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information on this topic, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan, 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-2 regarding the role of deregulation in aviation planning, for information regarding international gateways.

PC01617 McLoughlin, Didi None Provided

PC01617-1

Comment:

Please no expansion on LAX. We do not need that kind of traffic & people all over

Response:

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

PC01618 Smart, G. Red Caboose Ventures 7/20/2001

PC01618-1

Comment:

The LAX expansion - for the citizens of Playa del Rey, the LAX expansion is a true definition of false economy. The impact on the community caused by the LAX expansion plans and the Playa Vista project will destroy our quaint little beach town.

Response:

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

PC01618-2

Comment:

The people in Los Angeles need to learn to better distribute our mass transit systems. Commerce without a conscience is an unacceptable act of ignorance. Local travel within the region needs to be spread amongst the other 5 Los Angeles airports, freeing LAX for continued international trade.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to 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.

PC01619 Radanovich, Dave & Marty None Provided 7/15/2001

PC01619-1

Comment:

As a new homeowner/parent in Westchester the environment in which my family lives is extremely important. What I want is a safe and healthy environment. The L.A. Airport Expansion does not promote this healthy and safe environment, but a hazardous one. The short term and long term effects

3. Comments and Responses

are in no way safe for my children. Expanding the airport will only bring more noise, pollution, traffic and UNWANTED CRIME.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in 4.24, Human Health and Safety, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and law enforcement in Section 4.26.2, Law Enforcement. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, 14c, and 16b 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 and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC01619-2

Comment:

Right now there are too many business vehicles entering and existing Westchester. The Airport Maintenance crews only take care of the Airport and do not maintain Westchester Blvds and streets. Trash is everywhere; (uncut weeds, graffitied walls and unsafe taxi drivers) Westchester taxpayers are not reaping any benefits from the Airport as it is.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to Westchester. Maintenance of off-airport areas is not within the jurisdiction of LAWA. Maintenance of on-airport areas is within the jurisdiction and responsibility of LAWA, and is funded by airport revenues. No taxpayer dollars are used in LAWA maintenance activities.

PC01619-3

Comment:

You (Airport Commission) allow any type of business to enter without concern for the community and residents. The Airport Police allow transients to walk our community streets and sleep on our bus stops for weeks. If there is more to come of what is already happening - NO THANKS! NO AIRPORT EXPANSION!!!! MAKE ORANGE COUNTY ACCOUNTABLE TOO!!!!

Response:

Please see Topical Responses TR-LU-1 regarding quality of life impacts and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County aviation demand. Also note that 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. 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

PC01620

Dilaura, Dennis

None Provided

7/22/2001

PC01620-1

Comment:

I am firmly against any LAX expansion! The noise and traffic is bad 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, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical

3. Comments and Responses

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.

PC01620-2

Comment:

Why not 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.

PC01621	Johnson, Brian	None Provided	7/23/2001
----------------	-----------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01621-1

Comment:

I have been a Westchester resident 19 years. We do not need more noise or more traffic. I intend to do all I can to oppose this.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC01621-2

Comment:

I am also an educator in Lennox School District. Planes fly over way too much already. I am opposed to expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed impacts to schools in Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use, and Section 4.27, Schools.

PC01622	Garrett, William	None Provided	7/19/2001
----------------	-------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01622-1

Comment:

Noise and traffic are at uncomfortable levels now. More traffic and noise will only add to an unhealthy existence. I oppose expansion.

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 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.

PC01623

Jevons, Kathleen

None Provided

7/21/2001

PC01623-1

Comment:

I expect our new mayor to honor the pledge that he made that LAX should be constrained to operate safely within its existing facilities and should work with the airport and other communities to develop a regional air transportation 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.

PC01623-2

Comment:

Ontario and Palmdale should be developed. Let Orange Co. residents assume the burden of their many industries and personnel who depend on us for air travel. Let them know that NIMBY doesn't mean in our back yard! High speed rail can be developed and I'm sure there are many other alternatives.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand.

PC01623-3

Comment:

Negatives: Traffic increase locally
Loss of community development
Air pollution
More possibility of air disasters
Larger jets SST and cargo carriers

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, land use impacts in Section 4.2, Land Use, air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and safety impacts in Section 4.24.3, Safety, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 1, through 4 and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-2 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-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC01624

Cabot, William

Noisy Toys

7/16/2001

PC01624-1

Comment:

WE ARE OPPOSED TO THE LAX MASTER PLAN AS IT NOW READS.

WE BELIEVE THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION, BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY AND GENERAL QUALITY OF LIFE ARE TOPICS NOT SERIOUSLY CONSIDERED IN THE PROPOSAL.

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 4.1, Employment/Socioeconomics, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2, 3 and 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2, S-3, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts to quality of life. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01624-2

Comment:

TAKE MORE PUBLIC HEARINGS & LISTEN TO THE PEOPLE TELL YOU THAT THE L.A. AIRPORT HAS BECOME AN ENEMY OF THE SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES WITH EXTREME ARROGANCE. IN TAKING PEOPLES HOMES BEFORE CONSIDERING ALTERNATIVES IN UNDERUSED AIRPORTS.

Response:

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

PC01624-3

Comment:

THE FUTURE CONGESTION OF CONSTRUCTION ALONE, AS NOW STANDS, WILL KILL BUSINESSES IN THIS AREA.

Response:

Comment noted. Construction related traffic was addressed in Section 4.3.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-3 regarding construction traffic.

PC01624-4

Comment:

WE DO NOT WANT THIS UNCHECKED, OVER THE TOP NEEDLESS EXPANSION (FOR GREED) OF THE 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

PC01625 Plueger, Dale None Provided 7/21/2001

PC01625-1

Comment:

I am adamantly opposed to the expansion of L.A.X. 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.

PC01625-2

Comment:

I am near Sepulveda Bl. and traffic at the present time is unbearable. I have a hard time due to excessive traffic, getting out on Sepulveda.

Response:

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

PC01625-3

Comment:

Also the expansion of an Arbor Vitae expressway and the proposal of an Airport Bl. expressway would be disastress to us living between Airport & Sepulveda Blvds.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments AL00008-8 and AL00027-10 regarding an Arbor Vitae interchange with I-405, and Response to Comment PC00934-6 regarding Airport Boulevard.

PC01625-4

Comment:

We have lived in this area over 50 yrs. and this expansion would be a disaster for us.

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.

PC01625-5

Comment:

The airport noise and polution caused by the additional traffic going to & from the airport, would not be tolerable.

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.

PC01625-6

Comment:

It's been suggested that a tax be added to non-residents of the L.A. area who use our L.A.X. facilities.

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.

PC01625-7

Comment:

Approx. 30% of the airport traffic comes from Orange County. Let them develop facilities at the El Toro air base.

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.

PC01626

Zvanovec, Trene

None Provided

7/19/2001

PC01626-1

Comment:

I am opposed to expansion of LAX. Westchester homeowners and businesses should not be forced out.

Response:

Comment noted. Under Alternative D, no residential acquisition in Westchester is proposed and business acquisition is substantially less than under the other build alternatives. It should also be noted that Alternative D has been designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01626-2

Comment:

Expand the Palmdale and Ontario 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01627 Jones, Joyce None Provided

PC01627-1

Comment:

Its' too bad L.A. has to take the consequences of expansion. Time for some of our other cities (with airports) can't take some of the traffic & accompanying problems off LA's shoulders! Shared the problems as well as benefits of any major airport.

But we can't stop progress, can we?

Response:

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

PC01628 Gambini, Leslie None Provided 7/20/2001

PC01628-1

Comment:

I have made my home in Westchester for about 25 years. Over the past several years I have tried to stay informed on the plans to alter &/or expand LAX. I have kept up with print information and attended community meetings that have attempted to clarify all positions on this issue. After sifting through all the information that has been presented several things have become abundantly clear.

First of all, our elected officials are more than willing to sacrifice a fine community, jeopardize the health and safety of citizens, and rubberstamp a fatally flawed EIR for the sake of political expedience at best.

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.

PC01628-2

Comment:

Secondly, the dangling carrot of federal dollars for huge construction projects has dulled the commonsense of the decision-makers making it easy for them to justify their actions because of the "jobs" the projects will bring in the short term.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01628-3**Comment:**

Third, the air pollution health risk, noise pollution risk, ground and air traffic disaster risk that is being born by my community is not just or fair. The risks and rewards of growth must be shared regionally not foisted on a single area. This is the simple fact that many are working hard to ignore. Why should one area reap the rewards when my neighborhood suffers the consequences ?

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety, and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC01628-4**Comment:**

For example:

- The oily particles in the air that settle on all surfaces in and out of our homes will only increase if LAX volume increases. We are breathing this poison!

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 also see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase, and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC01628-5**Comment:**

Does the government plan to offer "Brown Lung" payments to us like they do in the West Virginia coal mine areas?

Response:

Please see 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01628-6

Comment:

- From my vantage point, the EIR doesn't really address air quality and how to mitigate it...unless they just plan to remove the people ...for their own good.

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 addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation.

PC01628-7

Comment:

- Ongoing noise is an insidious thing. I am sure most of the Westchester residents have already lost a portion of their hearing. I know I have. Even though we are not directly under the flight path, we feel the results of noise especially in restless disrupted sleep, irritability, and difficulty concentrating. Yet the idea of being sealed into a sound-proofed house with all the windows closed is not my idea of a remedy!

Response:

Comment noted. 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. In addition, 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.

PC01628-8

Comment:

- The already congested freeway and street traffic in the airport area has already degraded our environment, lengthened and complicated our days and minimized our family time. Building off-ramps through residential neighborhoods in order to facilitate even more vehicles are not the answer.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, particularly Subtopical Response TR-ST-4.1, and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts. Note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or the Ring Road. 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.

PC01628-9

Comment:

Bulldozing our Westchester shopping area to make way for a ring road will not improve the situation. It will only force us to drive further to more distant shopping areas.

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. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 for further discussion of effects on the community of Westchester.

PC01628-10

Comment:

Fourth, it is the responsibility of the FAA to clamp down on the airlines setting firm guidelines on the number of flights and passengers that can be handled safely. Right now it appears that the airlines are in the drivers seat making the rules and the government is just acquiescing.

Response:

Since passage of the federal Airline Deregulation Act of 1978, the airlines make the decision about which airports they will serve. As a general rule, airlines will choose to serve the airports near the highest concentrations of conveniently located customers. Within this general framework, however, airlines must make strategic decisions about air service to maximize their investments and gain competitive advantages. For instance, in regions with multiple airports, airlines tend to concentrate their air service at a single, well-located primary airport for reasons of economic efficiency. Concentrating service at a dominant airport also facilitates connecting service, which can significantly increase an airline's market and allow even greater frequencies to more destinations. International service in particular relies on the availability of domestic connecting flights to a wide range of destinations. The statutory role of the FAA, as directed by the U.S. Congress is to ensure the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace in the United States. The FAA's Air Traffic Service provides guidance to pilots to ensure that minimum safe separations between aircraft are maintained.

PC01628-11

Comment:

Certainly passenger traffic and air cargo are important to our region and our country. But a balance must be struck. I see no evidence that this will happen. Other airports could handle much more of the passengers and cargo. (Long Beach Airport is perfectly positioned to be a cargo airport...a stones through from the Harbor and next to the Alameda Corridor.It is a logistical dream location. Palmdale, Ontario, Van Nuys, and El Toro must be utilized also.)

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

the property for non-airport uses. Please see Response to Comment PC00599-54 for more information regarding cargo activity.

PC01628-12

Comment:

If it costs the airlines to operate several ground facilities, so be it. They will just pass the cost along. It would be more just if those who utilize the airports paid higher fares rather than the LAX neighbors suffer the negative impact alone of airport encroachment.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01628-13

Comment:

In closing, Mr. Ritchie, I suggest that you and the powers that be put your thinking caps back on and rethink your plan. Your Plan and EIR that has been proposed is sadly lacking the fundamental fairness that it should possess.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01629

Helling, Edward

None Provided

7/21/2001

PC01629-1

Comment:

The Master Plan is a short term fix. Other options should be considered - such as Palmdale & Ontario - also El Toro in Orange County; we should not have to be responsible for Orange County's traffic problems. Westchester already has traffic & congestion problems and does not need any extra.

Response:

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

PC01629-2**Comment:**

Playa Vista is also causing traffic & congestion, which is bad enough as it is now without imagining what it will be like if and when it is completed.

Response:

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

PC01629-3**Comment:**

We do not need further expansion or traffic. We need open space & better 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. 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-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC01630**Steinberg, E.****None Provided****7/22/2001****PC01630-1****Comment:**

I'M WRITING TO EXPRESS CONCERN OVER LAX EXPANSION. THE WESTCHESTER AREA ALREADY BEARS ENOUGH OF BURDEN WITH TRAFFIC AND NOISE. I SUPPORT A REGIONAL SOLUTION.

Response:

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

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.

PC01630-2**Comment:**

LET ORANGE COUNTY EXPAND TO ACCOMODATE ITS RESIDENTS' TRAVEL NEEDS.

3. Comments and Responses

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.

PC01631 Castro, Gilma None Provided 7/12/2001

PC01631-1

Comment:

I have lived in Westchester my entire life. I have already seen the airport take my original grammar school and a lot of homes belonging to my classmates in the making of the clear zone years ago.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01631-2

Comment:

I live near Nielsen Field and therefore close to the ring road. This will bring more noise and pollution to our homes. We have a lovely neighborhood with lots of children and senior citizens.

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. In addition, Alternative D does not include the ring road.

PC01631-3

Comment:

Orange County citizens use LAX which causes congestion on the north bound 405. It would be easier for them to use El Toro which is not in a residential area. There is also Palmdale and Ontario which could also be used. Expansion of LAX is not the only answer for air traffic congestion. There are other options that can and should be explored.

Response:

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

PC01631-4**Comment:**

Why is it necessary to destroy a neighborhood that has been here for over 50 years? With other options, the answer is "It is NOT necessary to disrupt the lives of an entire community.

Please study other options.

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.

PC01632 Roberts, Beulah None Provided**PC01632-1****Comment:**

I live between 88th Street and 89th Street since 1961 the air traffic is so bad.

Some evenings and early morning I can see two planes, to my left and two airplanes to my right. All visible at the same time. Less than two minutes apart. Sometime they fly so low I can see the wheels. I can tell what air line. And a stream of light smoke pollution behind.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01632-2**Comment:**

I think the traffic and Noise Air pollution impacts on low income and Minority Communities who live near LAX.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-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, Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation, Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement/enforcement, and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increases.

PC01633 Moses, Aaron None Provided 6/11/2001**PC01633-1****Comment:**

I am a first-grader at Paseo Del Rey School in Playa del Rey. I see lots of planes all the time. I don't want to see any more. They are loud and pollute the air. I also don't want any more traffic on my street in Westchester.

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 impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC01634 Awad Family, None Provided

PC01634-1

Comment:

We have been a resident of this West Los Angeles Neighborhood for 15 years. We don't wish to see our family and neighborhood health and safety threatened by the increased jet traffic at Santa Monica Airport. We hope to work out this issue.

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.

PC01635 Warren, S. None Provided

PC01635-1

Comment:

Recent reports indicated LAX as a terrorist bombing target. This alone would indicate we need to spread out. Build an airport in Palmdale. They need the revenue, we don't need the expansion on the west side.

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.

PC01635-2

Comment:

Traffic is too congested now

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01635-3

Comment:

and when Playa Del Rey is finished (hopefully it won't be a development) we will not be able to move on our streets.

Response:

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

PC01635-4**Comment:**

Please NO EXPANSION, we can and should be able to live without the additional revenue. There is too much NOISE and jet fuel pollution 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, economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socioeconomics, 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.

PC01635-5**Comment:**

This may fall on deaf ears now, but when (and it will happen) one airplane goes down in area - expansion will stop

Response:

Comment noted. 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.

PC01636**Ladvenicza, Ilona****None Provided****7/20/2001****PC01636-1****Comment:**

Since the jets are allowed to depart and arrive from the Santa Monica Airport, our life in the backyard and in the house is considerably altered. Frustration of the constant noise and the smell of jet fuel smell forcing us to stay inside with closed windows.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01636-2

The remainder of this comment letter is identical to form letter PFF; please refer to the responses to form letter PFF.

PC01637**O'Donnell, Janet****None Provided****7/13/2001****PC01637-1****Comment:**

I think the West Side is overcrowded - Lincoln & Sepulveda are congested -

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC01637-2

Comment:

Playa Vista will only add to the mess.

Response:

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

PC01637-3

Comment:

If N.Y. can have 3 airports & Chicago 2 why can't LA have 2 - 3 or 4?? I think expanding LAX shows lack of vision. Why can't Orange County get over their "Nimby" attitude & expand their airport for their community? Why drag Valley people thru this congestion to get out of town? Also - Recent News has LAX as terrorist bombing target. - Wouldn't it be nice to have a back up airport or 2 in case one needs shut down? Why does a major airport need to be in a residential district?

Response:

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

PC01638

Brass, Bonnie

None Provided

7/20/2001

PC01638-1

Comment:

Everyone says, "Not in my back yard". Seriously, we live 4.7 miles from the airport and it is mighty convenient to fly out of or pick someone up there.

My worrisome thought is Communist China. The U.S. is giving China the Panama Canal. They have established themselves on the Atlantic and the Pacific sides, namely Cristobal and Balboa. We are giving China port rights in Los Angeles Harbor.

If our biggest and best International Airport is only LAX, we could be doomed. Do not put all the eggs in one basket.

Response:

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

PC01639 Acquarelli, Pauline None Provided 7/19/2001
Mary

PC01639-1

Comment:

I am against airport expansion, because it will increase more air pollution, noise, traffic, and when the weather changes you get that kerosene smell, your eyes and throat burns, think about the children that live out here, that have to smell that.

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 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.

PC01640 Lewis, Ernestine None Provided 7/18/2001

PC01640-1

Comment:

The proposed expansion will have a negative impact upon the residents in the City of Inglewood.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01640-2

Comment:

Examples

1. More noise pollution which is unbearable at the present time, especially with open windows.

Response:

Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC01640-3

Comment:

2. Increased Auto and Air Traffic, Meaning increased particulates in the environment.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01392 - 3 regarding particulate matter.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01640-4

Comment:

3. Increased respiratory problems. - My husband and I have lived in Century Heights for 36 years and it gets worse each year.

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.

PC01640-5

Comment:

*Its time to expand elsewhere!!

Response:

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

PC01641	Marroquin, Marina	None Provided	7/14/2001
----------------	--------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01641-1

Comment:

I am writing in opposition to the expansion of LAX. This expansion would cause a burden on the homeowners of the area. The increased traffic and pollution would completely alter this community.

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.

PC01642	Chiella, Karen	None Provided	7/21/2001
----------------	-----------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01642-1

Comment:

(1) I am strongly opposed to LAX expansion - There is horrible traffic & attendant air pollution in Westchester today.

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.

PC01642-2**Comment:**

Added to Playa Vista traffic, LAX expansion will gridlock me into my home.

Response:

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

PC01642-3**Comment:**

(Note - the 405 is already a parking lot - we don't need added LAX traffic.)

Response:

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

PC01642-4**Comment:**

(2) Palmdale & Ontario should be developed to handle cargo - Palmdale wants a bigger airport - give them one!

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 and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. Also, please see Response to Comment PC00599-54.

PC01642-5**Comment:**

(3) No, No, No to the "Westchester Southside" development. I live on 90th St. & this proposed development will ruin my quiet enjoyment of my home

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 for a discussion of development and performance standards that would be incorporated into the Westchester Southside/LAX Northside project to ensure compatibility with nearby residential uses.

PC01643**Wakino, Wayne****None Provided****7/23/2001****PC01643-1****Comment:**

I am concerned with the LAX Expansion and how it will effect my community.

I do NOT want the expansion because it will cause additional noise and traffic. Also I am concerned about the effects on the air quality and the closure of intersections.

Please, do something about this.

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. 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.

PC01644 Abascal, Paul None Provided 7/21/2001

PC01644-1

Comment:

To even consider diverting more private jet traffic to Santa Monica is absolutely out of the question. As it is now living with the jet noise is horrible, unsafe and unhealthy.

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.

PC01644-2

The remainder of this comment letter is identical to form letter PFF; please refer to the responses to form letter PFF.

PC01645 Sadrpour, Mo and 91 Street Homeowners 6/9/2001
Bonnie

PC01645-1

Comment:

We are opposed to any airport expansion. Based on the diagram provided by LAWA, our primary concern is the overflow traffic from Westchester Parkway into/through/blocking our neighborhood's residential streets (see attached diagram). Our Westchester community has small streets and cannot handle traffic other than residential.

The small portion of Loyola Boulevard connecting Lincoln Boulevard via Loyola Boulevard to Westchester Parkway should be blocked at La Tijera to eliminate traffic from cutting through our neighborhood.

Loyola Boulevard connects to 91 Street traveling west toward Falmouth. 91 Street is the only direct cut through to Pershing and Manchester. Traffic studies on file with the city of Los Angeles were conducted during the development and construction of Westchester Parkway. 91 Street had so much high-speed traffic flow that the Department of Transportation installed temporary barricades providing one-way traffic and diverting traffic mitigations for that time period.

Constructing Westchester Parkway removed/eliminated La Tijera Boulevard from Loyola Boulevard going west to Falmouth and Pershing. Presently, this portion of La Tijera is one block long and connects Lincoln Boulevard with Loyola Boulevard. According to the LAWA diagram, traffic flow will be encouraged to flow in and out of the Westchester Parkway "ring road" and provide ingress and egress

to the Westchester Southside development "to include offices, retail shops, restaurants, recreational, industrial and commercial uses." (LAWA brochure)

Thus, the airport ring road and Westchester Parkway serving Westchester Southside will dump into our 91 Street neighborhood residential streets. The documented history of cut through traffic problems in our neighborhood is on file. Additionally, our neighborhood wishes to express its observations and concerns regarding present Westchester Parkway traffic; High-speed vehicular traffic, especially taxis, shuttles, trucks, two local high schools' traffic (parents, staff, and student commuters), and three local elementary schools' traffic (parents and staff); pedestrians; and bicycles (often in groups).

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. Note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or the Ring Road. 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.

PC01645-2

Comment:

To summarize, LAX expansion is secondary to the development of a high-speed rail system to the Palmdale, Ontario, and Orange County airports.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding the role of high speed rail in solving the region's air transportation issues.

PC01645-3

Comment:

LAX expansion west using a Westchester Parkway/Pershing/Imperial/Sepulveda ring road does not and will not accommodate the desired expansion and will drastically increase the health, safety, and traffic concerns of our neighborhood.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2, 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. Human health and safety impacts were discussed in Section 4.24 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or ring road, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01645-4

Comment:

Note: Additionally, considering the high-volume current traffic flow on Lincoln, the Playa Vista and Marina developments will exponentially increase the volume of traffic to the point of gridlock throughout Westchester, especially in our 91 Street neighborhood.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment PC00148-2. Please see Response to Comment PC00148-2. In addition, this comment also expresses a concern about the possible intrusion of traffic into neighborhood streets. This issue is addressed in Topical Response TR-ST-4, particularly Subtopical Response TR-ST-4.2.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01645-5

Comment:

Also, apply this formula to the proposed LAX expansion regarding noise, air, and non-resident population increases and pollution equals a plan for air, roadway, and civil problems too voluminous to control.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; and population growth 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.

PC01646

**Sadrpour, Mo and
Bonnie**

None Provided

6/9/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01645; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01645.

PC01647

Martinez, J. Jesus

None Provided

5/4/2001

PC01647-1

Comment:

Emissions of sulfur oxide will increase by 100 tons (55)% per year in 2015, or 548 pounds per day. We already face enough in pollutants in our air and don't need even more from an expanded LAX.

Response:

The content of this comment is essentially the same as comment PC00675-1; Please see Response to Comment PC00675-1.

PC01647-2

Comment:

Increases in traffic will add to the total nitrogen oxide emissions from the airport by 1592 tons (31%0 per year in 2015, or 44.4tons (8.223 lbs.) per day. The additional pollution to our communities air is why I cannot support LAX's expansion.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00675-2.

PC01647-3

Comment:

The EIS/EIR states that negative impacts of expansion will fall disproportionately on minority communities. I found this unacceptable and oppose any expansion of LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed environmental justice in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice. Supporting technical reports and analyses are provided in Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01647-4

Comment:

The 120% increase in annual cargo volume will add an additional 156 "18-wheelers". Everyday our communities find this unacceptable to our quality of life.

Response:

This comment is identical to comment PC00675-4. Please see Response to Comment PC00675-4.

PC01647-5

Comment:

I oppose any expansion of LAX. The current noise mitigation efforts are not sufficient. Even with noise insulation, residents will be forced to remain indoors with their doors and windows closed due the high amount of aircraft noise.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program, Topical Response TR-LU-4, for a discussion of outdoor noise levels, and 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.

PC01647-6

Comment:

According to the EIR/EIS, several major intersections in the cities surrounding LAX will see increases in traffic. This will lead to delays of emergency vehicles, endanger lives and destroy our roads. This is unacceptable to my neighbors and me.

Response:

As required under CEQA, measures are recommended to mitigate significant transportation impacts due to the project. In most cases, increases in traffic due to non-airport regional growth far outweigh the increases due to the project. It is not the responsibility of LAWA to mitigate the impacts due to non-airport regional growth. Please also see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC01647-7

Comment:

According to the EIS/EIR construction traffic will add to 25 trucks an hour to the roads surrounding LAX. In find this unacceptable.

Response:

As indicated on page 4-319 of the Draft EIS/EIR, average truck trips per hour during construction of Alternatives A, B, and C would vary from 18 to 42 depending on whether a 6 or 7 day work week was used for the project. Table S4.3.2-9 (page 4-270) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a distribution of construction truck trips over an average day. The impacts of construction traffic for all

3. Comments and Responses

Alternatives were described in Section 4.3.2.7 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 4.3.2.6.2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01648 Roa, Isabel None Provided 5/4/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01647; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01647.

**PC01649 O'Connor Heintz,
Maureen None Provided 7/20/2001**

PC01649-1

Comment:

My family and I live in Westchester. On any given day, the traffic is unbelievable. I can not imagine adding to this congestion through the expansion of the LAX. The LAX expansion would add several more cars and trucks to Westchester and the surrounding areas. There presently is no way to ease the traffic problems now and there will not be any way to do so with the LAX expansion. Move it to Palmdale!

Response:

The Master Plan would help to separate regional airport traffic from local traffic, and satisfy future airport traffic demand while mitigating impacts to the surrounding street system. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of 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.

PC01650 Hessler, Gary None Provided 7/20/2001

PC01650-1

Comment:

I'VE LIVED IN EL SEGUNDO SINCE 1972 ON WEST WALNUT AVE. NEAR HILLCREST FOR (30) YEARS'. I'VE JUST MOVED TO OAK AVE (JUNE) (4) BLOCKS SOUTH OF WALNUT. I COULDN'T HANDLE THE NOISE & AIR POLLUTION ANY LONGER. ITS BETTER HERE ON OAK BUT STILL NOT GOOD. I CAN KEEP MY FRONT DOOR OPEN NOW & STILL HEAR MY T.V. & I ONLY HAVE TO CLEAN THE WINDOWS ON MY CAR TWICE A WEEK RATHER THAN DAILY WHEN I LIVED ON WALNUT AVE.

WHEN I BOUGHT MY HOUSE ON WALNUT IN 1972 I WAS TOLD HOW MUCH BETTER THE NOISE & POLLUTION WAS GETTING, WELL GUESS WHAT! IT NEVER GOT BETTER, ONLY WORSE OVER ALL.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01650-2

Comment:

WITH THE LOW FLY OVERS ON ACACIA & WALNUT ITS ONLY A MATTER OF TIME BEFORE THERE WILL BE A SERIOUS AIRCRAFT ACCIDENT IN THE NORTH WEST SIDE OF EL SEGUNDO WHERE I LIVE.

Response:

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

PC01650-3**Comment:**

I'M AGAINST EXPANSION OF LAX, LET GET PALMDALE AIRPORT ON LINE. I BOUGHT PROPERTY IN PALMDALE AREA IN 1967, WITH PROMISES OF A NEW LAX TYPE AIRPORT HAPPENING SOON, GUESS WHAT! (35) YEARS' LATER I'M STILL WAITING! WHEN? NEED TO SHARE THE LOAD. LOOK AT A MAP OF SOUTHERN CALIF. WITH AN OPEN MIND & SEE WHAT MAKES \$EN\$E.

Response:

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

PC01651	Flynn, Theresa	None Provided	7/20/2001
----------------	-----------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01651-1**Comment:**

I am opposed to LAX Expansion for many reasons--My main objection is added air pollution and the possible related health hazards.

I began caring for my granddaughter from her very young life from age 4 months, while her mother was employed.

At age 3 1/2, a week before Christmas, Kristina came down with a fever that was not responding to the Doctor's advice. He requested her Mom bring her in on the weekend for more extensive testing. His diagnosis was a blood problem and a rush referral to UCLA. - The problem was leukemia. It took about a week's stay at UCLA for emergency transfusions and close observations.

After release from the Hospital and with more stable vital signs, Kristina had about 2 1/2 years of chemotherapy, lumbar punctures, surgery to insert a port-a-cath in her chest (to facilitate chemo to her system) There were several times she needed hospitalization, if the blood counts were low. When they were low, she had no resistance to infection and had difficulty fighting them.

Now at age 5, she has been considered to be "in remission." She will not be considered 'cured' until no cancer cells are found for 5 years. Her chemo treatments have been very hard on her little system. Last year she broke her ankle after a little jump for a balloon. The Doctor advised that the chemo can weaken the bones and has some other possible side effects down the line.

The Doctors can offer no explanation as to WHY she contracted leukemia. Coincidentally, there is a family a block and a half away, their daughter, age 12, has come down with 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01651-2

Comment:

I am concerned about the health consequences of a larger airport facility (more planes coming and going) and the subsequent increase in traffic. Why not another airport somewhere else - There are options.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 2, 3, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts 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.

PC01652

Hickman, Candace

None Provided

7/20/2001

PC01652-1

Comment:

I am writing to strongly express my opposition to the LAX Master Plan. There are a number of things about this plan that concern me greatly, to name a few, the noise levels generated are already impossible to live near without soundproofing of our house, for which we have applied to no avail as yet. It is impossible to listen to one complete news item on TV without missing at least one sentence, due to the loud noise.

Response:

The noise impact area which determines residential uses eligible for sound insulation under the ANMP 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 prioritization for sound insulation 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-3.4 regarding how eligibility for soundproofing is determined and Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.14 for a description of how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP, including an accelerated schedule to meet existing commitments. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

PC01652-2

Comment:

Secondly, we have just repainted our home for the fourth time in fifteen years (for \$6,000.00 a time) due to the fact that the jet fuel turns it black. LAX has not offered to pay for this unnecessary expense s yet.

Response:

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

PC01652-3**Comment:**

The most insidious impact is, of course, the traffic on Sepulveda Blvd., which is virtually useless for twelve hours a day (7am to 7pm). Many commuters try to circumvent this mess by driving through El Segundo, spreading the misery into our small town.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, particularly Subtopical Response TR-ST-4.1 and Subtopical Response TR-ST-4.2.

PC01652-4**Comment:**

The San Diego (405) Freeway is even more impacted than Sepulveda Blvd. for the same amount of time.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the Congestion Management Program.

PC01652-5**Comment:**

We would like to see an EIR that honestly and realistically addresses the impact of all the proposed increases generated by this expansion, not merely the absolute minimum (fingers crossed) impact, possibly occurring at 4:00 am on Feb. 29th.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed potential environmental effects associated with baseline (1996) conditions and future (2015) conditions for each of the Master Plan alternatives.

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.

PC01653 No Author Identified, McDermott Communications Co. 7/23/2001**PC01653-1****Comment:**

We, the employees of McDermott Communications are opposed to the LAX expansion for the following reasons:

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments below.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01653-2

Comment:

(1) The increased noise & pollution resultant from increased ground and air traffic will be detrimental to our health.

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.

PC01653-3

Comment:

(2) The above will negatively impact business in and around the airport area, our primary market for this business, therefore affecting our livelihood.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01071-2 for a general discussion of the economic benefits associated with the Master Plan. Also see Response to Comment AL00018-1 regarding commercial property acquisition within Westchester and efforts to provide relocation assistance to displaced businesses. As discussed in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Master Plan Commitment RBR-1, Residential and Business Relocation Program (Alternatives A, B, C, and D) proposed as part of the Master Plan would facilitate the timely relocation of displaced businesses to appropriate sites within the vicinity of LAX, including in LAX Northside/Westchester Southside, to the extent possible.

PC01653-4

Comment:

Also parking

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01653-5

Comment:

and our daily commute will be impacted

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.

PC01653-6

Comment:

(3) Safety is always a concern near major airports and expansion will surely make it worse.

Response:

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

PC01653-7**Comment:**

(4) A regional solution using all available resources should be the course of action taken.

Response:

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

PC01654**Spann, Aviva****None Provided****7/20/2001****PC01654-1****Comment:**

We are concerned by our neighbors comments that because they got in on the LAX soundproofing plan that they have signed away their easements and any right to be heard concerning the LAX expansion project. They are the residents that will be the most effected by this plan and should have a voice. But because of mis information or no information they are under the impression it is no longer their right. There has been no effort to dispel this notion at a time when the soundproofing program is in high gear in my neighborhood. This problem should be remedied.

Response:

LAWA is aware of no incidents of misinformation discouraging public input such as that alleged. The FAA and LAWA are committed to disclosure and public information. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process. Also, please visit the web site, www.laxmasterplan.org.

PC01655**Spann, Aviva****None Provided****7/20/2001****PC01655-1****Comment:**

Our home is on the hill overlooking the beach. We have only 2 ways to go north in the case of an earthquake or other emergency: 1) Pershing to Culver to the 90 Fwy or Manchester - to Lincoln to the 90 Fwy. Currently the traffic at 7:15 - 9 am is impossible. The traffic from Manhattan Beach through Playa del Rey by way of Pershing and Culver is gridlocked at rush hour traffic. If you put an opening to the airport on Pershing all our avenues to get away from our home will be blocked. The ocean on one side, the Marina on another side, the airport on another and Playa Vista to be on another. We will be like trapped animals on this hill in cases of emergency and at rush hour. Please do not place extra burden on our community and safety by placing an opening to the airport on Pershing. It is a boiling pot already ready to boil over. Thanks.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01086-4 regarding the future Pershing Drive access to the west terminal. See also Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the Congestion Management Program and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC01656 Schaffer, Richard None Provided 7/20/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01583; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01583.

PC01657 Wolf, Frank None Provided 7/23/2001

PC01657-1

Comment:

I was reviewing the brochure for the expansion of the Los Angeles International Airport when the enclosed article appeared in the newspaper; this sent me on close scrutiny of the describing material for the airport. I failed to find any proposal for the improvement of consumer safety.

Won't increasing the number of people frequenting the facility and adding several new concourse increase the potential for loss as described in the article.?

Yes, the article states that such protection of the patron and their property is the responsibility of the airline; however, I do not think of my being on airline property but rather on property of the city of Los Angeles and I look to them for the safety of my being and property.

Expanding the capacity of the airport should include provision for improved patron safety.

Response:

Comment noted. Relatedly, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security issues.

PC01658 Stump, Karen None Provided 7/22/2001

PC01658-1

Comment:

I am opposed to the expansion of LAX. The expansion will cause an increase in traffic, noise, and pollution which will result in a diminishment of the quality of life of the residents in 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; 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.

PC01658-2

Comment:

Please do not close the intersections of Loyola Blvd and Westchester Parkway as well as the intersections of Falmouth and Westchester Parkway. This will cause increased traffic on the streets

bordering the building in which I live (Falmouth Ave and Manitoba Street) and safety hazards as the students that attend St. Bernard's high school will be using these streets to get to the school.

Response:

This comment is similar in content to comment PC00217-1. Please see Response to Comment PC00217-1. Also, direct access to Westchester Parkway from Loyola Boulevard is eliminated in Alternatives A, B, and C. Access is provided from Loyola Boulevard to Westchester Parkway via Lincoln Boulevard. This access would not be altered in Alternative D. Please also see Topical Response TR-ST-4, which includes discussion of neighborhood traffic impacts and mitigation.

PC01659 Blackwill, Maryann None Provided 7/23/2001

PC01659-1

Comment:

Sir - I am 89 years old. Our family has lived here since 1949. Now I live here alone. Any expansion of the airport will cause

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.

PC01659-2

Comment:

(1) more fall out from the fuel which the planes use; which means oily residual on window ledges and walk ways - of course that is tracked in on my rugs unless I get out there and wash it off, a total waste of water

Response:

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

PC01659-3

Comment:

(2) During peak periods of air traffic a phone conversation can not be carried on, if my windows are open for cross ventilation.

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.

PC01659-4

Comment:

(3) 105 is carrying heavy traffic, which funnels into the airport often backing up as far as Imperial. This makes it more difficult for me to get to my dentist and doctors.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and TR-ST-2 regarding the Congestion Management Program.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01659-5

Comment:

Palmdale has acres of open land that could be used for an airport, and few sources of income.

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.

PC01659-6

Comment:

Have you people considered building a fast train system, with perhaps one stop, to carry passengers into Los Angeles?

Japan's major airport is many miles from Tokyo. As I recall a fast train carries air passengers into the city and proves to be no hardship to the travelers.

Response:

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

PC01660 Jackson, Huda & Ed None Provided 7/20/2001

PC01660-1

Comment:

My husband and I are highly opposed to increased traffic at LAX. The current operations negatively impact our 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC01660-2

Comment:

The pollutants from the airplanes and traffic are evident in the soot and dirt that collects on our windows and carpets. Since moving to El Segundo, we find ourselves spending more time cleaning to accommodate the additional pollution generated by LAX.

Response:

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

PC01660-3

Comment:

If this type of pollution collects on our carpet and windows, what are the effects on our lungs and health? What is the long-term impact of exposure to these pollutants?

Response:

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

PC01660-4

Comment:

Have studies been conducted to determine the respiratory illnesses associated with LAX operations?

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.

PC01660-5

Comment:

The master plan does not provide a reasonable range of alternatives. The alternatives are no improvements or improvements with substantial increases in traffic. Why is no alternative indicated that maintains the current traffic levels and provides for cleaner air quality, noise reduction and traffic mitigation?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding the range of alternatives analyzed in 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. Therefore, it is not possible to propose a Master Plan alternative that would maintain the current traffic level, or result in a reduction in air pollution emissions. Traffic and air pollution would increase over baseline conditions even under the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01660-6

Comment:

Today, we take alternative routes to stores and shops, avoiding the ever-congested Sepulveda Blvd. The plan proposes moving large portions of traffic west to Imperial and Pershing, this will only further our inability to commute freely.

Response:

Please see Response to Comments PC01086-4 regarding the future Pershing Drive access to the west terminal, and PC01135-4 regarding key components of the proposed access plan.

PC01660-7

Comment:

Although, we are fortunate to live on the East side of El Segundo, the aircraft noise levels are still an issue. Noise levels and noise duration need to be reduced and we do not see this as an alternative in the plans.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC01577-3; please refer to Response to Comment PC01577-3.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01660-8

Comment:

Air Cargo carriers are the worse offenders of night flights that keep us awake. There is no reason why air cargo operations need to be based out of LAX. Other communities are willing to take these operations to stimulate their economies.

Response:

Please see also Response to Comment PC00599-54 for more information about cargo activity.

PC01660-9

Comment:

Air safety has become an issue at LAX and the LAWA indicates that the only way to resolve this issue is to expand. This is inaccurate; regionalization will positively impact the overcrowded issues but is not fully explored in the plans. Additionally, if it is unsafe, why have the volumes of traffic for passengers (excluding cargo) increased from the planned 40 million to the current 67 million annual passengers? If operations are unsafe today, why does the documentation indicate that the current airport can handle 78 million passengers?

Response:

The Master Plan is a long range planning document that envisions improvements necessary at LAX to accommodate the region's need for international air service while the other airports in the region accommodate a larger share of domestic service. Market forces and the regulatory structure of the commercial air transportation industry favors and promotes the continued use of primary airports such as LAX. The airlines, not government, dictate where air service will be provided and the airlines tend to select airports convenient to their customers. Existing conditions at LAX do not create an unsafe environment. However, since FAA airport design standards have changed over time, certain features of the existing airfield do not meet current standards. While these conditions do not create an unsafe environment they do add to airfield congestion and create delay. Without the improvements at LAX, safety will not be enhanced and efficiency of the airfield will not be increased. 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, and was 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.

PC01660-10

Comment:

We are concerned about what LAX expansion will do to our property values. We have a nice home in a nice community and want to retain our residency. Continued expansion will reduce our property value and severely impact our quality of life.

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.

PC01660-11

Comment:

We are highly opposed to any LAX expansion efforts.

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.

PC01661 Woodhams, Scott None Provided 7/22/2001

PC01661-1

Comment:

OPPOSED TO ARBOR VITAE OFF RAMP.
NO MORE TRAFFIC ON WESTCHESTER PARKWAY.
OPPOSED TO 105 FWY EXTENTION.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and the 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, 3, and S-S. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-7 regarding Westchester Southside traffic. It should be noted that FHWA has withdrawn its support for a half interchange at Arbor Vitae and, more importantly, the proposed half interchange is not part of the LAX Master Plan. FHWA policy is to only consider full proposed interchanges not partial ones.

PC01662 Long, Clarene None Provided 7/22/2001

PC01662-1

Comment:

I am a 61-year old, black, female, 21-year resident of Inglewood.

There are already far too many planes flying over and near my residence. They fly over 24 hours a day.

I will continue to call the Noise Hotline

Council District I is the noise contour

New to some issues.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01662-2

Comment:

Noise Pollution
Soundproofing is a quick fix. People have to come outdoors.

Response:

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.

PC01662-3

Comment:

Single event noise levels must be recorded. The community level discounts and minimizes very noisy aircraft.

Response:

An analysis of single-event noise impacts was provided in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and the related appendices, S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft

3. Comments and Responses

Noise Technical Report and S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, regarding analysis of single-event noise impacts. Also, please see Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences.

PC01662-4

Comment:

Planes are flying lower and louder. It sounds like the roof is being torn off. I am under siege. I feel like they are executing military maneuvers and will attack at any moment.

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.

PC01662-5

Comment:

Now, more than ever before, my phone conversations and TV reception are disrupted.

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 information on 1996 baseline and Year 2000 noise levels and noise impacts projected to occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternatives A, B, C, and Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative). It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 regarding noise increases.

PC01662-6

Comment:

What are the cumulative health effects of repeated, chronic exposure to loud noises from aircraft over a 20-year period?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise.

PC01662-7

Comment:

Air Pollution

Large diesel trucks and jumbo jets will be spewing 4 tons of airborne pollutants daily on Inglewood and surrounding area residents.

Response:

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

PC01662-8

Comment:

These emissions contain at least 5 known carcinogens. Skin cancer, lung cancer, asthma, and other respiratory ailments will be the inevitable result.

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, and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PC01662-9

Comment:

Airport employees are cancer victims.

Response:

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

PC01662-10

Comment:

Resident Population

The EIR and EIS assume "NO GROWTH." The opposite is true. The South Bay and South Central L.A. are experiencing growth by leaps and bounds.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed population and employment growth in Section 4.5, Induced Socio-Economic Impacts (Growth Inducement).

PC01662-11

Comment:

Your report must address the obvious increase of ailments listed above in a rapidly growing 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.

PC01662-12

Comment:

Infrastructure

Our streets cannot handle the increased weight of more heavy vehicles.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01662-13

Comment:

Economic Justice

The economic benefits to Inglewood are trivial. There is no justice. There is "just us."

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding a detailed description of the environmental justice program, economic benefits, and employment opportunities for low income and/or minority communities.

PC01662-14

Comment:

Alternatives A, B, C, D
"None of the above."

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01662-15

Comment:

Other Alternatives
LAWA owns Ontario and Palmdale Airports. Include them in your plans

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

PC01662-16

Comment:

Most Viable Alternative
El Toro is a well-reasoned and supremely practical answer to any expansion scenario.

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.

PC01663

**Wietecha, Walt &
Marsha**

None Provided

7/11/2001

PC01663-1

Comment:

I AM SO UPSET TO SEE THE AIRPORT ENCROACH IN MY NEIGHBORHOOD I HAVE LIVED HERE 51 YRS. MY PARENTS LIVED IN MANCHESTER SQ. YOU ARE TAKING THEIR HOUSE AND THIS IS RUINING OUR COMUNITY. PLEASE RECONSIDER YOUR 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-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition/relocation and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding quality of life. Please note that Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition.

PC01664 Brown, Rosemary None Provided 7/21/2001

PC01664-1

Comment:

When will LAX stop picking on us? They've expanded and expanded and expanded.

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.

PC01664-2

Comment:

I have two children ages eleven and six. The pollution, which your expansion will cause will harm their health and the children of all the other families also. If they get repeated chest colds or cancer I'll blame it on LAX and I'm sure all the other parents will join me and sue LAX also. El Segundo is a prime area for raising young families. You know what Erin Brockovich did?

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.

PC01664-3

Comment:

What will you do about all the traffic it will cause? Its 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 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.

PC01664-4

Comment:

What will you do about the unbearable noise its bad enough now?

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Information on noise mitigation is included in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report Section 7, Noise Mitigation, of the Draft EIS/EIR. Additional information can be found in Topical Response TR-N-4 and Topical Response TR-N-6. Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided 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.

PC01664-5

Comment:

What will you do about safety. LAX is one of the unsafest airports now?

Response:

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

PC01664-6

Comment:

Camp Pendleton in El Toro was a marine base and they flew jets just a few years ago! Why can't you use that wasted space and fly the passengers and cargo from there? I'm sure the passengers from Orange County would appreciate being closer to home when they arrive from their travels.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand for a discussion of the reasons why El Toro will not be converted to commercial aviation use. Camp Pendleton, in San Diego County, is a very active Marine Corps base. According to a recent statement by a high-ranking Navy official, the U.S. Navy has no plans for making any part of Camp Pendleton available for civil aviation use.

PC01664-7

Comment:

Why can't we feel safe in our own home and town?

Response:

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

PC01665

Villa, Kuei

None Provided

7/21/2001

PC01665-1

Comment:

I am strongly opposed to all Master Plan provisions that will create more pollution, congestion, and potential safety problems for myself and my family.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed 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.

PC01665-2**Comment:**

I live only a few minutes from LAX. I believe that more flights and passengers at LAX will adversely affect my health and quality of life.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC01665-3**Comment:**

I would like to see a regional solution implemented.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to 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.

PC01665-4**Comment:**

I oppose any secret and or corrupt agreements between politicians, bureaucrats and others.

Response:

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

PC01666 Putnam, Heather None Provided**PC01666-1****Comment:**

As a new resident of El Segundo, I have been sadly amazed at the environmental difficulties imposed by LAX. The quality of life is diminished due to large traffic, smog and noise pollution problems. Therefore, I was shocked to know an expansion of LAX had been proposed.

Response:

Comment noted. 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. 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, 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.

PC01666-2**Comment:**

This letter is to send my STONG OBJECTION to any expansion of LAX. I support expanding other Southern California airports instead.

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

PC01666-3

Comment:

My father was a pilot, so I grew up with a love of airports, flying and the entire industry. I still enjoy watching planes, and enjoy the industry which flourishes due to cargo transportation. However, the cities in the LAX area have hit their saturation point.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01666-4

Comment:

My main concerns are centered around:

- Increased air pollution due to increased planes and trucking
- Increased noise, particularly at night due to cargo plane schedules
- Increased traffic on the 405 freeway
- Increased traffic on Sepulveda
- Decreased standard of living in surrounding areas

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; traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; and economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socioeconomics. 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, Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand, Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase, and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC01666-5

Comment:

Please consider building up Ontario, Chino or (hopefully) El Toro airports instead of LAX. Those areas could better handle the associated congestion and environmental impacts.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, for information on El Toro, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario International Airport and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC01667 Lehne, Mr. & Mrs. None Provided 7/23/2001
John

PC01667-1

Comment:

This plan does not serve the residents of this community. Westchester has revitalized to a community with long time residents and new growing families.

Response:

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

PC01667-2

Comment:

This neighborhood will be highly impacted by traffic, noise, and congestion introduced by the development of Playa Vista. The airport master plan as proposed will only add noise, pollution, traffic and negatively impact the quality of life and property values in this 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. For details on how the future traffic demand from the Playa Vista development was incorporated in the Draft EIS/EIR, please see Topical Response TR-ST-2. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts to quality of life and Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding residential property values.

PC01667-3

Comment:

Other alternatives must be provided that utilize other airport facilities.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to 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.

PC01668 Dynda, Marilyn None Provided

PC01668-1

Comment:

I am outraged at even the mention of LAX much less the proposed Master Plan. The Dynda Family has already been displaced by LAX expansion - North Runway back in 1971 - and we moved to the Northeast section of Westchester where it once was quiet.

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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester and Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

PC01668-2

Comment:

Over the years as more aircraft used the facilities the noise has drastically increased and my windows and floor vibrate.

Response:

Information on noise vibration can be found in Topical Response TR-N-8. Please also 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 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.

PC01668-3

Comment:

And now we are being gassed!! Yes gassed - by the smell of the fumes

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding odors.

PC01668-4

Comment:

God only knows what it is doing to our lungs. In fact, the cadets at the new police academy experience breathing difficulties during exercises. These breathing problems they don't experience at home.

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, and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PC01668-5

Comment:

About soundproofing. Residents live in L.A. for the marvelous year around climate to enjoy the outdoors - their back yards, patios, pools, etc. Are we suppose to shut our homes to an artificial environment so LAX can devour Westchester and surrounding communities? Is this anyway to live?

Response:

Please see Topical Response Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program, TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels, and TR-LU-2 for an analysis of potential effects on the community of Westchester.

PC01668-6**Comment:**

Make the present monster compatible, if you can, and move on!

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-121 regarding opportunities to alleviate impacts associated with past or present airport activities.

PC01669**Roy, Channon****None Provided****7/20/2001****PC01669-1****Comment:**

I am writing you to voice my concern and 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 that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01669-2**Comment:**

I live in the south west corner of El Segundo and am barraged with plane noise and missed approaches that seem to be landing on the roof of our town home. More flights, be it passenger or cargo will only exacerbate this ongoing problem.

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). The fly around (missed approach) pattern in the area will remain unchanged to assure safety of flight. For those alternatives with projected numbers of daily operations equivalent to baseline conditions (Alternatives No Action/No Project, C and D) the numbers of missed approaches should not change, and improved separation criteria and sequencing of operations may reduce them. For those alternatives with substantially increased operations (Alternatives A and B) the average number of arrivals on the runway will be reduced because a third approach runway is added in each alternative. Consequently, the number of missed approaches should be reduced. For further information about turns over El Segundo, please see Topical Response TR-N-3, particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2, and Subtopical Response TR-N-3.4, and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increases.

PC01669-3**Comment:**

The traffic on Sepulveda Blvd. is extremely heavy, due to the poor planning of exit off the 105 freeway. More passenger flights will only make this already overcrowded street even worse.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC01669-4

Comment:

Smog-forming emissions will be tripled, in an area already famous for its smog.

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.

PC01669-5

Comment:

A regional airport plan must be the alternative to expanding 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.

PC01669-6

Comment:

The EIR must analyze the impacts associated with a volume that could be as high as 120 million annual passengers.

Response:

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

PC01670	Webster, Scott H. & Lori A.	None Provided	7/19/2001
----------------	--	----------------------	------------------

PC01670-1

Comment:

We are concerned about all issues relating to the proposed 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.

PC01670-2**Comment:**

Traffic is bad enough already in Westchester - expansion of LAX will only add to it.

Response:

The Master Plan would help to separate regional airport traffic from local traffic and satisfy future airport traffic demand while mitigating impacts to the surrounding street system. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester.

PC01670-3**Comment:**

We don't want any more noise pollution. Our home is on the bluff in North Kentwood & we can hear the planes as they circle to land in the evenings. Years ago, that never happened, we never had airport noise. If the airport expands, how much more noise can we expect?

Response:

Information regarding future noise increases is provided in Alternative-Specific Abatement Opportunities in Section 7.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, particularly 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. Also, please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increases.

PC01670-4**Comment:**

Obviously, air pollution is a major concern. We don't need any more aircraft adding to it

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01670-5**Comment:**

We urge all involved to look to other areas for increased air traffic, such as Ontario and 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 and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, for information on El Toro, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario International Airport.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01671 Chen, Sherry None Provided 7/20/2001

PC01671-1

Comment:

I strongly oppose LAX Master Plan to expand 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.

PC01672 Sorensen, Cory None Provided 7/18/2001

PC01672-1

Comment:

* I don't think that LAX has to bear the burden of all the air travel in LA and Surrounding areas. Why can't we spread it out. Palmdale, Ontario, Orange County, all have room. Cargo Flights could Fly into outer areas to ease Truck Traffic. The air traffic in LAX is too much as it is. It Creates too much Noise Pollution as well as air Pollution.

There are So many other options! Why does LAX have to increase it's size and volume. Lets spread it around! I love my neighborhood and I don't need anymore noise or pollution and neither do my neighbors.

Response:

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

PC01673 Smith, Jack None Provided 7/23/2001

PC01673-1

Comment:

The proposed LAX expansion plan is a poor plan which subjects both the residents and businesses to unreasonable & unwanted 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.

PC01673-2

Comment:

1. What assurance will the Commisioners give to the public that there are no further expansion plans beyond the current plan?

Response:

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

PC01673-3

Comment:

2. Considering the current traffic congestion on Sepulveda Blvd. In Westchester and on the 405 Fwy. I believe that traffic congestion will be much worse and travel times will show a major increase.

Response:

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

PC01673-4

Comment:

3. Homes in the 65 CNEL - If people are forced to remain indoors with their doors and windows closed they may become very traumatized . Therefor expansion of the 65 CNEL area is very undesirable.

Response:

As stated in Table 13 of Technical Report 1, Land Use Technical Report, in the Draft EIS/EIR, under 1996 baseline conditions, a population of approximately 48,988 residents are within the 65 CNEL or greater noise contour. As presented in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, Table S3, under Year 2000 conditions, a population of approximately 52,619 residents would be within the 65 CNEL or greater noise contour. As indicated by these numbers, areas exposed to high noise levels continue to be heavily populated. In addition, parks currently exposed to high noise levels, such as Dockweiler Beach State Park and Vista Del Mar Park, are heavily used. Therefore, based on current conditions there is no evidence to suggest that people are forced to remain indoors or are traumatized by exposure to the 65 CNEL area. 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 that would result from development of the build alternatives and mitigation measures that would reduce exposure of noise-sensitive uses to high noise levels. Also refer to Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program.

PC01673-5

Comment:

4. Air Pollution so bad now that, for instance, the solid particles of the total emissions must be cleaned every day (indoors and outdoors)

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC01673-6

Comment:

5. Considering the frequency of "Near Misses" what assurance does the government provide that the AIR CONTROLLER SYSTEM will be upgraded to meet these increased requirements?

Response:

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

PC01673-7

Comment:

6. What possible explanation can be provided to explain why the "REGIONAL

7. SOLUTION" is ignored since the City of Los Angeles owns the Ontario and Palmdale 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, Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale, and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC01674 Karp, Peggy & David None Provided

7/24/2001

PC01674-1

Comment:

This is to verify our opposition to LAX expansion for the following reasons:

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC01674-2

Comment:

Noise - There is already too much flight noise in Westchester.

Response:

Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of master plan alternative on the community of Westchester.

PC01674-3

Comment:

Safety - Increased flights would increase the possibility of an air collision in a densely populated area.

Response:

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

PC01674-4**Comment:**

Home Values - Even if eminent domain were to occur, where would affected Westchester homeowners be able to buy another home in the LA area for the same amount of money.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00040-46. Also see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding the effects of LAX on property values and Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation issues, including affordable housing.

PC01674-5**Comment:**

Traffic - With Playa Vista the 405 will be impassible. No LAX traffic increase!

Response:

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

PC01675 No Author Identified, None Provided**PC01675-1****Comment:**

Re: LAX EXPANSION PLAN
It is a bad plan. It is a dangerous plan. It is an unacceptable plan.

Response:

Comment noted. The safety impacts of the project were addressed in Section 4.24.3, Safety, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data in Technical Report 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.

PC01675-2**Comment:**

The communities in the area of and adjacent to LAX have been exposed to and subjected to expansion and changes for a long time. The growth has accelerated in all areas in and around LAX resulting in increased noise, air pollution and exploding traffic. Addition of many new structures, condos, apartments, office buildings and retail stores will bring a population increase of great magnitude. Case in point: Playa Vista and Marina del Rey.

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.

PC01675-3**Comment:**

Enough is enough! Solution: Develop and enlarge facilities of other major airports (Ontario and Palmdale for example) Travel by air from these expanded facilities would be a plus for outlying communities and lessen convergence on 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.

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.

PC01676 Frizzell, Marvin Dean None Provided

PC01676-1

Comment:

My name is Marvin Dean Frizzell and have lived in El Segundo for 14 years .My Grandmother has lived in El Segundo since the mid 1940s, so I know first hand of the increase in noise and air pollution created by LAX .I live at 645 W .Pine Ave and my Grandmother lives at 647 W. Pine Ave.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01676-2

Comment:

We are appalled by any thought of more aircraft taking off or landing at LAX . We are under consistent noise from early morning deep into the next early morning. Every single day!

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.

PC01676-3

Comment:

I miss sleep every night from being woke-up by rumbling aircraft.

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.

PC01676-4**Comment:**

My windows rattle every day and cannot watch TV. without turning the volume very high. I must time my talking on the phone between aircraft taking off and landing. It is impossible to have a conversation in my back yard without raising your voice over the constant noise from LAX . We even have very low aircraft fly directly over our houses on occasions. We feel that there is way to much aircraft noise now and know more volume at LAX would decrease our quality of life even more.

Response:

Please see Subtopical Response TR-N-8.2 regarding vibration effects from aircraft operations; Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels; Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding residential sound insulation under the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP), how to file noise complaints, and how approval of the LAX Master Plan would revise the ANMP; and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding quality of life. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

PC01676-5**Comment:**

I work in Hollywood which is 25 miles from my home .It now takes me 1 hour to get there. The 405 Fwy is jammed everyday and Sepulveda Blvd is grid locked daily. The over flow of people trying to avoided the 405 and Sepulveda has even made alternate routes undesirable and time consuming.

Response:

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

PC01676-6**Comment:**

I Strongly Oppose Any 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.

PC01677**Green, Patricia****None Provided****7/21/2001****PC01677-1****Comment:**

As long time residents of Westchester, we have learned to live with the noise, pollution, and congestion that living near an airport demands.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC01677-2

Comment:

However, we feel strongly that the burden should be shared by all that use the airport, not just the neighbors. We strongly support the development of regional airports.

Response:

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

PC01677-3

Comment:

We are concerned about our health. There will be increased air pollution if the airport expands. All 4 members of our family now have respiratory problems.

Response:

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

PC01678

Wood, Linda

None Provided

7/19/2001

PC01678-1

Comment:

I am writing on behalf of myself and my parents, My parents have resided in Westchester for over 40 years. I was born and raised in Westchester and I am concerned with former Mayor Riordan's LAX Expansion 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.

PC01678-2

Comment:

I cannot imagine wanting to expand an airport that lies in the heart of a densely populated, over crowded city. When I think of many the other International airports that I've landed at, I've seen results of plans where the airport was deliberately placed away from the major city. Denver's International

airport is an example. Dallas is another. Why can't Palmdale be used in that same capacity? Palmdale would not only serve San Fernando Valley but other counties as well.

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.

PC01678-3

Comment:

Noise & Pollution:

Over the years, I've watched my parents' house near the LAX get noisier and noisier.

Response:

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

PC01678-4

Comment:

Eventually the airport paid the price of contracting with a company to install sound proofing measures at my parents' home to cut down on the noise. This idea works as long as one stays in the house with everything closed up. My parents cannot now entertain outside due to the noise. What happens when the airport expansion increases the decibel level? They cannot open a window at present.

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. To achieve the full benefits of the ANMP program, windows need to be closed. As described in Topical Response TR-LU-3, the residential soundproofing program would be revised to include noise-sensitive uses newly exposed to high noise levels.

PC01678-5

Comment:

The pollution is a real serious issue. Everything that remains outdoors at my parents' home has a layer of soot on it each day. When my mother hangs the clothes on the clothesline, I have noticed a thin layer of soot on the clothes the next day. The outdoor furniture, chairs, cars and patio are always covered with a dark dusty soot. In time, this will only get worse with airport expansion.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding soot.

PC01678-6

Comment:

Pollution will cover an even broader geographical area as we increase the airport usage.

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 increase.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01678-7

Comment:

Safety:

There is already a crisis with the lack of air traffic capacity. My parents' house is just north of the north runway. While lying in bed at night there have been many "near miss" flights when an aircraft is off course and comes rumbling overhead. Fog is another consideration. Fog causes delays. If a flight must land in these circumstances the risk of a ground disaster in a populated area increases.

Response:

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

PC01678-8

Comment:

We need a more regional plan for future growth. Already the LAX southbay area is not an area that people want to visit. With traffic a mess the visitor just want to "get out" of L.A. This will only get worse in the next 10 years. These once quiet family communities that I grew up in, have already had to pay a huge price! My family and I oppose the Master Plan not only because it affects our community and our standard of living, it affects all of the citizens of Los Angeles County.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. 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.

PC01679

Farnum, Margaret

None Provided

7/23/2001

PC01679-1

Comment:

The kindest word to describe the EIS/EIR for the LAX PROPOSED MASTER PLAN IMPROVEMENTS is "deficient". From a layman's perspective, the 12,000-page document is overwhelming, and not overly enlightening nor reassuring for those truly impacted by this elephant of a project. There is no assurance that growth ends here.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01679-2

Comment:

A L T E R N A T I V E S

Most glaring omission in the alternatives to LAX expansion is Regional Airports - Palmdale, Ontario, El Toro in Orange County. It points up the insensitive attitude of the FAA for the approximate 16 million persons in Los Angeles & Orange Counties.

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. The Draft EIS/EIR considered several regional scenarios, including the build out of a commercial airport at the closed Marine Corps Air Station El Toro. Please also 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, and shifts the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region.

PC01679-3

Comment:

H E A R I N G S

Why were the three hearings held on the same day? Why were they not scheduled on three different weekends to allow those who were on vacation, at funerals, weddings, meetings, et al, to also have an opportunity to be heard? Why were hearings not scheduled in Palmdale, Inland Empire or even Orange County since those persons are impacted if they use air travel?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 for a listing of all public hearings.

PC01679-4

Comment:

S A F E T Y

With LAX now leading the nation in "near-misses", the response on 4-58 of the Executive Summary - "LAWA, as operator of LAX, also serves a lead role in providing for, and maintaining, the high level of aviation safety that exists at the airport", is questionable. If this is "high level" safety, such proposed increase in air traffic at LAX is of great concern. All mitigations noted should have happened prior to the 78 million passenger capacity the FAA has thrust upon this landing site, and the citizens in the various communities and cities surrounding this airport. An incident at LAX, impacts an entire neighborhood on streets and freeways for hours, increases environmental pollutants, and costs millions.

Response:

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

PC01679-5

Comment:

E N V I R O N M E N T

The report does not adequately address the pollution of an area that was nearly pollutant-free when we moved here 43 years ago. If all of the "remedies" noted in the EIR worked, why have the pollutant levels in the airport and South Bay area escalated? The near-gridlock status of Westchester and 405 Freeway vehicular traffic (including the nearby Hughes and Playa Vista developments which are significant impacts) and aircraft emissions, all generate increased amounts of carbon monoxide, benzene, NOX, Sox, et cetera. It now takes three or four signal changes just to exit our neighborhood streets - adding to the pollutants and congestion.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00070-1.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01679-6

Comment:

These carcinogenics compromise our air, ocean, land, but most of all the health of those in Culver City, El Segundo, Inglewood, Playa Del Rey, Westchester and surrounding areas.

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-1 regarding air pollutant deposition and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC01679-7

Comment:

Additionally, there is the oil and grime that fall from the planes upon our cars, homes, lawns and the air we breathe.

Response:

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

PC01679-8

Comment:

Who compensates people for loss of quality of life and medical costs for respiratory and cancer illnesses?

Response:

Please see 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.

PC01679-9

Comment:

The AQMD and EPA should have great concerns for air quality in our basin with crisscrossing traffic, congested freeways and streets funneling into one targeted airport to handle air transportation for all Southern California. How can this qualify for "no significant environmental impact" when these pollutants impact our lives, our children, grandchildren. . .and universe?

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts relative to air quality, including traffic air emissions, in Section 4.6.9, Level of Significance After Mitigation, of both documents.

PC01679-10

Comment:

"Significance Assessment: By 2015 the analysis shows all three Master Plan Alternatives would result in unavoidable significant impacts for all five criteria pollutants emissions over the Environmental Baseline, including NO ACTION/NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE". With this EIS/EIR quote, how is the environmental pollutant mitigated except by Regional Airports?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01196-12 regarding air quality impacts and further mitigation measures. Please refer to Topical Response TR-RC-1 for information regarding the role of the LAX Master Plan in the regional approach to meeting aviation demand.

PC01679-11

Comment:

FUTURE GROWTH

By documenting available land in the vicinity of LAX, Palmdale, Ontario/Inland Empire, and El Toro, you can predict where future growth will occur. Knowledgeable persons can grasp the significance of having ample land to build a state-of-the-art airport with sufficient parking at Palmdale and El Toro NOW to be prepared for the future. With all major city airports facing growth problems, our federal representatives should be studying public transit funding to access outlying areas where the growth will take place. Pressure should be placed on the FAA to restrict expanding within major cities. The infrastructure of sewers, electricity and water are dangerously near a crisis state in the dense areas of all major cities.

Response:

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

Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand. Please note that the role of the FAA is to ensure the safe and efficient use of navigable air space in the United States.

PC01679-12

Comment:

TRAFFIC/PARKING

Requiring traffic to flow from all points north, east and south, tipping west to LAX, does not give consideration to persons living in outlying regions. Nearby air transportation should be accessible for all without having to travel great distance upon heavily burdened freeways and streets,

3. Comments and Responses

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 proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. For additional information 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. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC01679-13

Comment:

with little or no parking on arrival,

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included assessments of parking access congestion and parking space availability under each of the Master Plan alternatives in Section 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation.

PC01679-14

Comment:

long ticket lines in which to stand, and rewarded with late departures and/or waiting on the tarmac for empty gates to disembark.

Allowing growth to exceed 78 M passengers at a facility built for 40 M is gross negligence. No mitigation can significantly solve this except a NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE. . .and restricting the FAA to 68 M passengers at a site built for 40 M. If getting to and from the airport, playing dodge-cars through traffic is frustrating for those who live here, how miserable for those coming from outlying areas. Why must LAX be the only choice?

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC00928-3 for information regarding the ability of the FAA and LAWA to limit activity at an airport. Please refer to Response to Comment PC00297-9 for a discussion of the use of other airports as an alternative to development at LAX. 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.

PC01679-15

Comment:

N O I S E

Noise abatement solutions listed are weak and not acceptable in predominate residential communities with numerous churches and schools. Insulated windows may assist in keeping out noise, but it also presents a prison-like life style. You've lost the freedom of having open windows for fresh air and the smell of flowers. With closed windows on hot days, you've created a steam bath. The mitigations did not mention FAA supplying air conditioning for thousands of homes that do not now need it.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program (or ANMP), which includes alterations to existing ventilation systems or a new system to maintain fresh air circulation. Sound insulation currently provided to affected schools and proposed mitigation under the LAX Master Plan are also described in Topical Response TR-LU-3. The

ANMP provides for sound insulation of other noise-sensitive uses within the 65 CNEL noise contour including churches. Also please see Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding land use/noise mitigation.

PC01679-16

Comment:

How are school athletic teams, pony and little leagues, soccer, backyard barbecues/picnics, swimming and beach parties insulated from the noise and air pollution? Complete sentences are impossible at Dockweiler Beach with plane departures.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels, including Dockweiler Beach.

PC01679-17

Comment:

Not only quality of life, but hearing and health are compromised.

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

PC01679-18

Comment:

PERSONAL EXPERIENCE

My son's Westchester home backs up to Manchester Boulevard. The noise has increased in closeness and in loudness. He applied to LAWA about two or three years ago to be placed on the list for noise abatement for his house and was told that money was not appropriated for that area as it was not in the impacted zone. The noise has increased as flights, whether approved or not, have been encroaching much closer to Manchester. One night, a few months ago, we were talking on the phone when a plane came so close and so low that it drowned out my son's conversation. All I could hear from his phone was plane noise. Since he must sleep during the day when working at night, he again requested help. He was again told he was outside the affected boundaries. Since then we have seen copies of documents that were signed for insulation, stating you will never sue, and some that resulted in liens.

Response:

The noise impact area which determines residential uses eligible for sound insulation under the ANMP is described in Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4 and is based on the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL noise contour. Noise-sensitive uses exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour under the 1996 baseline were described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3), and shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Noise-sensitive uses exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour under Year 2000 conditions were described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3), and shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As shown on these respective figures, under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions the area within the 65 CNEL noise contour has decreased compared to the ANMP contour, which continues to define the area of eligibility for sound insulation. Although this is a comment on existing noise levels and conditions, the general focus of the document, pursuant to NEPA and CEQA, was 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-3.12, regarding how noise complaints are filed and handled, and Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.14 for a description of how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP, which includes incorporating residential dwelling units newly exposed to high single event noise levels into the ANMP. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise

3. Comments and Responses

levels. The document referred to by the commentor is an aviation easement. The current requirement of an aviation easement and how this requirement would be affected under the LAX Master Plan is described in Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.13.

PC01679-19

Comment:

There is a statement in the Report, I have been told, which notes that the airport construction noise will be no louder than the airplane noise. What a damning admission. The construction would eventually go away, but the increased plane noise remains. To those living in this area, this is a SIGNIFICANT IMPACT!

Response:

Construction noise associated with the development of the airfield would eventually go away. Aircraft noise will continue as long as there is an airport at the LAX site. 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.

PC01679-20

Comment:

QUOTES FROM EIS/EIR

"No community relocation is to be considered unless it can be justified on a cost/benefit basis." Please define.

Response:

Master Plan decisions based on a cost/benefit analysis are typically made when the economic benefits, rewards, or output of project actions and activities outweigh the associated costs or expenditures. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-117 regarding the land acquisition and relocation costs associated with Alternatives A, B, and C, as detailed in Technical Report 5, Economic Impacts of Los Angeles International Airport and the LAX Master Plan Alternatives on the Los Angeles Regional Economy, and summarized in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, of the Draft EIS/EIR. As was addressed in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics (subsection 4.4.1.6), by 2015 implementation of Alternatives A, B, and C would result in a net increase of between 17,695 and 40,408 jobs over 1996 baseline conditions (plus indirect and induced employment growth) and would have a positive direct impact on the regional economy of between \$82.1 and \$83.7 billion (plus indirect and induced economic growth); construction expenditures would yield between approximately 97,836 and 109,944 jobs, which in turn would generate indirect and induced employment, as well as between approximately \$19.4 and \$24.5 billion in net economic output in Los Angeles County. As such, the economic benefits of the Master Plan are considered to outweigh community relocation costs. Comparable data for LAWA staff's new preferred alternative, Alternative D, is provided in Technical Report S-3, Supplemental Economic Impacts Technical Report, and an associated analysis was provided in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The completed LAWA relocation plan will describe the means to ensure all persons displaced from their acquired homes will be provided a comparable replacement dwelling. If a shortage of comparable replacement dwellings is encountered LAWA will undertake housing of last resort procedures, as necessary, to provide comparable replacement housing, as shown to be most cost effective.

PC01679-21

Comment:

"The airport should be able to accommodate a variety of terminal configurations potentially involving a reconfiguration of exiting component parts in an ideal form". What is an "ideal form". . .and why was the plan not included in the document?

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 satisfy aircraft parking requirements and improve aircraft movement on the ground. As part of the West Terminal expansion, midfield satellite concourses will be built. The headhouse/satellite configuration is the most efficient way of providing the required separation between moving aircraft within taxilanes and allowing free-flow traffic to occur between taxiways.

The existing Central Terminal area is constrained by the existing landside infrastructure and airside configuration. However, Alternatives A, B, and C provide solutions to improve the parking and movement of aircraft between today's congested channels.

Following the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA developed a new alternative that, consistent with public comments calling for a regional approach alternative, is designed to accommodate passenger and cargo activity at LAX that would approximate those of the No Action/No Project Alternative, has fewer environmental impacts, and improves airport safety and security.

Alternative D would result in the demolition of Terminals 1, 2, and 3 which would be replaced by a linear concourse. A new west satellite would be constructed west of TBIT in the headhouse/satellite configuration.

PC01679-22

Comment:

"Ability to minimize acquisitions of residential property, highly improve commercial and maximize buffer potential between community and airport envelope." Please explain "minimize" and "maximize" in this context.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see also Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition/relocation.

PC01679-23

Comment:

"It is recognized that the ramp frontage and other functional requirements beyond forecast period may exceed physical capacity of the selected terminal options. For this reason, it is important that the terminal refinement process offer sufficient flexibility to accommodate further changes and additional development that may occur beyond the forecast horizon of the LAX master plan". And, when does it end?

Response:

The size of the proposed terminal facilities is in balance with proposed landside and airside capacity of the alternative. All facilities should be designed with the goal of providing maximum flexibility to allow for future changes in operations. However, the alternatives are not designed to handle activity beyond what is analyzed for the specific alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01679-24

Comment:

OBSERVATIONS

It is unconscionable to inflict on a small but dense segment of Los Angeles the burden of air transportation for millions of Southern Californians. There is an urgent need for REGIONAL AIRPORTS!

Response:

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

PC01679-25

Comment:

There is a need to legislate laws, regulating the FAA and airports, establishing maximum limits. . . 78 M passengers for us. It is inappropriate for a constituency which is ordained by the Preamble and Constitution to be guaranteed "domestic tranquility, common defence, and blessings of liberty" to be deprived of its quality of life by oppressive impaction of noise/air pollution, and excessive traffic. Are Westchester residents destined for "endangered species" status?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01018-29 regarding the authority of the FAA and LAWLA to limit future activity at airports. As described therein, Alternative D-Enhanced Safety and Security Plan is designed for an activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01679-26

Comment:

Any document punctuated with "preliminary", "general" "assumes", "constrained concepts", "potentially", "explore", "no boundary constraints were set", "mitigate, "minimizes impact", "as much as possible", "lowest disruption", "subjective assessment of potential impacts to Dunes, ocean, air quality and neighborhood tranquility", "sufficient flexibility to accommodate further changes and additional development that may occur beyond the forecast horizon of the LAX Master Plan" is SUSPECT!

How reassuring is the phrase "While desirable, post 2015 expansion is not a primary actor in the option evaluation"?

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01680 Hudson, Michael None Provided 7/24/2001

PC01680-1

Comment:

Airport Expansions should be done equitably between the various airports in the Southland - LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, & El Toro. It would be unfair for the neighborhoods around LAX to suffer a poorer quality of life because of too much expansion without first making sure that the other airports are handling their fair share of 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.

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.

PC01681 McDermott, Michael None Provided 7/23/2001

PC01681-1

Comment:

I am opposed to LAX Expansion plan for the following reasons:

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC01681-2

Comment:

1. It will ruin the Westchester community and business district as we now know 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, 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.

PC01681-3

Comment:

2. Increased traffic on surface streets

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the Congestion Management Program.

PC01681-4

Comment:

& the 405 will make a bad situation worse, much 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.

PC01681-5

Comment:

3. Increased air & noise pollution from cars & planes, leading to health concerns.

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, 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.

PC01681-6**Comment:**

4. Safety, Already LAX has some of the most near misses of any major airport. Increasing flights can only make it more dangerous!

Response:

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

PC01681-7**Comment:**

5. The most logical & reasonable solution is a regional approach to air travel and congestion that can be alleviated by that type of solution. Trying to expand LAX is like trying to force a round peg in a square hole.

Response:

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

PC01681-8**Comment:**

6. Last but not least, as a long-time resident, business and home owner I believe the expansion will cause more harm than good will be detrimental to my business and to my & family's quality of life!

Response:

Comment noted. LAWA Staff's new preferred Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC01682

**McAnany, Tim &
Nancy**

None Provided

7/24/2001

PC01682-1**Comment:**

We do not want any expansion at LAX. It is time for the other cities to do their fair share to help combat the increased flights.

We have been residents of Westchester and Playa del Rey for the last 30 years and seen marked increase in noise, pollution, traffic and congestion.

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. 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.

PC01682-2

Comment:

We suggest you move the freight elsewhere to allow room for passenger flights.

Push for El Toro and Mojave to have major airports-LAX should not be the only source of travel in Southern California.

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. 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.

PC01682-3

Comment:

We worry about our Property values and increased building will mean more noise and lower our values. The towns of Playa del Rey, El Segundo, Inglewood and important communities and should be considered.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding the effects of LAX on property values.

PC01682-4

Comment:

LAX IS NOT THE ONLY :SOURCE OF TRAVEL IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Please do not expand.....

Response:

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

PC01683**Roberts, Holly****None Provided****7/24/2001****PC01683-1****Comment:**

I believe that LAX should be updated and is currently experiencing many problems in its operations due to this fact. However, the expansion does not make sense. Once the construction is completed in 2015 we will be faced with the same problems that we face now.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC00297-9 regarding the development of other airports as an alternative to development at LAX. 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.

PC01683-2**Comment:**

We need to develop our other airports at Palmdale and Ontario as a solution and not a "quick fix" by expanding LAX.

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

PC01683-3**Comment:**

The EIR/EIS claims to have researched noise impacts on a daily average. This measure is very misleading in its findings. The noise levels should be reported at the maximum CNEL levels that the neighborhoods experience. During rain and Santa Ana conditions the flight patterns are reversed and the noise levels are extreme now. What will the CNEL's be then? People don't hear noise on a daily weighted average they hear noise during loud single events.

Response:

In accordance with both federal and state environmental guidance, noise contours are presented in CNEL for the average annual condition. Noise levels do change from day to day dependent upon wind and weather conditions. During days of east traffic flow, the daily CNEL contour would be much larger than the average annual condition because it would reflect the prevalence of departure noise. However, departure operations at the airport occur to the east only about 2-5 percent of the time. The principal purpose of the noise contour pattern is to guide the delineation of boundaries of noise mitigation. Consequently, the average, rather than the extreme condition of noise is mapped. The document presents information in tabular form related to the single event levels and amount of time per average day that many areas around the airport would be exposed to noise of different loudness. Information on these concepts is presented in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR and in particular the section on site location analysis. Appendix S-C, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, and Appendix S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, of the

3. Comments and Responses

Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provides an analysis of single-event noise impacts. See also Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences.

PC01683-4

Comment:

Our current freeways and streets can't handle traffic now

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01683-5

Comment:

and our area is expanding with other projects such as Playa Vista and Marina projects.

Response:

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

PC01683-6

Comment:

The proposed road improvements under the Master Plan will not mitigate our traffic problem.

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. As explained in the Draft EIS/EIR, the total package of improvements, including the Ring Road, LAX Expressway, and the proposed mitigation measures, would mitigate the project impacts to the extent feasible. There is also anticipated to be a benefit to existing traffic regarding separating airport-related traffic from non-airport traffic. However, the proposed plan would not necessarily mitigate existing traffic congestion. Also, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4, Airport Area Traffic Concerns regarding existing congestion.

PC01683-7

Comment:

We currently experience some of the best air quality in Southern California. With the expansion you report that we will experience 1,302% increase in our smog level. I attended the workshop at the Furama Hotel and no where did I see that statistic displayed.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 concerning air pollution.

PC01683-8

Comment:

I am 100% behind improving and modernizing our airport we truly need this. I am 100% against LAX expansion. This is not a solution but an additional problem for our city. I urge you to give your support to "regionalizing" our airports. This is the only solution that makes sense.

Response:

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

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

PC01683-9

Comment:

I tried to keep this as brief as possible and to the facts as I understand them. Thank you for your attention and I look forward to hearing personally from you.

Response:

In accordance with the provisions of NEPA and CEQA, written responses to all comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR are provided herein as part of this Final EIS/EIR. The Final EIS/EIR has been made available for public review at FAA and LAWA and through distribution to public libraries throughout the area, and is available electronically at www.laxmasterplan.org. Responses to individual comments included in this comment letter are provided above.

PC01684	Lindstrom, Dean L. & Margie L.	None Provided	7/24/2001
----------------	---	----------------------	------------------

PC01684-1

Comment:

COMMENTS ON THE LAX MASTER PLAN

1. SAFETY- - This should be a major factor in both LAWA and FAA considerations regarding air traffic. The number of close calls and diversions over our home is already a serious concern. Any plan or alternative should be subject to Risk Assessment. Risk analysis is used regularly in space programs as well as nuclear power and other fields. This should be a part of the expansion evaluations. Of course, it only takes reasonable judgment that the plan put forward by LAWA increases the safety risks over present safety considerations.

Response:

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

PC01684-2

Comment:

2. TRAFFIC - - At the present time, the travel time from Westchester to any other destination is difficult and time consuming. The increase in passenger and cargo flights will almost isolate those of us living in Westchester. The time required for people from north and south of LAX already is excessive; the expansion will compound it. This happens to be one of our biggest concerns.

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-7 regarding Westchester Southside traffic.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01684-3

Comment:

3. CARGO - - It just doesn't make sense to expand air cargo in this tiny area. It only makes sense to get the cargo as close as possible to the source or customer. Now, a truck has to drive 125 miles north or south to make these deliveries. If no other changes were to be made, this is an important one for traffic, noise, pollution, and eventual cost.

Response:

Please see also Response to Comment PC00599-54 for more information about cargo activity. 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.

PC01684-4

Comment:

4. NOISE - - While many homes are being soundproofed, the noise when we are outside and when we have windows open already is excessive. What will it be like with more flights? This has to be distressing to parents, teachers, and the children in the schools.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels. As described in Topical Response TR-LU-3, under the LAX Master Plan the current noise mitigation program would be revised to include schools newly exposed to high single event noise levels that result in classroom disruption that are not subject to an existing aviation easement. A complete analysis of schools that would be exposed to high noise levels, significant noise increases, or single event noise levels that result in classroom disruption was presented in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6), of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increases.

PC01684-5

Comment:

5. AIR POLLUTION - - Last year, we traveled by car (white) from California to Illinois. In that 3 week period, we traveled through the desert, through mountains, and on dirt roads. After 2 weeks in Los Angeles, our car became dirtier than on the whole trip to Illinois. Our windows and outside tables show the same effects.

Response:

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

PC01684-6

Comment:

But more serious is what that pollution does to the human beings in this area. Figures for asthma and other allergies have shown the greater frequency of these problems near the airport. What about the school children??

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.

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.

PC01684-7

Comment:

6. COMMUNITY - - One of the statements made by expansion supporters is that expansion here will be good for business. I doubt that the 250 business that would be eliminated or moved would agree with that.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00013-5 for a discussion of business acquisition and relocation impacts, proposed collateral development at LAX Northside/Westchester Southside, and the proposed Preliminary Property Acquisition and Relocation Plan. Business acquisition and relocation impacts were addressed in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. While significant business relocation impacts would occur under each of the build Alternatives for certain types of land uses, the long-term economic benefits occurring over the life of the Master Plan (through 2015) would include increases in employment opportunities, annual property taxes, and business tax revenues. Please see Response to Comment PC01679-20 regarding the increased employment and economic output expected to result from Master Plan implementation.

PC01684-8

Comment:

The Ring Road is a terrible idea. It says to the people around that the El Segundo Blue butterflies and the cargo carriers are much more important than we are. It really hurts to have this community destroyed in this way. When we moved into our house 42 years ago, the airport was on the east side of Sepulveda Blvd. Then it moved to within 5 blocks of us. Now they want to move the north runway another 300 feet closer to us. What is next?

Response:

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 and acquisition in Chapter 3 and Section 4.2, Land Use. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the Community of Westchester and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. 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, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative), does not include any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester Business District. Further, it does not include the 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 would be provided to any person displaced from their home or business. Also please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 with regard to residential acquisition and relocation.

PC01684-9

Comment:

7. REGIONAL SOLUTION - - Developing the air transportation to the north and east, as well as the south, will be required long before the LAX expansion can be completed. So then we will need many more billions in addition to that planned for LAX. Where is the growth in population? In Los Angeles county, it is to the north and east. Where will the business growth be? Where the people are - in the north and east. A regional plan is the only plan that truly will provide an efficient, safe and cost effective plan for air transportation growth.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC01684-10

Comment:

This also will fit well with the plans of the State of California for building high speed rail in Southern California.

Response:

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

PC01684-11

Comment:

It so happens that we have been fortunate to have traveled to several other countries. Every other major city is expanding their airports well outside of the city limits. These include: Milan, Italy; Munich, Germany; Beijing, Shanghai, and Hong Kong, China. Why are they so far ahead of Los Angeles in this type of planning?

Response:

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

PC01685	Lauderback-Davis,	None Provided	7/24/2001
	Leslie		

PC01685-1

Comment:

As a resident of Westchester since 1978 I greatly fear the negative impact on my community of LAX expansion occurs - the traffic increase, the noise increase the pollution increase & the loss of Neilsen field & part of business district all would be undesirable.

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 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, 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. Nielsen field would not be lost but rather expanded in size under Alternatives A, B, and C. Under Alternative D it would remain in place, but would not be expanded. Note that under Alternative D, LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative, no acquisition would occur within the Westchester Business

3. Comments and Responses

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

PC01686 Farnum, William None Provided 7/23/2001
Daniel

PC01686-1

Comment:

THE DRAFT EIS/EIR IS DEFICIENT IN ITS EVIDENCE OF TRUE MITIGATION OF TRAFFIC, NOISE, AIR POLLUTION, OR LOSS OF QUALITY OF LIFE.

Response:

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

PC01686-2

Comment:

THERE IS NO SOLUTION TO THE NEED FOR MORE AIR TRANSPORTATION THAN TO CONCENTRATE ON REGIONAL AIRPORTS WITH BUS AND RAIL TRANSIT.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-3 high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC01687 LeBouf, Janet None Provided 7/23/2001

PC01687-1

Comment:

I am a 45 year resident of Westchester. Even in the large city of L.A. Westchester has that small town feel. I am not in favor of the expansion plan for L.A.X. I feel like Westchester has suffered enough because of the airport. We have lost many homes and schools (including mine) because of the airport and it's flight path. I feel we are exposed to more than enough traffic, toxins and noise from 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. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, schools in Section 4.27, Schools, relocation in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, 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 1, 2, 3, and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR, and Appendices S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-2, S-4, and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01687-2

Comment:

It is time to spread out some of the problems caused by airports to other areas. People from Orange County and other areas should not need to drive all the way to L.A.X. for their airport needs. For an area as populated as southern California we should have several good sized airports instead of just one massive one.

Response:

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

PC01688

Calhoun, Lynda

None Provided

7/23/2001

PC01688-1

Comment:

I was not planning to enter the fray regarding the expansion of LAX and the potential movement of General Aviation services to airports other than LAX. However, this weekend showed me that I simply must let you know my opinion, that of my 86-year-old mother and various neighbors when it comes to the LAX expansion which will affect everyone near the Santa Monica Airport.

Simply stated, we absolutely cannot take any more jet aircraft coming into Santa Monica Airport. The smell, noise and vibration are already at a terribly high dose. Expansion of LAX will cause General Aviation to enter our area even further.

For example, this weekend was warm. On a warm day, we like to have our windows and doors open. We cannot during numerous times of the day (with no air conditioning it's pretty uncomfortable and sitting in our yards is absolutely out) as the smell from the jet fuel makes us literally sick. The planes taxi to the runway which ends across the street from our house on a cul-de-sac named Sardis; they idle there and spread their foul fuel fumes all around.

If you were to cause General Aviation to close down or lessen at LAX, then we would suffer. No other way to put it. We would suffer from sickness at the terrible smell and annoyance at the low flying jets (they have to fly low in order to get on the runways asap since the runways are not very long, I assume). We are not bothered by other smaller craft which use apparently less smelly fuel and which fly at a reasonable distance above our homes. I rather like the drone of an old prop. Reminds me of simpler times when all those jets didn't destroy our quality of life.

So when you contemplate the making of more money with an expanding LAX, please think of us who must live with your decision. And please be kind.

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.

PC01689 Well, Carol None Provided 7/20/2001

PC01689-1

Comment:

I am writing to officially state my objection to any plans to expand L.A. International Airport. Our area is already unfairly burdened by all the extra traffic and associated pollution and congestion caused by the current size of LAX. To add more flights per day would be very irresponsible and make getting to and from the Airport impossible. As a recent traveler, I can tell you that my experience at LAX was not pleasant. The traffic going into the airport was backed up through the tunnel onto the 105 freeway. Once inside, the baggage claim took forever, and the escalators could not be turned on because there were so many people trying to get through the security checks, that everything was held up. If you want to spend a lot of money at LAX, how about doing something to make it a more pleasant experience for the weary traveler.

Response:

Comment noted. As was described in Chapter 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the proposed Master Plan build alternatives include numerous improvements at, and around, LAX including, but not limited to, improvements to the airfield, the passenger terminal, the on- and off-airport surface transportation system, and parking areas. These improvements are specifically intended and designed to improve the efficiency and quality of passenger service at LAX, as well as to reduce impacts to surrounding communities.

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

PC01689-2

Comment:

You really must think about regional airports and spread the traffic and volume of people out. Other communities want regional airports, why try to force a larger LAX within communities that do not want it. Start listening to the people. It is such a pleasure to visit other airports where one can come and go with no hassles. Let's have LAX become a pleasant experience, not the biggest airport in the world!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to 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.

PC01689-3

Comment:

You must look at all the negative impacts expanding LAX would cause. We need no more smog emissions, cargo traffic, diesel emissions, or gridlock in this area. I'm sure that if you conducted all the environmental impact evaluations required, expanding LAX would not even be considered.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC01690 Strohkendl, Gizelle None Provided 7/20/2001

PC01690-1

Comment:

The jets are not safe on our small runways and our many surrounding neighborhoods.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety at and near LAX. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-GEN-4 regarding potential environmental impacts at surrounding other airports as a result of the LAX Master Plan.

PC01690-2

The remainder of this comment letter is identical to form letter PFF; please refer to the responses to form letter PFF.

PC01691 Lavant, Ida None Provided 7/30/2001

PC01691-1

Comment:

I have been reporting excessive noise from both jets and props for several years (!) and, as of yet, nothing has been done.

I have lived in Santa Monica over 35 years and now, for the first time have seriously thought of leaving the area only because of the airport noise.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01691-2

The remainder of this comment letter is identical to form letter PFF; please refer to the responses to form letter PFF.

PC01692 Lauderback-Davis, Leslie None Provided 7/22/2001

PC01692-1

Comment:

As a resident of Westchester since 1978 I greatly fear the negative impact on my community of LAX expansion. It would be undesirable & harmful to have increased noise, traffic & pollution as well as the loss of part of our business district & Nielsen Field.

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 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, 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. Also, Nielsen field would not be lost but rather expanded in size under Alternatives A, B, and C. Under Alternative D, it would remain in place, but would not be expanded. Note that under Alternative D, LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative, no acquisition would occur within the Westchester Business District. Also, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC01692-2**Comment:**

Please consider the development of alternative airports - a much more sensible alternative & a boon to those 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.

PC01694**Mescher, Lisa****None Provided****7/21/2001****PC01694-1****Comment:**

I think the proposed expansion of LAX is nothing short of insane. If anything, a reduction plan should be considered. This area simply cannot sustain any additional airport growth. On the other hand, the idea of expanding the other regional airports sounds very reasonable and rational. Not only is there room for growth, it help the local economies and provide better convenience for its customers. Why must all the focus be on expanding LAX where there is already over-crowding and NO 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.

PC01694-2**Comment:**

I have lived and worked in El Segundo for over 14 years. Although my home is well insulated, sometimes the airplane noise is excruciating and has gotten worse over the years. Granted, I moved to this location knowing there was an airport next door. Accepting that fact, the South Bay area still happens to be a very nice place to live with lots to offer.. besides convenience to LAX. It is

3. Comments and Responses

inconceivable to think that LAX could impose itself any further on the surrounding communities and infrastructure.

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 public infrastructure in Section 4.25, Public Utilities, and Section 4.26, Public Services. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, and Technical Reports 1 and 16 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 and S-10 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see 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.

PC01694-3

Comment:

I am also a Realtor in my community. Property values in El Segundo and all the surrounding airport communities, have and will always be negatively impacted compared to their opposite neighborhoods, because of LAX. I shudder to think what our communities might become if the proposed expansion were to take place.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding the effects of LAX on property values.

PC01694-4

Comment:

The traffic is already a nightmare around the airport. For many years I have strictly avoided North Sepulveda during certain times of the day. The 105 East bound is ALWAYS backed up exiting to the airport. And forget the 405, the biggest traffic horror of them all. It was an incredible waste that the Green Line was not incorporated to help ease airport traffic.

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 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. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding rail and bus access to LAX.

PC01694-5

Comment:

Another major concern is the pollution. We are fortunate to live in a mild climate that does not warrant air conditioning, however, just recently I am considering installing air conditioning just to be able to breathe cleaner air and to help filter the noise from the planes. Even with the nice ocean breezes we enjoy, I still get a thin layer of grit/dust overnight on outdoor furniture. It is gross, and to think we breathe that... Well, I don't like to think about it!

Response:

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

PC01694-6**Comment:**

Certainly living near LAX negatively affects our quality of life in many ways already. It is time for LAX to be a good neighbor and discontinue any idea of expansion. People and communities have to matter, even to LAX. You are not doing Southern California any favors by forcing air travelers and freight businesses to cram into an already over-crowded 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 and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in a regional approach to meeting demand.

PC01695**Garbanati, James****None Provided****7/24/2001****PC01695-1****Comment:**

We are very concerned & upset at many of the LAX expansion plans. We depend on many of the businesses on Sepulveda Blvd. & wiping some of them out will decimate our 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, 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.

PC01695-2**Comment:**

We are very concerned and upset about the expansion plans of LAX airport. We depend on many of the businesses on Sepulveda Blvd. And wiping them out will alter this community forever in a very negative way. Shopping will be more difficult, opportunities for engaging with other community members will be diminished, and if these areas become industrial (related to cargo) we will experience great losses and have pushed on us many things that we do not want: added truck traffic, congestion in general, pollution and loss of the ambience that many of us moved here to experience. Would you like to live near huge cargo buildings?

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

3. Comments and Responses

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.

The areas proposed for acquisition under Alternatives A, B, and C are intended for portions of a ring road, an open space landscape buffer, and berms. No cargo or industrial uses are proposed to replace the businesses that would be acquired along Sepulveda Boulevard. 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, Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, (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 impacts to the community of Westchester, including traffic and air quality effects. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase. See also Topical Responses TR-ST-1, TR-ST-2, TR-ST-3, TR-ST-4, TR-ST-6, and TR-ST-7 regarding traffic impacts.

PC01695-3

Comment:

I am very concerned about noise. Even where we live (77th Place) it can (because of weather conditions or how the airport is operating, I don't know) the noise is often very loud. If we have guests, we have to close the windows to have peaceful conversations.

Response:

Information regarding future noise, was provided in Alternative-Specific Abatement Opportunities in Section 7.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, particularly 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. When wind or weather conditions require takeoffs to be made to the east, the conditions described by the commentor occur. These will not change under any of the proposed alternatives. However, 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. 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. As noted by the noise abatement procedures delineated in Topical Response TR-N-7, exceptions to the over-ocean procedures are available when weather of wind conditions require east traffic flow. Additionally, for more information about easterly arrivals at night, please see Topical Response TR-N-5 and particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-5.2. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester.

PC01695-4

Comment:

This inconvenience is rare now but I am very concerned what noise levels will be like if LAX expands, especially as bigger planes are allowed to land further north.

Response:

Section 4.2.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR, identified noise-sensitive uses and land areas that would be newly exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour or greater under Alternatives A, B, and C compared to 1996 baseline conditions. As described in Topical Response TR-LU-3, residential uses newly exposed to the 65 CNEL contour are eligible for sound insulation under the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP). In addition, Section 4.2.6 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR identified noise-sensitive uses and land areas that would be newly exposed to the 65 CNEL contour compared to Year 2000 conditions for Alternatives A, B, and C as well as a new Alternative D. Section 4.2.6 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR also provided a comparison of Alternative D to 1996 baseline conditions and presented a new

analysis of single event noise levels that result in nighttime awakening (defined by the 94 SEL noise contour). Due to the phasing out of older, noisier Stage 2 jets and the acquisition of residential uses within Manchester Square and Belford, the number of dwelling units to the north of LAX, in the community of Westchester, exposed to high noise levels (as defined by the 65 CNEL and 94 dBA SEL contours) would decrease under all of the build alternatives compared to 1996 and Year 2000 conditions, with the greatest reduction in noise exposure occurring under Alternative D. As described in Topical Response TR-LU-2, under Alternative D, the Westchester community would experience an overall decrease of 4,431 units exposed to 65 CNEL noise levels and 5,957 units exposed to single event noise levels of 94 dBA SEL compared to 1996 baseline conditions. However, even with the overall reduction in noise exposure, some areas north of the airport, within Westchester, would be newly exposed to the 65 CNEL and 94 dBA SEL contours under all alternatives. As was shown on Figures S4.2-10 and S4.2-11, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the greatest increase in exposure to significant noise levels compared to 1996 baseline conditions would be under Alternative B. As was shown on Figures S4.2-16 and S4.2-18, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D would have the least amount of noise-sensitive uses newly exposed to these high noise levels compared to 1996 baseline conditions. As was presented in Section 4.2.8 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, under mitigation measures MM-LU-1 and MM-LU-2, residential uses newly exposed to the 65 CNEL or 94 dBA SEL contour would be eligible for sound insulation under the revised ANMP.

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding quality of life, Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels, and Subtopical Response TR-N-6.3, regarding noise increases associated with larger aircraft.

PC01695-5

Comment:

Some modest modifications make sense as demands on LA grow, but why this community should share the brunt is not clear and not fair. Why can't cargo go to other locations (Palmdale, Ontario, Orange County) especially if most of the growth in the next 25 years will be in those communities. This could only mean increased congestion, pollution here, compromises in safety and greater delays in getting shipments to other 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 and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding 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. 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.

PC01695-6

Comment:

Of particular concern is the plan to connect Airport Blvd. to the freeway off ramp. This turns Airport into another Sepulveda Blvd. This street is now relatively quiet and completely filled with homes from 74th to La Tijera. To make this a direct connector road to LAX would decimate the Westport Heights community. The increase in traffic and danger to children never seems warranted especially when so

3. Comments and Responses

little is gained. Young children on my street play near Airport and older children bike and skate to and across it. This plan is more than an inconvenience, this is an issue of conscience. If cars are in a hurry to get to the airport, I cannot imagine what will happen when these drivers are confronted with numerous stop signs. If street lights are put in, then we are talking about a Sepulveda or La Tijera traffic situation on a residential street. This plan indicates a serious lack of concern for our community to the point that it would threaten the safety and integrity of our community.

Response:

Only Alternatives A and C include access to Airport Boulevard from the Ring Road, with Alternative C only including right-in-right-out access. It is anticipated that these connections would primarily provide access to only the residential areas along Airport Boulevard, and would not encourage cut-through traffic on this route. In fact, the LAX Expressway and the Ring Road are designed to provide more attractive routes for through traffic than local routes such as Airport Boulevard. The impacts of the plan were provided in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation of the Draft EIS/EIR. See also Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology and results. Also, please note that Alternative D, presented in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, would not include the LAX Expressway or ring road.

PC01695-7

Comment:

Please respond to these issues as our well being and safety are just as important as the forces that are driving this expansion.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC01695-1 through PC01695-6 above.

PC01696

Cherman, Diana

None Provided

7/27/2001

PC01696-1

Comment:

I do not feel the expansion of LAX is the solution. The solution is to build airports in non residential areas & bus the people to these airports. LAX & Santa Monica airports do not have adequate buffer zones.

Response:

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

PC01696-2

The remainder of this comment letter is identical to form letter PFF; please refer to the responses to form letter PFF.

PC01697 Fritts, Douglas None Provided 7/22/2001

PC01697-1

Comment:

I LIVE IN THE CARLTON SQUARE COMMUNITY OF INGLEWOOD, AND I AM OPPOSED TO ANY EXPANSION WHATSOEVER OF THE LOS ANGELES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT.

I STRONGLY FEEL THAT IT IS UNFAIR TO EXPECT THOSE OF US ALREADY EXPOSED TO THE POLLUTION, NOISE AND CONGESTION CAUSED BY LAX, TO HAVE TO BE SUBJECTED TO EVEN MORE OF THE SAME.

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-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase. It should be noted that under Alternative D, air pollution and noise pollution are expected to be less than under the No Action/No Project Alternative. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01697-2

Comment:

THE ONLY FAIR THING TO DO IS TO HAVE THE ENTIRE REGION SHARE THIS BURDEN AND SPREAD IT OUT, INSTEAD OF ASKING ONE LOCAL COMMUNITY TO BEAR THE BRUNT OF IT ENTIRELY.

PALMDALE-LANCASTER, ONTARIO AND ORANGE COUNTY SHOULD ALL BE REQUIRED TO TAKE THEIR SHARE OF ALL OF THIS EXPANSION. LAX IS ALREADY OVERCROWDED AND ITS OPERATION SHOULD NOT BE EXPANDED ANY FURTHER.

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, 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

PC01697-3

Comment:

IT IS HIGHLY PRETENTIOUS OF ORANGE COUNTY RESIDENTS TO THINK THAT THEY ARE SO PRIVILEGED THAT THEY SHOULD NOT HAVE TO BEAR SOME OF THIS BURDEN, WHILE AT THE SAME TIME JAMMING UP THE SAN DIEGO FREEWAY TO GET TO AND FROM LAX.

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.

PC01697-4

Comment:

THE PEOPLE OF THE INLAND EMPIRE AND THE NORTHERN DESERTS WOULD PREFER TO USE THEIR OWN REGIONAL AIRPORT, IF SERVICE WERE READILY AVAILABLE, INSTEAD OF HAVING TO MAKE THE LONG COMMUTE TO LAX.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01697-2.

PC01697-5

Comment:

PALMDALE-LANCASTER COULD BE UTILIZED PRIMARILY FOR AIR FREIGHT TRAFFIC;

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.

PC01697-6

Comment:

WHILE LAX, ORANGE COUNTY AND ONTARIO COULD BE UTILIZED PRIMARILY FOR PASSENGER TRAFFIC.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01697-2.

PC01697-7

Comment:

FINALLY, WHEN LAX CANNOT FOLLOW THE CURRENT GUIDELINES AND CURFEWS BECAUSE OF ATMOSPHERIC AND WEATHER CONDITIONS, WHY IS ANY EXPANSION THERE EVEN BEING CONSIDERED AT ALL?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures and Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement.

PC01697-8**Comment:**

LAX EXPANSION IS RIDICULOUS AND NOT FAIR TO ITS NEIGHBORS. IT SHOULD BE OUT OF THE QUESTION. NO WAY SHOULD IT EVEN BE UNDER 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. 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.

PC01698**Hill, Teresa****None Provided****7/20/2001****PC01698-1****Comment:**

The Draft Master Plan and EIR both state that LAX must handle its share of regional air transportation demands. We would think that the current 67 million passengers served annually more than exceeds LA's share of the regional air transportation demand. LAX currently handles over 80% of the regions traffic, since LA residents do not represent 80% of air travelers, it seems our share should be less versus more. Why does LAWA continue to try to funnel millions of people into a very small geographical location, creating sub-standard air quality, incompatible living conditions for residents and increasing traffic congestion? What is the estimated growth by region? The master plan clearly states that the population is moving south and east to Orange County, San Bernardino and Riverside; this evidence further supports a regionalized 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. 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.

PC01698-2**Comment:**

The alternative plans addressed in these documents give no real solution or viable option. We believe that there are relatively simple solutions to many of the issues facing communities impacted by LAX's operations. Why is there no plan to improve roadways for the existing airport? The last plan was not evaluated the current 67 million or the proposed capacity of 78.7 million passengers, let alone the cargo operations currently in operation. Improvements should be initiated regardless of any expansion efforts. These required improvements are a normal cost of doing business. Surrounding communities are being held hostage by LAWA's refusal to implement required improvements unless they agree to expansion.

3. Comments and Responses

This demonstrates the lack of ethics LAWA has consistently portrait and supports the position that any information provided by LAWA is bias towards expansion and the revenue associated with increased capacities at LAX.

The expansion plan proposes to reduce runoff problems. This is a requirement for continued business operations and should not be included as a benefit of expansion. Why is the LAWA not held accountable to correct current problems? Instead, they deceptively attempt to incorporate required fixes as benefits that accompany 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, would shift 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.

PC01698-3

Comment:

LAWA is taking credit for the reduction of phase 2 aircraft as part of the expansion efforts. This is a federal mandate, not a benefit of expansion. The documentation takes credit for the decrease in decibels due to a federal mandate and then fails to reflect the increased noise exposure duration that would accompany LAX expansion. This type of misrepresentation is consistent in the documentation provided by LAWA and is the type of inaccurate, misleading, irresponsible communication that has been part LAWA's history.

Again, LAWA incorporates the CNEL reduction efforts as part of the expansion plan. These efforts are not part of the expansion effort; they are the result of laws instituted to protect individuals. Passenger airline fees have been used to fund noise abatement programs in the Los Angeles area as a means to secure support for expansion. Houses in the Los Angeles area (including Westchester, Play Del Rey and Los Angeles) have been sound proofed with full funding even though houses with higher CNEL exposure levels have not been fully funded and are required to wait until the FAA funds become available.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR accounted for aircraft noise characteristics based on baseline conditions in 1996, including the federal noise regulations in effect at that time, and for aircraft noise characteristics for future (2015) conditions based on continued implementation of the federal noise regulations. The Draft EIS/EIR analysis did not take "credit" for continued reductions in aircraft noise levels as being a benefit of the proposed alternatives. It should be noted that the No Action/No Project Alternative noise analysis for future (2015) conditions accounted for continued reductions in aircraft noise levels, and provided a basis for NEPA comparison to each of the build alternatives,

PC01698-4

Comment:

We have concerns related to the proximity of the airport to populated residential areas. What are the other major airports proximities to populated communities? How many individuals do other airlines effect and at what levels? A graphical representation of the top ten airports, their traffic volumes, and their effect on surrounding populations should be developed for evaluation and incorporated into the expansion plan. JFK is outside of the major city location and located on over 4,930 acres and handles

significantly less traffic than LAX today. Dallas and Chicago have huge landmasses; to compare LAX's capacities to theirs is unrealistic.

Response:

Evaluating the environmental impacts of the top ten airports in the country is beyond the scope of the EIS or EIR.

PC01698-5

Comment:

There is absolutely no reason why air cargo operations need to be based out of LAX. Several other communities would embrace the air cargo operation. A win/win situation could be obtained for both cargo carriers and communities outside of Los Angeles. Even the Los Angeles area would be a beneficiary as a result of reduced traffic congestion, noise and air pollution.

Response:

There are many reasons why cargo airlines and freight forwarders use LAX. The primary reasons are access to many domestic and international passenger flights and the investment in specialized facilities that have been developed over time to serve the international demand. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding the role of airline economics in shifting operations to regional airports.

PC01698-6

Comment:

LAX airport space is currently limited to 3500 acres of land. This is only after having acquired property that was devaluated because of the airports operations. This is not sufficient to house the current operations let alone additional flights. Without the airport, the surrounding communities would benefit from decreased traffic congestion, cleaner air quality, reduced noise pollution and increased property values. The report indicates that real estate values are too high for LAX to acquire additional property today, the work around appears to be to make the area so undesirable that the real estate values fall and property becomes available for further airport acquisition and expansion.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values. As was discussed within Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, acquisition of property and relocation of residents and businesses by federally funded airports such as LAX is governed by the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (codified as amended at 42 USC 4601-4655), its implementing regulations (49 CFR Part 24), FAA Order 5100.37A, and Acquisition and Relocation Assistance for Airport Projects (April 4, 1994, P.L. 91-646), collectively referred to as the Uniform Act. The purpose of the Uniform Act is to ensure fair and equitable treatment for individuals who are displaced or whose real property is acquired as a result of a federally funded project. Procedural requirements regarding notification to affected owners, appraisals, compensation at fair market value, relocation payments, and advisory assistance are specified in the Uniform Act.

PC01698-7

Comment:

The operations today negatively impact the communities surrounding LAX. The LA basin is one of the worse air quality locations largely due to the airport traffic, cargo trucks, airport vehicles and airplanes. To say it is the best location because of its proximity to the ocean is ludicrous at best. Eastward breezes blow air pollution east, directly into neighboring communities that are heavily populated.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-3.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01698-8

Comment:

The report indicates that NOx and SO2 emissions will increase significantly with expansion efforts. Additionally, it states that there will be significant increases (well above the CEQA thresholds) in all five-criterion pollutants. This is unacceptable given the proximity of the airport to heavily populated areas.

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.

PC01698-9

Comment:

The document fails to disclose the true impact of pollutants based on the increased traffic levels from the last EIR. What are the actual levels of pollutants today as compared to what was reported on the last EIR when capacity was estimated at 40 million?

Response:

As was indicated in the Introduction to Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR, in accordance with state laws and regulations, environmental impacts under CEQA are measured against conditions that exist at the time the Notice of Preparation for the EIS/EIR was published, i.e., June 1997. Please also see Response to Comment PC00045-3 regarding the relative contributions to emissions from on-road vehicles and Response to Comment PC00070-1 regarding ambient air quality near LAX during the environmental baseline period (1996) and in 2000.

PC01698-10

Comment:

Why hasn't LAWA proposed a more regionally distributed air traffic approach?

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 Response to Comment PC01698-1.

PC01698-11

Comment:

Why have seven cities in Orange County spent \$40 million opposing plans to make El Toro an airport? Obviously, these cities are not lacking in valuable property, residents or businesses and the draft clearly indicates that regional growth will come primarily from these areas not Los Angeles, further contributing to the traffic congestion and air pollution problems faced by Los Angeles and its neighboring communities.

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.

PC01698-12**Comment:**

More personally, we have many concerns related to the quality of life around LAX. These include:

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. Also please see Responses to Comments below.

PC01698-13**Comment:**

1) The decreased property values of surrounding LAX communities. Continued expansion will only accelerate the devaluation.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding the effects of LAX on property values.

PC01698-14**Comment:**

2) Increased noise pollution. The noise is unbearable today. We often call the airport hotline and consistently receive letters indicating no fly-overs. We are asked for the airline, time, date and type of aircraft. Often we provide the first three only to receive a letter that there was no record of a flight. We have on several occasions allowed the individual on the other end of the telephone listen and on more than one occasion they have been shocked at the level of noise from the airport.

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, addressed by LAWA Noise Management staff, and the responses (broken down by date, time and block address) are sent to the requesting community members. LAWA has recently installed a PASSUR system to assist the community in tracking aircraft operations. By going to the LAWA website (www.lawa.org) and entering the Noise Management section, community members can specifically identify LAX operations that cross their community. Please see Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.12 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program for additional information on filing noise complaints and LAWA's handling of noise complaints.

PC01698-15**Comment:**

I cannot concentrate on my studies because of the airport noise levels. How is our child going to do her homework? What are the long-term consequences of this high level of noise exposure? How can teachers teach our children when they have to stop every few minutes for the plane noise to subside? Just yesterday, when yet another plane flew directly overhead, our four year old said, "I don't like that sound, it hurts my ears" and proceeded to cover her ears with her hands.

Response:

Comment noted. 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

3. Comments and Responses

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 Response to Comment AL00038-11 regarding the impact of high noise levels on children.

PC01698-16

Comment:

3) Increased air pollutants. We get more respiratory problems that we did at our prior residence outside the LA basin. Most of my family's colds end up with chest congestion.

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.

PC01698-17

Comment:

We clean our windows and a week later they are dirty. Soot is on the walls and carpets. How will the expansion help these issues?

Response:

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

PC01698-18

Comment:

What studies have been conducted in relation to the effects of pollutants to residents?

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.

PC01698-19

Comment:

4) Increased traffic congestion. Traffic is already too heavy in the west area. Freeways are roadblocks. Sepulveda is a gridlock and if LAWA expands the conditions will only worsen. We have no capacity for additional traffic in the area.

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.

PC01698-20**Comment:**

5) Increased crime rates are a concern. Airports are notorious for crime. How will this affect our property values and the surrounding communities welfare.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00378-2 regarding crime impacts. As there is no expectation that crime rates would increase with implementation of the LAX Master Plan, crime is not expected to affect property values.

PC01698-21**Comment:**

Expansion at LAX has few beneficiaries with the exception of LAWA and airlines. Expansion of LAX is not a viable solution for the increased regional air traffic demands. The area is too populated, congestion is too heavy, pollution levels are too high and LAX is located on and near premium beachfront property.

We are highly opposed to any LAX expansion efforts.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socioeconomics, traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, growth impacts in Section 4.5, Socio-Economic Impacts (Growth Inducement), air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and coastal zone impacts in Section 4.14, Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendices G and S-E and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4, 5, S-2, S-3, 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. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01699 Takemoto-Inokuchi, None Provided
Caroline

7/23/2001

PC01699-1**Comment:**

No LAX expansion. We don't have to be the largest, loudest, dirtiest airport in the nation. We should share this distinction with other cities such as Ontario, Palmdale and El Toro.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC01699-2

Comment:

We bought in this area for convenience, yes, but not to be polluted on or to be landlocked because of traffic.

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.

PC01700	Dittus, Eleanor	None Provided	7/21/2001
----------------	------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01700-1

Comment:

-This document represents our opposition to the proposed LAX expansion for all the reasons publicly expressed via the news media and the internet.

Response:

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

PC01700-2

Comment:

-It is time to halt LAX expansion and begin to develop other alternatives such as the Palmdale and Ontario Airports. The reason is obvious.... we can't go on indiscriminately enlarging the airport to accommodate increased passenger and air freight every fifteen years!

Response:

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

PC01700-3

Comment:

-The proposed expansion represents a 30% increase over the currently 68 million passenger capacity. When the airport originally was designed for 40 million passengers and now accommodates 68 million

3. Comments and Responses

passengers, that represents an increase of 70%. Therefore it seems that the proposed expansion is even insufficient for the year 2015.

Response:

The proposed expansion (Alternative C) is insufficient to accommodate forecast demand in 2015. In response to feedback from the community and oversight agencies, LAWA is not pursuing the maximum development needed to serve the unconstrained 2020 market demand. 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.

PC01700-4

Comment:

-Because of the foregoing it is imperative that LAX hierarchy immediately start thinking and develop alternative airport facilities before airlines have to be restricted from issuing tickets on such holidays as July 4th, Labor day weekend or Christmas/new year.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC01700-1 through PC01700-3 above.

PC01701	Willock, Donald M. & Antoinette M.	None Provided	7/23/2001
----------------	---	----------------------	------------------

PC01701-1

Comment:

Please consider my approval of the proposed \$12-billion LAX master plan.

The is a successful business and needs to grow to its potential. Los Angeles needs the business and the many jobs the expansion will create. The wealthier Los Angeles becomes will eventually lead to more money available to build public transit to help our traffic problems.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01702	Wrubel, John	None Provided	7/14/2001
----------------	---------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01702-1

Comment:

I have been to your airport at least once and I'll be the first to admit it, but, I'm impressed at what I saw and the last time I went. However, I have a few questions.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC01702-2

Comment:

I understand that you might have improvement plans for the next 20 years. If so, does it include any improvements to the main passenger terminal buildings? If so, do those improvements include building additional passenger terminal buildings?

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00562-3 regarding new terminal locations and improvements to existing terminals.

PC01702-3

Comment:

In addition, to that, would you, please, send me the above info and any additional info you might have? I would really appreciate it because I would find that helpful.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review.

PC01703	Brown, Donald	None Provided	7/22/2001
----------------	----------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01703-1

Comment:

I object to the expansion plans for 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.

PC01703-2

Comment:

Traffic is like grid-lock on Lincoln & Sepulveda in the morning, and late afternoon, north of the airport.

Response:

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

PC01703-3

Comment:

With the addition of the Marina Del Rey project on Jefferson, plus the airport traffic, the grid-lock will even be worse.

Response:

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

PC01703-4

Comment:

There are not enough roads to handle the present traffic let alone the expected increase from the two projects. Unless you can double the North - South roads, forget it!

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the Congestion Management Program.

PC01704 McKenney, Krissy & Scott None Provided 7/25/2001

PC01704-1

Comment:

I have been a resident in Westchester since 1965. And I am tired of Airport Expansion Plans.

I want Westchester to stay a community.

It's bad enough that Playa Vista is being built and will bring an increase in traffic and pollution.

I don't need more traffic, more noise, more pollution and more businesses being torn down in the town where I live.

Stop 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, and relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 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. For details on how the future traffic demand from the Playa Vista development was incorporated in the Draft EIS/EIR, please see Topical Response TR-ST-2. In addition, 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.

PC01705 Niemiec, Elza None Provided 7/25/2001

PC01705-1

Comment:

I have been a victim of LAX expansion projects before. My house was originally at 9030 Goebel Avenue. My late husband fought the Airport tooth and nail to get a fair market value for his house.

We owned a 3 bedroom 2 bath property. Houses of that size were selling for \$80K.

The Airport swore we would get fair market value.

The Airport's idea of fair market value was \$54,000. That was it.

My late husband refused to leave the property. He was thrown out by the Sheriff's Department. You people are criminals.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC01705-2

Comment:

No on LAX Expansion. I don't want more noise, pollution and traffic. I don't want the Airport ruining my life 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. 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.

PC01706

de Leon, Laurie

None Provided

7/23/2001

PC01706-1

Comment:

I oppose the LAX expansion proposal. There is already too much traffic in the surrounding 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. 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, 3, S-2a, and S-2b.

PC01706-2

Comment:

There are 3 other airports in the area that can be utilized to meet air travel & air cargo needs, they are Ontario, El Toro & Palmdale.

Response:

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

PC01706-3

Comment:

There is also a health and safety risk to the residents of Westchester with this proposed expansion, as there would be more air pollution and risk of air disasters. Please do not expand, there will not be enough benefit to out-weigh the negative impacts of this expansion.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, 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-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.

PC01707 de Leon, Curt None Provided 7/23/2001

PC01707-1

Comment:

I strongly oppose any expansion of LAX. It makes no sense to cram more planes and people & traffic into an already congested area. Ontario, Palmdale and El Toro are all better alternatives and should all start bearing their share of the load. One airport is not enough and the impact on the surrounding areas of LAX would be greater and would Provide less air traffic increase than any of the other airport alternatives. Don't Do 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, 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.

PC01708 Boggess, George W. None Provided 7/23/2001
& Rosemary J.

PC01708-1

Comment:

I have been a resident of Westchester for 55 years, and my wife and I moved into our home on New Years day, 1956. In those 55 years I have seen the airport devour hundreds of acres and thousands of homes as it grew from Mines Field to the coast, to the construction of the North runway complex and to a recognized international gateway. Maybe that expansion was justified by our plunge into the post WWII jet age but it came at a terrible price in uprooting households, businesses and neighborhoods.

The increase of traffic, noise, pollution (and crime) is readily apparent and is already beyond the saturation point. PLEASE, let us not make it worse by continuing to destroy neighborhoods and continuing to increase the level of traffic, pollution, noise and safety risk.

3. Comments and Responses

My wife and I believe that these expansion plans satisfy only the greed for profit, the self aggrandizement of recent L.A. mayoral dynasties and those in an airport position who will gain some false prestige from "what they have accomplished".

With alternative regional diversification available and practical it is not justified to inflict such trauma and destruction as envisioned by LAX expansion. Does El Segundo, Inglewood and Westchester have to be sacrificed for the "greater good" of Los Angeles? The answer is NO! WE HAVE SACRIFICED 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. 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, law enforcement impacts in Section 4.26.2, Law Enforcement, and safety impacts in Section 4.24.3, Safety. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation, and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. As indicated in TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester business district. 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.

PC01709 Hittinger, Patricia None Provided 7/23/2001

PC01709-1

Comment:

Expanding LAX can only have a negative impact on the city:
-More noise
-Increased traffic
-Greater threat of air related disasters
-More pollution
-No easy way to handle the increased thruput of people into the area

I urge you to NOT expand LAX.

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-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety, 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.

PC01710 Holmblad, Kristi None Provided 7/24/2001

PC01710-1

Comment:

My husband, child (now age 3) & I moved to Westchester 2 yrs ago. It is a wonderful community consisting of many families with young children & many elderly that have lived here for many years. It is hard to believe there is a chance LAX will be expanded & therefore putting our community at risk for

more health problems because of the increase in pollution & noise pollution; & stress, because of the increase in 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-2 regarding potential effects of Master Plan alternatives on 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.

PC01710-2

Comment:

The increase needs to be disbursed to other airports. Please save our community from this plan. LAX is tolerable now - but an expansion will not 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-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC01711 Durand, Thomas None Provided

PC01711-1

Comment:

I AM A NEW HOME OWNER, AND AM VERY, VERY CONCERNED WITH YOUR PLANS FOR CONSTRUCTION AND ADDING TRAFFIC WHICH WOULD AFFECT OUR NEIGHBORHOOD AND MY STREET, WILEY POST.

I AM A LOS ANGELES - NATIVE, GROWING UP IN LADERA HEIGHTS, BUT SPENDING A LOT OF TIME IN WESTCHESTER, COACHING SOCCER AT NEILSON FIELD, PLAYING FLOOR HOCKEY AT WESTCHESTER PARK. THIS IS A WARM, FRIENDLY COMMUNITY, WITH KIDS BICYCLING IN THE STREETS, AND WHERE NEIGHBORS KNOW EACH OTHER. THAT'S WHY WE BOUGHT OUR HOUSE HERE.

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.

PC01711-2

Comment:

I AM DISPLEASED TO HEAR THERE ARE PLANS TO DISRUPT MY NEIGHBORHOOD BY ADDING MORE TRAFFIC,

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.

PC01711-3

Comment:

AND I UNDERSTAND THERE ARE NO MITIGATION MEASURES FOR HANDLING THE EXCESS TRAFFIC.

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. A complete mitigation package was prepared to address project traffic impacts. This mitigation package was presented in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, subsection 4.3.2.9.

PC01711-4

Comment:

AS AN AVID CYCLIST, WHO LOGS OVER 2500 MILES EACH YEAR, MOSTLY ON CITY ROADS, I HAVE FOUND A BICYCLE HAVEN HERE AND WILL WORK HARD TO PROTECT IT. I AM COMMUTING TO WORK BY WAY OF WILEY POST - WESTCHESTER PARKWAY - PERSHING AND TO THE BEACH PATH GOING SOUTH TO MY JOB IN REDONDO BEACH. THIS IS A WONDERFUL COMMUTE, AND I HOPE TO GO FROM MY 2 BIKE DAYS/WEEK TO 5/WEEK. IT IS WONDERFUL BECAUSE I DON'T HAVE TO FIGHT TRAFFIC!

Response:

The project alternatives would not hinder your ability to bike along this route. Where bike paths would be impacted along this route by the project alternatives, the paths would be replaced.

PC01711-5

Comment:

FROM THE L.A.X.E.N. MEETINGS I HAVE ATTENDED, I UNDERSTAND THERE IS A PUSH - AND IT SEEMS WELL-FOUNDED - TO URGE YOU TO CONSIDER DEVELOPING EL TORO AND PALMDALE. TALKING TO MY ORANGE COUNTY FRIENDS, IT SEEMS LIKE THIS IS A NATURAL - THEY WOULD LIKE QUICKER ACCESS TO AN AIRPORT, AND NOT HAVE AN EXPANDED AIRPORT WHICH HAS A 2 HR FREEWAY JAM TO GET 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.

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.

PC01711-6**Comment:**

OUR COMMUNITY IS ESTABLISHED. IT'S SAFE. AND THERE IS LITTLE ROOM OR NEED FOR AN EXPANDED 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.

PC01712**Syta, Thomas****None Provided****7/24/2001****PC01712-1****Comment:**

Southern California Solution - The people around LAX should not have to bear the entire brunt of the air commerce needs of Southern California.. 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.

PC01712-2**Comment:**

El Toro (Orange County) should be developed.

Response:

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

PC01712-3**Comment:**

Destroying Westchester - 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.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC01712-4

Comment:

Air Quality - 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.

PC01712-5

Comment:

This will affect respiratory systems and may cause cancer.

Response:

This comment is essentially the same as comment PC00908-11. Please see Response to Comment PC00908-11.

PC01712-6

Comment:

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.

Response:

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

PC01712-7

Comment:

Noise - Step in any classroom in Westchester and you will hear the airplanes and hear a teacher practically shouting so that the students can hear. It is at a barely acceptable level now.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments AL00038-6, PC00267-4, and PC00314-6 regarding existing and future noise levels at Westchester public and private schools. See also Topical Responses TR-LU-2 regarding overall noise impacts on the community of Westchester and TR-LU-5 for a discussion of how aircraft noise impacts on schools are determined and mitigated under the LAX Master Plan.

PC01712-8

Comment:

More noise may mean that people will have to remain indoors in their soundproofed homes with their doors and windows closed just to have conversation.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program and TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels.

PC01712-9**Comment:**

Traffic - There are no mitigation measures for handling the traffic on the freeways, which are already the worst in the state.

Response:

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

PC01712-10**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 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.

PC01712-11**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.

PC01712-12**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.

PC01712-13**Comment:**

Cargo - 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 essentially the same as comment PC00908-9; please refer to Response to Comment PC00908-9 regarding cargo demand.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01713 Nau, Teresa None Provided 7/20/2001

PC01713-1

Comment:

AIR QUALITY - 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.

PC01713-2

Comment:

This will affect respiratory systems and may cause cancer.

Response:

This comment is essentially the same as comment PC00908-11. Please see Response to Comment PC00908-11.

PC01713-3

Comment:

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

Response:

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

PC01713-4

Comment:

TRAFFIC - There are no mitigation measures for handling the traffic on the freeways, which are already the worst in the state.

Response:

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

PC01713-5

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 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.

PC01713-6**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.

PC01713-7**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.

PC01713-8**Comment:**

REGIONAL SOLUTION - The people around LAX should not have to bear the entire brunt of the air commerce needs of Southern California.. 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.

PC01713-9**Comment:**

El Toro (Orange County) should be developed.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC01713-10

Comment:

DESTROYING THE COMMUNITY - 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. Where will our children play soccer?

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 discussed in Section 4.26.3, Parks and Recreation of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, no acquisition of Carl E. Nielson Youth Park is proposed under any of the Master Plan Alternatives. 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.

PC01713-11

Comment:

NOISE - Step in any classroom in Westchester and you will hear the airplanes and hear a teacher practically shouting so that the students can hear. It is at a barely acceptable level now.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC01712-7; please refer to Response to Comment PC01712-7.

PC01713-12

Comment:

More noise may mean that people will have to remain indoors in their soundproofed homes with their doors and windows closed just to have a conversation.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program and TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels.

PC01713-13

Comment:

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

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The content of this comment is essentially the same as comment PC00908-9; please refer to Response to Comment PC00908-9 regarding cargo demand.

PC01714 Stark, Harwood None Provided

PC01714-1

Comment:

We were victims of the first airport expansion, it took our home, and due the reduction in the people base, it ruined our schools, ruined our business district and increased pollution. Prior the expansion, we had two theaters, two department stores, three drug stores, 3 large grocery stores, 2 hardware stores etc. Now churches fill our empty buildings. As far as schools our 3 children all attended grade school through High School, all graduated from Calif. Universities. Two out of three made Phi Beta Kappa.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01714-2

Comment:

We still have the best weather found anywhere. Considering the impact on the community and considering that expansion is only a short term solution, why not make all communities help solve the problem.

Response:

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

PC01715 Azer, Mike None Provided 7/21/2001

PC01715-1

Comment:

Airport's noise is too too Loud. Some airplanes have much harmful noise than others.

Response:

The degree to which aircraft noise is harmful to individual health was addressed in Section 4.24.2, Health Effects of Noise (CEQA), of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. 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.

PC01716 Flatland, David None Provided 7/23/2001

PC01716-1

Comment:

I definitely oppose LAX EXPANSION. This Airport was designed for 48 million passengers. It is currently handling 69 million. The expansion would increase it to 89 million passengers.

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-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels.

PC01716-2

Comment:

This is entirely too much congestion, noise, and pollution in our little communities of Inglewood, Lennox, and Westchester. Such an expansion would decimate them, especially Westchester with Airport Blvd. and Arbor Vita Interchange.

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 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, 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. Note that under the LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative, Alternative D, no ring road and associated Airport Boulevard/Arbor Vitae interchange is proposed. As described in Chapter 3, Alternatives of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC01716-3

Comment:

Instead of outlying areas motoring their passengers into LAX, let those outlying areas develop their own airports. Areas such as Palmdale, Ontario, Riverside, Orange County (El Toro), and Burbank need to develop their own Airports. And they have more available space than the LAX area.

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, 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.

PC01717 Lesperance, None Provided 7/23/2001
Gabrielle

PC01717-1

Comment:

My fiancé and I just bought a home on Wiley Post Ave in the community of Westchester because we wanted to live in a real community. In the two-and-a-half weeks in our new residence, we have met most of our neighbors and their children, and have felt that this is the right place for us to eventually raise a family. However, we dread to imagine what would happen to this community if LAWA were allowed to go forward with their short-sighted "Master Plan". This neighborhood would clearly suffer, since the homes slated for acquisition by LAWA are all here.

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.

PC01717-2

Comment:

Instead of destroying a healthy community of upstanding, tax-paying citizens, I feel that the El Toro Airport should be developed. There would be no communities destroyed in the El Toro area, and the environmental impact would clearly be less detrimental there than in 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-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.

PC01718 Thomas, Ralph & None Provided 7/13/2001
Nina

PC01718-1

Comment:

As a resident of Westchester for over 30 years we have watched and HEARD the airport take up more and more of our space. Enough is Enough! The traffic increase with the purposed expansion would be unbearable.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01718-2

Comment:

All residence of Los Angeles should not have to bear the burden of grid lock on freeways and streets. This is unsafe - unhealthy and unwise.

We encourage you to drop this plan and let one of the other location be considered for 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-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 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 Technical Reports 2, 3, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-2, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC01719 Andrews, George J. None Provided
& Cleo**

7/24/2001

PC01719-1

Comment:

It does not take a degree in rocket science to see that the only meaningful expansion of LAX is to add two more runways between the present north runways and Manchester. This would give a first order 50% increase in capacity. Of course this would wipe out half of downtown Westchester and all the residences, churches, schools and businesses south of Manchester. Where is the money to acquire all these properties going to come from? Are the planners trying to give us band-aid solutions to a major problem? Where does one go for the next expansion?

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01719-2

Comment:

The good folks around El Toro and Ontario should bite the bullet and allow their regional airports to expand to take care of their regional needs and not burden LAX and the people around it. It is not logical to expect LAX to expand to accommodate all the major air traffic of southern California. The jammed freeways around LAX are also a testament to the situation.

Response:

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

PC01719-3

Comment:

The logical solution would be to tie Ontario, LAX and El Toro with high speed rail lines going right into each airport forming a triangular synergistic solution for all of southern California airport needs.

Response:

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

PC01719-4

Comment:

It is time for the city planners to take the future of Los Angeles out of the hands myopic hucksters and bought politicians. Los Angeles should be in a league with Chicago, New York, Paris, etc. There is no more worthy endeavor for a citizen than to leave his/her city a better and more beautiful place than when he/she entered it.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01719-5

Comment:

The above comments should not be construed to imply that LAX should not be continually improved. For example, the stupid arrangement of landing on the outer runways while planes are taking off on the inner runways needs to be reversed and now. We have already seen two major catastrophes because of this arrangement, yet our fearless leaders can only pussyfoot around the problem. Safety should never be compromised for a minuscule reduction in noise levels.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02204-24 for an explanation of aircraft runway operating procedures and optimal runway use.

PC01720

Novy, Betty

None Provided

PC01720-1

Comment:

We are now learning that the terminals at LAX are too close together to accommodate the larger planes. Extending the runways and building the LAX Expressway and Ring road will not solve this problem.

Response:

The existing terminal configuration does have some limitations to the size of aircraft it can accommodate. By building the West Terminal facilities, the new terminals would be better designed to accommodate today's newer and larger aircraft fleet. Modifications to the existing terminal buildings would help them accommodate a wider mix of aircraft types.

Following the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA developed a new alternative that, consistent with public comments calling for a regional approach alternative, is designed to accommodate passenger

3. Comments and Responses

and cargo activity at LAX that would approximate those of the No Action/No Project Alternative, has fewer environmental impacts, and improves airport safety and security.

Alternative D does not propose construction of a ring road. However, airfield improvements, including runway improvements, would help LAX safely accommodate NLA.

PC01720-2

Comment:

We contend that the regional solution will be more economical. We can find no acceptable reason for all cargo to come into LAX. The planes will fly all the way across the city to the western-most edge where huge warehouses will take up prime real estate space. Then the cargo will be loaded on large polluting trucks to carry it on congested freeways back to eastern, northern or southern areas.

We need regional airports to reduce pollution, traffic congestion and the possibilities of air disasters in overcrowded air corridors.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding 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 also Response to Comment PC00599-54 for more information about cargo activity.

PC01721	Rosengrant, Ken	None Provided	7/24/2001
----------------	------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01721-1

Comment:

Airport service throughout Los Angeles needs to be expanded - Not at one place like LAX, but covering the entire L.A. basin as much as possible.

Response:

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

PC01722 Nau, Mr. & Mrs. John None Provided

7/20/2001

PC01722-1

Comment:

NO LAX MASTER PLAN

Share the noise, traffic, & pollution with neighboring airports. No major expansion at LAX!

Response:

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

PC01723 Carlson, Vern None Provided

PC01723-1

Comment:

I have been a frequent flyer at LAX for the past 30 years. Considerable changes have taken place to handle the added traffic. However, the traffic at present peak times in the airport loop causes excessive delays with cars backed up to Nash Street on the #105.

Response:

The proposed alternatives outlined in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR would help alleviate congestion at airport loop road by providing improvements to the on-airport road system and/or relocating much of the passenger activity away from the CTA. Alternative D, if implemented, would eliminate all public traffic in the CTA.

PC01723-2

Comment:

Excessive people lines at most gates cause excessive delays.

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.

PC01723-3

Comment:

New York City has essentially 3 airports serving the Metropolitan area. Maybe the city fathers in LA need some lessons.

Why hasn't a plan been developed to include an El Toro Airport, Enlarge Ontario, develop a Palmdale airport.

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-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.

PC01723-4

Comment:

To date I have not seen a Master Plan that addresses the resulting problems that will occur with greater air traffic passenger count & ground traffic.

Response:

The Master Plan, which addressed all aspects of the proposed alternatives, was included as part of the Draft EIS/EIR. This document, together with Sections 4.3.1 (On-Airport Surface Transportation) and 4.3.2 (Off-Airport Surface Transportation) of the Draft EIS/EIR, presented the potential impacts associated with ground traffic and proposed mitigation measures to reduce these impacts, where feasible. 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.

PC01724

Weiss, David

None Provided

7/20/2001

PC01724-1

Comment:

The most appropriate solution to deal w/long term air traffic in LA is to have the airport(s) closer to the concentration of growth. In addition LAX is a true "eye sore" w/planes taking off over our beaches. We should sell the LAX land in 5,000 square foot parcels & because this property is near the ocean it will bring top dollar. Take that money & put the airport where the "true" traffic will be (south & east).

Response:

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

PC01724-2**Comment:**

The other great benefit to putting the airport traffic further east is it will not pollute the entire LA basin.

Response:

Comment noted. Please note that air quality impacts were calculated for LAX-related traffic throughout the South Coast Air Basin, as described in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and Appendix S-E of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Slight shifts on a local level would not result in any change in traffic-related regional air emission impacts, as reported in Table S4.6-20 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01725**Rosser, Robin****None Provided****7/21/2001****PC01725-1****Comment:**

LAX expansion destroys a magnificent, old, family oriented neighborhood, and does not address the long-term problem. Eventually expansion will be needed elsewhere, such as Palmdale, anyway. So why not bite that bullet now, and save 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.

PC01726**Barouch, Roslyn****None Provided****7/23/2001****PC01726-1****Comment:**

My husband and I have been residents of Westchester since 1953. During this time we have seen a significant portion of this community eliminated due the first expansion of the airport.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01726-2**Comment:**

If this master plan is adopted, our shopping area will be swallowed up, more houses eliminated and the end of Westchester as a viable community.

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

3. Comments and Responses

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.

PC01726-3

Comment:

Noise The experience of Playa del Rey will be repeated here - it will be impossible to stay outside of our homes because of intolerable noise levels.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels, including thresholds used to identify significant noise levels and mitigation measures under the LAX Master Plan that would reduce exposure of noise-sensitive uses to high noise levels. As was shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S4.2-2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, noise levels continue to decrease over time over the Playa del Rey area. However, as was shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, under 1996 baseline conditions some areas of Playa del Rey are exposed to significant high single event noise levels (shown as the 94 dBA SEL) that are currently outside the residential sound insulation or ANMP boundary (defined as the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL noise contour). Under the LAX Master Plan, the ANMP boundary would be revised to include those areas exposed to the 94 dBA SEL and outside the current ANMP boundary. For more information noise impacts on Playa del Rey, see Response to Comment PC00499-1.

PC01726-4

Comment:

We we have to close Westchester High and Orville Wright HS as we did to another junior high school on Airport Blvd. because it was impossible to hear anything every time a plane went over the school.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00038-6 regarding LAUSD facilities that experience significant noise levels under 1996 baseline, noise impacts that would occur on these facilities from development of the LAX Master Plan alternatives, and mitigation provided for LAUSD facilities under the "Settlement Agreement."

The comment reference appears to be about Orville Wright Middle School (rather than Orville Wright HS). Based on information provided in Table 14 of Technical Report 1, Land Use Technical Report, in the Draft EIS/EIR and Table S9 of Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Orville Wright Middle School is not exposed to significant aircraft noise levels under the 1996 baseline. Westchester High School is exposed to significant noise levels (defined by the 65 CNEL noise contour) and significant single event noise levels that result in classroom disruption under 1996 baseline conditions. Orville Wright Middle School and Westchester High School would not be exposed to significant aircraft noise levels as a result of development of any of Master Plan alternatives compared to the 1996 baseline.

See also Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding overall noise impacts on the community of Westchester.

PC01726-5

Comment:

Traffic - Sepulveda & Lincoln Blvds are already jammed most of the day and into the late evening.

Response:

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

PC01726-6**Comment:**

The 405 freeway north comes to a dead stop at Manchester Blvd.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the Congestion Management Program.

PC01726-7**Comment:**

Traffic will be sorely impacted as Playa Vista is developed. More airport traffic will lead to an impossible situation.

Response:

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

PC01726-8**Comment:**

Regional airports - Isn't it logical that passengers going to and from northern Los Angeles County (Palmdale) and eastern L.A. or San Bernardino County, Riverside, etc. would benefit from having an airport facility in their own areas? It would certainly cut down on gasoline usage, as well as air and noise pollution!

Response:

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

PC01726-9**Comment:**

NIMBY - Orange County residents want no part of expanded air traffic in their area yet they want the benefits of cargos that are needed in their area. Why do we in Westchester, El Segundo and Inglewood have to be burdened by their needs? We have been doing it long enough!

3. Comments and Responses

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.

PC01726-10

Comment:

We implore you to reject LAX expansion and implement the development of a regional solution.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01726-8.

PC01727 Asper, Jess & Cindy None Provided 7/23/2001

PC01727-1

Comment:

We are recent home-buyers in Westchester and are very opposed to the proposed LAX expansion. We live in Loyola Village and have already experienced (in just 1 year) a higher volume of traffic on Lincoln and Sepulveda. We are very concerned about the increased noise, traffic and air pollution that the proposed expansion would bring.

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, Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase, and 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.

PC01727-2

Comment:

Please put more time & energy into exploring other areas that could provide for the commercial 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.

PC01728 Russell, Kathleen None Provided 7/22/2001

PC01728-1

Comment:

I am against expansion on the LA Airport because of impact on traffic. The traffic in the area is already congested. I live in Westchester, off of La Tijera. This expansion will cause more congestion and make traffic even worse on the main streets, especially La Tijera, Century and Sepulveda.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the Congestion Management Program.

PC01728-2**Comment:**

The Playa Vista project, the Howard Hughes Promenade and the proposed airport expansion at LAX are causing tremendous problems for this area.

Response:

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

PC01729**Casey, Virginia****None Provided****7/21/2001****PC01729-1****Comment:**

Master Plan: Bad Idea. Noise, Bad Traffic Congestion, Dangerous Air Traffic, Etc.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR address noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC01729-2**Comment:**

When will we be told if (and whose) BIG MONEY is pushing this devastating plan for a monumental LAX expansion which will obviously ruin forever another precious residential area along the So. California coast?

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.

PC01729-3**Comment:**

We have lived in our Westchester home since 1957. At the time of the previous big expansion, as I recall, there was a promised break from the noise of the jet engines between the hours of 11:P.M. and 7:AM. Well, those of us still here and not deaf would like to know what those roaring noises are in the wee hours of the morning! Ear plugs are not that comfortable!

Response:

LAWA's night operating procedures are used when practicable. For information on these procedures and circumstances in which they are not practicable, please see Topical Response TR-N-5 and Topical Response TR-N-7. An analysis of nighttime single event noise awakenings was provided in Section 4.1, Noise and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01729-4

Comment:

Please nix the Master Plan and share this dangerous air traffic increase with the other airports where the workers in those areas will welcome the jobs as well.

Response:

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

PC01730

**McCarty-
Blumenthal, Linda**

None Provided

7/23/2001

PC01730-1

Comment:

We have lived in Westchester for almost 3 years now. I have grown to appreciate the community energy here & its commitment to betterment.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01730-2

Comment:

Although we are slated for soundproofing in the near future, which we appreciate, it will have little impact on local traffic & outdoor noise if expansion is approved. I do not want to be held hostage indoors to avoid noise outdoors.

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 that would result from development of the build alternatives and mitigation measures that would reduce exposure of noise-sensitive uses to high noise levels. Also, refer to Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program, which would reduce interior noise levels to 45 CNEL. To achieve the full benefits of this program windows need to be closed.

PC01730-3

Comment:

Increased traffic will greatly complicate access & egress into our home neighborhood.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 concerning the Congestion Management Program.

PC01730-4

Comment:

The additional air pollution is self-explanatory & that safety would be compromised I feel is inevitable.

Response:

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

PC01730-5

Comment:

We don't need cargo expansion at an Int'l LAX airport, when there are surrounding areas available, larger, and better equipped to accept it.

I support the regional solution. It is long-range, smart, & more economical. Most importantly, it will preserve our community as a whole. Remember Westchester is the "home" of LAX. Please preserve our home & we will be able to live as neighbors.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding 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 also Response to Comment PC00599-54 for more information about cargo activity.

PC01731 Blumenthal, Dr. Jim None Provided

PC01731-1

Comment:

We live within 1 1/2 miles of LAX. LAX traffic already affects our neighborhood to some extent. Expansion of the already uncontrolled traffic overflow will increase the crime in our neighborhood, the danger to children and pets, and the congestion.

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. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Subtopical Response TR-ST-2.21 regarding neighborhood traffic.

PC01731-2

Comment:

This attacks our neighborhood, reduces our property value, and threatens our family!

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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01731-3

Comment:

We are already being affected by pollution from planes and autos. Increased traffic will increase this pollution and the threats to our health.

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. 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.

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.

PC01731-4

Comment:

Arguments that LAX is overburdened are true and the easiest solution is to move cargo operations to the other regional airports (Palmdale, Ontario, etc.) to increase available space, reduce traffic in the air & on the ground, and improve 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.

Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale and Response to Comment PC00599-54 for more information about cargo activity. 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.

PC01731-5**Comment:**

LAX has been cited repeatedly for near-miss-disasters. Reducing cargo traffic by rerouting it reduces the chance of a catastrophic crash at LAX or, worse yet, over the homes which surround LAX.

Response:

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

PC01731-6**Comment:**

As a member of the Westchester neighborhood, LAXWA can & should pay attention to the needs of the entire community. Expand the economy regionally, expand the use of airports regionally, and plan rationally to protect both the economy of Los Angeles and our 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-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.

PC01732**Tracy, Nancy****None Provided****7/23/2001****PC01732-1****Comment:**

This memo that I've delivered to the neighbors in my condominium complex basically makes my opinion on airport expansion clear. Please ease the burden on the 405 by developing an additional site.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC01732-3 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-RC-1 regarding the role of the LAX Master Plan in a regional approach to meeting demand.

PC01732-2**Comment:**

I will be the first to admit that I am not up on all of the finer points of the LAX expansion plan. I do know that I hear jets flying overhead at night and am glad I don't live in Westchester or Inglewood. I know that I don't want increased air pollution, sound pollution, street traffic and jet traffic.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01732-3

Comment:

I know that LAX does not have to be the only major airport serving Los Angeles, Ventura, Santa Barbara, and Orange Counties. I know that there are other sites suitable for development as an airport. I would like to urge you to send a letter to:

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to 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.

PC01734

Griffin, Barbara

None Provided

7/1/2001

PC01734-1

Comment:

As a resident of Playa del Rey, I want to express my objection to the proposed LAX Airport Expansion. I do, however, support using the other regional airports to assist with the expanding numbers of passengers and flights. The financial responsibility of this solution should also be shared with other airport facilities, where expansion would enhance their communities and lead to residential growth.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to 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.

PC01734-2

Comment:

The traffic on the 405 and 105 freeways is also a major concern, as well as the traffic congestion on the streets of Westchester and El Segundo. These cars are not on our streets to patronize our businesses, but using local streets to enter or leave the LAX airport. I object!

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. 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.

PC01734-3

Comment:

NO ON THE LAX AIRPORT EXPANSION!!!!

Response:

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

PC01735**Griffin, Barbara****None Provided****7/1/2001****PC01735-1****Comment:**

As a resident of Playa del Rey, I want to express my objection to the proposed LAX Airport Expansion. I do, however, support using the other regional airports to assist with solution of expanding numbers of passengers and flights.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to 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.

PC01735-2**Comment:**

To expand LAX, many more families would lose their homes. Also in jepordy are our local schools, churches, businesses and parks.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed land acquisition for each of the alternatives in Chapter 3, Section 4.2, Land Use, and Section 4.4.4, Community Disruption and Alteration of Surface Transportation Patterns. 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, 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.

PC01735-3**Comment:**

The noise is already so loud that classroom instruction comes to a complete halt with each and every departure and arrival. The bungalow classrooms vibrate loudly, making it difficult to learn.

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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01735-4

Comment:

I have been a resident of Playa del Rey for over 20 years and take great pride in my home. Over the years I have had to cope with the increased noise level, the air pollution and traffic congestion near the airport. There is now a very real concern for air safety in general. The airport is presently operating above its capacity and we are taking far too many risks with planes operating in such close air space.

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.

PC01735-5

Comment:

NO ON THE LAX AIRPORT EXPANSION!!!

Response:

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

PC01736

Ford, Betty

None Provided

7/1/2001

PC01736-1

Comment:

I am writing to express my concern for the proposed LAX expansion. I feel strongly about using an approach that utilizes the other airports in the region and sharing the responsibility of the increasing number of passengers departing and arriving at LAX.

Response:

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

PC01736-2

Comment:

As a resident of Playa del Rey, I object to the air quality that my family is forced to ingest. The residue of jet fuel is evident on my mini blinds, drapes and plants on the patio.

Response:

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

PC01736-3**Comment:**

The noise level is sometimes unbearable, as the airplanes take off late at night and very early in the morning. It disrupts the ability to sleep, and therefore its' impact is far reaching. The result is increased stress, which often leads to illness and irritability. The local schools are greatly impacted by the noise! With each departure or landing during the school hours, the teachers have to completely stop talking during a lesson and wait for the plane to pass. By then, it is necessary to start over, making it difficult for the children to learn.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise 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.

PC01737**Ford, Betty****None Provided****7/1/2001****PC01737-1****Comment:**

As a flight attendant of Trans World Airlines and a resident of Playa del Rey, I want to express my concern for the safety of LAX, if the expansion plan is put into place. Already this airport is operating at over it's capacity! This means that in addition to safety, the delays in departures and landings are also suffering.

Response:

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

PC01737-2**Comment:**

It would be a crime to take any more homes and displace families, just to accommodate more and more flights. Our homes, schools, churches, businesses and libraries will all suffer if the expansion takes place.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, impacts to libraries in Section 4.26.4, Libraries, and impacts to schools in Section 4.27, Schools, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 5, 16d and 17 in the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition. As noted in TR-RBR-1, no residential acquisition is proposed under Alternative D. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01737-3**Comment:**

NO ON THE LAX AIRPORT EXPANSION!!!

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC01738

Fuglie, Gordon

None Provided

7/24/2001

PC01738-1

Comment:

We oppose the expansion of LAX as proposed in the Draft Master Plan for 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.

PC01738-2

Comment:

The fundamental flaw is in the concept of the plan. The plan focuses on the needs of LAX itself, with some attention to the required mitigation of impact on the surrounding community. We need a larger vision, one that encompasses air and surface transportation and its impact on the quality of life in the communities of Southern California.

The danger in the current plan lies in its inherent reliance on the expansion of LAX to serve regional growth in both passenger and cargo air transportation. We see no reason to believe that passenger traffic into LAX would stop at the targeted level. History suggests otherwise, particularly in the absence of a coherent plan to develop and incentivize the use of other airports in the region, such as Ontario, Palmdale, March AFB, John Wayne, and the former El Toro Marine airfield.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00008-12 for a discussion on growth beyond the identified capacity for Alternative C. Please see TR-RC-1 concerning a regional approach to air traffic. 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.

PC01738-3

Comment:

Traffic congestion on the 405 is already a serious problem. With the proposed expansion of LAX, the 405 will achieve virtual gridlock from the South Bay to the Valley. The Draft Master Plan includes elements to reduce traffic on the 405 between the Marina Freeway and Century Boulevard; presumably these efforts would have some impact. But if LAX expands as proposed, people still have to get there. Build it and they will come -- mostly in cars, compounding congestion problems on the 405, as well as La Cienega, Sepulveda Boulevard and other surface routes. Build it and they will come -- belching pollutants and aggravating stress for all drivers. Build it and they will come - in much greater numbers than targeted in the plan.

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 proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR discussed the air quality changes for the proposed airport alternatives. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC01738-4

Comment:

Population growth is already expected to slow the average freeway mileage in the region to 18 miles per hour - 20 m.p.h if Governor Davis' current plan is enacted. Traffic congestion erodes the strength of our economy, the quality of our air and the quality of our lives. But the virtual gridlock we experience now and project for the future is optional. We the people, governments and businesses of Southern California, by action or inaction - created a car-dependent metropolis in which traffic congestion is inevitable. We can create a better future for ourselves and our children if we try.

Response:

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

PC01738-5

Comment:

It is imperative for the future of Southern California that we start designing a metropolitan area that is less dependent on car travel, particularly freeway travel over significant distances. That effort must start with a regional vision for air transportation that distributes air passengers and cargo broadly around the region, minimizing the surface transportation impact. Los Angeles does not - yet - have a well developed surface rail/subway system to move people efficiently to and from a single regional air transportation hub. What we do have is a network of regional airports that can be developed to meet air transportation needs more locally. Despite the inherent challenges, regional airports can be developed much more quickly than a comprehensive regional subway system.

Response:

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

PC01738-6

Comment:

In addition to passenger traffic expansion, the Draft LAX Master Plan adds infrastructure for an expansion of cargo traffic at LAX. This has even less justification than the proposed expansion of air passenger traffic. Most air cargo packages do not need a hub airport in order to make connecting flights. After arriving at LAX, locally-destined cargo shipments are loaded onto trucks and driven throughout the region on already-congested freeways. Design a system that allows packages to have less surface travel, too!

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. For a discussion about cargo truck traffic concerns, please see Topical Response TR-ST-1.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01738-7

Comment:

Remember that the LAX plan must first serve the needs of Southern Californians, not the needs of airlines. Airlines do not care how long passengers must travel to get to the airport. Residents do. Air cargo companies do not care how badly the trucks carrying their packages compound problems of pollution, danger and traffic on already-congested roads and freeways. Residents do. It is time for the residents of Los Angeles to have a transportation plan that serves us.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the roles and responsibilities of LAWA, the City of Los Angeles, SCAG, and SCRAA in meeting regional demand. 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, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

PC01738-8

Comment:

We recommend the following specific actions with respect to the Draft LAX Master Plan:

1. Scrap the plan and design a solution that distributes air passengers and air cargo more widely throughout the region, minimizing the impact on surface transportation.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01738-5.

PC01738-9

Comment:

2. Connect the Green Line to LAX by a people mover system that connects hotels, rental car lots and the Green Line directly to the LAX terminals. This will cut out a tremendous amount of pollution and congestion generated by vans within the terminal area and make the Green Line a more reasonable connection between LAX and Downtown Long Beach and Pasadena (once the proposed light rail to that area is completed). We need this step as an immediate action commitment, not as an option much later in the expansion process.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan particularly Subtopical Response TR-ST-5.4 for more information. Note that Alternative D is very 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.

PC01738-10

Comment:

3. Improve safety at LAX by diverting slower corporate and private jets to Hawthorne or other small airports. This can be probably be accomplished by market incentives if we quit subsidizing small jets by low landing fees. Small jets actually require more runway time and therefore controller attention than big ones. Let the landing fees accurately reflect the resource burden created by these jets, and help them find attractive alternatives.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00281-17 regarding the diversion of slower aircraft to other airports. Please also see Response to Comment PC00215-1 regarding the landing fee.

PC01738-11**Comment:**

4. If elements of the "ring road" approach are implemented, be certain to preserve a safe, workable bike path. The existing bike path on Westchester Parkway offers the only reasonably safe passage between the beach and Sepulveda Boulevard. It is a vital connection not only for beachgoers and cycling clubs, but also for those of us who want to move about the Westchester neighborhood without jumping in our cars. Westchester can and should be a neighborhood that is a walkable, bikable community, not a parking garage.

Response:

The project alternatives would not hinder the ability to bike along Westchester Parkway. Where bike paths would be impacted along this route by the project alternatives, the paths would be replaced.

PC01739

**[unreadable],
Joseph**

None Provided

PC01739-1**Comment:**

23. Servicio de buses in and out para llegar al trabajo y cuando uno sale tener un buen servicio.

24. Preparacion para cambiar de posieron.

23. In and out bus service to get to work and when one exits, have good service.

24. Preparation to change position.

Response:

Please refer to Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, page 4-427, of the Draft EIS/EIR and page 4-333 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding the provision of public transit terminals to better serve the surrounding community.

PC01739-2

The remainder of this comment letter is identical to form letter PFH; please refer to the response to form letter PFH.

PC01750

**No Author Identified, South Bay Latino Chamber of
Commerce**

7/25/2001

PC01750-1**Comment:**

The capacity of the airport has continued to increase over the past decade and is expected to continue growing with or without the Proposed Master Plan of LAX. In light of the anticipated increase in

3. Comments and Responses

passengers and cargo annually, Latino residents, workers and business owners of the Lennox, Inglewood, South Central and Hawthorne communities officially submit this Memorandum that explains our concerns and suggested recommendations for consideration, response and support by LAWA.

We respectfully submit this memorandum in compliance with the established July 25, 2001 deadline for comment submission. We also understand that LAWA is obligated to respond to the individual organizations that submit comments prior to the established deadline. In an effort to remain engaged in a proactive and constructive manner, we request a meeting to be held between LAWA decision makers and the South Bay Latino Chamber of Commerce and LULAC Lennox Council No. 3056 before the newly established comment period deadline of September 24, 2001. Subsequently, we request scheduling meetings twice a year to review progress toward the implementation of adopted recommendations. Latino community leaders, residents and business owners seek a partnership with LAWA that will benefit Latino residents, Latino business owners and Latino employees who reside adjacent to LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. Please note that responses to the comments on the Draft EIS/EIR and/or the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR are made available to the public in this Final EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process.

PC01750-2

Comment:

This memorandum is presented in light of the increases in air travel, traffic congestion, noise and subsequent impacts on air quality that together have had a detrimental effect on the quality of life in communities closest to the airport, as well as those located in route to LAX. The information below summarizes concerns and recommendations from Latino organizations representing residents, employees and business owners in the communities of Lennox, Hawthorne, Inglewood and South Central. This submission reflects the communities' urgent needs that LAWA should assist in mitigating, given the physical, environmental and negative impacts that have occurred and will continue to occur with the proposed expansion of LAX.

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.

PC01750-3

Comment:

For various reasons, Latinos have not fully participated in the series of public hearings and community workshops coordinated by LAWA. This does not in any way reflect the interest and concern that Latino residents, employees and business owners have on the issues impacting their communities, and the ongoing discussions of expansion. Attached to this Memorandum are copies of petitions signed by long-time business owners, residents and employees of the most affected areas.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01750-4

Comment:

We appreciate LAWA'S efforts to seek input of residents, employees, and business owners of the impacted areas, through the creation of the Environmental Justice process. We fully support LAWA's concern consistent with your Executive Order that "Minority or low income populations should not be

disproportionately exposed to environmental hazards resulting from federally funded programs."1 It is important to note that we understand the importance of airport expansion for the improvement of operations at LAX, and if the approval of expansion should occur, area residents, employees and businesses within the impacted communities should benefit from the economic prosperity that will naturally result from this growth.

1Current LAWA Initiatives.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01750-5

Comment:

We acknowledge that a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between LAWA and the City of Inglewood has been established. However, this memorandum incorporates Latino residents, employees and business owners of the City of Inglewood, whose concerns are not reflected in the current MOU.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01750-6

Comment:

In addition to the already planned improvements such as neighborhood beautification, noise abatement measures, alternative transit modes, and improvements in air quality in neighborhoods impacted by LAX growth, we submit the following concerns and recommendations on behalf of adjacent Latino communities:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC01750-7

Comment:

Creation and Construction Projects/Contracts

Senior Housing - We recommend that LAWA locate available land in Lennox, Inglewood, Hawthorne, and South Central, purchase it and construct a soundproofed complex to be utilized as senior housing for residents of these communities. If land is not available, we recommend the rehabilitation of an existing complex to be designated as Senior Housing in these impacted communities. We believe that noise and air quality impact negatively on the well-being of highly vulnerable Senior residents.

Response:

As stated on page 4-337, in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA received a substantial number of recommendations for mitigation measures and other benefits relating to environmental justice concerns from environmental justice workshops, comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR, and subsequent community outreach. All recommendations were thoroughly evaluated against such criteria as whether the recommendation had a nexus or connection with the environmental effects of the proposed LAX Master Plan, or whether it would be feasible for the FAA and/or LAWA to fund and implement. Those recommendations that best met the criteria were instrumental in defining the Environmental Justice Program that was included in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As further described in Topical Response TR-EJ-2, public input was also received in association with public circulation of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, through additional environmental justice workshops, public hearings, and comments on the EIS/EIR. Environmental justice outreach was also conducted more recently through meetings with local organizations, environmental groups, and civic, religious, and

3. Comments and Responses

business leaders in adjacent communities. This additional input was considered and evaluated through a process similar to that undertaken prior to circulation of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The final Environmental Justice Program is presented in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of the Final EIS/EIR, with supporting information provided in Appendix F-A, of this Final EIS/EIR. As shown in Appendix F-A, Attachment 1, senior housing, while considered, did not meet the criteria for inclusion within the Environmental Justice Program.

PC01750-8

Comment:

Procurement - South Bay Latino Chamber of Commerce - Latino small businesses are the fastest growing segment of the business community, particularly in Greater Los Angeles. For procurement, we request that the South Bay Latino Chamber of Commerce member businesses be considered as a preferred partner for expansion contracts for any and all projects approved of and executed by LAWA especially for products and services in the areas of Inglewood, Lennox, South Central and Hawthorne. Currently, Latino business owners within these impacted communities are under-utilized for business contracts with LAX. Developing an ongoing business relationship with the South Bay Latino Chamber of Commerce and its member companies, will significantly further the potential for economic growth in these areas.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding a detailed description of the environmental justice program, economic benefits, and employment and business opportunities for low income and/or minority communities.

PC01750-9

Comment:

We are also concerned that construction positions will not be made available to Latino area residents who are skilled to work on these projects. We recommend that an arrangement be made with LAWA and LAX for area residents of the impacted communities to be given priority for job opportunities for any and all construction projects.

Response:

Please see Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of this Final EIS/EIR and Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding employment opportunities that would benefit minority and low-income communities and disadvantaged business enterprises.

PC01750-10

Comment:

Airport Magnet High School in Lennox - We recommend that LAWA locate available land, and aid in the construction of an Airport Magnet High School in the Lennox area. Lennox does not currently have a High School. Construction of a high school would speak to a desperately needed resource to Lennox area residents and provide a training ground for future employees. LAWA should assist the Lennox community in obtaining funding for construction of the facility, and provide support for the Magnet school curriculum, and operations. The Airport Magnet High School can also provide a site for Adult Education Training for Airport Employees. We are confident that a quality high school education is a mutual benefit to the local community and to the objective of preparing area youth to work in the largest local industry, LAX.

Response:

As stated on page 4-337, in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA received a substantial number of recommendations for mitigation measures and other benefits relating to environmental justice concerns from environmental justice workshops, comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR, and subsequent community outreach. All recommendations were thoroughly evaluated with consideration of benefit provided relative to cost, whether the

recommendation had a nexus or connection with the environmental effects of the proposed LAX Master Plan, or whether it would be feasible for the FAA and/or LAWA to fund and implement. Those recommendations that best met the criteria were instrumental in defining the Environmental Justice Program included in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As further described in Topical Response TR-EJ-2, public input was also received in association with public circulation of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, through additional environmental justice workshops, public hearings, and comments on the EIS/EIR. Furthermore, environmental justice outreach was conducted more recently through meetings with local organizations, environmental groups, and civic, religious, and business leaders in adjacent communities. This additional input was considered and evaluated through a process similar to that undertaken prior to circulation of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. While all recommendations were considered as possible additional components of the Environmental Justice Program, there was a practical limit to the number of benefits that could be selected to help off-set disproportionately high and adverse environmental effects on minority and low-income communities. Furthermore, while LAWA will investigate and pursue environmental justice benefits as feasible and allowable by law, implementation of any programs or measures is dependent upon LAWA's ability to utilize airport revenue funding or other state or federal funding sources for such implementation. The final Environmental Justice Program is presented in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of this Final EIS/EIR, with supporting information provided in Appendix F-A, of this Final EIS/EIR.

PC01750-11

Comment:

Current Academic Institutions - The current demand for seats in existing local area schools is not being met. Relocation or removal of any academic institution in Lennox, Hawthorne and Inglewood, is not negotiable. In fact, the addition of K-12 academic institutions is an urgent need.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01750-11.

PC01750-12

Comment:

The LAX Business Assistance Center in Lennox - It is in LAWA's best interest to support the local community in the construction of a LAX Business Assistance Center in Lennox. The Center will create a partnership between local businesses and LAX. In order to ensure the success of the Center, it is important that LAWA provide the necessary funding for services needed, program development, maintenance and upkeep of the Center after construction has been completed.

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.

PC01750-13

Comment:

The LAX Employment Training Center in Lennox - The LAX Employment Training Center can serve for re-training of current LAX employees for new employment opportunities and career advancement. In addition, an important component identified by area residents and employees of LAX alike, is the creation of a Language Institute. The Language Institute can be incorporated in the curriculum of the Training Center. The LAX Employment Training Center can further be utilized to provide shuttle service to and from the airport, and as a free employee parking facility.

Response:

As stated on page 4-337, in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA received a substantial number of recommendations for mitigation measures and other benefits relating to environmental justice concerns from environmental justice workshops, comments

3. Comments and Responses

received on the Draft EIS/EIR, and subsequent community outreach. All recommendations were thoroughly evaluated against such criteria as whether the recommendation had a nexus or connection with the environmental effects of the proposed LAX Master Plan, or whether it would be feasible for the FAA and/or LAWA to fund and implement. Those recommendations that best met the criteria were instrumental in defining the Environmental Justice Program included in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As further described in Topical Response TR-EJ-2, public input was also received in association with public circulation of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, through additional environmental justice workshops, public hearings, and comments on the EIS/EIR. Furthermore, environmental justice outreach was conducted more recently through meetings with local organizations, environmental groups, and civic, religious, and business leaders in adjacent communities. This additional input was considered and evaluated through a process similar to that undertaken prior to circulation of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The final Environmental Justice Program is presented in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of this Final EIS/EIR, with supporting information provided in Appendix F-A, of this Final EIS/EIR. Although a job training center is not proposed in Lennox, the program does incorporate job training and educational components that support a fundamental priority for ensuring that jobs, job training, and related education provisions benefit local communities that are subject to environmental effects associated with the LAX Master Plan, including the community of Lennox.

PC01750-14

Comment:

LAWA Childcare Center - Area residents, employees and business owners unanimously support the recommendation of the construction of a LAWA Childcare Center for employees of LAX. The Childcare Center should be constructed at a convenient site on the airport perimeter, such as Lennox or Hawthorne.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding the environmental justice program and benefits to the surrounding communities.

PC01750-15

Comment:

Recruitment, Certification, Permitting and Insurance for Latino Businesses - We request that LAWA and LAX recruit, with the assistance of the South Bay Latino Chamber of Commerce, local Latino businesses who are registered as MBE/WBE/OBE/DBE firms to contract with and work on construction projects and provide funds for programs to assist in the certification process. The area businesses are concerned that the contracting/insurance requirement process is difficult and intimidating for local Latino businesses. We recommend that LAWA streamline the process of applying for contracts to do business with LAX, including the elaborate insurance and permitting requirements currently in place. This will ensure access and participation by Latino owned small/middle sized businesses.

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. and Section 4.4.3.7 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and the Final EIS/EIR for additional information on the jobs outreach program.

PC01750-16

Comment:

Employment

Linking Jobs and Training---We recommend that the Business Assistance Center proposed above, be used to coordinate existing job training programs and services. We also request that any and all efforts by LAWA and LAX incorporate unions in the process. Unions can serve as co-sponsors for job training

and potential recruitment that could be available at LAX. There is a concern that current employees who are union members will not have the opportunity to take part in and receive job training for new opportunities and positions available at LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC01750-15.

PC01750-17

Comment:

Local Workers and Reduced Traffic Demands - Local residents comprise an able and willing work force that has easier access, and with the appropriate shuttle service and free parking, will not increase traffic volume or create demands on parking. We request that LAWA provide job opportunity information to area residents for positions available now, and in the future at and around LAX.

Response:

The Environmental Justice Program described in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of the Final EIS/EIR, sets a priority for enlisting local disadvantaged business enterprises and employing local residents with implementation of the proposed LAX Master Plan.

PC01750-18

Comment:

Living Wages for LAX Workers - We request a guarantee that any and all positions created or currently in place should require a minimum salary equivalent to the established living wage. We also request that a benefits package, including health, dental, vision, educational assistance, life insurance, childcare and parking, be provided for all employment through LAX.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01750-19

Comment:

Summer Internship/After School Programs - We request that LAWA institute a Summer Internship Program for area youth at LAX Headquarters. Local area youth do not have sufficient job training and educational programs available to them during the summer, and as after-school programs.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01750-11.

PC01750-20

Comment:

Local Non-Profits - We request that LAWA organize meetings between Local Non-Profits and Airline Managers to begin the process of building relationships, and for the creation of partnerships that may result in mutually beneficial projects at LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. As described in Section 2 of Appendix S-D, Supplemental Environmental Justice Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA has made a concerted effort to engage communities in decisions regarding mitigation of current and future environmental impacts associated with past, present, and future actions at LAX. For example, a Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Los Angeles and the City of Inglewood began a new level of cooperation to pursue and implement measures to study and mitigate the possible environmental impacts on Inglewood of existing and potential future operations and improvements at LAX. Please see

3. Comments and Responses

Topical Response TR-EJ-2 for information about the Environmental Justice Program. Also see Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of this Final EIS/EIR, which presents benefits that were developed through an extensive public outreach program in order to help off-set identified disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and low-income populations.

PC01750-21

Comment:

Noise

Soundproofing Job Opportunities Program - An immediate potential employment opportunity for area residents and local businesses is to provide a direct link to upcoming projects for soundproofing of homes, businesses and area schools. The minority communities closest to LAX are concerned that they will not have an opportunity to pursue contracts and/or employment opportunities available through projects coordinated by LAWA and LAX.

Response:

Priorities for contracting with local disadvantaged business enterprises (DBE's) and employing local residents with implementation of the LAX Master Plan are set forth in the Environmental Justice Program described in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of the Final EIS/EIR. The priority for contracting with local DBE's and businesses would extend to soundproofing contracts related to implementation of the LAX Master Plan. Also, please see Response to Comment PC01750-13.

PC01750-22

Comment:

Sound-Proofing Expansion - We recommend that LAWA monitor noise levels in adjacent areas currently designated for these services. The area residents and businesses should be sound proofed if the monitoring indicates that these areas are adversely affected by noise due to increased air traffic at LAX. The area residents and businesses within blocks of the area identified as impacted by noise believe they qualify for soundproofing due to their close proximity to LAX. Insulation can include: solid core doors, glass insulated screen doors, double windows, weather stripping, attic insulation, central air condition and at times a new roof, if required.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding noise monitoring and qualification for receipt of sound insulation. Also see Mitigation Measure MM-LU-5, in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding a recommended upgrade and expansion of noise monitoring.

PC01750-23

Comment:

Reduce Noise on Surface Streets - Community residents in areas closest to the airport are concerned about the noise levels on surface streets. Clearly the increased cargo and passenger volume at LAX is especially felt by the communities closest to the airport. LAX should study the best means to reduce noise and implement an appropriate program.

Response:

Mitigation measures for traffic and aircraft noise were provided in the Environmental Action Plan, Section 5.3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for all four build alternatives. Also please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program, Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding land use/noise mitigation, and Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation.

PC01750-24

Comment:

Air Conditioning for Classrooms - Despite the fact that schools have already benefited from initial soundproofing and insulation programs, we recommend that a reassessment of all classrooms at local area schools be undertaken before the end of 2001. Schools in the most affected low income areas and minority census tracts should also be considered for enhanced soundproofing and insulation efforts including air conditioning where needed.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program, noise effects on schools, and applicable school mitigation. Please also see Mitigation Measures MM-LU-3, Conduct Study of the Relationship Between Aircraft Noise Levels and the Ability of Children to Learn, and MM-LU-4, Provide Additional Sound Insulation for Schools Shown by MM-LU-3 to be Significantly Impacted by Aircraft Noise, discussed in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01750-25

Comment:

Flight Restrictions -The quality of life for communities surrounding the airport is negatively impacted due to the high volume of flights in and out of LAX, as well as the long hours that they are in operation. We urge that a restriction of flight arrivals and departures after midnight and before 6:00 a.m. be strictly enforced. We also recommend that LAWA institute a penalty for airlines who are in violation of the time restrictions, and that penalty funds be allocated to non-profit organizations supporting education/job training programs. We recommend that LAWA institute a monetary penalty of \$5,000.00 for every fifteen (15) minutes for airlines that are in violation of the midnight and 6:00 a.m. time restriction.

Response:

Please see Subtopical Responses TR-N-7.1 and TR-N-7.5 regarding enforcement of flight restrictions and monetary penalties.

PC01750-26

Comment:

Freeway Sound Wall - There is no sound wall along the 405 Freeway running through the Lennox community between Imperial Highway and Century Boulevard. A significant proportion of the freeway traffic is related to airport and airport passenger traffic. Construction of a sound wall at this location will mitigate airport related noise to residents and school children in the area.

Response:

Please see Section 4.1, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding noise impacts associated with surface transportation. This section concludes that airport related noise level increases along roadways and freeways under Alternative D would not be considered significant or substantial according to Caltrans, therefore, no soundwall along the I-405 is proposed. Also see Appendix K of the Draft EIS/EIR and its evaluation of noise, including potential effects along I-405, and Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding the effectiveness of sound barriers.

PC01750-27

Comment:

Noise and Air Quality Monitoring Over Time - We request that LAWA conduct constant monitoring of noise and air quality impacts to neighboring communities. This monitoring will determine if more areas are being negatively impacted or current areas are having greater impacts over time. LAWA should

3. Comments and Responses

determine if the current areas receiving noise and air quality mitigation measures need to be upgraded, and/or expanded to include additional areas not already receiving these services.

Response:

Comment noted. Regarding air quality mitigation measures see Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 and Mitigation Measure MM-LU-5, in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR concerning noise monitoring and improvements to noise monitoring systems.

PC01750-28

Comment:

Air Quality/Health

Airport Employee Health Screening Center - Open an Airport Employee Health Screening Center located at LAX and screen all employees on an annual basis. Provide appropriate health care to employees with preventable medical conditions.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01750-29

Comment:

Air Purification Programs for Local Schools and Public Buildings - We understand that additional filters can be added to current air conditioning systems to cut down on negative effects of smog and other pollutants in classrooms in the Lennox, Hawthorne and Inglewood School Districts. A similar program should be considered for all other public buildings.

Response:

Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided information on air quality mitigation measures. Specifically, mitigation measure MM-AQ-1, Implement Revised Air Quality Mitigation Programs (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), includes a wide array of actions to reduce airport-related air quality impacts. Most of the components of this mitigation measure focus on actions that would be taken at LAX to address impacts both in and around the airport, with additional actions providing benefits that would accrue more broadly to the South Coast Air Basin.

PC01750-30

Comment:

Employee Health and Wellness Center at LAX - LAX employees are exposed or believe they are exposed to a high level of stress due to the nature and demand of a major airport operation. Providing an Employee Health and Wellness Center at LAX will contribute to a reduction of stress and an improvement of work performance.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01750-13. A health and wellness center, while considered as an environmental justice benefit, did not meet the criteria for inclusion in the Environmental Justice Program. However, a mobile health clinic is proposed as a benefit, as described in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of this Final EIS/EIR.

PC01750-31**Comment:**

Green Space - Insufficient green space is available in areas such as Lennox and Hawthorne. We request that LAWA locate areas where green space can be added to provide local children a place where they can have soccer fields, baseball fields, basketball, a skateboard park, and a gymnasium.

Response:

As stated in Section 4.26.3, Parks and Recreation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, access to public parks or recreation areas within the study area would not be impaired with implementation of any of the four build alternatives. Please see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding the environmental justice program and benefits to the surrounding communities.

PC01750-32**Comment:**

Relocation

Home Ownership Program - Latino residents of Lennox, Hawthorne, Inglewood and South Central want to remain in the communities where they currently reside. Many residents live, work, shop and go to church in their community. However, consistent with already established homeowner relocation programs, we urge LAWA to ensure that Latino residents that are eligible, be provided with benefits that exceed the minimal levels of assistance required by these programs.

Response:

Comment noted. LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative, Alternative D, does not propose residential acquisition. LAWA's existing and proposed Relocation Plans incorporate provisions that ensure the special needs of minorities are addressed to the degree feasible.

PC01750-33**Comment:**

Affordable Housing Program - There is a lack of affordable housing in Lennox, Hawthorne and Inglewood for area residents. We request that LAWA support local organizations and businesses in the rehabilitation of existing housing stock or the construction of new buildings under the Affordable Housing Program. The housing, both for rehabilitation and new construction, should take into consideration mitigation efforts to curb the negative issues of noise and air quality.

Response:

Comment noted. While the Environmental Justice Program presented in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of this Final EIS/EIR does not include provisions for LAWA to rehabilitate housing, LAWA is implementing a "Move On Housing Program," a collaborative effort between public and not-for-profit organizations to move and rehabilitate Manchester Square and Airport/Belford area structures in order to transfer housing assets to residential areas in Los Angeles County, provide reasonable housing for displaced tenants, and provide construction-related employment opportunities to community residents.

PC01750-34**Comment:**

Transit

LAX Employee Shuttle - In an effort to reduce traffic congestion in and around LAX, we urge LAWA to improve the current employee shuttle service and parking. The current shuttle system is inefficient for employees to the point that an average 8 hour day often extends to an 11 to 12 hour day because of the infrequent number of shuttles available to and from the parking structure. We have found that a large

3. Comments and Responses

number of Latino employees live in the surrounding communities of Lennox, Hawthorne and Inglewood who have to park further from the airport than the location of their residence to the airport. Latino employees of LAX have indicated that they are often required to arrive at least one hour prior to their starting time in order to punch in on time. We recommend that LAWA provide a free shuttle service that has scheduled service every 15 minutes instead of the current 30 minutes interval. LAX should also investigate the possibility of funding a local organization to provide a Jitney Service for employees that reside in adjacent communities.

Response:

Comment noted, measures for addressing traffic congestion were presented in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Improvements to employee parking are proposed under the Master Plan and LAWA will continue efforts to improve shuttle service for employees.

PC01750-35

Comment:

Connect Green Line - There is no doubt that a disproportionate number of Latinos utilize public transportation to arrive at their place of employment. Connecting the Green Line to LAX will further reduce traffic and the environmental impacts to neighboring communities. Employees should be given discounts for using public transportation.

Response:

As indicated in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA has an employee commute program that includes a subsidy for employees who use bus or light rail as their primary mode of transportation. With a pedestrian connection to the MTA Green Line, as proposed under Alternative D, LAWA Staff's preferred alternative, participation in this program would likely increase.

PC01750-36

Comment:

Road Improvements-Impacted communities are also affected by increased volume of passengers and cargo at LAX. Roads and sidewalks that bear a large portion of airport related traffic should be widened, made into one-way streets, or be reconfigured to funnel traffic out of residential areas.

Response:

Traffic issues and associated mitigation measures that address potential impacts associated with the proposed LAX Master Plan were presented 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 Report S-2 and S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The mitigation program proposes numerous improvements to area roadways and transportation facilities and sets a high priority for diverting traffic out of residential areas. Furthermore, as described in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Final EIS/EIR, the Environmental Justice Program includes a benefit to expand the Gateway LAX Improvements to the east along Century Boulevard through the City of Inglewood. Such improvements would include roadways, landscaping, signage, and other aesthetic enhancements.

PC01750-37

Comment:

Traffic Lighting Improvements - It appears that traffic lighting in neighborhoods closest to the airport have not been upgraded consistent with recent technological advances. In addition to safety considerations, upgrading and coordinating traffic lighting is essential for improving access, passenger drop off/pick up and the movement of cargo in and out of LAX. Reducing traffic and accidents will directly benefit LAX and the minority communities, residents, tourists and the City of Los Angeles.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01750-37 and note that the mitigation measures that address potential traffic impacts associated with the proposed LAX Master Plan include improvements to area roadways and transportation facilities, including signalization.

PC01750-38

Comment:

LAX Transport Services - It is our belief that there has been a substantial increase in truck, not only automobile traffic, especially through the community of Lennox, as a direct result of the record volume of cargo arriving at LAX. The negative physical and environmental impact are beyond acceptable limits and have had far reaching implications to residents, businesses and to the infrastructure. Mitigation programs should be instituted to reduce or eliminate these negative impacts.

Response:

Traffic issues and associated mitigation measures that address potential impacts associated with the proposed LAX Master Plan were presented 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 Report 2 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The mitigation program includes all feasible mitigation measures available to address the significant surface transportation impacts of the proposed project. Please also see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding efforts to minimize cargo truck impacts.

PC01750-39

Comment:

Traffic Accidents - LAWA should monitor on a consistent basis the volume of traffic accidents on local streets adjacent to LAX. If the volume of traffic accidents continues to increase in communities around LAX, LAWA should provide measures such as stop signs, speed bumps and more traffic signals to address this rise in accidents.

Response:

See Response to Comment PC1750-36, Response to Comment PC1750-38, Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic, and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC01750-40

Comment:

Services

Incorporation of Lennox - As an Unincorporated Area, Lennox is in a non-traditional position to negotiate with LAWA. Unlike neighboring cities such as Inglewood, Hawthorne, El Segundo and the City of Los Angeles, Lennox is a community lacking elected officials and a municipal infrastructure. Nonetheless, we expect that LAWA will treat the issues, concerns and recommendations equal to any other municipality. LAWA could provide a valuable service to this community by treating them as you would any other City and if Lennox residents desire to become a city, assist in their efforts.

Response:

Comment noted. LAWA and FAA have treated public comments from citizens and organizations representing Lennox in the same manner as comments from neighboring cities. It should be noted that the unincorporated area of Lennox is represented by elected Los Angeles County Supervisors. The County of Los Angeles provided comments on both the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01750-41

Comment:

Adopt A School - We request that LAWA begin an "Adopt A School" program for local area schools and provide incentives for employees of LAWA and LAX to volunteer at these academic institutions. Volunteer efforts can include job training programs geared at educating local area youth for future positions at LAX.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01750-11.

PC01750-42

Comment:

Mural Art at LAX - Create a "Mural Art Program" for local area youth to create mural art for LAX projects.

Response:

As stated on page 4-337, in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA received a substantial number of recommendations for mitigation measures and other benefits relating to environmental justice concerns from environmental justice workshops, comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR, and subsequent community outreach. All recommendations were thoroughly evaluated with consideration of benefit provided relative to cost, whether the recommendation had a nexus or connection with the environmental effects of the proposed LAX Master Plan, or whether it would be feasible for the FAA and/or LAWA to fund and implement. Those recommendations that best met the criteria were instrumental in defining the Environmental Justice Program included in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As further described in Topical Response TR-EJ-2, public input was also received in association with public circulation of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, through additional environmental justice workshops, public hearings, and comments on the EIS/EIR. Furthermore, environmental justice outreach was conducted more recently through meetings with local organizations, environmental groups, and civic, religious, and business leaders in adjacent communities. This additional input was considered and evaluated through a process similar to that undertaken prior to circulation of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. While all recommendations were considered as possible additional components of the Environmental Justice Program, there was a practical limit to the number of benefits that could be selected to help off-set disproportionately high and adverse environmental effects on minority and low-income communities. Furthermore, while LAWA will investigate and pursue environmental justice benefits as feasible and allowable by law, implementation of any programs or measures is dependent upon LAWA's ability to utilize airport revenue funding, or other state or federal funding sources for such implementation. The final Environmental Justice Program is presented in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of this Final EIS/EIR, with supporting information provided in Appendix F-A, of this Final EIS/EIR.

PC01750-43

Comment:

We look forward to meeting with you and other LAWA representatives prior to September 24, 2001 deadline. Thank for your commitment that minority communities not be omitted from this important issue and that all comments, suggestions, ideas and recommendations are considered and taken seriously. Please contact Mr. Candy Saenz, Executive Director of the South Bay Latino Chamber of Commerce, at (310) 419-7975 to coordinate all future meetings.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01750-44

PFH and PFI submitted along with this comment letter; please refer to the responses to form letters PFH and PFI.

PC01751	Rotolo, Mr. & Mrs. Pat	None Provided	7/21/2001
----------------	---------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01751-1

Comment:

There is no end to the expansion of LAX, if they keep on going the way they plan on going.

When we moved here the airport was at Mines Field, then in the 1960's they expanded by adding a north runway and taking 30% of the homes in Westchester and Playa del Rey. Then in the 1980's they expanded again to accommodate more passengers and cargo and taking more homes.

Response:

Comment noted. This comment is identical to comment PC00854-1; please see Response to Comment PC00854-1.

PC01751-2

Comment:

Now, in the new millenium they want to take more homes and businesses, which includes one-half 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 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.

Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition.

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. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 for further discussion of effects on the community of Westchester.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01751-3

Comment:

Now we read that LAX is one of the five unsafest airports in the country. What will it be with more expansion?

Response:

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

PC01751-4

Comment:

Isn't it time to send some of the passengers and cargo directly to their destinations? The area around the airport will be off limits for the people who live here!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Response to Comment PC00281-19 regarding relocating cargo operations, and Response to Comment PC01881-176 regarding re-routing passengers.

PC01751-5

Comment:

Pollution will be unhealthy for everyone in the area and cause cancer not only to the elderly, but to the young families which live in the area, El Segundo, a prime area for raising young families, Westchester, Playa del Rey, Inglewood, etc. also with many young families.

Response:

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

PC01751-6

Comment:

No matter what you do traffic will be a problem, and there already is a problem, and a hazard to locals and passengers going to and from the airport.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01751-7

Comment:

We've had noise in the area for all the years we've lived here having to turn the sound louder so we could hear the T.V. and shouting to each other to be heard.

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 AL0006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

PC01751-8

Comment:

Our daughter lives in El Segundo and the noise is unbearable.

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement and Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation.

PC01751-9

Comment:

Even with soundproofing, which means we have to keep our doors and windows closed, and turn on the fan for polluted air, which raises the price of our electric bill also. That also means we will breathe in polluted air when we do our garden work or go out to run errands.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00088-2.

PC01751-10

Comment:

What are you doing to us?

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01751-11

Comment:

(PS) If our grandchildren get too many chest cold or (God forbid cancer) we'll work like Erin Brockovich.

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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01752 Gorman, Many None Provided 7/16/2001

PC01752-1

Comment:

Stop the LAX Expansion Plan. This plan will destroy the Westchester community, increase traffic, worsen air pollution, and increase noise. The negative impact on property values and quality of life are not acceptable.

Response:

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

PC01753 Velick, Paul None Provided 7/23/2001

PC01753-1

Comment:

We will do everything in our power as a community of legal professionals to halt the operations of jets.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01753-2

The remainder of this comment letter is identical to form letter PFF; please refer to the responses to form letter PFF.

PC01754 Ryan, Andy None Provided 7/26/2001

PC01754-1

Comment:

MYSELF & MY FAMILY ARE DEAD-SET AGAINST THE EXPANSION OF LAX & THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE RING ROAD.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D, which does not include a ring road, has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01754-2**Comment:**

WE FEEL A REGIONAL SOLUTION (AS PROPOSED BY JAMES FLANIGAN IN TODAY'S LA TIMES) IS A MORE REASONABLE APPROACH.

ANY INCREASE IN CARGO DEMAND AS WELL AS SOME OF THE CURRENT CARGO TRAFFIC SHOULD BE MOVED TO OTHER AIRPORTS IN THE REGION. I HAVE MANY FRIENDS IN SIMI VALLEY, ORANGE COUNTY, SANTA CLARITA, AND OTHER AREAS WHO COMPLAIN BITTERLY ABOUT HAVING TO DRIVE IN TRAFFIC TO LAX TO CATCH A FLIGHT TO THE EAST COAST. THINK OF THE TIME & MONEY WASTED.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding 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 also Response to Comment PC00599-54 for more information about cargo activity.

PC01754-3**Comment:**

WITH THE CONSTRUCTION OF PLAYA VISTA TRAFFIC IN THIS PART OF TOWN IS GOING TO GET MUCH WORSE.

Response:

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

PC01754-4**Comment:**

ANY LAX EXPANSION WILL ONLY BRING IT TO A STAND STILL.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01754-5**Comment:**

WE WILL FIGHT ANY LAX EXPANSION FOR AS LONG & AS HARD NECESSARY.

HOPE THIS ISN'T TOO LATE - WE'VE BEEN OUT OF TOWN.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC01755 **Rotolo, Mr. & Mrs.** **None Provided** **7/21/2001**
Pat

PC01755-1

Comment:

There is no end to the expansion of LAX, if they keep on going the way they plan on going. When we moved here the airport was at Mines Field, then in the 1960's they expanded by adding a north runway and taking 30% of the houses in Westchester and Playa del Rey. Then in the 1980's they expanded again to accommodate more passengers and cargo and taking more houses.

Response:

Comment noted. This comment is similar to comment PC00854-1; please see Response to Comment PC00854-1.

PC01755-2

Comment:

Now, in the new millenium they want to take more homes and businesses, which includes one half of the Westchester business district.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC01751-2; please refer to Response to Comment PC01751-2.

PC01755-3

Comment:

Now we read that LAX is one of the five unsafest airports in the country. What will it be with more expansion?

Response:

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

PC01755-4

Comment:

Isn't it time to send some of the cargo and passengers directly to their destinations? The area around the airport will be off limits for the people who live here!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Response to Comment PC00281-19 regarding relocating cargo operations, and Response to Comment PC01881-176 regarding re-routing passengers.

PC01755-5

Comment:

Pollution will be unhealthy for everyone living in the area and cause cancer and chest infections not only to the elderly, but to the thousands of young families which live in the areas, El Segundo, Westchester,

Playa del Rey, Inglewood, etc. There is great abundance of young families in these areas especially in El Segundo.

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.

PC01755-6

Comment:

No matter what you do traffic will be a problem, and a hazard to locals and passengers going to and from the airport and be nerve wracking to all.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01755-7

Comment:

We've had noise in the area for all the years we've lived here having to turn the sound louder on the T.V. to hear it and having to shout to each other to be heard.

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.

PC01755-8

Comment:

Even with soundproofing, which means we have to keep our doors and windows closed, and turn on the fan to breathe in polluted air, which raises the price of the electric bill and we will all breathe in polluted air, when we work in our gardens or go shopping and run errands.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00088-2.

PC01755-9

Comment:

What are you doing to us?

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01755-10

Comment:

(PS) Our children and grandchildren live in El Segundo. God forbid they should get 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.

PC01756

Rasmussen, Peter

None Provided

7/25/2001

PC01756-1

Comment:

My family and I wish to continue living in Westchester, where we have lived for 16 years. We consider any form of expansion of LAX completely irrational, based on the current levels of traffic, noise and pollution. The area available is simply too small to accomodate additional traffic.

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.

PC01756-2

Comment:

Rather, we wish to see other regional areas expand their airports to accomodate their own residents, as well as sharing the burden of having an airport as your neighbor.

Response:

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

PC01757 McDermott, Susan J. None Provided

7/24/2001

PC01757-1

Comment:

I have been a resident of Westchester for 15 years now. I enjoy living on the Westchers/Playa border.

I feel very strongly that increasing the size of LAX airport will hurt our community.

Increasing the size of LAX is a disaster waiting to happen. The traffic will be worse and there is no place for also the trucks and cars to go!

Air pollution is already a problem, and the noise level will only get worse.

Response:

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

PC01757-2

Comment:

The Master Plan is a short term approach. Ontario and Palmdale has a lot more room for expansion. Please don't expand LAX. I beg of you.

Response:

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

PC01758 Carlson, Carol None Provided

7/24/2001

PC01758-1

Comment:

One area is bearing the brunt of airport use. This is the densely populated area around Los Angeles International Airport. There is no more room for expansion. Any more expansion would decimate the 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-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01758-2

Comment:

Does it not make sense to go to outlying regions where there are airports in sparsely populated areas (Palmdale, Ontario, etc.). Cargo will come into to LAX and then be trucked to these areas as well as the inland Empire and Orange County. Build airports there and save freeway congestion and air pollution from both planes and cars.

A long term sequential regional solution plan is needed, not a short term, quick fix plan such as the Master Plan. The Master Plan only creates problems. It does not solve 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. 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.

PC01759

Hatton, William

None Provided

7/23/2001

PC01759-1

Comment:

Master Plan with No Expansion

The draft Master Plan should be reviewed for elements that involve improving safety, the environment, or passenger convenience, but are not directly connected to changes to increase the number of flights and passengers. Examples of these kinds of changes are changes in airport facilities to improve ground safety or changes that reduce the vehicle traffic congestion in the airport. These elements could be identified in some manner such as marginal codes and/or footnotes.

If the present plan is not approved, these elements could serve as a basis for a revised plan.

Response:

Alternative D has been added to 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.

PC01760 Goodman, Brad None Provided 7/13/2001

PC01760-1

Comment:

You must consider other airports for your Master Plan. LAX is too burdened will make the nice Westchester Playa del Rey area worse to raise families.

Please consider the Oxnard or Palmdale airport.

I am an accountant and base on my assessment it will cost less in the long term for a solution to consider other airports.

Please let go of your ego and think of the community before yourself.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to 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.

PC01761 Cooney, Betty-Jo None Provided 7/22/2001

PC01761-1

Comment:

I am opposed to the LAX Expansion. Our community is overcrowded with current airport 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. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR, and Technical Report S-2 in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01761-2

Comment:

The air pollution would be increased & that is an issue we already are concerned with. The jet fuel causes a film to rest on the soil in our yard & garden. We must break the surface tension of the soil to allow the water absorb. If you don't do this the water simply beads & flows away from the soil.

Response:

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

PC01761-3

Comment:

I want to continue to raise my children in a community that feels safe.

NO TO LAX EXPANSION - NO TO POLLUTION!

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, 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. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01762 Cooney, David F. None Provided

PC01762-1

Comment:

I AM CATEGORICALLY OPPOSED TO THE LAX EXPANSION ON MANY FRONTS. THIS CITY IS BEING ENCROACHED UPON FROM MANY INTERESTS THAT ARE ALSO ADDING TO THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, POLLUTION & OVERALL CONGESTION IN AN ALREADY POPULUS SITE.

IF IT WAS AN ECONOMIC NECESSITY IN A LESS THAN VIABLE COMMUNITY, IF THERE WERE NO ALTERNATIVE SITES TO AFFIX THE SAME LOAD OF COMMERCE & CONCOMITANT CONGESTION (MORE EASILY ABSORBED & COMMUNITY EMBRACED), MY RESISTANCE WOULD BE MUTED - BUT THAT ISN'T THE CASE.

PLEASE RECONSIDER - NO LAX EXPANSION - NO TO MORE CARS, COMMERCIAL TRAFFIC, POLLUTION, CONSTRUCTION & OVER INDULGENCE OF PERCEIVED OPEN SPACES.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, growth impacts in Section 4.5, Induced Socio-Economic Impacts, and construction impacts in Section 4.20, Construction Impacts. 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 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01763 Brown, Pamela None Provided 7/23/2001

PC01763-1

Comment:

MY FRIENDS IN CLAREMONT, UPLAND & ONTARIO ALL HATE THE DRIVE TO LAX. EVIDENTLY THE ONTARIO AIRPORT DOES NOT HAVE ENOUGH NON-STOP, CONVIENENT FLIGHTS TO MEET THEIR NEEDS.

DOES IT MAKE SENSE TO EXPAND LAX AND HAVE ALL THE CITIZENS FROM SANTA BARBARA, THE INLAND EMPIRE AND ORANGE COUNTY COMING TO LAX, CLOGGING THE FREEWAYS AND POLLUTING THE AIR?

Response:

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

future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. 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.

PC01764 Nakamoto, Tetsuo None Provided 7/24/2001

PC01764-1

Comment:

Frequent air traffic in our city is reason enough for a denial of LAX expansion. More traffic would cause unacceptable noise levels. Take care of this problem first, before you even consider expansion.

Response:

Traffic and noise impacts were addressed in Sections 4.3 and 4.1, respectively, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also note that Alternative D-Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which calls for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region. 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 Environmentally Superior alternative and would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region.

PC01765 Fujii, Julie & Glenn None Provided 7/24/2001

PC01765-1

Comment:

The air traffic noise level in our community is inappropriate, inconsiderate, and very disruptive. Phone conversations cannot be heard, and television viewing is interrupted quite frequently.

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.

PC01765-2

Comment:

Although we are not a "neighbor" to your airport, we experience similar irritants and request that expansion of LAX be denied.

Response:

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

PC01765-3

Comment:

We also request that you route your aircraft away from our bedroom community.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01766

Randall, Anne

None Provided

7/24/2001

PC01766-1

Comment:

Please do not destroy this community for a temporary solution to the need for more airport(s) space.

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.

PC01767

Baird, Dan & Mary H. None Provided

7/23/2001

PC01767-1

Comment:

THE LAX MASTER PLAN IS NOT IN THE INTEREST OF THE AREA ENVIRONMENTALLY OR HUMANLY.

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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC01767-2

Comment:

CONGESTION, NOISE, POLLUTION INCREASED BY PLAYA VISTA DEVELOPMENT WILL RESULT IN OVERWHELMING LOSS OF QUALITY OF LIFE AND SPACE -

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; 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.

PC01767-3**Comment:**

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.

PC01768**Swagman, Lorraine****None Provided****7/23/2001****PC01768-1****Comment:**

I've lived on 91st street in Westchester since 1952. Homes behind mine have been built and torn down. Prop planes were replaced by turbojets then jets & monstrous jets. I've lived through years of plane noise & construction noise of LAX north runways & Westchester Parkway.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01768-2**Comment:**

There is no air space or runway room left for more planes. Recently planes have been waved off over my house. That's scary!

Response:

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

PC01768-3**Comment:**

I believe expanding the airport is dangerous in all respects - traffic, noise, pollution, etc! MAKE USE OF 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. 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

PC01769 Wicklin, Martha Lee None Provided 7/24/2001

PC01769-1

Comment:

No LAX expansion! Ontario, Palmdale & El Toro should be developed instead. They have more room for expansion & the communities would probably welcome the increased business.

Response:

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

PC01769-2

Comment:

Westchester is already crowded enough, and we're not even up & running with the traffic and pollution of Hughes Center & Vista del Rey developments that are underway.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00018-19 regarding the evaluation of cumulative impacts in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of Master Plan Alternatives on the community of Westchester.

PC01769-3

Comment:

We don't need more cargo, more traffic, more pollution in our high tax base neighborhood. Please no 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 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.

PC01770	Eisen, Dr. Herman M. & Marge G.	None Provided	7/24/2001
----------------	--	----------------------	------------------

PC01770-1

Comment:

We are writing to express our vigorous opposition to any expansion of LAX.

We like our community the way it is. We do not want to lose one-third of the central business district on Sepulveda Blvd. What will happen when this expansion doesn't last? Will we have to give up our home in No. Kentwood? There is a huge volume of traffic on Sepulveda Blvd. right now. Expansion would add many more cars to surface streets and to freeways.

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. As indicated in TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not include any acquisition within the Westchester Business District. 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.

PC01770-2

Comment:

The EIR/EIS predicts that the increased ground and air traffic will result in elevated emissions of all 5 EPA classified major Air Pollutants. Have you read these reports??

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.

PC01770-3

Comment:

It is clear that an increase in pollutants will have a deleterious effect on citizens of all ages, and especially the very young & very old.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC01770-4

Comment:

We support and expect LAX-NO EXPANSION. Long-term planning is needed - Look at Ontario, Palmdale, & El Toro in Orange County if you need more space.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to 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.

PC01770-5

Comment:

In sum, we are firmly opposed to further LAX expansion. Thank you for considering our views.

Response:

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

PC01771	Ginsburg, Robert	None Provided	7/24/2001
----------------	-------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01771-1

Comment:

My personal experience is a marked deterioration in quality of life these past few years since jet traffic has become so pronounced at our local Santa Monica Airport. It seems we deserve a full investigation and evaluation of the environmental impact of LAX Master Plan Alternatives before any such plan is adopted.

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.

PC01771-2

The remainder of this comment letter is identical to form letter PFF; please refer to the responses to form letter PFF.

PC01772	Burns, Hugh	None Provided	7/23/2001
----------------	--------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01772-1

Comment:

Building ofc. bldgs. or an industrial park setting between Pershing Dr. and Splvd. Bl., on the north side of Westchester Parkwy should be eliminated from the master plan.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that the development identified in this comment has previously been approved as part of the LAX Northside project.

PC01772-2**Comment:**

Residents are already suffering from airplane ie jet exhaust that is contaminating our community; settling in our yards, our homes on automobiels and our bodies.

Response:

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

PC01772-3**Comment:**

More aircraft, more bldgs., more autos and transportation vehicles, equals a death sentence for the Westchester community and all surrounding communitys.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed transportation impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2, 3, S-2a, and S-2b. 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. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01773**Klein, Michael S.,
Julie J. & Rachel E.****None Provided****7/23/2001****PC01773-1****Comment:**

We write to express our opposition to all of the LAX Master Plan Alternatives as currently proposed because of the significant and unavoidable environment impacts.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01773-2**Comment:**

We believe the Draft Environment Impact Report (the "DEIR") should fully analyze the environmental consequences of the Master Plan and provide acceptable mitigation for impacts on Santa Monica, including:

a) provision for guaranteed infrastructure, facilities, and airside acreage to fully support transient business aircraft and fixed-based business operations, including a minimum of three fixed-based operations for business jets and an exclusive runway for small to mid-size jets; and

b) Provision for surface transportation enhancements to coincide with or precede any air transportation enhancements; and

3. Comments and Responses

c) Most importantly, as residents directly impacted by an increase of jet traffic at the Santa Monica Airport, we are particularly concerned about the proposed LAX Master Plan Alternatives 62% REDUCTION in acreage dedicated to General Aviation Operations.

In the last three years, jet operations have doubled at Santa Monica Airport. Our local airport was never intended to accommodate the type of jet aircraft currently using its facilities. There is NO Safety Zone at the ends of the runways. Only the width of a street separates residence from both ends of the runway. This is dangerous!!!!

The closest home is only 220 ft from the runway terminus. Two gas stations are across the street from the east side of the runway. Aircraft control hours end at 9:00pm even though aircraft are allowed to depart until 11:00pm and arrive 24 hours a day.

Diverting additional business jet operations to small general aviation Airports such as Santa Monica is NOT a solution to LAX's overcrowded runways if the ramification of this option is to create safety hazards and additional problems at other airports.

We urge you to stop this now.

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.

PC01774 Hollenbach, Kathy None Provided 7/24/2001

PC01774-1

Comment:

(1) HAVE YOU EVER BEEN ON THE 405 NEAR THE AIRPORT??? AT VIRTUALLY ANY TIME OF THE DAY THAT AREA IS CONGESTED.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the Congestion Management Program.

PC01774-2

Comment:

SEPULVEDA IS THE SAME. THE ROADS ARE NOT BUILT TO HANDLE THE CURRENT TRAFFIC LET ALONE ANY FUTHER TRAFFIC.

Response:

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

PC01774-3

Comment:

(2) THERE IS A BUTTERFLY SANCUTARY NEAR-BY (EL SEGUNDO) - THE WETLAND MARSH IN PLAYA. IN ADDITION TO THE MANY PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN THE SURROUNDING AREAS WHO ENDURE ENOUGH AS IT IS.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed impacts to the El Segundo blue butterfly in Section 4.10, Biotic Communities, and Section 4.11, Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna, and wetlands impacts in Section 4.12, Wetlands. Supporting technical data and analyses are 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. In addition, please see Topical Response

3. Comments and Responses

TR-ET-1 regarding potential impacts to the El Segundo blue butterfly and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC01774-4

Comment:

PLEASE BUILD UP EL TORO, ONTARIO & PALMDALE INSTEAD - IT WILL BE BETTER FOR EVERYONE IN THE LONG RUN.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to 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.

PC01775

**Karyadi, Eddy &
Adrienne M.**

None Provided

7/23/2001

PC01775-1

Comment:

Our home faces a street which is already busy. Vandalism by passing cars and speeding are not uncommon, making the area less safe for our property and child. Any increased traffic, especially by people "just passing through" the neighborhood, would worsen these problems.

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 Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PC01775-2

Comment:

It goes without saying that the noise and air pollution would substantially reduce the quality of life in our neighborhood, which is less than a mile from LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC01775-3

Comment:

Recent news reports make it clear that LAX is unsafe and congestion there endangers the passengers and crew of aircraft. Any plan to increase air traffic at LAX, even with an expansion of runway space, would be extremely unwise. How many hundreds must die in a runway-related accident to make it clear to LAWA Commissioners that the area is unsuitable for a major expansion of LAX's capacity?

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC01775-4

Comment:

The only feasible solution is to move some air traffic to other airports. Moving cargo traffic to outlying airports would enable carriers at LAX to reduce the cancelled and delayed flights which are also in the news lately.

Response:

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

PC01776

Rogers, Larry

None Provided

7/23/2001

PC01776-1

Comment:

The expansion of LAX will devalue my home. Cause more pollution and noise that would make it unacceptable to live in this area affecting my families health as well as increased safty hazards associated with congestion inherant in expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, 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, Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase, Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, 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.

PC01777

Young, Byrd

None Provided

7/25/2001

PC01777-1

Comment:

Sect. 4.4.3 - Environmental Justice

126 occasions were referenced to public involvement of LAX Masterplan. Yet, I did not receive but three.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR addressed past outreach efforts by LAWA in minority and low-income communities on pages 4-398 through 4-401 of Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice. As indicated on these pages,

the outreach efforts were diverse and included meetings and smaller presentations with neighborhood groups, homeowner associations, small business groups, minority and women owned business groups and political leaders in various communities and locales. Broader noticing and involvement took place through the environmental justice workshops during public circulation of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice outreach and Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process.

PC01777-2

Comment:

Noise: The noise abatement program was not well received by the community as it is currently administered. Neighbors are both living beneath the same flight path yet one receives it and the other does not

Response:

The noise impact area which determines residential uses eligible for sound insulation under the ANMP 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 were shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Noise-sensitive uses exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour under Year 2000 conditions were described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3), and were shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As was shown on these respective figures, under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions the area within the 65 CNEL noise contour has decreased compared to the ANMP contour, which continues to define the area of eligibility for sound insulation. Although this is a comment on existing noise levels and conditions, the general focus of the document, pursuant to NEPA and CEQA, is to evaluate the potential future environmental effects of the project and to provide feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts. See Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4 regarding how eligibility for soundproofing is determined and Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.14 for a description of how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

PC01777-3

Comment:

4.24.1 There appears to be no known epidemiological study which relates to air quality and the effect on individual human health factors. For example: respiratory disorders and cancers. Such study is need within the surrounding communities at LAX.

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.

Studies performed near airports in large metropolitan areas found no link between airport operations and respiratory diseases. An analysis of the human health risk was provided in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analysis are provided in Technical Reports 14a and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The human health risk assessments evaluated potential adverse health effects, including respiratory diseases, associated with exposure to LAX emissions. Note also that the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR did not predict substantial increases in pollutants. In fact, as a result of more efficient operations and other factors, air quality impacts from the airport may actually be less in most areas around LAX for Alternatives A, B, C and D.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01778 Marlin, Lisa None Provided 7/23/2001

PC01778-1

Comment:

The current plans show that Nielsen field, where Westchester & the surrounding areas send their children for soccer, softball, & baseball games will be enlarged, yet retain its current location. This means that the children will be exposed to both higher levels of air pollution & noise than they are now.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the health effects of air pollution and noise in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and addressed park facilities in Section 4.26.3, Parks and Recreation. Carl E. Nielson Youth Park is a private facility leased by LAWA on the northeast corner of the LAX property. With implementation of the LAX Master Plan under Alternatives A, B and C, the park would be expanded by five acres, under Alternative D, the park would not be modified. Under 1996 baseline conditions, a portion of the park is exposed to 65 dB CNEL. With implementation of the LAX Master Plan under Alternatives A, B and C, the 65 dB CNEL contour would extend throughout the park; however, under Alternative D, noise levels are not expected to significantly change from baseline noise levels. For all of the build alternatives, noise levels are expected to remain below 70 dB CNEL, which would not be incompatible with athletic field use pursuant to FAR Part 150 Guidelines. Under Alternatives A, B, and C, the park would be subject to significant operational and construction related air quality impacts as further described in Section 4.6.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Regarding health impacts, as stated on page 4-1000 of the Draft EIS/EIR, "reductions in incremental human health impacts for both cancer risk and non-cancer health hazards are predicted to occur after implementation of preliminary mitigation for all or almost all areas around the airport included in the analysis." Please see also Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase, Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts. Also please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC01778-2

Comment:

The report erroneously states that use of surrounding park facilities can be expected to decrease due to the # of homes that would be "taken" for expansion. The teams that play at Nielsen are not comprised solely of Westchester residents; the areas incorporate Playa del Rey & Ladera & Inglewood in some cases.

Response:

While it is accepted that residents from outside of Westchester use Carl E. Nielson Youth Park, implementation of the LAX Master Plan is expected to reduce demands placed on the facility through expansion of the park and residential land acquisition. As stated on page 4-1195 of the Draft EIS/EIR, "...limited increases in demand for park and recreational facilities associated with passenger and employee use would be considered less than significant due to the reduced local demand on parks from residential land acquisition and the offsetting benefits from the park improvements.

PC01778-3

Comment:

But even controlling for a population comprised solely of Westchester residents, there is never enough space for youth sports, particularly soccer. Right now inadequate local school facilities are pressed into service because there is not enough field space & time slots @ Nielsen.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01014-3 regarding expansion of Carl E. Nielson Youth Park. Also, please see Response to Comment PHF00030-2 regarding park and recreation supply and demand.

PC01778-4

Comment:

In short, as the airport expands, children will continue to see their health hazards increase.

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.

PC01778-5

Comment:

Also, current soundproofing for homes located in the eligible area merely allows for better audio clarity when viewing TV, etc. It does nothing to compensate for the activities one should be able to enjoy at one's home that occur out-of-doors. Activities such as an outdoor barbeque or arranging for play in a children's wading pool would now be both unenjoyable (because of the noise) & hazardous (due to increased health risks due to particulate matter, carbon monoxide levels, etc.).

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of thresholds used to identify significant noise levels and Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program. See Section 4.6, Air Quality (subsection 4.6.3) of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding health risks due to particulate matter, carbon monoxide and other pollutants under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions.

PC01778-6

Comment:

Children in these areas who are already asthmatic are likely to find the problem even worse, as proximity to industrial/polluting sources increases asthma "triggering" episodes.

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.

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.

PC01778-7

Comment:

Finally, there is little likelihood that airport compensation for homes to be removed will be adequate to enable the affected parties to relocate in a similar area nearby one on the Westside.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation issues, including affordable housing; and see Response to Comment AL00040-46.

PC01778-8

Comment:

With a citywide dearth of housing and few sites available for new construction in LA, to remove single family/multi-family housing seems also to speak to the issue of density and affordability of housing stock.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation issues, including affordable housing.

PC01778-9

Comment:

Those who can afford to move out of the Westchester area will, minorities/low income families with no where to go will be left, contributing to the "ghettoization" of the airport area & increased proximity to pollutants for already disadvantaged groups.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects on the community of Westchester. As further described in TR-LU-2, under the heading "Overall Neighborhood Effects," taken as a whole, operation of the airport with implementation of the LAX Master Plan is not expected to significantly

change or degrade the quality of life in nearby communities. For example, concerning the key issue of aircraft noise, exposure to high noise levels overtime within the community of Westchester would not increase with implementation of the LAX Master Plan, but would actually decrease compared to both 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions. Based on the above, and as further described in TR-LU-2, there is no expectation that the project would result in an exodus of residents from Westchester. Also see Section 4.2, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding increases in air emissions and potential effects on disadvantaged groups.

PC01779 Flatland, Faye None Provided 7/23/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01716; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01716.

PC01780 Felton, Verdis None Provided 7/24/2001

PC01780-1

Comment:

If you are going to expand LAX, you at least owe the homeowners effected the courtesy of soundproof windows.

Response:

The noise impact area which determines residential uses eligible for noise insulation under the ANMP is described in Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4, and is based on the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL noise contour. See Topical Response TR-LU-3, Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.14 for a summary of noise impacts on residential uses and how approval of the LAX Master Plan would result in revisions to the existing ANMP.

PC01781 Haley, Dorothy None Provided

PC01781-1

Comment:

I have lived 50 years in my Westchester home. Some of the LAX changes in that time have been very detrimental to the community. Now further airport expansion will only exacerbate our problems.

The noise level is very bad at times even though I live north of the airport. Air pollution is increasingly noticeable and traffic congestion has become intolerable.

Please protect Westchester from further erosion as a decent place to live.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC01782 Walsh, Suzanne None Provided 7/23/2001

PC01782-1

Comment:

My greatest concern is the impact of the greater traffic in the area. Our major boulevards (Sepulveda & Lincoln) are already overly crowded with cars and trucks. Our area simply cannot bear the increased traffic which will effect our air.

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. Air pollution from traffic was addressed in Section 4.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01782-2

Comment:

Greater use of the other airports in LA (specifically Palmdale and Ontario) is a must.

Response:

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

PC01782-3

Comment:

Soundproofing and forcing residents to stay indoors is not a solution.

Response:

Comment noted. 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-N-5 regarding land use/noise mitigation.

PC01782-4**Comment:**

It is simply unfair to have our area take the brunt of the increased need for more flights.

Response:

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

PC01783**Galbreath, Margie****None Provided****7/16/2001****PC01783-1****Comment:**

I RECENTLY WENT TO A PUBLIC HEARING ON THE AIRPORT EXPANSION AND WAS SHOCKED TO HEAR THAT MY HOME WILL NOT BE AFFECTED BY THE NEW ,PROPOSED, CONSTRUCTION. MY HOME HAS BEEN LISTED AS NOT IN THE AIR PATH. I CAN SIT IN MY BACK OR FRONT YARD AND READ THE PRINT OR NAME THE PLANES.

I AM A HOME OWNER IN THE PATH OF THE CURRENT PLANES UTILIZING LAX AND I AM TOTALLY OPPOSED TO THE NEW 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-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

PC01783-2**Comment:**

THE PLANES NOW FLYING ARE AFFECTING MY HEALTH AND PROPERTY. THE DROPPING OF FUEL PRIOR TO LANDING IS A POSSIBLE CAUSE OF MY BREATHING PROBLEMS. THE NOISE FACTOR HAS DECREASED MY ABILITY TO HEAR IN MY HOME MY HOME HAS CRACKS THAT ARE EXPANDING DAILY.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding residential property values, Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping, Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, and Topical Response TR-N-8, regarding noise-based vibration.

PC01783-3**Comment:**

THIS EXPANSION WOULD NOT BE PUSHED ON HIGHER INCOME HOME OWNERS, BUT BECAUSE WE ARE MIDDLE INCOME HOMEOWNERS WITH LIMITED INCOMES AND NO POLITICAL REPRESENTATION IT'S A GO WITH THE LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL'S BLESSING.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-EJ-3 regarding environmental justice.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01784 Enzen, Ada None Provided 7/25/2001

PC01784-1

Comment:

Traffic on 405 is already impossible. Lets not make it worse. Friends living in San Fernando Valley tell horror stories about taking 3 hours to get to LAX.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the Congestion Management Program.

PC01784-2

Comment:

Palmdale sounds like a smart choice for airport expansion so people from out-lying areas don't all have to converge to LAX.

Do not bring more congestion to LAX and the 405 freeway.

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.

PC01785 Hiller, Robert None Provided 7/17/2001

PC01785-1

Comment:

THE TRAFFIC FLOW IMPROVEMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PLAYA DEVELOPMENT ARE, I THINK, COMPLETE. THE TRAFFIC FLOW HAS NOT IMPROVED ONE WHIT. COMPLETION OF THE PLAYA PROJECT AND

Response:

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

PC01785-2

Comment:

SUBSEQUENT EXPANSION OF THE LAX IS GOING TO INCREASE THE VEHICULAR TRAFFIC TO LEVELS THAT ARE DIFFICULT FOR ME TO COMPREHEND. THE IMPACT OF THIS OUTLANDISH LEVEL OF TRAFFIC ON THE QUALITY OF LIFE SHOULD BE OBVIOUS - SAFETY, POLLUTION, NOISE, ETC.

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. Noise is addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR, air pollution from traffic in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, with supporting technical data

and analysis provided in Appendices D, G, S-C, and S-E and Technical Reports 4, 14, S-4, and S-9. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding quality of life.

PC01786 Frelinger, Amy None Provided 7/24/2001

PC01786-1

Comment:

As a taxpayer, a registered voter, a proactive Westchester homeowner and a lifelong citizen of Los Angeles, PLEASE stop LAX expansion! In 1969, I was a 12-year-old 9th grader at Airport Junior High School on Airport Blvd. Airport JHS was closed due to airport noise intrusion. Every few minutes our teachers would have to stop their teaching in order to let the noise from the jet planes finish its boisterousness. Ultimately, it meant we couldn't hear so much of the time that teaching and learning could not continue so close to the LAX traffic pattern.

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 Sections 4.1, Noise, and 4.27, Schools, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding the impact of various alternatives on schools. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 17 of the Draft EIS/EIR and in Appendix S-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 impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC01786-2

Comment:

I want to add my voice to the others in our communities that beg you to HEAR us and reconsider the negative consequences of LAX expansion on its neighbors. With 67 million annual passengers, our L.A airport has more than enough traffic.

I understand that more passengers would generate more income for the city. What could be wrong with more revenue? I ask you all, what is the price of the additional solid waste, air pollution, noise pollution, traffic congestion and criminal activities drawn by larger numbers of passengers? It is IMMEASURABLE!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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 solid waste impacts in Section 4.19, Solid Waste, air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, law enforcement impacts in Section 4.26.2, Law Enforcement, and economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Appendix G and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, and 16 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-2, S-3, and S-7 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01786-3

Comment:

I urge you to encourage Orange County and other counties to develop regional airports like El Toro, Ontario and Palmdale. It will save countless Californians hours of wasted time commuting. It will avoid emotional frustration fighting traffic gridlock on their way to LAX. It will also conserve millions of gallons of gasoline from both automobile and airplane fuel tanks as they shorten their efforts to get to an airport.

3. Comments and Responses

In developing a regional airport expansion plan, we will share the wealth, the waste and the responsibilities that airports create.

Response:

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

PC01786-4

Comment:

My personal thanks goes to Ruth Galanter, Mick Gordon and Jane Harman especially for foreseeing the future and supporting our neighborhoods' best interests as well as the economic growth Of outlying regions that can benefit from their own airports.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01787

Samuel, Sandy

None Provided

7/21/2001

PC01787-1

Comment:

LAX and the neiboring communities have already done enough to support the transportation needs of Southern Californians. Expanding LAX would further increase the pollution, traffic, and noise in our neighborhood. It's time that other communities share the transportation burden. Develop El Toro, Ontario, or Palmdale, they do not have nearly the congestion that LAX faces.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to 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; 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.

PC01787-2**Comment:**

The 1302% increase in pollution is frightening & the thought of increased traffic especially on the 405 is disheartening. Give Westchester a break, we've supported enough already!

Response:

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

PC01788**Sher, Jon****None Provided****7/22/2001****PC01788-1****Comment:**

(1) The airport expansion will so increase - traffic as to make the area unliveable.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways.

PC01788-2**Comment:**

Traffic on Lincoln is extremely heavy most mornings as is traffic on the 405.

Response:

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

PC01788-3**Comment:**

With Playa Vista the area north of the airport & the 405 will be in gridlock most of every day.

Response:

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

PC01788-4**Comment:**

(2) Increased volume of air traffic with increase noise surrounding the airport to intolerable levels.

Response:

For information regarding increased noise levels see Topical Response TR-N-6. 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

PC01789 Wittenberg, Andrea None Provided 7/23/2001

PC01789-1

Comment:

We need a regional plan now. Wiping out healthy communities is not the way to go. Traffic overflow, the air we breathe & safety are my concern. Noise and auto emissions are also on my list. In ten years or so will we again be faced with this? Will I have to leave my home in Venice so it too can become an airport?

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, safety in Section 4.24.3, 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, 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-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01789-2

Comment:

Why not Palmdale in addition to Ontario & LAX? with a light rail link to downtown.

Response:

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

PC01789-3

Comment:

Future increases in activity may cause us not to be able meet businesses demands. Rival cities, San Francisco, Las Vegas, Phonix may capitalize on our inability to meet demands.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01790 Schubert, Lynn & None Provided
Roy

PC01790-1

Comment:

Our family has lived in Hermosa Beach since 1967 and we have seen the devastating impact LAX growth has already had on the South Bay infrastructure and quality of life (noise, traffic, pollution, and the general irritability of everyone). We are unalterably opposed to LAX expansion for the following reasons:

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed public infrastructure in Section 4.25, Public Utilities, and Section 4.26, Public Services, 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 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, 14, and 16 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9 and S-10 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC01790-2

Comment:

1. You have no way to mitigate, noise, flight paths, and the other impacts related to flight operations, because, as you yourself admit, these impacts, which are primary and catastrophic for quality of life, are out of your control, and instead are in the control of the FAA over which we (and you) have no influence.

Response:

Topical Response TR-N-7 provides detailed information on the actions that the airport has taken to reduce noise from aircraft operations. Please also see Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation and 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.

PC01790-3

Comment:

2. The amount of land you have available for the expansion is totally inadequate for the plans which you promoting. Equivalent airport capacities have ten times the land available to you.

Response:

The amount of land necessary to serve a given number of passengers can vary widely at different airports depending on a variety of factors such as local wind and weather conditions, runway layout, the instrumentation available on the runways, the proximity of other airports (and corresponding airspace), the fleet mix, and hourly demand patterns. Many airports are not able to operate with all runways at all times due to wind conditions. Chicago O'Hare is a good example of this. O'Hare has seven runways but not all of the runways can be used at the same time because many of the runways intersect. At LAX, there are four parallel runways with sufficient instrumentation available that the runways are usually not closed due to wind and weather conditions. This allows LAX to serve more passengers per acre than other airports. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative,

3. Comments and Responses

Alternative D, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, is designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport capacity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. Alternative D will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient, and will have the fewest negative impacts to local communities and the region. Analysis of Alternative D is contained in the Draft Master Plan addendum and in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The No Action/No Project Alternative examined the capacity of all of the airport components and defined the maximum level of activity (approximately 78.9 MAP) that could be accommodated at LAX without improvements. See Chapter V, Concept Development, Section 3.3.2 of the Draft LAX Master Plan and Chapter 3, Alternative D Constrained Activity, Section 3.1 of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum for more information on the activity and constraints associated with each alternative. Also see Response to Comment PC00539-6 regarding land acquisition.

PC01790-4

Comment:

3. The rebuilding of infrastructure required by the LAX expansion will be a horrendous 10-20 year disaster for the local residents.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01790-5

Comment:

4. And finally, and not unimportantly, we find your attitudes arrogant, callous, and uncaring. It's clear from hearing your plans and presentations that you regard us as ignorant provincials who don't understand our own best interests, and that you are here to show us the way to the truth.

Response:

LAWA and FAA are committed to an open flow of ideas and input. As such, there is a website, www.laxmasterplan.org and several public hearings. For more information on the public outreach process, please see Topical Response TR-PO-1.

PC01790-6

Comment:

Other than providing good jobs for you people, this is a bad deal for everyone, and we, and the all the airport neighborhood areas, will fight this project to a dead stop. That's what great about democracy: the people get to judge.

Response:

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

PC01791

**Le Falle, Ph.D.,
Jacqueline**

None Provided

7/25/2001

PC01791-1

Comment:

I walked to the welcome and informative Environmental Justice Public Workshop at Jesse Owens Park Gymnasium on the 14th. Though we did not have an opportunity to meet, I sat in on a community

3. Comments and Responses

dialogue you had with a number of concerned community members. The focus seemed to be on equity re the current soundproofing program.

I am a homeowner who has lived in my beautiful community for 30+ years. I have privately opposed the LAX expansion enterprise, and have been disappointed and frustrated at the seeming arbitrary nature of decisions re soundproofing program inclusion exclusion. As I regularly walk in my community, it mildly boggles my mind to notice one community member's home included in the program, while her/his immediate neighbor's home is not. My own home rests outside the current soundproofing program zone. "Noise reduction programs [and] air quality mitigations" have always been a personal and familial concern for me and mine, affecting us, literally, where we live.

However, with the advent and inclusion of the Environmental Justice Task Force in LAWA planning, I am somewhat more encouraged re creative, fairer treatment of--and possible additional benefits for--communities of color.

Response:

Comment noted. See Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of the Final EIS/EIR regarding the Environmental Justice Program.

PC01791-2

Comment:

Of additional note: I am an avid reader, and will routinely give a cursory read to flyers left on my front porch before placing -99% of them in my recycling bin. Had I not read the announcement re the workshop, I would not have known about it. I saw none of my Haas Avenue neighbors at the workshop, and do not believe that the flyer method of notification to our community was optimal in ensuring turnout. I--and I imagine my neighbors--would prefer receiving such notifications via US mail. E.g., last summer, we received mailing(s) from our city councilman re soundproofing program community forum(s).

Response:

Comment noted. As indicated in Response to Comment PC00178-2, a variety of means were used to notice the workshops, including community newspapers, posting of notices and door-to-door delivery of fliers. Also see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding the overall environmental justice community outreach process.

PC01791-3

Comment:

I have not yet had an opportunity to carefully read most of the material I gathered at the 14 July workshop. However, as the workshop focus was ostensibly "environmental justice", I wanted to address my commentary accordingly.

Response:

Comment noted. Environmental Justice was addressed in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01792	Aubry, Jacqueline	None Provided	7/1/2001
----------------	--------------------------	----------------------	-----------------

PC01792-1

Comment:

The airport took my home in Playa del Rey in 1978 from 327 Sterry St. This was one of the most traumatic times in my life. I had a gorgeous home and under eminent domain the airport said "get out."

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC01792-2

Comment:

We have now been in the home in West Westchester for over 21 years - and you want this land now?

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D does not propose any residential acquisition.

PC01792-3

Comment:

I will fight you tooth and nail you arrogant money grubbing money hungry sub-humans. - go to Palmdale & use rapid transit -

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-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.

PC01792-4

Comment:

you should not use the Los Angeles city as a flying pattern at any cost - its time you used some common sense if you have any.

Response:

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

PC01793

Holabird, Rhoda

None Provided

7/27/2001

PC01793-1

Comment:

I am opposed to any expansion of LAX for passengers or cargo.

Response:

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

PC01793-2

Comment:

I am in favor of improvements for safety, i.e. lengthening or rerouting runways.

I am in favor of non-auto access to LAX by Light Rail.

I am in favor of the LA Expressway to lighten traffic on the freeways.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01793-3**Comment:**

I would like to propose that the major portion of the cargo air traffic be moved to Palmdale and an airport in the Inland Empire. Included with this move would be high speed rail transportation of goods from the airports to the centers of industry.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-3 high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC01794**Rettig, Verona****None Provided****7/15/2001****PC01794-1****Comment:**

We do not need any more noise, pollution, or traffic added to our neighborhoods!

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.

PC01794-2**Comment:**

Build a large international airport at Palmdale. Make it big enough to accommodate all projected air travel for the next 50 years.

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.

PC01794-3**Comment:**

LAX should be downscaled in size, not enlarged. The air traffic has an adverse effect on too many people who make their homes in the flight path and surrounding areas.

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

PC01795 Flatland, Curtis None Provided 7/23/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01716; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01716.

PC01796 Carlson, Carol None Provided 7/28/2001

PC01796-1

Comment:

Air Pollution:

LAX is one of the largest sources of air pollution in the Los Angeles Basin. By adding more passenger (cars) and more planes (jet fuel emissions) there will be a tremendous increase in pollutants (particulate matter, NOx emissions, carcinogens, etc.)

Response:

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

PC01796-2

Comment:

The EIR/EIS does not measure toxic air pollutants correctly nor does it properly study toxic air 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. Human health risk impacts were addressed in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01796-3

Comment:

The EIR/EIS does not satisfactorily show the health effects of the huge increase in these pollutants. The possible increase in respiratory diseases among residents is not taken into consideration. Much more study needs to be done and many questions answered on the air pollution problem.

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 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.

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). Estimates of risk and hazards associated with airport operations were presented on figures that show community boundaries or locations in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Additional figures presenting risk and hazards that show community boundaries are available in Technical Report S-9a of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01797 Houston, Carol None Provided 7/24/2001

PC01797-1

Comment:

The purpose of this letter is to state that I am vehemently opposed to any further expansion of Los Angeles International 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.

PC01797-2

Comment:

I am 59 years old and have always lived within 5 miles of LAX. I can remember when the entire airport was EAST of Sepulveda Blvd. Through the years, I have witnessed homes destroyed and families forced to move. I have witnessed the closing of schools and the gridlock that we must live with every day. All this in the name of "progress". Each time, we were told it would be the last time. I no longer believe what the politicians and airport officials tell us.

Response:

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

PC01797-3

Comment:

I feel deceived and cheated. When the riots came, people fled Los Angeles. When the earthquake came, people fled Los Angeles. When the severe recession of the 90's came, people fled Los Angeles. My family and I stayed. We struggled through loss of jobs and hard times. Now things are good, people are back and we are being pushed out again. 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.

PC01797-4

Comment:

The only thing that makes any sense at all is for the burden (and the advantages) to be shared equally by all. . . that means the people that sit in their pristine Orange County communities, the people of Riverside and San Bernardino Counties and those in Ventura County, as well. The residents of Westchester, Playa del Rey, Inglewood, El Segundo, Hawthorne have already given enough. It is now time to do the right thing.

Take a regional approach to solving the problem of growth in the air transport industry.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added 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-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC01797-5

Comment:

There is simply no way LAX can be expanded and still allow for quality of life for the many, many hardworking, decent people that live in the area surrounding 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC01798 Jacobson, Joni None Provided 7/23/2001

PC01798-1

Comment:

The Santa Monica Airport is already using aircraft not intended for the size of the runway and does not meet FAA safety guidelines currently used for newly constructed airports. Increasing air traffic will only aggravate this dangerous situation & increase the possibility of a serious jet accident.

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.

PC01798-2

The remainder of this comment letter is identical to form letter PFF; please refer to the responses to form letter PFF.

PC01799 Addison, Larry None Provided 7/26/2001

PC01799-1

Comment:

As a resident of Playa del Rey living in the "red zone" noise level area, I am very much against the LAX Master Plan. I will stand with the many who attended the LAX meeting at the Furama Hotel and oppose your program.

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01800 Hills, Eleanor None Provided 6/20/2001

PC01800-1

Comment:

NIBBLE, NIBBLE MONSTER MOUSE, GOBBLING UP EACH STORE AND HOUSE
FIRST THE WEST, NOW THE EAST - DON'T COUNT ON US TO PROVIDE THIS FEAST
AS MOST LOCALS IN THIS VENUE ARE LOATHE TO BE THE AIRPORT MENU!

Response:

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

PC01801 Phillips, Mark None Provided 7/26/2001

PC01801-1

Comment:

I disagree with and oppose all LAWA's current proposed plans regarding the LAX airport expansion project. I would like to add to many complaints already lodged that all the various proposed LAWA plans still make people drive up to 125 miles from their homes in able to for them to reach an international airport. LAWA's expansion proposals will only add to the traffic and smog problems that already plague the Los Angeles 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-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.

PC01801-2

Comment:

I also feel that since the LA area already has four other regional airports, not including the Palmdale site that hasn't been developed yet, that LAWA has to first look at expanding those airports before the LAX expansion option is considered. This just makes common sense.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC01801-3

Comment:

I also believe that new LA mayor Hahn should live up to his campaign commitment to veto any and all expansion plans for the LA Airport.

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.

PC01801-4

Comment:

Former LA mayor Riordin is only interested in LAX expansion because he is planning on having his airport concession company which he owns, bid on the LAX concession next year when the current contract ends.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01801-5

Comment:

The LAX area is already struggling with gridlock at peak traffic times, how does LAWA plan to alleviate this in their various expansion proposals? A people mover and new highway around LAX will not help the bumper to bumper traffic on the 405 freeway.

Response:

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

PC01801-6

Comment:

LAWA is being very short sighted in their LAX expansion plans. Regional airport expansion plans need to be addressed first? Why hasn't LAWA also offered three or four new regional airport plan proposals?

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.

PC01801-7**Comment:**

I feel that we the public, are just getting railroaded into a LAX expansion plan that really only helps the few and neglects the needs of the many. Let's have everyone be considered in this and all long term planning for this and all the airports in the Southern Calif. 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. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC01802**Ahern, Brian****None Provided****7/12/2001****PC01802-1****Comment:**

This was upside down on my side lawn. Not sure what it is and if it is for me. The envelope was on the side as well. I will put this in envelope with my stamp - But can only hope I get a response.

Response:

It is assumed that the commentor is referring to the comment form he then used to submit his written comments on the LAX Master Plan. In accordance with the provisions of NEPA and CEQA, FAA and LAWA have prepared written responses to all comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. These responses are provided herein as part of this Final EIS/EIR which has been made available for public review at FAA and LAWA and through distribution to public libraries throughout the area, and is available electronically at www.laxmasterplan.org. Responses to individual comments included in this comment letter are provided above.

PC01802-2**Comment:**

We do not want any 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.

PC01802-3**Comment:**

I would like to know "what" comments need to be expressed, to whom, when and why.

Response:

The public comment period was made available so that neighbors, residents, and interested parties could provide commentary or input on the project and alternatives as well as the contents of the environmental documents prepared to analyze the effects of the proposed project. Opportunity to submit verbal and written comments to LAWA and FAA was provided during the public review process for the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01802-4

Comment:

I've lived in Westchester all my life - The airport took my parents home on De Haviland Ave. in 1970 - can this happen here??

They did get a good settlement.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition/relocation associated with the proposed LAX Master Plan. No residential acquisition is proposed under Alternative D.

PC01803 Saulsby, Evelyn None Provided 7/25/2001

PC01803-1

Comment:

I am a retiree widow, I am 70 yr old. I am writing about the air plains noise, my bedroom is in the rear of the house, and the plains are so loud sometime I cant sleep in the afternoon, and if I am looking at TV I have to turn it all the way up so that I can hear it. I've been living here thirty six yrs. and its much worse, and more frequent.

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.

PC01804 Bobak, Juliet None Provided 7/22/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01566; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01566.

PC01805 Coddington, Susan None Provided 7/28/2001

PC01805-1

Comment:

While some reconfiguration of the Los Angeles International Airport can certainly be made, it is my feeling that outlying airports are going to have to be developed to take some of the traffic.. The current airport area cannot function with greatly increased traffic. More accidents seem inevitable.

Response:

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

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

PC01805-2

Comment:

Could we not provide a speedy monorail from Ontario to downtown LA, continuing to LAX? Let's use our imagination and go ahead and do what needs to be done to provide additional venues that are safe and efficient.

Response:

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

PC01805-3

Comment:

There are a couple of things on my mind regarding the current configuration of LAX. As things are now, leaving LA is not too bad. The upper level of the airport seems to work well. However, arrivals are horrendous. I often wonder what passengers from other places must feel when they pick up their bags and exit into the confusion, noise and relative darkness of the lower level. With private cars, shuttle buses, rental vans, long-distance buses all vying for too little space, spewing noxious fumes, honking horns, this is a hellish space. The upper level casts a giant shadow making the lower level dim. It should be possible to give much more light, use paint and plants to make the area more attractive. There should be more places to sit down, arranged so as not to impede pedestrian patterns. Also, there is insufficient information for deplaning passengers.

Response:

Comment noted. As described in Chapter 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the proposed Master Plan build alternatives include numerous improvements at, and around, LAX including, but not limited to, improvements to the airfield, the passenger terminal, the on- and off-airport surface transportation system, and parking areas. These improvements are specifically intended and designed to improve the efficiency and quality of passenger service at LAX, as well as to reduce impacts to surrounding communities.

PC01805-4

Comment:

Another ongoing concern of mine is that in the International Terminal, incoming passengers must go through customs and then push heavy loads of luggage up a ramp to an overcrowded waiting room to meet friends and relatives. It's a terrible greeting to tired passengers.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01806

Corte, Thomas

None Provided

7/13/2001

PC01806-1

Comment:

I can't sleep anymore at night Cargo Planes...1 AM...5 AM...11 PM...so loud the windows rattle.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The commentor resides in an area adjacent to the north runway complex and is subject to noise from the application of reverse thrust by aircraft that arrive when over-ocean procedures are in effect, as well as by departure noise from the south (or occasionally) north runway complex. LAWA evaluated the effects of sleep disturbance and reported the results in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR with appropriate recommended mitigation actions. The commentor's residence lies just beyond the boundary of the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program and well beyond the area significantly impacted by any of the sleep disturbance criteria. For further information, please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations and Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration.

PC01806-2

Comment:

I can't have a meal in my own backyard.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels.

PC01806-3

Comment:

There's soot on our cars our houses, our lives.

Response:

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

PC01806-4

Comment:

This airport mania is total greed, total insanity, total disregard for anything living in its path.

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. 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.

PC01806-5

Comment:

Oh and the FAA says my house is 1 block away from qualifying for soundproofing.

Response:

The noise impact area which determines residential uses eligible for sound insulation under the ANMP is described in Topical Response TR-LU-3, in particular Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4, and is based on the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL noise contour. Noise-sensitive uses exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour under the 1996 baseline were described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3), and shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Noise-sensitive uses exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour under Year 2000 conditions were described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3), and shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As shown on these respective figures, under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions the area within the 65 CNEL noise contour has decreased compared to the ANMP contour, which continues to define the area of eligibility for sound insulation. Although this is a comment on existing noise levels and conditions, the general focus of the document, pursuant to NEPA and CEQA, is to evaluate the potential future environmental effects of the

3. Comments and Responses

project and to provide feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts. See Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4 regarding how eligibility for soundproofing is determined and Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.14, for a description of how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP.

PC01806-6

Comment:

Do not expand LAX. I vote move it 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.

PC01807	Tamura, Randall	None Provided	7/27/2001
----------------	------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01807-1

Comment:

I live two blocks from Pershing. Under "Effect of Master Plan Improvements" it does not describe the INCREASE of traffic on Pershing due to the new terminal. The percentage increase on Pershing should be calculated. This will increase congestion in this neighborhood on the main access road to our area. This is a significant and negative impact to the neighborhood. The airport must not build a new terminal on Pershing.

Response:

Protecting neighborhoods is one of the four principles guiding the development of the Ground Access Plan. The Neighborhood Protection Program is summarized in Topical Response TR-ST-2, Subtopical Response 7.3.4. In addition, it should be noted that Alternative D does not include new terminal facilities on the west end of the airport property.

PC01808	Gordon, Chad	None Provided	7/20/2001
----------------	---------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01808-1

Comment:

I am extremely concerned with the expansion of the airport. There are several issues that need to be discussed prior to the 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.

PC01808-2

Comment:

I am an asthmatic, and the air content is poor presently. With the expansion of LAX, it will only get worse.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PA00070-1 regarding existing air quality.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01808-3

Comment:

I leave for work at 7:00 a.m. each morning only to enter onto Sepulveda, a heavily congested street. The expansion would only increase my daily commuting time.

Response:

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

PC01808-4

Comment:

Please do everything you can to stop the LAX expansion.

Response:

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

PC01809

Pfeil, Shirley

None Provided

7/26/2001

PC01809-1

Comment:

I have resided in Westchester since 1947. At that time the airport was East of Sepulveda. We vote to allow 40,000 passengers a year – what happened to that number. We do not believe anything the airport promises.

Response:

Comment noted. 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.

PC01809-2

Comment:

I hope all of the people who want the expansion get stuck in the tunnel. The noise is bad & will get worse along with the 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.

PC01810 Rousseve, Sylvia None Provided 7/20/2001

PC01810-1

Comment:

1. There is no such thing as a reasonable 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.

PC01810-2

Comment:

2. Great concern has been expressed about the need for housing in this county. Expansion of LAX will ultimately destroy a long-term and stable community of housing, churches, and schools.

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, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative), does not include any residential acquisition. As described in Section 4.27, Schools, there would be no significant impacts on public schools, due to acquisition, under the proposed Master Plan alternatives. Acquisition of the 98th Street school within Manchester Square would occur under a separate program and independent of the LAX Master Plan. Churches that would be acquired under the Master Plan Alternatives are presented in Appendix P of the Draft LAX Master Plan and Chapter 2.7 of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum. However, due to LAWA's programs for the acquisition and relocation of properties described in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences and Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR impacts on acquired churches and housing (under Alternatives A, B, and C) would be less than significant. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

PC01810-3

Comment:

3. Traffic in the area (north, south, east, and west) is already far past the breaking point with accidents increasing on Sepulveda, Lincoln, and the 405.

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 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.

PC01810-4

Comment:

4. Pollution and noise are already destroying the quality of life for all the surrounding communities.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. 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.

PC01810-5

Comment:

5. The pollution has already contributed to the health especially 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.

PC01810-6

Comment:

6. Possibly the community which already suffers most is Inglewood our neighbors to the east.

Response:

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

PC01810-7

Comment:

Regional!!

Why should El Toro have a beautiful park and open space while this region suffers the burden of this unacceptable growth?

Response:

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

PC01811

**White, Steve &
Virginia**

None Provided

7/29/2001

PC01811-1

Comment:

Too much noise, no safety concerns

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 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.

PC01811-2

The remainder of this comment letter is identical to form letter PFF; please refer to the responses to form letter PFF.

PC01812	Gordon, Danelle	None Provided	7/19/2001
----------------	------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01812-1

Comment:

I am completely against the expansion of the airport. I have listed some of my reasons below.

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.

PC01812-2

Comment:

* Traffic - the roads, especially Sepulveda, will be much more congested.

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.

PC01812-3

Comment:

* Safety - I am going to have my first child in October, and we are near Sepulveda Blvd. There will be many cars using alternative roads to get to LAX and that will lead to an increased risk of accidents.

Response:

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

PC01812-4

Comment:

* Pollution - the air is bad enough at the present time. LAX expansion will only increase air pollution.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PA00070-1 regarding existing air quality.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01813 Hyra, J. None Provided 7/28/2001

PC01813-1

Comment:

Our family has been living with the pollution, traffic, and noise caused by LAX for years. Regional airports have to be developed to handle freight and passengers. No to LAX expansion!

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; 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. 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-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.

PC01814 Wills, Arnita None Provided 7/25/2001

PC01814-1

Comment:

I was reading an small article in the Los Angeles Times just a few days ago, and it mentioned "The LAX Master Plan" and the location in which they were holding meetings concerning the plan. However, I am not sure that I can get away to attend any of those meetings. Therefore, I am writing you with one simply question. What is the "LAX Masterplan"? Sense I travel a lot I would like to know what is going on at the airport. Please send me information at the following address:

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review. Also, please see Response to Comment PC01348-4 regarding impacts associated with the Proposed Action under the LAX Master Plan.

PC01815 Stiles, Robert CitiCar 7/26/2001

PC01815-1

Comment:

Hello I am concerned that LAWA is reaching back to the 20th Century for a 21st Century Airport.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment below.

PC01815-2

Comment:

THE PROBLEM

The People Mover proposed in the LAX Master Plan may be an excellent means to move people about the airport, but it can do nothing to reduce traffic congestion in and about what was once one of the finest airports in the world. A congested airport is a disgrace. Adding an expressway approach will help a little but will only add to the automotive congestion. Too many cars.

THE SOLUTION

Install the CitiCar People Mover, a 21st Century transit system.

CitiCar is a multi-purpose transit system. It runs on Ultra-Light-Rails. It is fully automated. It is fast. And it can handle large crowds as well as individuals. It is small enough to enter buildings, follow the proposed LAX guideway route, and can be elevated.

The CitiCar Concept was devised primarily to relieve congestion on the freeways by virtually doubling a freeway's rush hour capacity. Because of its size and speed, it can move many more automobiles (including one of yours) over the freeway, than three lanes of concrete.

Concerning LAX, the advantage that CitiCar has is that it can both serve as a local people mover and, connected into the freeway transit system, it can greatly reduce automobile traffic within the airport complex. EXAMPLE:

A trip from LA City Hall to LAX Terminal 3 10 minutes anytime 24/7

A trip from LAX to Palmdale Airport 45 minutes anytime 24/7

Once the system is completed, most airline passengers will prefer to travel CitiCar direct.

For more CitiCar information, please contact us.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR does not assume any specific technology in determining general people mover impacts. More detailed plans will be developed prior to the actual construction of any structure or procurement of systems and equipment. At that time, CitiCar could be potentially considered as a candidate technology for the automated people mover (APM) system functions. Supplemental information on the transit technologies accessing the airport and their associated alignments is provided in Topical Response TR-ST-5.

The Draft EIS/EIR addressed surface transportation impacts in Section 4.3, Surface, Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 3a, On-Airport Surface Transportation Technical Report, and Technical Report 3b, Off-Airport Ground Access and Mitigation Measures.

PC01816	Sampson, John	None Provided	7/24/2001
----------------	----------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01816-1

Comment:

WE NEED SOUND INSULATION. WE HAVE AIRCRAFT FLYING OVER OUR AREA ON BOTH SIDES. SO WE EXPERIENCE A GREATER OCCURRENCE OF NOISE THAN THE ONES DIRECTLY UNDER THEIR PATH.

Response:

The noise impact area which determines residential uses eligible for sound insulation under the ANMP is described in Topical Response TR-LU-3, in particular Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4, and is based on the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL noise contour. Noise-sensitive uses exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour under the 1996 baseline were described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3), and shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Noise-sensitive uses exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour under Year 2000 conditions were described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3), and shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As shown on these respective figures, under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions the area within the 65 CNEL noise contour has decreased compared to the ANMP contour, which continues to define the area of eligibility for sound insulation. Although this is a comment on existing noise levels and conditions, the general focus of the document, pursuant to NEPA and CEQA, is to evaluate the potential future environmental effects of the project and to provide feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts. See Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4 regarding how eligibility for soundproofing is determined and Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.14, for a description of how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the

3. Comments and Responses

ANMP. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

PC01817 Anaya, Michelle None Provided 7/24/2001

PC01817-1

Comment:

It is uncomfortable at night to put ourselves to sleep. The noises get really loud at times. I wish to have new windows to minimize the noise. I will be helpful when going to sleep at night.

Response:

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, resulting in nighttime awakenings. This area is defined by the 94 dBA SEL noise contour. The 94 dBA SEL contour for the 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions was shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and summarized in Tables S6 and S7 of Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The noise impact area which determines residential uses eligible for noise insulation under the ANMP is described in Topical Response TR-LU-3, in particular Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4, and is based on the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL noise contour. As also shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, portions of the 94 SEL extend outside the ANMP boundaries, which continues to define the area of eligibility for sound insulation. 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. 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, in particular Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4, regarding how eligibility for soundproofing is determined and Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.14 for a description of how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

PC01818 Mason, James None Provided 7/24/2001

PC01818-1

Comment:

THE AIR PLANES MAKE LOUD NOISES WHEN FLYING OVER MY NEIGHBORHOOD.

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.

PC01819 Sligh, Aldene None Provided 6/25/2001

PC01819-1

Comment:

As a resident living in one of the most impacted areas of pollution, noise and traffic caused by LAX, as it exists today, the EIS/EIR Draft causes my neighbors and myself great trepidation. It exhibits little concern for our health, safety and community life. The implications of your "Master Plan" speaks loud and clear that the people of Inglewood and surrounding communities are expendable and of no concern.

Upon reviewing portions of the very technically written, 12,000 page EIS/EIR draft, the following are some of the reasons this plan should never be considered for implementation:

Response:

Impacts regarding air pollution, noise, and traffic were addressed in Sections 4.6, 4.1, and 4.3, respectively, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Impacts regarding human health and safety were addressed in Section 4.24 of the subject documents, and land use impacts were addressed in Section 4.2. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts to quality of life, and responses to comments that follow.

PC01819-2

Comment:

- Environmental Justice Issues have been completely ignored. Nothing can mitigate the destruction that this plan would cause. LAX cannot mitigate the problems it has created already by expanding the airport far and beyond the targeted 40 MAP that should exist today.

Response:

Pursuant to NEPA and CEQA, and consistent with Executive Order 12898 and DOT Order 5610.2, the analyses, mitigation measures, and benefits contained in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice and Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided comprehensive information on the degree to which the Master Plan alternatives would comply with federal and state regulations and policies pertaining to environmental justice. Regarding the extent of the evaluation of environmental justice, please also see Response to Comment AL00022-20. Regarding airport expansion, note that 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. Also see Topical Response TR-EJ-3 regarding environmental justice and regional context.

PC01819-3

Comment:

- Section 4.5 of the EIR/EIS Draft, page4-446

This section is where the citizens of Inglewood were completely ignored by city officials. They did not inform the people of actions being taken to assist LAX with expanded cargo facilities. There was no input whatsoever by the community regarding the City's General Plan. We believe our health is more important than the Socio-Economic advantages this expansion would supposedly create. Plus, no mention is made of how much LAX would profit from our city official's generosity; or how much or how little Inglewood residents would profit. Whatever it is, the losses would be far greater to the people.

Response:

Comment noted. The actions of the City of Inglewood are outside the jurisdiction of the City of Los Angeles. This comment does not pertain to the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01819-4

Comment:

- The draft does not contain an honest and up-to-date AIR QUALITY STUDY. Before this report was released the Air Quality Study should have been completed and included in the EIS/EIR Draft. But knowing how damaging an honest report would have been, it's no wonder it was not included. Without a proper Air Quality Study, the entire document should be considered fraudulent.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality impacts in and around the airport in Section 4.6, Appendix G, and Technical Report 4, and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality impacts in and around the airport in Section 4.6, Appendix S-E, and Technical Report S-4.

PC01819-5

Comment:

- The EIS/EIR Draft solves many of its mitigation problems and obstacles with simple acquisition and relocation. This is devastating to communities like Inglewood, Westchester, El Segundo and Manchester Square because it literally destroys neighborhoods and our much needed schools. Those who do not want to sell their homes are forced to because their communities begin to look like war-zones with homes demolished and properties left to go to seed.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed land acquisition and relocation for each of the alternatives in Chapter 3, Section 4.2, Land Use, and Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences and Businesses. Please see Topical Responses TR-LU-1 regarding overall acquisition effects on communities, TR-LU-2 concerning acquisition impacts within the Community of Westchester, and TR-MP-3 regarding acquisition within Manchester Square that is currently being implemented under a separate program. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation. 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 residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester Business District. As discussed in Section 4.27, Schools, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, there would be no significant impacts on public schools due to acquisition. 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. As was stated on page 4-88 in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, properties acquired by LAWA are fenced, hydroseeded, and maintained.

PC01819-6

Comment:

- None of the alternatives presented; A, B, C or "No Action" in the EIS/EIR Draft are acceptable. Each has its own problems in regards to safety, pollution, traffic and noise. Each will get progressively worse as additional flights are added

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01819-7**Comment:**

Inglewood will suffer 24 hours a day, seven days a week with no relief. It is almost to that point now due to the planes being allowed to ignore FAA rules not to fly between the hours of 12a.m to 6a.m. As a matter of fact, I've been advised that flights between 12a.m. to 6a.m are now scheduled flights.

Response:

The commentor is correct that flights are scheduled at night. However, there are no restrictions on the type of aircraft that may land or depart at LAX during the night hours. Therefore, no FAA rules are being ignored. In February 2001, the City of Los Angeles and the City of Inglewood signed a Memorandum of Understanding to study and mitigate the possible environmental impacts on Inglewood, among which are the effects of easterly departures at night. 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. LAWA will be seeking 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. 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. Additionally, for more information about easterly arrivals at night, please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime noise levels, particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-5.2.

PC01819-8**Comment:**

The I-405 and Arbor Vitae exchange addressed in the EIS/EIR Draft admittedly destroys an elementary school and many homes but fails to mitigate traffic congestion on other arteries such as Lincoln Blvd, Manchester Blvd., and Sepulveda. They will become virtual parking lots leading into the airport, releasing huge amounts of additional toxins into our air on top of what is already there.

Response:

Comment noted. This comment is similar to comment AL00008-8 and comment PC01608-4. Please see Responses to Comments AL00008-8 and PC01608-4.

PC01819-9**Comment:**

There is so much more I would like to address but I do not want my response to end up 12,000 pages. So suffice it to say that the entire LAX EIS/EIR Draft Master Plan Report is unacceptable.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01819-10**Comment:**

A regional solution is the only sane and viable route to consider in preparation for the increase in future air travel.

Los Angeles World Airports has alternatives. Also, El Toro is the perfect place for a second international airport. Rather than using that airbase for a huge, frivolous park, the 30 million O.C. passengers that fly out of LAX on an annual basis should take up their share of the burden. No homes, schools, hospitals or churches would be impacted like they would be and are in Inglewood. If the residents in Inglewood could boast of the economic status that Orange County can, a regional solution would be underway now!

3. Comments and Responses

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. Also please see Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01819-11

Comment:

Implementation of this "MASTER PLAN" would be committing premeditated, genocidal murder on the residents of Inglewood and all other impacted and potentially impacted communities surrounding the Los Angeles World 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. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR, and Technical Reports S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC01820

Creig, Quila

None Provided

7/18/2001

PC01820-1

Comment:

I am absolutely opposed to any more expansion of LAX. The traffic in and around this area is becoming unbearable as 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.

PC01820-2

Comment:

With Playa Vista adding a new community of 30,000 residents and unknown thousands of commuters to this area, Cal Trans says we will already be in gridlock. How can we possibly absorb any more people?

Response:

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

PC01820-3

Comment:

I want a detailed analysis of the traffic impact on Lincoln Blvd from LAX to Santa Monica, on Sepulveda from Hermosa Beach to Westwood, and on the 405 Freeway from Orange County to Northridge.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and 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. The study area for the off-airport surface transportation analysis fulfills the requirements of

the program-level document, per NEPA and CEQA. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology and results.

PC01820-4

Comment:

I want a detailed analysis of the cumulative impact of the proposed Playa Vista development and all LAWA alternative plans.

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.

PC01820-5

Comment:

Since the current airport was projected to handle 40 million passengers per year and now serves 67 million, we need a detailed analysis of the impact of an additional 67% increase over your projected 98 million passengers, or 164 million passengers per year.

Response:

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

PC01820-6

Comment:

LAX is already the number one source of smog-forming NO_x emissions. The proposed expansion will as much as triple this pollution. We need a detailed analysis of how to mitigate all this additional pollution.

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 NO_x. Those measures which are currently available are insufficient to mitigate the NO_x-related impacts of the project to below a level of significance.

PC01820-7

Comment:

We already have an FAA report stating LAX has the nation's highest number of serious near-collisions. Maybe we already have too much traffic. We need a detailed analysis of how to mitigate the problems we currently have.

Response:

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

PC01820-8

Comment:

Last, and most important, any plan to increase the number of passengers and cargo activity at LAX without seriously considering regional alternatives is totally unacceptable. The majority of population

3. Comments and Responses

growth will happen in the Inland Empire and Central Valley. Ontario and Palmdale are eager for growth. Orange County needs to learn to deal with their own growth instead of sending their problems out of their area to be solved by someone else.

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.

PC01820-9

Comment:

We need a detailed analysis that includes a regional plan to be proposed by the Southern California Regional Airport Authority.

Response:

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

PC01820-10

Comment:

We have already shouldered more than our fair share of the burden of traffic, noise and pollution in this area. Please support a regional plan that allows us to maintain a reasonable quality of life.

Response:

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 PC01820-8.

PC01821 Capp, Linda None Provided 7/26/2001

PC01821-1

Comment:

I am extremely opposed to any & all LAX Expansion.

Last LAX take over of homes in the area it destroyed many families.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed residential and business 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. Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester business district.

PC01821-2

Comment:

There are many areas that an Airport could be expanded. Also all other person's from the Valley, etc., would not have to travel to LAX & add to traffic congestion.

Response:

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

PC01822 Graves, Wayne & None Provided 7/29/2001
Nancy

PC01822-1

Comment:

We are writing you with our concerns about the proposed LAX Expansion. We live on West 80th St across from the West Bluffs. We hear the run-ups of plane engines that are being serviced. ALL NIGHT LONG! Not to mention the noise during the day - especially if we are outside or have our windows open.

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 any run-ups down that are found 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, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-5.3 regarding night run-up activity.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01822-2

Comment:

The traffic is awful with dangerous conditions on Lincoln Blvd. Cars are always running the red light in a hurry to get to the airport, plus all the expansion in the Marina area with added cars, trucks & busses. It's as tho we are being chocked to death.

Response:

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

PC01822-3

Comment:

If the weather is overcast or starting to get foggy the emissions from the planes is doubly bad.

Response:

Foggy conditions do not have an effect on the generation of aircraft emissions.

PC01822-4

Comment:

We are hoping that you will use other available lands I.E. Palmdale and Ontario who would welcome development of their facilities.

Response:

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

PC01823 Armstrong, Penny & None Provided
Eric

7/13/2001

PC01823-1

Comment:

We have several concerns regarding the proposed expansion of LAX. The following are a few. We chose this community for the lack of traffic and the small town feel of Sepulveda Blvd. If you take this away, you change our community for the negative.

Response:

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. 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.

PC01823-2

Comment:

We are concerned that by bringing more traffic, noise, pollution, etc. into this area the value of our investment is going to drop. Leaving us with little or no value on our property.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding the effects of LAX on property values.

PC01823-3

Comment:

Increased air pollution will have a negative effect upon my son's already bad allergies. Leaving me to wonder about the health of all the children in our community.

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.

PC01823-4

Comment:

If you choose alternative sites to expand ie: Palmdale, Ontario, etc. aren't you making it more convenient for those people in outlying areas to travel? Bringing them to LAX is inconvenient to them, too much traffic, nowhere to park, an already congested site getting more and more difficult to navigate. If I lived in Orange County I would prefer a less busy airport for my families 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

3. Comments and Responses

pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC01823-5

Comment:

Please don't take away our homes and our little community for a short term, short sighted solution to a very large problem.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed residential and business 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. Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester business district.

PC01824	Henry, Willis	None Provided	7/21/2001
----------------	----------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01824-1

Comment:

THE AIRPORT HAS ALREADY DESTROYED OUR ONCE FINE NEIGHBORHOOD, BY EXPANSION. HERE LISTED ARE A FEW EXAMPLES.

- 1 - TRAFFIC
- 2 - DISPLACED HOMES
- 3 - AIR POLLUTION
- 4 - NOISE
- 5 - DRIVEN BUSINESSES FROM WESTCHESTER
- 6 - REMOVED PARKING
- 7 - VEGETATION DESTROYED
- 8 - NEIGHBORHOOD SAFETY (AIR CRASHES) BOTH ON THE AIRPORT & OFF. THERE HAVE BEEN MANY!

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-121 and Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding opportunities to alleviate impacts associated with past or present airport activities at LAX. Please also 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.

PC01824-2

Comment:

I HAVE LIVED IN WESTCHESTER SINCE 1949 & HAVE BEEN DISPLACED BY THE AIRPORT. I HAVE SEEN THE DAMAGE THAT HAS BEEN DONE BY THE EXPANSION, AND THE LACK OF CONCERN BY OUR ELECTED OFFICIALS. STOP THIS RAVAGE NOW. GO ELSEWHERE.

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. 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.

PC01825**Rolston, Jack****None Provided****7/30/2001****PC01825-1****Comment:**

Some minor additions to the plan.

Create additional bus transportation to LAX similar to the Van Nuys-Lax bus (Fly-Away) with similar parking at the bus terminal.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan (see Subtopical Response TR-ST-5.5 on Van Nuys FlyAway and the possible Development of New Fly-Away Sites).

PC01825-2**Comment:**

Urge CATTRANS to complete HOV Lanes with special HOV lanes into the terminal for buses only

Response:

Completion of the HOV system on I-405 is assumed in the background assumptions for the year 2015, with a substantial portion of the system completed by the year 2005. Special HOV lanes were considered in the definition of Alternatives A, B, and C. However, it was determined that making the LAX Expressway available to all travelers had a much greater benefit to the entire region. Special HOV ramps are proposed to connect I-405 south of the airport to the extension of I-105/Ring Road toward the west terminal. Continuation of the HOV lanes into the west terminal was also considered, but found to be no better than the system proposed.

PC01825-3**Comment:**

Give buses preferred access to terminals.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01825-4**Comment:**

Allow 2 hour free parking at parking lots near terminals to encourage drivers to avoid drop off and pick up at the curb in front of the terminals. Provide baggage check in at terminal parking lots.

Provide passenger drop off at each LAX satellite parking lot.

3. Comments and Responses

Provide Passenger drop off and pick-up at nearby Malls such as Fox Hills Galleria, The Galleria at South Bay, and Hollywood Park or similar locations. Airport Bus would pick up and return passengers at no charge

Response:

Remote check-in locations such as the Van Nuys Fly Away Buses were studied as part of the EIS/EIR. In fact, the concept of multiple "Fly Away" bus routes from satellite terminals all over the region has been incorporated into all master plan alternatives as one means to reduce roadway, curbside and parking demands. Baggage handling at these remote locations is part of the plan, within the constraints of TSA security requirements. More information regarding those systems can be found in Topical Response TR-ST-5.

The concept of a curbside at a remote parking facility, away from the terminal buildings, for passenger drop-off and pick-up and associated transport of people between the remote location and the terminals is in fact the basis for Alternative D.

PC01826	Hittinger, Gerard	None Provided	7/23/2001
----------------	--------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01826-1

Comment:

THIS IS TO URGE YOU TO NOT EXPAND LAX. THE PROPOSED "MASTER PLAN" WILL ONLY BRING MORE TRAFFIC, POLLUTION, NOISE ETC. TO THE WEST SIDE 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. 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 noise in Section 4.1, Noise, 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.

PC01826-2

Comment:

WITH THE EXPECTED INCREASE IN POPULATION, THERE IS NO WAY TO AVOID TOTAL GRIDLOCK ON THE NEARBY STREETS + FREEWAYS.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01826-3

Comment:

THE OUTLYING AIRPORTS - ONTARIO, PALMDALE, EL TORO, ETC. SHOULD BE DEVELOPED TO SPREAD OUT THE TRAFFIC, NOISE & POLLUTION.

Response:

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

in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding 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.

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.

PC01827 Hobson, Lyn None Provided

PC01827-1

Comment:

[POSTER SIZE EXHIBIT]

Response:

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

PC01828 Vincent, Richard & Amy None Provided

PC01828-1

Comment:

As a resident of the Westchester community for the past 29 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. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed residential and business 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 and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester business district.

PC01828-2

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 29 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.

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 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 regarding outdoor noise levels, Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition, and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC01828-3

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

PC01829 Bobak, Esq., Martin None Provided 7/22/2001

PC01829-1

Comment:

I writing you regarding the LAX Draft Master Plan and Draft EIR. I oppose all currently proposed concepts.

Response:

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

PC01829-2

Comment:

The Westside is solidly built with no room for future growth or expansion.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00539-6.

PC01829-3

Comment:

The cost to remove existing properties in order to temporarily meet air demand will cost billions of dollars more than building new where there is room for future growth and expansion. The expansion of LAX will only be a temporary fix, and will lower the quality of life for thousands of Los Angeles residents.

Response:

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

PC01829-4

Comment:

The projected cost for expansion does not include the probable mass lawsuits that will be filed by surrounding residents due to decreased quality of life and loss in property values.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

PC01829-5

Comment:

The LAX Master Plan EIR does not state an alternative for a regional air traffic solution. Bringing the entire sprawling Los Angeles community into a densely populated area with only one international airport is irresponsible. With the size of the Southern California region, there should be 3 or more international airports to meet demand as there are in other large cities.

Response:

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

PC01829-6

Comment:

The LAX Master Plan EIR notes that the air pollution in the area will increase by over 1300% due to the increase in auto emissions, and airplane emissions. The EIR predicts that with expansion there will be an increase of all five EPA classified major air pollutants. This increase will be felt in an area with a dense population. Airport growth should take place in an area with much more land and a less densely populated area for the health and safety of Los Angeles residents.

Response:

This comment is identical to PC01563-6. Please refer to Response to Comment PC01563-6.

PC01829-7

Comment:

LAX holds the record for airport near misses. Flights should be decreased in the LAX area to increase safety and expansion should take place with a regional plan in areas where there is more space for the

3. Comments and Responses

increase of flights. The actual acreage of LAX is only 3425 acres and is densely surrounded by homes, businesses and schools, where as the new Denver airport has 34,000 acres.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC001563-7. Please refer to Response to Comment PC001563-7.

PC01829-8

Comment:

With the expansion of LAX, close to 100,000 Los Angeles residents will be subjected to over 65 decibels of noise from the airport. This compares to 0 residents who are subjected to noise at the new Denver International Airport.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC01563-8; please refer to Response to Comment PC01563-8.

PC01829-9

Comment:

Sound proofing homes can not mitigate the noise for residents. Family outdoor playtime, picnics and barbecues will be destroyed with the noise increases.

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 that would result from development of the build alternatives and mitigation measures that would reduce exposure of noise-sensitive uses to high noise levels. Also refer to Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a discussion of the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

PC01829-10

Comment:

The Los Angeles Freeways are the slowest in the entire nation. Bringing the entire Los Angeles population to one international airport on the extreme Westside is inexcusable. The traffic on the 405 is already grid-locked, with no room for increased traffic.

Response:

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

PC01829-11

Comment:

The master plan shows no mitigation measures at all for handling the traffic on the freeways.

Response:

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

PC01829-12

Comment:

Air Cargo will be landing on the Westside and will then be trucked out via the 405 and adjacent freeways to all of the outlying areas of Los Angeles. Air Cargo must not be increased at LAX but should be increased at regional airports where the population is growing.

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.

PC01829-13

Comment:

The Master Plan EIR does not take into account other developments in the area that will be increasing traffic on the freeways and major arteries such as the huge Playa Vista Development and the dense growth that will be taking place in the Marina area. The statements made in the EIR are incorrect without projections for these projects in addition to the expansion of LAX.

Response:

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

PC01829-14

Comment:

Los Angeles communities such as Palmdale and Ontario want airports in their areas. These areas are growing and will be the source for increased air traffic demand. There is very little growth on the westside. Logically, airports should be built where populations are continually growing.

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. 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.

PC01829-15

Comment:

On a last note, I have witnessed at least two additional alternatives for LAX modernization presented by local businessmen to community groups. These alternatives include newly designed mass transportation alternatives mixed with beautification measures at a fraction of the cost of the current plans you have presented. They do not include the destruction of homes or businesses.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC01563-15; please refer to Response to Comment PC01563-15.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01830 **Goldstein, Jacqueline** **None Provided** **7/25/2001**

PC01830-1

Comment:

I heard an extension for comments was authorized. Therefore, I direct my comments to the increase in traffic caused by additional cargo & personnel on our streets & freeways. The 405 is constantly bumper to bumper now, any increase will make living in Westchester difficult.

Response:

Traffic impacts were addressed in Section 4.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4, in particular Subtopical Response TR-ST-4.3, regarding impacts to I-405. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC01830-2

Comment:

Palmdale & Ontario have less congestion & need the jobs this development will bring.

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. 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.

PC01831 **Whittle, Tom** **None Provided** **7/17/2001**

PC01831-1

Comment:

MY IMMEDIATE NEIGHBORHOOD ALREADY EXPERIENCES BARELY TOLERABLE NOISE LEVELS ALL DAY AND THROUGH EVENINGS EVERY DAY. NOISE LEVELS THAT MAY OR MAY NOT BE GREATER THAN THE 65 db NOTED IN THE EIR ALREADY (NOW) ARE ADVERSE TO HEALTH.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise.

PC01831-2

Comment:

INCREASING THE PROXIMITY OF THE RUNWAYS, INCREASING THE # OF FLIGHTS, ESPECIALLY THOSE OF HEAVIER PLANES NORTHSIDE, WILL NEGATIVELY AFFECT THE HEALTH & WELL BEING OF THE PUBLIC AND PRECLUDE OUTSIDE (YARD) ACTIVITIES.

Response:

Impacts associated with noise and public health were described in Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.6), Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6), and Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety (subsection 4.24.1.6), of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC01831-3**Comment:**

THIS WILL NOT BE MITIGATED & WILL PREDICTABLY DRIVE DOWN HOUSING VALUES. WHO WILL PAY FOR THIS?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding the effects of LAX on property values.

PC01832	Sledge, Alex	None Provided	7/1/2001
----------------	---------------------	----------------------	-----------------

PC01832-1**Comment:**

I do not want any expansion for LAX area. I think that you can go elsewhere like Ontario, Palmdale, El Toro there is bigger area's and more space.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to 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.

PC01832-2**Comment:**

I don't want the airport pollution getting worst and I like the area the way it is, that is why we brought a house in the area!

Response:

Comment noted. Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC01833	Halpine, Susana	None Provided	7/30/2001
----------------	------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01833-1**Comment:**

I have lived in Playa del Rey for five years and hope to purchase my first home in Westchester this year. I strongly object to all three alternatives for LAX expansion as outlined in the Master Plan.

My main objections to Expansion include:

3. Comments and Responses

- 1) Moving the northern runway further North.
- 2) The proposed Ring Road extension of the 405 into residential neighborhoods.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient and efficient. Alternative D does not include the Ring Road or relocation of Runway 6L/24R. Under Alternative D, Runway 6L/24R would be extended to the west. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC01833-2

Comment:

- 3) The proposed "South Westchester" commercial development is an additional and unnecessary slap in the face to local residents, lowering real estate values.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding the effects of LAX on property values. Also see Response to Comment AL00018-1 regarding commercial property acquisition within the Westchester Business District and Response to Comment PC00013-5 regarding collateral development at LAX Northside/Westchester Southside. Additionally, refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding the potential effects of the Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester.

PC01833-3

Comment:

- 4) The majority of Cargo transport will be on the Northern runways, again putting the burden of the expansion on local Westchester residents.

Response:

Please see Section 3, Future Aircraft Operating Conditions, located in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR regarding runway operating conditions and utilization for Alternatives A, B, C, and Section 3, Future Aircraft Operating Conditions, in Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for runway operating conditions and utilization for Alternative D. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC01833-4

Comment:

- 5) Increase the ambient Noise Level from above items 1-4. Sound proofing will not be effective when one is trying to enjoy gardening in the backyard.

Response:

Ambient noise levels (in the CNEL and SEL metric) resulting from runway relocation (including Alternative A - Added Runway North) were presented in Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.6), and Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6), of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Increases in ambient noise resulting from development of the ring road were identified in Appendix K of the Draft EIS/EIR. An increase in ambient noise levels from Westchester Southside would not result in a noticeable increase due to landscaped buffer areas, building setbacks, and use restrictions that would be incorporated into Westchester Southside. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-5.4 regarding air cargo noise. Also refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 impacts to the community of Westchester. As stated in TR-LU-2, aircraft noise levels would decrease over time, even with the development of the LAX Master Plan. See also Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC01833-5**Comment:**

6) The increase in Air Pollution from above items 1- 4. This increase in the adjacent areas as well as the Los Angeles basin is unacceptable.

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 increase.

PC01833-6**Comment:**

7) Finally, I've been flying since I was 3 years old to destinations around the world. The proposed design of the airport, funnelling the majority of 98 million annual passengers through a "People Mover," sounds like a travelers worst nightmare. This human congestion will certainly lead to increased "Flight Rage."

Response:

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

PC01833-7**Comment:**

I urge LAWA to minimize the burden on local residents and consider a Regional Approach to address the increase in future air travel in 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.

PC01834**Kraal, Lies****None Provided****PC01834-1****Comment:**

We are 2 artists who are lucky enough to own a house and studio in Venice. We moved here (in 1993) because it was quiet, had good air and was close to the ocean...a good environment to create in. The coast of Southern California is one of the best places in the world to live...we are privileged and don't take it for granted.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01834-2

Comment:

About 3 years ago in August when we usually sleep with the windows open, all of a sudden during the whole night there was a constant roaring sound and vibration very much like a continuous thunder. We found out later after many calls that some "Class-B airspace had been opened up over our area." We live about 20 minutes north of LAX and it often keeps us awake all night.

Response:

There were no changes made to Class B airspace that would impact operations north of the airport in the commentor's location. The commentor may be hearing nighttime arrivals in over-ocean operations as they are crossing Santa Monica in a westerly direction at 8,000 feet. The aircraft go out 7-10 miles then turn around and land on the north complex where the commentor may also be hearing reverse thrusters during braking action to lower ambient noise levels. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations for more information. Also please see the analysis of nighttime single event noise awakenings provided in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01834-3

Comment:

Closing the windows doesn't help enough...and soundproofing with dual-glazing is effective only if you don't open your windows and never spend time outside in your yard. But this is S. California!

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC01834-4

Comment:

Now they've added a couple of flight patterns over our area during the day and a dreadful holding pattern at night. It's definitely been getting worse...and this is WITHOUT EXPANSION!

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC01834-2 for more information on flight patterns. Additionally, for information on nighttime awakenings please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and the related appendices S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, and S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01834-5

Comment:

We had always supported you as mayor until now. It is so hard to believe that the "compassionate conservative" could not only allow but actually promote and support the expansion of LAX. It is going to have such an obviously negative impact on so many residents...not only the noise but the traffic and pollution will be unbearable. Have you tried driving down Lincoln Blvd. lately? It's uncomfortably packed almost all the time. And this is not to mention the effect on our 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-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.

PC01834-6

Comment:

There must not be any flight patterns over your homes or you would never consider this project. We are miles away. Think how it is for the residents that live closer? We invite you to spend a few days with us to get a real flavor of what it's like. We are unfortunately also under a flight pattern from Santa Monica airport, but we are very aware of the differences between those flights and those of LAX. They at least are not asking to double their size.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

PC01834-7

Comment:

The major airports around the world are outside of town...it always takes at least 1/2 - 1 1/2 hrs to get into the city. This doesn't seem to interfere with people traveling.

Response:

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

PC01834-8

Comment:

Palmdale WANTS IT! That's important. All we need is quick transportation...like a high speed monorail for instance.

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.

PC01834-9

Comment:

It is still so hard to believe you can view yourself as compassionate...compassion for big business is all we can see in your eyes. Our peaceful lifestyle is being threatened and we are very concerned and upset about that. For us it has canceled out all the good you've done. Hopefully you will actually read this and maybe even reply.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC01835 Cope, Danna None Provided 7/16/2001

PC01835-1

Comment:

While I appreciate the extension of the public comment period on the EIS/EIR from 45 to 180 days, this is still not enough time to evaluate this massive document. It is sincerely hoped that more time will be allowed for review. Allowing only one day for receiving testimony was also not adequate.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review. Also, please visit the web site, www.laxmasterplan.org.

PC01835-2

Comment:

After reviewing the report, I find that the EIS/EIR is fatally flawed. It does not meet the goals of CEQA and NEPA. All the build alternatives proposed would clearly inflict undue economic, health, and environmental hardships and burdens on the surrounding communities.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01835-3

Comment:

The organization and presentation of information was confusing and many sections were inaccessible making analysis almost impossible; thus the document is inadequate and does not meet requirements for public dissemination.

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. Additional information is included in appendices and supporting documents

PC01835-4

Comment:

Tables and figures are not near the references in the text. The colors used on many figures did not reproduce clearly when copies were printed off the net. It was particularly difficult to distinguish between the shades of color. More attention should have been paid to display by using techniques that would reproduce clearly. Technical reports and appendices were not available for review or downloading on the net. Some tables were reduced to illegibility, such as Table 4.3.1-5, when there was no need to make them so small.

Response:

Comment noted. Production, publication, and distribution of the Draft EIS/EIR was conducted in accordance with CEQA and NEPA.

PC01835-5

Comment:

It was difficult to determine what models were used for the analyses in the EIS/EIR.

Response:

Information regarding analysis models was provided in the "General Approach and Methodology" discussion for each environmental discipline addressed in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, and is elaborated upon, where appropriate, in the relevant Appendices and Technical Reports.

PC01835-6

Comment:

There are very few real mitigation measures included.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AR00003-63.

PC01835-7

Comment:

Since Alternative C is the LAWA "preferred" plan, information that was shared with Alternatives A and B should have appeared in the C section. Reviewers of Alternate C were constantly referred to A and/or B to obtain information. The impression was clearly one of trying to obscure information, not disseminate it.

Response:

The cross-referencing of information pertaining to Alternative A or B when addressing the impacts of Alternative C was intended to avoid repeating the same previous discussions and avoid further enlargement of the document.

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, would shift 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. Alternative D is now the LAWA staff-preferred alternative. 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.

PC01835-8

Comment:

While the complete document was available at several libraries and at a local restaurant, many people did not have the time required to make a complete review at these locations. Many people do not have computer systems capable of downloading and printing the information from the disks. The cost for

3. Comments and Responses

procuring the complete document should not have been passed on to the public. For the \$61 million paid so far for generation of the EIS/EIR report, more copies should have been readily accessible from the contractor.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review.

PC01835-9

Comment:

Alternative C and No Action/No Project were not included in the scoping process.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00022-17 regarding the public notice pertaining to Alternative C. The 1997 NOI and NOP both identified and described the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01835-10

Comment:

In many sections, the word "significant" is used. For each usage of the word, it must be defined, explained, and quantified for that particular usage.

Response:

As 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.) 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.

PC01835-11

Comment:

Although the EIS/EIR pays lip service to a regional approach to air traffic demand, there is very little or nothing included in the document to foster or promote a regional approach. Other airports, not LAX, must expand to support the air traffic demand in those areas (especially Orange County which accounts for a large portion of EIS/EIR current and projected LAX passenger and cargo traffic).

The assumptions that all projected air traffic demand must be met and that LAX must be expanded to meet projected demand are false. Much of the projected growth and demand comes from other areas, especially Orange County. Since the airlines would be the major benefactors of meeting this supposed air demand, the airlines should shoulder responsibility for meeting the demand by working with other communities to develop and/or expand their own airports.

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, 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. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-2 regarding airline response to market demand and deregulation.

PC01835-12

Comment:

Far too many EIS/EIR exercises end with a full acknowledgement of negative environmental impacts and the admission that there is no mitigation available. These impacts are then blatantly ignored in favor of what is termed "overriding economic concerns." The economic benefits from expansion at LAX would mainly go to large companies often headquartered elsewhere, to stock shareholders who could reside anywhere in the country or world, and to regional areas (such as Orange County) which would not then be required to create facilities to handle their own air travel demand. The negative environmental, health, and economic impacts, however, fall almost exclusively on those who live or work in the communities immediately surrounding the airport and constitute an undue hardship and burden on them. The hardships and burdens that would be caused by LAX expansion under any of the build alternatives is excessive and must not be overridden by misplaced economic concerns for absentee entities.

Response:

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

PC01835-13

Comment:

Airlines should also voluntarily accept a system of fines and restrictions for violating noise, air pollution, and traffic regulations at LAX. The EIS/EIR should include airline participation in redress for violations of regulations.

Response:

Airlines operate under a variety of international accords, federal laws, and local rules and regulations. They are not governed by one local set of rules. This would make it impractical as each airports' governing agency could develop its own set of rules, thus making a patchwork quilt of different noise, air pollution and traffic laws which would paralyze the air traffic system. The Draft EIS/EIR was available for the airlines to review, along with the numerous public hearings and workshops. Aircraft noise rule enforcement is addressed in Topical Response TR-N-7, Air Pollution is addressed in Topical Response TR-AQ-3, and traffic concerns are addressed in Topical Response TR-ST-2.

PC01835-14

Comment:

There can not be any legitimate evaluation of noise or air quality impact until the FAA delineates flight paths for all the alternatives. This EIS/EIR does not supply complete or adequate information for these analyses. The FAA information must include flight paths, climb-out/landing angles and speeds, and minimum and maximum altitudes at specific points along the flight paths (at least every 100 feet from the end of the runway) for both easterly and westerly field operations, for day and nighttime operations, and for different weather conditions.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Section 4.1, Noise, and Appendix D, Aircraft Technical Noise Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR were completed under FAA Orders 5050.4A and 1050.1D. Modeling aircraft operations for every known or potential flight situation would be burdensome and impractical. Hence, average annual conditions were used. For additional information on flight track utilization, noise screening of track changes above 3000 feet, and location impact analysis please see Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01835-15

Comment:

Information on individual noise footprints for each aircraft (as has been done at SFO) is necessary for complete public review and would serve to pinpoint impact areas. These noise footprints must be listed for all weather conditions (including inversion layers), at all rates of ascent/descent (including power climb-outs), and at all altitudes.

Response:

Comment noted. In accordance with the guidance provided by both federal and state government, the environmental evaluations base its determinations of significant impacts and mitigation on cumulative noise contours, and in limited cases, on single-event effects on schools or nighttime awakenings. It would be impractical to provide an aircraft footprint for every conceivable operating condition because conditions vary on a daily basis. These footprints may vary due to weight, weather, crew operation and FAA requirements, therefore, two identical type aircraft may vary in the noise footprint they provide. LAWA's Noise Monitoring Program measures and models the noise for aircraft operating in all types of conditions and incorporates the results into its Quarterly Noise Monitoring Reports. These reports are reviewed and verified by the County of Los Angeles and they are also kept on file by the State of California Aeronautics Division. The Draft EIS/EIR does include noise exposure patterns for some identified aircraft in Appendix D, Aircraft Technical Noise Report, Figures 22-26. These were presented as representative samples of the individual noise footprints that might be associated with several common aircraft types in existing and future years.

PC01835-16

Comment:

Escape corridors for aborted landings must be clearly defined for all conceivable conditions and for all approaches and take-offs to/from all runways. Of particular concern is allowing sufficient space for aircraft (probably the heaviest, least maneuverable) which must be waived off from 24R/6L and 25L/7SR - runways that are currently the outboard runways, but would become "middle" runways if additional runways were added as in Alternative A and B. As pressure is put on airlines and the tower for increased through-put, more aircraft would be unable to keep up with the "rammin-and-jammin" and have to use escape corridors after being waived off. Because most of these (if not all) escape corridors would be over residential areas, they need to be listed, studied, and evaluated, and mitigation measures for the negative impacts included in the EIR/EIS study.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC01881-21; please see Response to Comment PC01881-21.

PC01835-17

Comment:

LAWA's incredible claims that noise would be reduced although operations would increase, may be due, in part, to LAWA's hoped-for "scatter" pattern for flight paths; i.e., aircraft would approach/take off over many portions of the surrounding communities, thus spreading the noise impact over the entire communities at a 63- or 64-dB CNEL level, instead of over a specific, narrow area at 65 or above dB. This scatter approach is curiously out of sync with current technology within much narrower flight paths than previously possible. Again, specific flight paths must be defined.

Response:

See Response to Comment PC01881-22.

PC01835-18

Comment:

The EIS/EIR also seems to include aircraft noise reduction due to the fleet converting to Stage 3 in the build alternatives, but not in the No Action/No Project alternative, yet the fleet is now completely Stage 3. The noise impact figures for NA/NP must be corrected to also include Stage 3 noise reductions.

Response:

Section 3.1.1 of Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, clearly details the No Action/No Project Alternative Operations and Fleet Mix. Only Stage 3 aircraft are used for operations by airplanes weighing more than 75,000 pounds, in strict accordance with the phase out of large Stage 3 aircraft by December 31, 1999. No change to exhibits of future no action contours is required.

PC01835-19

Comment:

Alternatives A, B, and C would impose undue economic, environmental, and health burdens and hardships on the areas surrounding LAX, especially on the Westchester, El Segundo, Lennox, and Inglewood areas.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socioeconomics, and health and safety impacts in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 5, 14, S-3, and S-9. 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 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.

PC01835-20

Comment:

The Westchester Central Business District has only recently recovered from the customer-base loss created by the LAX land/residential homes acquisition in the 1970s. There would not be enough room in LAX Northside to relocate all the businesses that would be demolished by the ring road and its proposed connections. Additionally, since there has been no construction in the LAX Northside area (although an EIR was approved for development in the 1980s), no accommodations would be ready for relocating businesses.

Response:

The Master Plan is considered separate from growth and expansion that has occurred at LAX in the past. Please see Response to Comment AL00018-1 regarding commercial property acquisition within the Westchester Business District. Also see Response to Comment AL00033-123 and Response to Comment PC00013-5 regarding phasing of and development within LAX Northside/Westchester Southside. It should be noted that, in contrast to the other build alternatives, Alternative D would not involve acquisition within the Westchester Business District.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01835-21

Comment:

Westchester and Playa del Rey have already endured the loss of thousands of residences in prior LAX expansions (which the community was promised were to be the last land acquisitions by LAX).

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC01160-1. No residential acquisition is proposed under Alternative D. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC01835-22

Comment:

Playa del Rey and El Segundo suffer from early turns during operations with the present airport configuration and level of traffic. With the extensions of runways, the probable increase in early turns, whether tower or pilot initiated, would cause severe noise impacts in all the communities adjacent to LAX. By lengthening runways, the smaller aircraft will be even more tempted to make early turns.

Moving 24R/6L 350 feet north (or 500 feet, as was erroneously-? listed in two sites in the report) would entice commuter aircraft to cut across east Westchester. Early turns on take-off and landing need to be studied, evaluated, and regulations with fees and penalties for violations need to be included in the EIR/EIS study.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01881-25.

PC01835-23

Comment:

Shifting 24R/6L 350 feet closer to the Westchester community (as outlined in Alternative C) places an undue burden on the community and is not necessary to accommodate wider wingspan aircraft. Judicious phasing (by airlines and the FAA) of arrivals and departures throughout the daylight hours could accommodate the aircraft.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D, the LAWA staff preferred alternative, would not relocate Runway 6L/24R. Alternative C would include the relocation of Runway 6L/24R (the northern-most runway) further north in order to enhance safe aircraft operations by providing a taxiway between the parallel runways. Please see Response to Comment PC00015-1 for a discussion on the need of a taxiway between the parallel runways and its associated noise impacts. Without improvements to upgrade taxiways to accommodate wider wingspan aircraft, such as Boeing 747s in current fleet and New Large Aircraft (NLA) anticipated in the future, operations of these aircraft would add airfield congestion and require time-consuming coordination; therefore, increased controller workload and reduced capacity would be expected. See also Topical Response TR-LU-2 concerning impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC01835-24

Comment:

Lennox, Inglewood, and east Westchester would be subjected to much higher levels of noise and air pollution due to the extension of runways to the east. This would mean that aircraft would be much lower in altitude over residential areas in approaches from and take-offs to the east. These impacts would cause undue environmental hardships and burdens on these areas.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01881-26.

PC01835-25

Comment:

LAWA officials have stated that there would not be any mid-field take-offs/landings (in effect having two operations per runway at the same or almost same time) even if/when the runways are extended. Is there any guarantee in the EIS/EIR that the communities would have this protection? This may be an FAA decision; therefore, the proposals can not be legitimately evaluated until the FAA comes forth with this information.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01881-27.

PC01835-26

Comment:

Especially during field reversals, when aircraft take off to the east, the Osage area of Westchester already has low-altitude aircraft overflying the community. Adding another runway (as in Alternative A), moving 24R north (as in Alternative C), and/or extending the runways to the east would greatly escalate these overflights. This would cause even more noise impact in east Westchester, Inglewood, and Lennox. Adding a new runway to the south complex (as in Alternative B), would exacerbate the early turn/overflight problems of El Segundo and Lennox. Without FAA's delineation of flight paths, the noise, traffic, health, and air quality impacts can not be legitimately evaluated.

Response:

Due to the prevailing winds, aircraft at LAX normally approach and depart to the west (westerly operations). When weather conditions require, operations are reversed, with aircraft arriving and departing to the east (easterly operations). Because departure operations use more power than arrivals, the easterly operations are louder for those residing east of the airport. The development of Alternative A could result in additional takeoffs nearer Westchester, but the new northernmost runway in the north runway complex would be planned for arrival use only. Therefore it is less likely that small aircraft departing either runway in the north complex would turn across the landing course of aircraft using the new north runway. The development of Alternative C would move Runway 24R north 350 feet, however, new procedures would ensure that all westerly departures reach the coastline before initiating turns. For further information, please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2, regarding early turns over areas north and south of airport. In addition, potential noise abatement measures are addressed in Appendix D, of the Draft EIS/EIR in particular subsection 7.1.1.3, Noise Abatement Flight Routes, and 7.1.2, Airport Regulation Changes. However, all Alternatives do not increase total population and dwellings exposed to aircraft noise above 65 CNEL. Only Alternative B increases the total population. The Added Runway South Alternative (Alternative B), would expose considerably more total people to 65 CNEL compared to Alternatives A, C, and the No Action/No Project Alternative. Although Alternative B also includes the phase out of Stage 2 jets, the estimated noise reduction would be more than offset by increased noise exposure due to the southern location of that alternative's additional runway that creates new flight paths over communities to the southeast of the airport. Compared to the environmental baseline, Alternative B would increase the total exposed population by about 12,000 people. Compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative, Alternative B would increase exposure by 16,400 people. Although total exposure would drop for two of the Master Plan alternatives, the 65 CNEL contour would shift in various ways for each alternative due to runway extensions or additions. As a result of this shift, each of the build alternatives would expose some people to 65 CNEL that had not been previously exposed. Some others who live within the 65 CNEL noise contour would be exposed to a 1.5 decibel or greater increase in noise levels. A much more substantial shift in flight patterns under Alternative B would create much greater noise impacts than any of the other conditions studied. The Added Runway South Alternative (Alternative B), would expose considerably more total people to 65 CNEL compared to Alternatives A, C, and the No Action/No Project Alternative. Although Alternative B also includes the phase out of Stage 2 jets, the estimated noise reduction would be more than offset by increased noise exposure due to the southern location of that alternative's additional runway that creates new flight paths over

3. Comments and Responses

communities to the southeast of the airport. Compared to the environmental baseline, Alternative B would increase the total exposed population by about 12,000 people. Compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative, Alternative B would increase exposure by 16,400 people. Although total exposure would drop for two of the Master Plan alternatives, the 65 CNEL contour would shift in various ways for each alternative due to runway extensions or additions. As a result of this shift, each of the build alternatives would expose some people to 65 CNEL that had not been previously exposed. Some others who live within the 65 CNEL noise contour would be exposed to a 1.5 decibel or greater increase in noise levels. A much more substantial shift in flight patterns under Alternative B would create much greater noise impacts than any of the other conditions studied.

PC01835-27

Comment:

Safety for air passengers, air transport and airport employees, and people living and working near the airport or under the flight paths should be of prime concern. This must include regulations protecting the health of these people from noise, traffic, and air pollution impacts and setting limits (with fees and penalties for violations) for exceeding the regulations. These communities also must be protected from air disasters; flight paths and escape routes over populated areas must be eliminated.

Response:

Comment noted. Human health risk and aviation safety were addressed in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, of the Draft EIS/EIR and 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 awakenings in homes and classroom disruption 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. The Draft EIS/EIR also addressed the health effects of noise in Section 4.24.2, Health Effects of Noise, with supporting information in Technical Report 14b. 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-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures and enforcement and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PC01835-28

Comment:

Protection for the El Segundo Dunes and Blue Butterfly Preserve areas must be sustained and enhanced. Comprehensive and specific information on the noise and air quality impact the increased air and ground traffic would have on air pollution on that area must be included in the EIR/EIS study. Without specific information on the proposed ring road and the access, ingress/egress to and from it defined in the EIS/EIR, the document is inadequate and incomplete.

Response:

Potential impacts to the El Segundo Dunes and the El Segundo Blue Butterfly Habitat Restoration Area were addressed in Section 4.11, Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Potential impacts related to air quality and traffic were addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the subject documents.

PC01835-29

Comment:

Concentrating air service at one large airport has severe safety drawbacks. In the event of a catastrophic natural event, such as an earthquake, all air service for Southern California, including emergency and relief efforts, could be severely damaged. It was recently revealed that a terrorist had targeted LAX for a bombing attack. Again services for all of Southern California, including emergency services, policing, and investigative efforts, could be severely sabotaged in the event of a terrorist attack. The EIS/EIR must address emergency options in the event of natural or terrorist disasters.

Response:

Comment noted. This comment is similar to comment PC01881-31; please refer to Response to Comment PC01881-31.

PC01835-30

Comment:

The EIS/EIR must contain a complete analysis of the environmental impacts of the ring road. Ingress and egress intersections must be defined and analyzed. If there is an access that would allow traffic to flow from Vista del Mar and/or Culver Blvd in Playa del Rey directly into the Western Terminal via the Ring Road, there would be profound and irreparable damage to the coastal road and wetlands. Similarly, traffic flow from Vista del Mar and/or Imperial would encourage airport traffic onto those streets. Access from these points would create immediate traffic gridlock coming north from the South Bay cities and south from the Westside to access LAX. It would create a tremendous traffic impact on roads not equipped to handle the level of traffic currently on them. If the access points remain at Falmouth and Loyola Blvds, the impact would also increase at those points. The Ring Road would not mitigate traffic, it would shift it to areas and roadways not able to withstand the impact. The Ring Road would not function as advertised to reduce traffic. Without specific information on the design of the road, no analysis of its impact or mitigation capabilities can be legitimately performed. The EIS/EIR is inadequate and incomplete in this area.

Response:

Please see 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. Also, the alternatives were 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 was 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.

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR are program-level environmental documents intended to analyze the impacts of a master plan. It is acknowledged that further documentation may be required to address certain environmental issues in a more specific manner, as necessary and appropriate.

PC01835-31

Comment:

The economic impact the ring road and its connections would cause for communities and businesses along Arbor Vitae and in the Westchester Central Business District constitute an undue economic burden. It might also divert business from the airport-related commercial businesses along Century Blvd and these potential impacts must be included.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00013-5 regarding business acquisition and relocation impacts and proposed collateral development at LAX Northside/Westchester Southside. Also see Response to Comment AL00018-1 regarding commercial property acquisition within the Westchester Business District. With the increase in passenger levels at LAX projected for each of the Master Plan alternatives, increased patronage at many of the businesses along Century Boulevard (e.g., restaurants and hotels serving travelers) would be expected. Also, please note that Alternative D does not include a ring road, thereby precluding associated impacts.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01835-32

Comment:

What happened to the storm water runoff containment area originally slated near the north-east corner of Imperial Highway and Pershing Drive?

Response:

Alternatives A, B, and C, as described in the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, involve the elimination of the Imperial retention basin that currently releases water to the Dominguez Channel. In the case that any of these alternatives is selected as the preferred alternative, additional structures would be built to replace the function of the Imperial retention basin in compliance with SUSMP requirements. Alternative D does not involve the removal of the Imperial retention basin.

PC01835-33

Comment:

Executive Summary, Description of Fully Evaluated Alternatives, Summary of Activity, Comparison of Alternatives (page ES-9)

The difference in level of activity (comparing No Action/No Project to Alternative C) is very slight; in fact, often the NA/NP is close to, or better than, C. There would also be only a slight increase in the passengers per departure under Alternatives A and B. The slight differences do not warrant the expenditure of funds and impact to the local communities that the build alternatives would entail.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC01881-34.

PC01835-34

Comment:

The increase in MAP seems to be based on the assumption that airlines would purchase and operate larger-capacity aircraft; a circumstance entirely outside LAWA's control and possibly, due to the economic downturn, not viable now for the airlines.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02143-10 for a discussion on the predicted air service changes, fleet mix assumptions, and the airlines' ability to replace their fleet.

PC01835-35

Comment:

- Total aircraft operations show less than a 2% increase between NA/NP and C.
- All weather peak hour operations would be 144 for NA/NP and only 145 for C.
- Three-hour average operations would be 140 for NA/NP and (a loss of 2!) only 138 for C.
- Total MAP is projected as 78.7 for NA/NP and 89.6 for C, a difference of 13.85%.
- Passengers per departure are projected as 127.47 for NA/NP vs. 145.09 for C, a difference of 13.82%
- Passengers per departure for Alternatives A and B are listed as 133.09, an increase of only 4.4%, compared to NA/NP.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01881-34.

PC01835-36

Comment:

Description of Fully Evaluated Alternatives, Summary of Features, Comparison of Alternatives (pages ES-9 to -11):

Total public parking stalls as compared to MAP are unrealistic: there is a projected increase of almost 55% (31.6 MAP) in passengers between the baseline and Alt. C, yet an increase of only 16.4 (5,565) in public parking stalls. It also shows an increase in public parking of 10.89% (3,879) from NA/NP to C, yet there is a projected increase of 13.9% (10.9) in MAP between NA/NP and C. This is a total of 39,491 public parking stalls for 89.6 MAP in Alt. C; compared to a total of 35,612 public parking stalls for 78.7 MAP in the NA/NP, and a total of 33,926 public parking stalls for 58.0 MAP in the baseline.

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As stated on page 4-238 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the demand for most airport surface transportation facilities is not based on total airport passengers. Rather, it is based on originating and terminating passengers only, which are the passengers who begin or end their air travel in the Los Angeles region. It excludes connecting passengers, which are those passengers who connect from flight to flight, since they do not use the airport's surface transportation system. Connecting passengers are, however, included in many passenger demand figures such as million annual passengers (MAP). The originating/terminating forecasts for the Build Alternatives are similar if not identical in some cases. However, MAP increases for the Build Alternatives indicating that the number of connecting passengers increases. As stated above, connecting passengers do not use the airport's surface transportation system since they only connect from flight to flight on the airside. Therefore, increasing MAP is not justification for increasing the parking supply in the Build Alternatives. The assessment of parking supply and demand is a much more complicated process and the LAX Master Plan Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR analyses started with an estimation of originating and terminating passengers, then used computer models to incorporate all the other parameters such as mode choice, trip purpose, vehicle occupancy, parking facility choice and terminal/gate destination.

PC01835-37

Comment:

How many passengers does LAWA expect to use the Green Line? Other airports have found that passenger usage of train service is difficult to create and that takes a long time to build confidence in train availability and dependability. When would the Green Line extension be completed? How is it going to be funded? The train cars now in use on the Green Line do not have luggage racks. Would LAWA finance the purchase of new cars more amenable to passengers with luggage?

Response:

The percent of air passengers forecast to use the Metro Green Line extension was kept conservatively low (5 percent or less) in the technical analysis for the LAX Airport Master Plan. This comment is similar to Comment AL00017-26 regarding funding. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-26. Also, please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail and transit plan for more information.

PC01835-38

Comment:

Other transit methods are mentioned in the EIS/EIR, but no specifics are listed as to location, routes, or capacity.

3. Comments and Responses

Is LAWA expecting the non-parking passengers to use non-existent transit? How many more parking stalls should there be for this level of MAP at LAX, given the strong propensity for private automobile transit in this area?

Response:

A complete discussion on the parking requirements was provided in Section 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Parking was discussed in detail in Section 4.3.1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The parking stalls proposed in those documents should be sufficient to accommodate the parking demand without spilling into surrounding communities. Please also see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail and transit plan for more information.

PC01835-39

Comment:

If the Western Terminal were to be built with this inadequate parking, how many cars would be spilling into the surrounding communities searching for parking? In view of the fact that there are no nearby Lot C or Wally-Park type of accommodations, when the parking lots at the Western Terminal would be full, where would the traffic be directed?

The Western Terminal would be a parking disaster under all the build alternatives; the parking situation must be reevaluated in the EIS/EIR.

Employee parking stalls, however, increase by 77.6% comparing NA/NP and the baseline to Alternative A; 103.4% increase for B, and 111% comparing the NA/NP and baseline to C. This is out of proportion; LAWA has had active ride-sharing, van service, and 9-80 work plans to reduce employee parking needs. Is LAWA planning on discontinuing these efforts? Is there no expectation that employees would utilize the Green Line?

The information here does not seem to correlate to the data in Section 4.3.

Response:

The parking impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. All project alternatives incorporate large remote parking facilities on the southwest corner of the airport. This is in addition to approximately 12,000 close-in parking stalls adjacent to the west terminal. There should be ample opportunities on the west side for either short-term or long-term parking. In addition, many private parking operators would remain available on the east side of the airport. These facilities would be easily accessible via shuttle bus to the terminals, as exists today.

The parking forecasts and impacts for each of the Master Plan Alternatives were discussed in subsections 4.3.1.6.1, 4.3.1.6.2, 4.3.1.6.3 and 4.3.1.6.4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and subsection 4.3.1.6 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Neighborhood protection through traffic management measures has been an objective of the ground access plan from the beginning, and is included as one of the four guiding principles for the transportation analysis. Information on protecting neighborhoods is provided in Topical Response TR-ST-3. Additionally, the impacts to neighborhoods are presented in Topical Response TR-ST-4, airport area traffic concerns.

The analysis of employee parking requirements has used somewhat conservative assumptions, although such assumptions are not unique in comparison to other airport master plans in North America. Providing employee vehicle parking still remains a high priority for LAWA. Employee parking forecasts and impacts for each of the Master Plan Alternatives were discussed in subsections 4.3.1.6.1, 4.3.1.6.2, 4.3.1.6.3 and 4.3.1.6.4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and subsection 4.3.1.6 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. With regard to employee travel to and from the airport in high occupancy transport modes, the analysis process has incorporated the thinking of many planning agencies and authorities in the forecasting of how such modes would be used in the future. LAWA encourages means to reduce traffic generated by employees and plans to continue these efforts in the future. Reductions in vehicle trips were assumed as a result of the completion of the Green Line; however, historical data from other airports served by rail systems in the United States show, relatively speaking, the mode shift to rail is small and accounts for only a small reduction in vehicle trips.

PC01835-40**Comment:**

Airline Administration and Maintenance are almost 76.8% (295 acres) of the total of 384 ancillary acres in the baseline and NA/NP, yet only 25.5% (24 acres) of total acreage in C (94 acres). Airline administration is certainly a usage that could mainly be moved off-airport under the NA/NP, thus freeing up acreage for LAX usage.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01881-39.

PC01835-41**Comment:**

Because both Manchester Square and the so-called Belford Area are listed as vacant in Alternative C and because land acquisition is currently ongoing in those areas, the acreage should be included in both the baseline and NA/NP columns.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02401-106 regarding land acquisition in the Manchester Square and Airport/Belford Areas.

PC01835-42**Comment:**

Where is existing Parking lot C included in the parking for the baseline and NA/NP columns? It is included in the total public parking stalls? If not, why is Lot C not listed as remote parking?

Where are the remote parking stalls listed for Alternatives A, B, and C? Off airport property? If so, what control would LAWA have over them? If LAWA does not control them, why are they listed as airport parking?

Response:

The parking impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The 8,147 stalls in Parking Lot C were included in both the environmental baseline and No Action/No Project Alternative capacities. Off-airport parking operators were included in the capacity figures for Alternatives A, B, C, and D. It is important that the off-airport parking facilities that primarily serve airport parkers be included in the capacity analysis. If they were not included, then the project would be required to add sufficient parking to accommodate 100 percent of the airport's parking demand. This would result in a severe overbuilding of parking in the project. If that large supply was provided on-airport, it would also leave no parking demand for the off-airport parking operators.

PC01835-43**Comment:**

The Unconstrained Forecast needs to be defined. On what projections are these figures based? This column does not add any information to the EIS/EIR and seems to be here just to confuse and shock reviewers.

Response:

A discussion of the methodology and data used to develop the unconstrained forecast can be found in the Draft LAX Master Plan, Chapter III. Please see Chapter IV of the Draft LAX Master Plan for a discussion of the unconstrained activity levels and the design day activity levels.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01835-44

Comment:

Executive Summary, No Action/N Project Alternative (page ES-11): ". . .current plans. . ." ". . .continuation of existing plans. . ." and "Improvements that are currently approved, in the planning states, or underway. . ." must be completely defined and listed.

Executive Summary, On-Airport Surface Transportation (page ES-23): There is no reason measures such as consolidating shuttle services could not be done now at LAX; therefore, the traffic congestion under NA/NP would be much less. The traffic data for the NA/NP must be recalculated.

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.

PC01835-45

Comment:

Executive Summary, Off-Airport Surface Transportation (page (ES-24): Although there would be more available land for development in the LAX Northside area under NA/NP, it does not have to be as densely developed as the EIS/EIR suggests. By locating businesses at LAX Northside instead of elsewhere throughout Southern California, airport-destined trips through the whole area would be decreased. Therefore, the figures for NA/NP trip generation are inflated.

Response:

Please see Subtopical Response TR-ST-2.5 regarding trip generation and Topical Response TR-ST-7 regarding Westchester Southside.

PC01835-46

Comment:

4.3 SURFACE TRANSPORTATION

4.3.1 On-Airport Surface Transportation

Overview- Key Conclusions

Dispersal of Congested Traffic: Constructing a West Terminal and Ring Road would merely create a new location for surface traffic congestion. The lack of adequate near-by short - and long-term parking would create panic in car drivers, with the distinct possibility that drivers would recirculate the loop looking for parking and/or cars would be abandoned in traffic lanes. The West Terminal and Ring Road have not been demonstrated to be traffic mitigators.

Response:

The traffic impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 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 analysis showed that the west terminal and Ring Road would help the Central Terminal Area (CTA) operate much better, by off-loading over half of that demand to the west side facilities. Further, the plans include ample close-in parking on the west side to allow drivers to easily identify available parking without recirculating. The CTA does not have enough close-in parking to accommodate all of the future demand; however with most of the parking demand off-loaded to the west side, there should be sufficient close-in parking in the CTA to accommodate the demand in each project alternative. Finally, the total mitigation package has been shown to be effective in mitigating the project-related impacts, as summarized in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, subsections 4.3.2.9 and 4.3.2.10.

PC01835-47

Comment:

Effect of Master Plan Improvements and On-Airport Parking: The number of parking stalls for Alternative C does not seem adequate; while MAP increased by 13.9% (from NA/NP to C), the number of parking stalls increased only 10.9%.

Response:

As stated on page 4-238 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the demand for most airport surface transportation facilities is not based on total airport passengers. Rather, it is based on originating and terminating passengers only, which are the passengers who begin or end their air travel in the Los Angeles region. It excludes connecting passengers, which are those passengers who connect from flight to flight, since they do not use the airport's surface transportation system. Connecting passengers are, however, included in many passenger demand figures such as million annual passengers (MAP). The originating/terminating forecasts for the Build Alternatives are similar if not identical in some cases. However, MAP increases for the Build Alternatives indicate that the number of connecting passengers would increase. As stated above, connecting passengers do not use the airport's surface transportation system since they only connect from flight to flight on the airside. Therefore, increasing MAP is not justification for increasing the parking supply in the Build Alternatives. The assessment of parking supply and demand is a much more complicated process and the LAX Master Plan Draft EIS/EIR analyses started with an estimation of originating and terminating passengers, then used computer models to incorporate all the other parameters such as mode choice, trip purpose, vehicle occupancy, parking facility choice and terminal/gate destination.

PC01835-48

Comment:

Consolidated Rental Car Facility/Reduced Shuttles: Consolidating rental car facilities could be explored in the existing airport configuration - there are possible areas where cargo buildings have been proposed or in the area bounded by Sepulveda on the east, the Century entrance on the south, the 96th St. exit on the west and north (currently a commercial parking area). The shuttle vans should have been consolidated long ago into a common bus service and could certainly be done now in the NA/NP plan - which would lower the trip generation figures for NA/NP.

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. Also, a new consolidated rental car facility would constitute a new project, and could not occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative. Therefore, a No Action/No Project Alternative with projects such as a new consolidated rental car facility was not evaluated.

PC01835-49

Comment:

4.3.1.2 General Approach and Methodology: It is unclear what year the on-airport surface transportation analysis was conducted (only "August" is indicated). Technical Report 3a, "On-Airport Ground Transportation Report" was not available on the net. It is very difficult to analyze data; some is from 1995, some 1996, and some 1997.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology, in particular Subtopical Response TR-ST-2.2 regarding definition of baseline scenarios and incorporation of local/regional plans and programs.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01835-50

Comment:

4.3.1.2 Roadways and Curbfront: On what basis was the 25% increase in constant hourly curb demand used to determine the peak hour demand? Table 4.3.1-1, Roadway Capacity and corresponding Free Flow Speeds, indicates the designed capacity, but there is no table showing a comparison between all the alternatives indicating projected traffic.

Response:

The 25 percent figure was used to increase the peak hour demand to account for peaking within the peak hour, as often occurs when the passengers on several large jets exit simultaneously. This figure was used based on past experience at LAX and other airports. A comparison table for project traffic is provided as Table 4.3.1-5 in Section 4.3.1 of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01835-51

Comment:

4.3.1.2 Parking: The figures here do not seem to correlate to the information in the Executive Summary, Comparison of Alternatives (page ES-10). This needs to be clarified.

Response:

The Executive Summary table showed 8,441 on-airport, short-term stalls in the environmental baseline. This includes 1,147 metered stalls, which are not part of the on-airport, short-term stall estimate in Table 4.3.1-7. Table 4.3.1-7 excluded metered stalls because those types of stalls are typically not accounted for when forecasting future stall demand, which is the intent of Table 4.3.1-7. Table 4.3.1-7 also excludes off-airport stalls in the definition of the environmental baseline, because the demand for off-airport stalls is unknown in the environmental baseline scenario. However, both the demand and capacity of off-airport stalls were estimated for the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternatives A, B, C, and D; therefore, that information was shown in the table. Also, please see Response to Comment PC00248-3.

PC01835-52

Comment:

4.3.1.2 Transit Systems: Given the length of preparation time and cost of this EIS/EIR, a more current survey on LAX air passengers should have been included. The 1993 study is 8 years out of date.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology, in particular Subtopical Response TR-ST-2.2 regarding the definition of baseline scenarios and incorporation of local/regional plans and programs. A discussion of the conditions under an updated baseline scenario was included in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01835-53

Comment:

4.3.1.2 Pedestrians/Inter-Terminal Circulation: An automated people mover system should have been installed years ago and certainly could be done with the present airport configuration.

Response:

A people mover system has been evaluated in the past, but to retrofit the existing terminals with a new people mover would be cost-prohibitive. It is much more cost-effective and would result in less impacts to the existing terminal operations to continue operating a shuttle service.

PC01835-54

Comment:

4.3.1.3 Affected Environment/Environmental Baseline: CTA congestion could be alleviated now by emphasizing systems such as the Van Nuys FlyAway, with the added advantage of remote baggage check-in. This feature would greatly enhance the attractiveness of transit systems. It is noted that CTA traffic is compounded by passengers being dropped off and picked up by a non-passenger (making two trips into the airport). If curbside checkin and baggage return were faster and more efficient, there would be less congestion in front of terminals. Is any program/incentive/motivation included in the EIS/EIR for the airlines to make curbside checking and baggage retrieval more efficient? If not, why not?

Response:

Remote Check-In Locations such as the "Van Nuys Fly Away" were given emphasis within the LAX Master Plan Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan for more detailed information regarding the FlyAway operations in Alternatives A, B, C, and D.

The LAX Master Plan Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR are program level environmental documents, intended to analyze the impacts of a Master Plan. It is acknowledged that further documentation may be required to address certain environmental issues in a more specific manner, as necessary and appropriate. It can be said, however, that new security restrictions at the airport limit the way baggage handling is performed and curbside baggage check-in will likely continue to be constrained by these requirements.

PC01835-55

Comment:

4.3.1.6 Environmental Consequences

4.3.1.6.1 No Action/No Project

Roadways

There could be more improvement in timing of traffic lights, both on- and off-airport. Since airlines wish to increase air traffic, they should be encouraged to stagger arrivals and departures, thus alleviating peak travel hours with the present airport configuration.

Signage could be greatly improved. As people approach the airport, they need to have more information about what lanes to be in and the locations of airlines. Several people have commented that the pylons of color along Century leading into LAX may be attractive, but they do not provide airport information - and that is what drivers entering the CTA want.

Response:

Staggering of airplane arrivals and departures is already assumed in the analysis, as described in Technical Report 3a. Coordination of traffic signals is an important part of the mitigation program for LAX, with both ATSAC and ATCS signal control systems being recommended. Signage plans would be developed during the design stage after the LAX Master Plan is approved.

PC01835-56

Comment:

Curbside

Much of the congestion is due to slow baggage checkin for departing passengers and much slower baggage delivery for arriving passengers. Why was improving these services not explored? As this is mainly an airline responsibility, is any program/incentive/motivation included in the EIS/EIR for the airlines to make curbside checking and baggage retrieval more efficient? If not, why not?

3. Comments and Responses

Was any consideration given to triple-decking the existing CTA? If not, why not?

New transit systems (similar to the Van Nuys FlyAway) would also alleviate curbside congestion and could be done with the existing LAX configuration. Systems that provide remote baggage check-in would be most beneficial. What systems were examined, in what locations. If none were, why not? New approaches to transit could and would reduce curbside and CTA congestion and reduce trip generation.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01835-54 regarding baggage check-in. Also, triple-decking the existing CTA was not considered due to capacity limitations of the on-ramps and off-ramps entering and exiting the CTA. The alternatives studied reduce the demand on the CTA roads and curbs by spreading the traffic to the proposed new West Terminal, or to the Ground Transportation Center (GTC) in Alternative D.

Remote check-in locations such as the Van Nuys FlyAway were given emphasis within the LAX Master Plan Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01835-57

Comment:

Public Parking

The NA/NP parking would be adequate especially by adding parking structures to the increase capacity in locations such as Lot C. Was this considered in the EIS/EIR? If not, why not.

Response:

New parking structures were included in the project alternatives. By definition, any new parking structures would constitute a project, and could not occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative. Therefore, a No Action/No Project Alternative with projects such as new parking structures was not evaluated.

PC01835-58

Comment:

Employee Parking (Table 4.3.1-8)

The number of daily employees in Table 4.3.1-8 is listed as 60,400 for NA/NP and for all three build alternatives for 2005. The daily employees for 2015 for NA/NP and all three build alternatives is listed as 71,360. These figures are grossly inflated for NA/NP and must be corrected.

According to Table 4.3.1-8, under the Environmental Baseline there were 51,700 employees and 8,990 parking spaces - and the capacity met the demand.

- Compared to the baseline, for NA/NP and all three build alternatives, 60,400 employees are projected for 2005 - an increase of 16.82%. However, the projected number of needed parking spaces increases by 26.52%.

- Compared to the baseline, for NA/NP and all three build alternatives, 71,360 employees are projected for 2015 - an increase of 38.02%. However, the projected number of needed parking spaces increases by 58.67%.

- This is completely out of proportion; LAWA has had active ride-sharing, van service, and 9-80 work plan to reduce employee parking needs. Why is there an apparent expectation that the new employees would not participate in these programs? Is LAWA planning on discontinuing these efforts? Is there no expectation that employees would utilize the Green Line?

- Is there any consideration of adding parking structures to existing employee parking lots? If not, why not?

Response:

The parking impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Both parking space demand and daily employees are expected to increase approximately 17 percent over environmental baseline conditions in 2005. They both increase approximately 38 percent over environmental baseline conditions by 2015. They increase consistently, however, the capacity differs by alternative, depending on the land available for parking space development in each. Employees are expected to continue ride sharing, van service, Green Line use, etc. and those efforts were accounted for in the analyses. The project alternatives accommodate parking in the locations identified in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Those locations are considered best suited for employee parking, while minimizing the environmental impacts.

PC01835-59

Comment:

Pedestrian/Inter-Terminal Circulation: A pedestrian conveyance system could and should be added to the present airport configuration.

Response:

The Automated People Mover (APM) system is considered to be a type of pedestrian conveyance system, and is already an important element of all build alternatives. Discussions on the pedestrian conveyance systems in each of the Master Plan Alternatives are discussed in Sections 3.2.8, 3.3.8 and 3.4.8 of Technical Report 3a, On-Airport Ground Transportation Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Other pedestrian conveyance systems, such as elevators, escalators and moving walk systems, will be addressed as part of the terminal building design.

PC01835-60

Comment:

4.3.1.6 Environmental Consequences

4.3.1.6.4 Alternative C: The numbers used in tables for number of passengers and parking spaces are exaggerated for NA/NP and grossly underestimated for all the build alternatives. The estimates of curbfront congestion are far too high for NA/NP and far too low for the build alternatives. The economic and environmental burdens and LOS impact for the West Terminal and Ring Road are enormously underestimated. They must be revised.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment PC00248-3. Please see Response to Comment PC00248-3. Also, the curbfront analysis and economic and environmental analyses of the west terminal and ring road were fully detailed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.3.1.6. Please note that Alternative D does not include the Ring Road.

PC01835-61

Comment:

Roadways

All the traffic and transportation computations and forecasts must be redone to reflect the corrected number of employee trips for NA/NP and corrected parking impact for the build alternatives.

Response:

The employee trips and parking impacts are correct, as explained in Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.3, Surface Transportation.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01835-62

Comment:

The assumption is made that the Green Line extension would be in place by 2015. However, there is no information given as to how this would be accomplished or funded. Would LAWA fund it? What process would be required to obtain state authorizations? Is all of the extension planned on airport property?

Response:

The content of this comment is similar to Comment AL00017-26 regarding funding. The extension would be both on airport property and within the right of way of Imperial Highway. Please note that Alternative D would connect the people mover to the Green Line without a Green Line extension. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-26. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail and transit plan for more information.

PC01835-63

Comment:

What trip numbers were used to arrive at the LOS levels given in Table 4.3.1-5? Why are so few intersections listed? The airport traffic impacts a very large part of the area, especially in Westchester, Inglewood, and El Segundo.

The Ring Road and West Terminal would create LOS F at many Playa del Rey intersections - why is this not evaluated?

Response:

Trip generation assumptions (i.e. trip numbers requested by the commentor) used to generate the LOS levels in Table 4.3.1-5 were summarized in Table 4.3.1-4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Nine intersections (five intersections along Lincoln Boulevard, as well as Culver/Jefferson, Culver/Vista del Mar, Pershing/Manchester, and Westchester Pkwy/Pershing) and four roadway links in or adjacent to Playa Del Rey were analyzed. In Alternative C, mitigation measures were proposed for five of these intersections (Lincoln/83rd, Lincoln/Jefferson, Lincoln/La Tijera, Lincoln/Manchester and Pershing/Manchester) and two of the roadway links. 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-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology, and 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 Ring Road, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01835-64

Comment:

Public Parking (Table 4.3.1-7)

The NA/NP and all three build alternatives are listed as having the same number of Originating Daily Passengers (84,847) for 2005, which is too high for NA/NP.

However, even though NA/NP and Alternates A, B, and C all have the same number of Originating Daily Passengers for 2005, the Daily Demand for parking for NA/NP is listed as 29,600 vs. 29,288 for A, B, and C - yet the main change in demand for spaces seems to be the Green Line, which would not be operational in 2005.

In 2015, the projected number of Originating Daily Passengers for NA/NP is 87,280 and daily demand for parking is 36,600. For A, B, and C, the 2015 projected Originating Daily Passengers number is over 108,000, yet the daily demand is only 36 spaces more than for NA/NP. This is a difference of 24% in passengers and only 0.09% in spaces. The assumption is apparently that over 20,000 people will use the Green Line which would probably not yet be installed: this is blatantly overly optimistic and must be corrected.

Employee Parking.

The number of daily employees in Table 4.3.1-8 is listed as 60,400 for NA/NP and for all three build alternatives for 2005. The daily employees for 2015 for NA/NP and all three build alternatives is listed as 71,360. These figures are grossly inflated for NA/NP and must be corrected.

According to Table 4.3.1-8, under the Environmental Baseline there were 51,700 employees and 8,990 parking spaces - and the capacity met the demand.

- Compared to the baseline, for NA/NP and all three build alternatives, 60,400 employees are projected for 2005 - an increase of 16.82%. However, the projected number of needed parking spaces increases by 26.52%.

- Compared to the baseline, for NA/NP and all three build alternatives, 71,360 employees are projected for 2015 - an increase of 38.02%. However, the projected number of needed parking spaces increases by 58.67%.

- This is completely out of proportion; LAWA has had active ride-sharing, van service, and 9-80 work plan to reduce employee parking needs. Why is there an apparent expectation that the new employees would not participate in these programs? Is LAWA planning on discontinuing these efforts? Is there no expectation that employees would utilize the Green Line?

- Is there any consideration of adding parking structures to existing employee lots? If not, why not?

Response:

This comment is similar to comments PC00248-3 and PC01835-58. Please see Response to Comment PC00248-3 regarding No Action/No Project public parking demand. Also, please see Response to Comment PC01835-58 regarding employee parking.

PC01835-65

Comment:

Consistency with Adopted Plans: Specify what transportation plans were reviewed and include what are the adopted or revised dates of the plans and the agencies responsible for the plans. List what and how components of the three build alternatives and NA/NP comply and which components do not comply with these plans.

Response:

Consistency with regional and local transportation plans was presented in Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, pages 4-305 (Alternative A), 4-311 (Alternative B), and 4-317 (Alternative C). As stated, no component of any project alternative conflicts with the plans. Some of the plans need to be updated, however, to reflect current and future traffic conditions. The analysis for Alternative D, summarized in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, was identical.

PC01835-66

Comment:

4.3.1.7 Construction Impacts

4.3.1.7.1 No Action/No Project Alternative: As noted, whatever construction that would take place in LAX Northside and Continental City would have little impact on the CTA. Also, the construction deliveries could be scheduled for non-peak traffic hours and, especially for Continental City, some

3. Comments and Responses

construction could take place at night. There is no requirement that either of these sites be fully or densely developed; in fact, there is a golden opportunity to create open space and green belt areas at these sites. Therefore, there would be little impact from construction during NA/NP.

4.3.1.7.2 Alternatives A, B, and C: Continental City does not seem to be slated for much development in Alternative C, but there could be as much commercial development at that site in the build alternatives as is noted for NA/NP. Therefore, construction impacts from development at Continental City should be the same for A, B, C, and NA/NP.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR analyzed impacts for the project alternatives. It did not analyze impacts of the No Action/No Project Alternative, which is the only alternative that includes both the LAX Northside and Continental City developments. The impacts of the LAX Northside and Continental City developments were determined in prior environmental studies conducted for those specific projects.

Construction impacts from the Continental City site were fully analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR for Alternatives A, B and C and in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for Alternative D, in which the site would become the Intermodal Transportation Center.

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-3 for additional information regarding construction traffic.

PC01835-67

Comment:

4.3.2 Off-Airport Surface Transportation

Overview

Key Conclusions

The intersections that would be heavily impacted by the Ring Road were not included in the analyses for the build alternatives; therefore, the EIS/EIR is inadequate and incomplete. The statement: "In Fact, in many cases, airport-related traffic impacts would be reduced on off-airport streets and freeways compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative in 2015" is not substantiated due to this lack of data on traffic loads on streets such as Vista del Mar, Imperial Highway, Main St, Pershing, Culver Blvd, Jefferson Blvd, Falmouth Ave, Loyola Ave, and intersections such as: Vista del Mar/Rosecrans, Vista del Mar/Grand Ave, Vista del Mar/Pershing, Main/Imperial, Pershing/Nicholson, Vista del Mar/Culver Blvd, Culver Blvd/Jefferson, Manchester/Falmouth, Loyola/Lincoln. Without complete traffic figures for these streets and intersections, the potential environmental impact to the coast, beaches, recreational areas, wetlands, and Blue Butterfly Preserve can not be determined.

Response:

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

PC01835-68

Comment:

Projected Growth: Claims of great economic benefits for the whole Los Angeles region are made in the EIS/EIR based on growth of passenger and cargo traffic at LAX. This growth leads to regional population growth, yet LAWA wishes to take no responsibility for the tangential traffic, noise, and air pollution due to that growth. If these related environmental and health burdens are not to be attributed to LAX growth, then the broad claims of economic benefit are null and void.

Response:

The environmental consequences associated with each of the expansion alternatives (Alternatives A, B, and C) were addressed throughout Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR. 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.

PC01835-69**Comment:**

Vehicle Trip Generation: The unnumbered graph shown in this section blatantly states that the trip generation figures inflate the NA/NP column due to more extensive LAX Northside development. The amount of development in LAX Northside is entirely within LAWA's and the City of Los Angeles' control. There is no need for high density commercial development at this site - there would be no undue economic burden to LAWA or Los Angeles if this site would be low-density development geared towards businesses that could generate off-peak hour traffic, or established as a buffer/green belt area. The vehicle trip generation attributed to NA/NP is inflated and the EIS/EIR assumptions are erroneous and must be corrected.

Vehicle Trips: Alternative C is projected to accommodate lower passenger activity levels during the peak commuter hours. However, this would depend largely on the airlines' cooperation. The EIS/EIR does not seem to include any agreements/incentives/requirements for the airlines to limit flight schedules. How would this lower passenger activity be achieved without airline cooperation?

Congestion: Because the streets and intersections noted above that would be seriously impacted by the Ring Road were not included in the EIS/EIR traffic study, all the claims for reducing traffic on arterial streets and improvement of LOS F intersections are unsubstantiated and must be recomputed. Also the effect of LAX traffic was not carried out to a large enough area in the surrounding communities. This also must be corrected.

Response:

The airlines' response to the future conditions was estimated in the analysis, with the airlines' oversight and concurrence. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-7 regarding Westchester Southside, and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding trip generation and study areas.

PC01835-70**Comment:**

Environmental Action Plan

Design/Planning

The proposed I-405 expressway would cause undue environmental, economic, health, and historical burdens on the Osage area of Westchester. Since SCAG has not included this in the planning for the area, funding would have to come from other sources. Is LAWA prepared to fully fund this? How could airport funds be used to create a roadway that could and would be used by other than airport-related traffic? Rather than relieve traffic for the airport, it seems to be an attempt at traffic mitigation for the Howard Hughes Center and Playa Vista.

The incomplete and inadequate information about the potential hazards and traffic impacts of the Ring Road must be addressed in the EIS/EIR.

Mitigation Measures: The two Intelligent Transportation System Mitigation Measures (an Adaptive Traffic Control System, and Automated Traffic Surveillance and Control) could be (and should have been) installed with the present airport configuration, thereby reducing the traffic impact of NA/NP.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. The LAX Master Plan proposes to provide major investments that would greatly improve operations on the freeway system. These proposed improvements would receive airport funding only if the LAX Master Plan is approved. Also, protecting neighborhoods is one of the four principles guiding the development of the Ground Access Plan. The Neighborhood Protection program is summarized in Topical Response TR-ST-2. The Ring Road would be reviewed in additional detail in a future project-level EIS/EIR that would be prepared for that project after approval of this program-level Draft EIS/EIR. As described in Subtopical Response TR-ST-4.3, LAWA has been prohibited by federal law from implementing the ATCS and ATSAC mitigation measures. Adoption of the LAX Master Plan would make it possible for LAWA to contribute to improvements such as those referenced in the comment.

PC01835-71

Comment:

This EIS/EIR has so many flaws, inconsistencies, and missing information, that it is fatally flawed. It does not meet the goals of CEQA and NEPA. All the build alternatives proposed would clearly inflict undue economic, health, and environmental hardships and burdens on the surrounding communities.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01836 Diewood, E. None Provided

PC01836-1

Comment:

I think it is appalling that you would consider tearing down an area that for the 1st time in my 20+ years in Westchester people have a chance to shop a good store (Ralphs) sit down and have a cup of coffee, visit a few small stores and in this square have semblance of "a village"

When you soundproofed my home I appreciated that, but was not told of this plan to raze downtown Westchester.

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 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 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.

PC01836-2**Comment:**

(By the way I am having an awful time with the windows)

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of residential sound insulation provided under the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP), including contact information for questions or comments regarding sound insulation.

PC01836-3**Comment:**

I don't mind a small increase in noise but that plan is a bit over the top

Response:

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 information on 1996 baseline and Year 2000 noise levels and noise impacts projected to occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternatives A, B, C, and Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative). It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. For additional information on potential noise impacts, please see Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 and Subtopical Response TR-N-6.2.

PC01837**Apodaca, Jamie****None Provided****7/15/2001****PC01837-1****Comment:**

It is asinine to even consider expanding LAX. There is a severe lack of housing in Los Angeles, and LAWA plans to destroy close to 200 homes to bring in more planes.

Response:

Impacts associated with residential acquisition under Alternatives A, B, and C were addressed in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and included the acquisition of 84 dwelling units in the community of Westchester. Please also see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation. LAWA is currently implementing a voluntary residential acquisition and relocation program for the Manchester Square and Belford area, which is independent from the LAX Master Plan and is described in Topical Response TR-MP-3. Note that under LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative, Alternative D, no residential acquisition is proposed.

PC01837-2**Comment:**

This in turn will bring in much more traffic, including taxis, shuttle buses, tour buses and limousines. It is almost impossible now to get out of Westchester in the afternoons because of all the traffic. Bringing in more planes will only exacerbate the matter.

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 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

3. Comments and Responses

with implementation of the Master Plan Alternatives, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-7 regarding Westchester Southside traffic.

PC01837-3

Comment:

In addition, where do you propose all the people displaced from these homes go to? Certainly there is not enough housing in the area for all the displaced people. In addition, many of the people in Westchester have lived here for decades, including my husband. Why should LAWA be allowed to destroy their lives?

Response:

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

PC01837-4

Comment:

I firmly believe that LAWA's plan is to completely level Westchester, from Imperial Highway to Loyola Marymount, for their airport. They just aren't being honest about it because the uproar would be too great. So they instead will chip away at us, a couple hundred houses at a time, until they have a monster airport here.

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. As indicated in TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester business district.

PC01837-5

Comment:

The only real solution is to expand other airports, especially at 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.

PC01837-6

Comment:

Palmdale could easily become primarily a cargo facility, and people in that area would welcome the jobs. This would leave much more room at LAX for passenger traffic.

Response:

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

PC01837-7**Comment:**

DO NOT ALLOW THE AIRPORT TO DESTROY WESTCHESTER!!!! It is a unique community that deserves better than to be paved over for LAWA's benefit.

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 include any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester business district.

PC01838**Hunt, Hal****None Provided****5/14/2001****PC01838-1****Comment:**

My name is Hal Hunt. I live at 826 Bungalow Drive in El Segundo, 90245.

I would just like to speak to the -- at the moment, the traffic around L.A.X. And I think at the moment there's very congested, very dangerous areas around the airport, particularly at certain times. I assume that there are times -- when the airport has the most traffic going on certain holidays. And one in particular is the offramp at Sepulveda, Sepulveda north leading into the airport. And people come around -- or I come around the corner from the San Diego Freeway coming from the north and going to my home in El Segundo down the 105 west, or coming north on -- coming from the south on the San Diego Freeway and coming on the 105. So more than once I've been going 50 or 60 miles an hour and suddenly had to brake quite a distance from Sepulveda because all the traffic is backed up trying to get into the airport. I think it's extremely dangerous.

And I feel like the way they built the freeway -- I'm going to need to look at the plan -- but the way they built the freeway offramp leading onto Sepulveda is just almost -- to me it's almost a crime against the people in a way, because you come against this -- this traffic jam that's either coming too fast, people are turning, trying to pass each other in a dangerous way or put on their brakes really quickly. And then if you are actually coming to the airport expecting to get in in a timely manner, you can't do it, which I've had the occasion to do also.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. 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. Additional improvements are programmed for this off-ramp and will be implemented by Caltrans in the very near future. This has doubled capacity and helped to reduce operational problems associated with this off-ramp. As discussed in Technical Report 3b, Attachment D, traffic volumes on this ramp will 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 will decrease, and its demand would stay below capacity through and beyond 2015. See also Topical Response TR-ST-2 surface transportation analysis methodology.

PC01838-2**Comment:**

And the other thing I'd like to speak to is the fact that there really is no public transit access to the airport, reasonable public transit access. You can come and take a Green Line and take a shuttle to the airport, which to me is very inconvenient. You can take the bus up near the airport, but you have to either walk a long distance to get the bus and take a tram to get there. So for a large city to have an airport where people can't access it, even with their bags, in an easy way by taking the bus or subway-type train right into the airport and get off, I think is not a good thing.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

As described in the published documents, Alternatives A, B, and C include an extension of the Metro Green Line to the Westside terminal. Alternative D does not. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan. 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.

PC01838-3

Comment:

To wrap it up, I think it's a dangerous -- I think the traffic is a dangerous situation as well as time consuming, wasting fuel, making noise, causing heat, all those type of things. And the access to it, even for me as a passenger, I've got a higher \$20 tax, which I'm kind of used to that, but I think from El Segundo it seems you should be able to go right over there through public transportation.

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 proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding noise and air pollution issues, respectively. The comment of taking public transportation from El Segundo to LAX is very similar to the new Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, Alternative D. In this alternative, public transportation need only to go to the proposed Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC) at Aviation and Imperial Highway, from there passengers can take a people mover directly to the terminals. This alternative was analyzed in detail in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01839

Suezia, Joseph

None Provided

5/14/2001

PC01839-1

Comment:

Joseph, J-0-S-E-P-H, Suezia, S-U-E-Z-I-A, 511 Oregon Street, El Segundo, 90245.

Other than traffic, noise, pollution, will the home value of El Segundo residents decrease in value with the expansion of the master plan?

Response:

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

PC01839-2

Comment:

A couple comments: My six year old has had hearing problems due to the excessive noise. When a lot of the noise from the planes idling is excessive, he's actually had to go inside the house on multiple occasions because of that noise. The noise levels get to him. And I've heard about other kids in the neighborhood having the same problem.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-246 regarding the fact that existing and future noise levels at and around LAX are projected to be well below the OSHA and CalOSHA standards that serve to protect against hearing loss. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00038-11 regarding the impact of high noise levels on children.

PC01840 Kelly, Herbert None Provided 5/14/2001

PC01840-1

Comment:

Herbert Kelly, 525 Penn Street, El Segundo, 90245.

I've lived in El Segundo over 40 years. I'm retired. I'm a retired supervisor, and, well, I was president -- union -- and union official.

And having lived here that long, when I first came here, I didn't realize, but the air was good. And as far as I don't -- I don't even think the airport was here, that was down on Slauson or something.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00070-1.

PC01840-2

Comment:

And over the years I've never noticed how bad it is, excepting that I noticed oil on my cars from fuel of airplanes. Nothing I could do about it, so --

Response:

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

PC01840-3

Comment:

Anyway, so I have had occasion now to go to Salt Lake City, where my granddaughter was getting married. I went. I wasn't -- hadn't been feeling good in quite some time. I mean, nothing serious or anything, just felt like the air was closing in on me. But when I got up there, after I was there about four hours, I got to feeling real good. And air is lighter up there. And they told me that's probably what it was, the clean air, and the air is lighter. And all the time I was up there I felt real good.

Coming back, I get off the plane, and as soon as I get off the plane, I start feeling kind of closed in. I'm back to where I was before I left for Salt Lake City. So I know -- I know it's the air. I know it's the air. Even though the air is lighter up there, that much -- that should make an ordinary person who is used to breathing heavier -- you know, it wouldn't -- normally I'd get more tired, but I didn't. I felt wonderful. What else can I say?

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC01841 Connell, John None Provided 5/14/2001

PC01841-1

Comment:

John Connell, 316 Maryland Street, Number 2, El Segundo, California, 90245.

I just came back from Las Vegas and noticed a difference in the air quality between Los Angeles Airport and Las Vegas, which is not the cleanest city in the world. It is still a huge difference, being worse at L.A.X. than Las Vegas.

Response:

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

PC01841-2

Comment:

Also, what is the plan to solve the problem of the noise pollution for residents on Imperial Avenue? They have constant noise of jet airplanes taking off to the point where people can't even talk sometimes, all on the entire street in El Segundo.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01377-9 regarding the effect of aircraft noise on the City of El Segundo from development of the build alternatives. Although portions of Imperial Avenue (generally east of Sepulveda Boulevard) would continue to be exposed to noise levels 65 CNEL and greater under all of the Master Plan alternatives, overall noise levels along Imperial Avenue would decrease compared to 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions. In addition, areas exposed to high single event noise levels (defined by the 94 dBA SEL noise contour) along Imperial Avenue would decrease under the build alternatives compared to 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions.

PC01841-3

Comment:

And what is the plan for the 105 Freeway, which almost every day has cars jammed in trying to get off the 105 into the airport, so much that they block more than one lane and they block both -- two lanes trying to exit the freeway and all jam in there just to get off the 105.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment PC01838-1. Please see Response to Comment PC01838-1.

PC01841-4

Comment:

And there are times when I can smell the fuel from the airport, the fumes from the airport, up to Maryland Street. On the top of the hill, there are times I can smell all the way up there spent fumes -- you know, exhaust fumes.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding the topic of odor.

PC01842 Mulvaney, Ana None Provided 5/14/2001

PC01842-1

Comment:

My name is Ana Mulvaney, and my post office box is 881771 in L.A., 90009. I'll give you my address if you want, but I get no mail there. I live at 83rd Street and Stewart Avenue -- S-T-E-W-A-R-T -- in Westchester.

In 1965 and 1966 they took -- we were forced to sell our home to the airport. When I was 12, I lived under the north runway. It was so loud we could not hear each other talk. And so my question is: What are they -- what did they use in 1965 to get rid of us all and are they going to use the same thing now to get rid of us? They bought all the houses from Sepulveda Boulevard to the ocean under the path of the L.A. airport, and it just decimated our neighborhood.

Response:

Comment noted. The specifics of relocation of existing residences or businesses under Alternatives A, B, and C were addressed in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses of the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation. It should be noted that under Alternative D, no acquisition/relocation of residences is proposed as part of the project.

PC01842-2

Comment:

And I have been working in Inglewood for about 20 years now. I was a six-year tenured teacher at Inglewood High School before I resigned. Every morning my classroom would be blanketed with a fine blanket of dust.

Response:

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

PC01842-3

Comment:

I work now substitute teaching at Oak Street School in Inglewood and in El Segundo, and the -- the planes are probably almost sometimes 300 feet above the heads of the children. The noise is deafening.

Response:

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. 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.

PC01842-4

Comment:

My post office box is at the airport post office. I cannot get my mail without plugging my ears. It's horrible. So I want -- I don't want it to go through. It's just very insensitive to the people, the neighborhoods. That's all.

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.

PC01843 Chaykowski, Jon None Provided 5/14/2001

PC01843-1

Comment:

My name is Jon Chaykowski. I live at 218 John Street, Manhattan Beach, California, the zip code is 90266.

I wish to voice my concern regarding the negative impacts of expanding L.A.X. and the EIS and EIR. And I think they haven't adequately addressed some of the negative impacts.

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.

PC01843-2

Comment:

Obviously, if there are going to be additional planes in the area, there is obviously going to be added planes in the air space that is going to be above and around -- in the surrounding areas around L.A.X. Being from Manhattan Beach, I, as well as other citizens, are witnessing and reporting more fly-overs over our city. And also at additional hours we're finding throughout the day and evening we have these fly-overs.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

PC01843-3

Comment:

Specifically on February 6th, that's a Tuesday, of 2001 at 12:15 A.M., 12:25 A.M., and 12:35 A.M. in the morning, I was awakened, trying to sleep, from the noise of planes flying overhead.

Response:

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

PC01843-4

Comment:

I repeat, this is -- this has to do with the additional planes. I'm say saying with the EIR, that as more and more planes are flying from and to L.A.X., we're going to have more fly-overs over our city.

Response:

The commentor may be affected by easterly takeoffs circling back to the west on their departures to Asia. LAWA will be pursuing Federal approval of a restriction to alleviate that situation by making over-ocean procedures mandatory when they are in effect between midnight and 6:30 a.m. During a recent 18 month period, 82 jets departed to the east when over-ocean procedures were in effect, an average

of about one per week. As noted by the noise abatement procedures delineated in Topical Response TR-N-7, exceptions to the over-ocean procedures are available when weather or wind conditions require east traffic flow. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1.

PC01843-5

Comment:

That's not only the noise problem, obviously, not only being disrupted in the middle of the night, but there is additional things like safety. We all know that there are parts, general debris that come off of planes on occasion. Additional fly-overs mean there is going to be additional risk for those things to occur. Obviously we don't want to hear of a crash, but they happen as well. So any time there is additional air flights, air traffic, there is going to be more risk.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. The potential for debris to dislodge from an aircraft is greatest during departure. Under each of the Master Plan build alternatives, all new and/or redesigned runways would have an associated Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) that would meet FAA airport design requirements to protect persons and property on the ground.

PC01843-6

Comment:

Now, those fly-overs, I did actually report those to the L.A.X. airport, and they -- I did receive a zone violation check. And this was an evening when the wind change required the planes to take off in an eastward direction and circle back to go over to the ocean. They were flying as low as 2,900 feet over the city of Manhattan Beach before they got to the coastline. Obviously, that's not very favorable to have that happen in your neighborhood.

Response:

When wind or weather conditions require takeoffs to be made to the east, the conditions described by the commentor occur. These will not change under any of the proposed alternatives. However, 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. 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. 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. Additionally, for more information about east flow operations at night, please see Topical Response TR-N-5, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-5.2. Also see Subtopical Response TR-N-7.1 regarding situations in which noise rules are not enforced.

PC01843-7

Comment:

Again, regarding the expansion, any kind of expansion is going to only exacerbate the problem and make all of the risk and all of nuisances greater.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed environmental impacts, both adverse and beneficial, in Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01843-8

Comment:

Add to that what's been happening to the traffic in the El Segundo area. I am a commuter that commutes from Manhattan Beach into El Segundo, traveling on Sepulveda northbound. Ever since the establishment of the Century Freeway offramp that drops on Sepulveda Boulevard, there has been a snarled situation with the commuter traffic in the morning hours.

If you add to the situation that's going to occur with the additional flights, additional traffic, additional passengers and all the traffic that's going to be required, all of the EIR does not recognize what is going to happen, and it's going to make that situation, the traffic situation, very unbearable in that area.

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. The Century Freeway off-ramp was improved with the addition of a second lane in 2000. 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.

PC01843-9

Comment:

Last, I'd like to address the general noise problems. Living in Manhattan Beach, I very often hear in the evenings and the mornings the planes that take off in a westerly direction. That is the normal route. And the air traffic flying out of the airport going around the Palos Verdes Peninsula and even straight west out of the airport, there is a nuisance factor of the noise from the jet engines.

The EIR has to recognize that with additional planes flying in the area, they are going to have to be spaced around the surrounding air space, and the noise problems will be only worsened as the expansion occurs.

Response:

Recent changes to FAA operating procedures are not a part of the proposed actions of the Master Plan. However, turns over the Palos Verdes Peninsula area are addressed in Topical Response TR-N-3, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1. Alternatives A and B would result in significantly increased numbers of overflights. Alternatives C and D project little growth from the future no action condition. Much of the growth anticipated by Alternatives A and B is through the expansion of the peak hours of operations - that is, the airport would operate at peak capacity for longer periods of time during the day. If either of these alternatives is selected for development, the number of departure flights would increase and departure routes over the ocean may further be adjusted to accommodate greater traffic levels. Additionally, please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for the conditions associated with Alternative D.

PC01843-10

Comment:

I thank you for listening to my concerns and I look forward to them being addressed and hopefully their being addressed by the L.A. Airport not being expanded.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC01843-2 through PC01843-9 above.

PC01844 Krick, Willard None Provided 5/14/2001

PC01844-1

Comment:

Willard E. Krick, K-R-I-C-K, 1414 E. Mariposa Avenue, El Segundo.

I've got so many comments, I don't think I can say them all now, but I want to say some of the highlights.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC01844-2

Comment:

Big concern I have is the traffic that we have today, which you know on our streets there is no way -- we're already getting the streets widened. And the trouble is that they get narrow again as the major thoroughfares that go -- that lead into L.A.X., there are bottlenecks down there. And there is no way that -- it's going to turn into a bigger parking lot than what we have. Right now we have a big parking lot. The streets is what I'm talking about. And if they are going to increase from what the current level is -- I heard it's 58 million passengers annually -- up to 78-, 98-, or whatever they can get in there, there is no way that our traffic -- you know, that we can handle that additional traffic on our streets.

We've got what is called level F intersections at five different major intersections that lead into El Segundo, and three of them are intersections leading directly to the airport. And I feel that right now, they are one of the major impacts that cause that.

What this does is cause gridlock. That's a safety concern for people who are trying -- that have -- if there is any emergency in our area where we have to get across that street, the major thoroughfare primarily is Sepulveda Boulevard. We're blocked in. There is no way that you can get through it at certain times of the day. It primarily has to do with not only employees that are working, but also when the business people are -- when the majority of the flights are taking off and the passengers are getting to and from the airport.

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 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.

PC01844-3

Comment:

The other thing is noise. We've -- I've experienced some severe noise -- I live about a half mile from the airport, and three weeks ago there was some engine run-ups that went on for at least a half hour at a time. It would stop for five minutes and they would start up again.

I called in and complained about it. There wasn't anything they could do about it. It's something that they said they can do up to 11:00 o'clock at night. We don't need any more of that. And the more traffic you have, the more airplanes that come in and out, the more of that that's going to happen.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Ground run-ups are not allowed at night between 11 p.m. and 6 a.m., but they do occasionally occur. When that happens, Airport Operations personnel are authorized to halt the run-up immediately. According to Scott Tatro of the Environmental Management Bureau, abuse of the restriction may be turned over to the City Attorney's office for action in accordance with violations of the users operating agreement. See Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-7.2. Additionally, 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. 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. 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 discussions of nighttime noise impacts. Please see Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.12 for additional information regarding filing noise complaints and LAWA's handling of noise complaints. Please also see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PC01844-4

Comment:

And that was very -- I was outside, and it wasn't just the noise that's bothering you, it was just enough to -- I have a ringing in my ears, and it was so loud that I'm sure it was affecting my hearing.

Response:

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

PC01844-5

Comment:

The other thing is that we're in the flight path -- I think the wind very often is blowing in our direction where we get the smell of the jet fuel that's not fully burned. The more of that that we get, it's -- I'm sure it's not healthy to breathe that, and so I'm concerned about that.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition. Please also see Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding fumes.

PC01844-6

Comment:

And I'd say, you know, other than some of the other -- well, I think that's all I'm going to say for right now.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01845 Jordan, Lana None Provided 5/14/2001

PC01845-1

Comment:

The name is Lana, L-A-N-A, Jordan, J-O-R-D-A-N, 855 Hillcrest, and I have some real concerns. I mean, it's numerous, but I have -- my parents own a home on Eucalyptus, and there was a airplane crash that did go in there. It's been a number of years, but it's possible. We've lived through that, and the house was partially destroyed and there were lives that were taken. That's always a possibility.

Response:

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

PC01845-2

Comment:

But the traffic, if they do something where Pershing Drive becomes part of L.A.X. and there is no way -- I don't travel Sepulveda. I avoid it at every juncture. There is no reason to get out there on Sepulveda and fight the gridlock. Even if I go to the airport, I'll often go the back way to the airport, go in there and pick up passengers. It's -- we'll just be locked in. We won't be able to leave El Segundo. I just don't see how they could consider us not being able to leave town.

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. 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.

PC01845-3

Comment:

The noise is a real problem. I live at one of the last streets in El Segundo. If my windows are open, these planes -- they say they don't make, you know, turnoffs, that they go out to the ocean coastline and then make a left turn or right turn or whatever. They are over the top of my house, and it is very, very noisy. So this is a real concern.

Response:

Early turns over El Segundo have been a focus of public complaint for years. The airport attempted to resolve 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. One 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). When safety reasons dictate, air traffic control will occasionally direct lighter propeller-driven aircraft to initiate turns prior to reaching the coastline to prevent them from being overtaken by larger jet aircraft. For further information about early turns over El Segundo, please see Topical Response TR-N-3, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2. Please also see Topical Response TR-N-7, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-7.1 regarding situations enforcement of noise rules.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01845-4

Comment:

And, of course, the pollution and all of that. So it's just -- I mean, it goes on and on, but just everything.

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.

PC01846

Green, Michelle

None Provided

5/14/2001

PC01846-1

Comment:

My name is Michelle Green. My address is 812 McCarthy Court, El Segundo.

I'm a 34-year resident of this town. I have three children, all of which have asthma, possibly due to the pollution and 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. 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.

PC01846-2

Comment:

I'm most concerned about the air traffic control issues. Besides the fact that it's impossible to travel on the freeways and our local streets, there are so many airplanes in the air at one time, it's like Christmas. There are so many lights in the sky, planes coming in to land, planes taking off. And our system wasn't designed to accommodate 68 million passengers, much less 90 million passengers. It's a huge concern because people control the guidance systems. We can't rely on computers to make sure that all those passengers get to their destination safely.

And we have all seen plenty of situations where the planes have gone over our house. I've actually seen the number of an airplane at the local park -- on the underbelly of the plane. I don't have that good of eyesight -- at my kids' soccer game.

And I think that this is a small town, there is a lot of airplanes in the sky, and I'm just concerned that we try to make sure that if we're going to have a larger airport, that we also update any kind of air traffic control because that's what keeps us safe. And those are my comments.

Response:

Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) sets standards for aircraft separations in the air to ensure operation safety. Please see Table II.2-10 in Chapter II of the Draft LAX Master Plan for a summary of these standards. Please also see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 concerning aviation safety and the adequacy of air traffic controllers and their equipment. The FAA manages air traffic in such a manner that safe separation between aircraft is always maintained. In September of 2001, the FAA commissioned the Airport Movement Area Safety System (AMASS) at Los Angeles International Airport. Though not an airborne system, AMASS increases the safety of aircraft and vehicles operating on the surface of the airport.

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

Alternative D, the Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, has been added since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR in light of the events of September 11, 2001, and is specifically designed to protect airport users and crucial airport infrastructure, and to incorporate federal security recommendations as they are developed to the greatest extent possible. Please see Chapter 2 of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum regarding the airfield and safety improvements associated with Alternative D.

PC01847 Collis, Adrienne None Provided 5/14/2001

PC01847-1

Comment:

Adrienne Collis, 1501 East Maple, El Segundo, California, 90245.

Okay. I'm concerned about the noise. I'm concerned about the vibration. I'm concerned about the monitoring and when it was done on the contour maps. I'm also concerned about the non-monitored ground noise.

Response:

As described in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR, and Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR field measurements are not the foundation of noise contours developed by computer modeling for representation of noise levels in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Measurements are used in the development of contours for the Quarterly Reports submitted to the California Department of Transportation by LAWA. These Quarterly Report contours were compared to the computer modeled contours for existing conditions in the draft document, but because it is not possible to accurately measure alternative or future conditions, the computer generated noise levels are accepted for use in comparing baseline to future conditions. Ground noise is incorporated into the noise model to the extent it can be identified and quantified, including all ground run-up events anticipated for each alternative and baseline condition. For information regarding increased noise levels, vibrations, noise modeling approach and ground noise, please see Topical Response TR-N-6, TR-N-8, TR-N-1, and TR-N-4, in particular TR-N-4.2.

PC01847-2

Comment:

I believe that L.A.X. has acted as a bad-faith neighbor because they have offered us soundproofing, pulled it away, and that we're getting the brunt of all the noise and the night traffic.

Response:

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 the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC01847-3

Comment:

I'm concerned about the impact of the noise on people that they don't realize, such as when they are sleeping and they react to it and they don't remember.

3. Comments and Responses

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.

PC01847-4

Comment:

I'm concerned about the impact on children and their attention spans, especially for people who are actually in the city for 24 hours as opposed to people who are commuters and not hearing it 24 hours.

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. Also please refer to Response to Comment AL00038-11 regarding the impact of high noise levels on children.

PC01847-5

Comment:

I'm concerned about all the agencies that deal with L.A.X. and the responsibility for the problems they cause because they point to each other instead of resolving the problem. They will say it's the FAA, and the FAA says it's the airline and the airline says no, it's airport policy. And meantime, somebody is turning over the city or doing some other kind of violation that cannot be fixed because nobody's responsible for it.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01847-6

Comment:

I'm concerned about L.A. city government agencies as well as the CalTrans people for the way they have already messed up the transportation situation by not having the Metro go directly to the airport,

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01847-7

Comment:

by having the 105 dump under the Sepulveda tunnel when they could have double-deckered the freeway over Aviation and dumped it onto Century so that it would not impact Sepulveda, which was already a nightmare. That's about it.

Response:

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

PC01848	Puleo, Joanne	None Provided	5/14/2001
----------------	----------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01848-1**Comment:**

Joanne Puleo, 419 Concord Street, El Segundo.

Just yesterday I called because the second plane of the day went overhead. And I called 64-NOISE, which I've done, I'd say, at least three times a month for the last five years, and got no -- no answer at all today. They did have an answer thing. It said, "Leave your name and number and someone will call you back." Well, no one has called back. I've received two letters in the last five years from calls. Usually they just tell me, "Oh, that was a wave-off." And it seems that if they can wave them off, why don't they go out over the ocean and then come back instead of going straight over? I can go outside my house and look up and they are going almost like parallel to the ocean. And it just seems like they have too many doing that. It's gotten to be worse.

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 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. Please refer to Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase. Even though the City of El Segundo is not located directly under the flight path (that is, not located off of either end of runways) there is concern from the community due to its proximity to LAX and the potential for increased missed approaches from aircraft. Aircraft operating into LAX are typically metered into the local airspace through a process known as flow control. This process provides a manageable rate of acceptance of arrivals that does not exceed the capacity of the airport by holding aircraft at their destinations or while they are in route to LAX. Aircraft that execute missed approaches or go-arounds do so to avoid unexpected incursions onto the landing runway. Aircraft are positioned for arrival many miles from the airport so that under normal conditions they are in a landing sequence that allows the preceding aircraft to exit the runway before the trailing aircraft is committed to land. When the lead aircraft misses its exit taxiway or is held up for a variety of reasons in its exit from the runway, a missed approach may occur. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.4 regarding missed approach turns over El Segundo.

PC01849	Puleo, Richard	None Provided	5/14/2001
----------------	-----------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01849-1**Comment:**

Richard Puleo, P-U-L-E-O, 419 Concord Street, El Segundo, CA, 90245.

My biggest beef right now is when I leave -- when I leave where I live, I have to work my way out onto Imperial, and I go back the back way, I think that's Pershing. And we -- now, that's really nice because that's the quickest way I can get out and go north, and that's the way I get up north.

If I go east and get on the freeway, I have a heck of a time not only with morning traffic, but with people getting to the airport. And if I take Imperial and go north on Sepulveda, I got all that airport traffic. That's now. What will it be like when they come in with the new expanded airport?

3. Comments and Responses

What else? That's about it for now, but that's my big complaint. Coming home, it's even worse. When I come home, I get off of the freeway and I try to sneak around and go off into El Segundo to get home because that airport traffic -- and you've probably seen it -- stacks up all the way back to -- I bet its Aviation. It stacks up.

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. Please also see Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PC01850 Freeman, Edna None Provided 5/14/2001

PC01850-1

Comment:

I'm Edna Freeman, and I live at 418 Loma Vista Street in El Segundo. I've lived in El Segundo all of my life in America. I came to El Segundo in 1957. When we came to El Segundo, the airport was on Century Boulevard, where the old post office was, east of Sepulveda. It was just a shed, and you had to get off the plane and walk into the shed, you know. It was a very tiny little airport. So when we say that the airport was here before El Segundo, that's not true. El Segundo was here a long time before the airport, then they built the airport that we now have. I can't remember the dates or anything, but somebody will remember that.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01850-2

Comment:

And then in a few years it wasn't big enough, they had to expand it. They had to expand the airport. Well, I say that if they had to expand the airport then and they expand it again now, in about ten years' time they will have to expand it again. And then what happens? We keep expanding all the time? We've got Palmdale, we've got El Toro.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00297-9 regarding the development of other airports as an alternative to development at LAX. Please also refer to Response to Comment PC00287-3 regarding the need for expansion beyond 2015. Please see 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.

PC01850-3

Comment:

And what else? When we had apartments in Inglewood and the planes used to come over in Inglewood and in Westchester, we had to renew carpets all the time because of the filth from the planes coming over.

Response:

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

PC01850-4**Comment:**

But not only the planes coming over. In the middle of the night you can hear the planes revving up and testing their engines up in the mechanical bases there.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01822-1.

PC01851	Reppucci, Dianne	None Provided	5/14/2001
----------------	-------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01851-1**Comment:**

Dianne Reppucci, 512 Oregon Street, El Segundo.

And my comments are going to start with the fact that I grew up in Westchester, Playa Del Rey, went to Visitation Elementary and Saint Bernard High School. I graduated from Saint Bernard High School 17 years ago, before the air traffic got as bad as it is today. Every day the common occurrence was the teacher would have to stop talking and stop teaching in order to let the planes go overhead, and then once the planes went overhead, they would start again. That is highly disruptive to the students. It's highly disruptive to the teaching process. I think that's a huge issue. I can't imagine how awful it is today.

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.

PC01851-2**Comment:**

I used to live on the 800 block of Loma Vista. And what I said up there was this -- there are two words: Sleep deprivation. It was an awful experience because the planes would be idling in the middle of the night, and I mean 2:30, 3:30 in the morning when you are -- should be getting your best sleep. This affects people's lives in so many ways -- their family life, their work life. You can't normally function if you lose sleep consistently.

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.

PC01851-3**Comment:**

And I had to eventually move out of that area of El Segundo to a quieter area which, fortunately I bought a home. But the reason why I decided to actually stay in El Segundo and buy was because of how safe and quaint this community is. And the expansion of L.A.X. is probably going to destroy that. So the redeeming qualities of El Segundo are probably going down the tubes with the expansion of L.A.X.

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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC01852

Fuentes, Suzanne

None Provided

5/14/2001

PC01852-1

Comment:

My name is Suzanne Fuentes, S-U-Z-A-N-N-E F-U-E-N-T-E-S. My address is 618 Eucalyptus Drive, E-U-C-A-L-Y-P-T-U-S, Drive.

And I have several comments. First of all, I grew up in this town. I moved in 35 years ago when I was eight. I've always been aware there is an airport. And my friends would always comment on the noise, and I'd tell them, "Oh, I don't even hear it, I'm used to it." I hear it now for the last maybe five to eight years. It's all I hear. And I make a daily decision to stay in town. Every day I tell my mom, "I'm going to move out of here. This noise is making me nuts," because it's unrelenting 24 hours a day.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01852-2

Comment:

When she tells me I should soundproof my house, I say, "What am I going to do about my yard?" I go out in the backyard, it's like being in the runway at L.A.X., 26 left or right. It just makes me crazy.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC01852-3

Comment:

I have white windowsills. They are filthy all the time. I'm always washing my windowsills. Regardless of where, if it's a direct result of the jets or residual from trucks and everything else that comes into town, if that's how filthy my windowsills are, it alarms me what my lungs must look like. And I keep my doors and windows closed all the time because of that same soot, grease that is on everything. I don't want that in my house.

Response:

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

PC01852-4

Comment:

I do see planes go overhead almost every day when I'm home. Again, I'm in the 600 block by the high school. And it's a daily occurrence to have a jet go over, which is probably maybe six blocks over from the airport, maybe more than that.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01852-5**Comment:**

And my last comment is about the traffic. Growing up here, we always went to Westchester for everything: For shopping, music lessons -- everything. And now I avoid going north like the plague. I go south for everything. That is just too draining to get into that traffic now and try to battle past the airport to get to the other side. It's just not worth it.

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

PC01853**Freeman, Peter****None Provided****5/14/2001****PC01853-1****Comment:**

My name is Peter Freeman, at 418 Loma Vista Street, El Segundo.

I'd like to know why they don't do anything about rail connections from the outlying cities. I notice when you travel to countries abroad, particularly in England, if you go to Gatwick, they have a rail that goes direct nonstop from Gatwick, which is about 40 miles out of the center of London, right into the center of London, and they got the same thing at Heathrow. Takes about 45 minutes. Those were put in to create better connection to the airports. At Gatwick, which is an overflow airport from Heathrow -- and I feel they could do exactly the same thing here and use Palmdale. They could do the same from Ontario because they have already got the rail lines going in that direction.

Response:

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

PC01853-2**Comment:**

The other thing I'd like to mention is they overlook the congestion in the airport itself. If you go to the airport somewhere around 3:00 P.M. in the afternoon, on most flights -- I've run into this on flight -- on terminals 1, 3, 6, and 7 -- that the traffic is double parked, and it can be dangerous if people are walking out and you are trying to pull out, and sometimes you are kept in and you can't get out.

I have mentioned this at a previous meeting, but they said it's too expensive

Response:

Reduction of traffic congestion at the curbfront is an important objective of the LAX Master Plan. The on-airport roadway forecasts, impacts, mitigation measures and improvements are discussed in Technical Reports 3a, On-Airport Surface Transportation Technical Report, and S-2a, Supplemental On-Airport Surface Transportation Technical Report.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01853-3

Comment:

And I don't -- I can't see that there is any reason that they can't at least make a rail connection to outside airports.

Response:

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

PC01854

Brady, Kate

None Provided

5/14/2001

PC01854-1

Comment:

Kate Brady, 511 Standard Street, El Segundo, 90245.

I think my allergies are due to the fall out from the airport, and lately I've been thinking that they think my attic is a hangar. I have been awakened several times with them trying to land in it.

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. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, and Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects.

PC01854-2

Comment:

Also, the -- I have no idea what they do on the ground, but, golly, it sounds like World War II. The noise that they make from about midnight to -- from the run-ups, I have no idea what the noise is. They are not overhead, they are on the ground. And it just -- there is rumbling, and it's terrible and it's kind of scary.

Response:

If the noise events occur for several minutes at a time, the commentor is likely hearing noise events from maintenance run-up activity. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-5.3 regarding night run-up activity.

PC01854-3

Comment:

And today, coincidentally, about noon, I think one of those big guys was trying to land on Main Street. I'm not quite sure, but I think he was. And I mean -- or he was casing the joint out, I don't really -- I'm not quite sure. Also, if Boeing manages to get a contract to put out there 6- or 800 passenger planes, that will be -- that will be a disaster.

Unfortunately, it doesn't -- because the plane is larger, it means there is going to be more noise. Just by physics there is going to be more noise. It's going to need a bigger motor to lift up more weight. And

also, they don't measure -- and I use the wrong term. The noise level is measured per passenger rather than the actual noise that's being made. So the more passengers, it's per -- the less noise it's recorded as being, even though there is more noise because there is more passengers.

Response:

As noise certification is weight based, an aircraft that can carry more passengers will be heavier and still meet the designated FAR Part 36 Stage 3 criteria. There is no relationship between the number of passengers and the amount of noise that an aircraft is allowed to make. For example, a large 747 all-cargo jet and a passenger jet of the same type carrying 400 passengers are allowed to produce identical amounts of noise. However, larger aircraft won't necessarily mean increased noise levels. Please refer to Subtopical Response TR-N-6.3 regarding the relationship between aircraft size and noise levels. Even though the City of El Segundo is not located directly under the flight path (that is, not located off of either end of runways) there is concern from the community due to its proximity to LAX and the potential for increased missed approaches from aircraft. Aircraft operating into LAX are typically metered into the local airspace through a process known as flow control. This process provides a manageable rate of acceptance of arrivals that does not exceed the capacity of the airport by holding aircraft at their destinations or while they are in route to LAX. Aircraft that execute missed approaches or go-arounds do so to avoid unexpected incursions onto the landing runway. Aircraft are positioned for arrival many miles from the airport so that under normal conditions they are in a landing sequence that allows the preceding aircraft to exit the runway before the trailing aircraft is committed to land. When the lead aircraft misses its exit taxiway or is held up for a variety of reasons in its exit from the runway, a missed approach may occur. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-3.4 regarding standard missed approach procedure.

PC01854-4

Comment:

If they succeed in making a ring road around there and eliminate my very favorite shortcut to every place, Pershing Drive, I will be exceedingly angry.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed surface transportation in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 in the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2 in 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. Alternative D does not include a Ring Road.

PC01855

Dankanyin, Evelyn

None Provided

5/14/2001

PC01855-1

Comment:

My name is Evelyn Dankanyin, 521 Standard Street, El Segundo.

My comments are all personal, my reasons are all selfish for objecting, but they are all health related. My hearing has really deteriorated terribly in the last six years. I've lived here for 20 some years.

When I -- let's see, my hearing has gone, I had cancer, eight of my friends living in, around the same neighborhood, in the general area, the airport, have all had cancer. Five of the eight, all of us are going around saying, "Huh? What?" All of us have hearing problems.

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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01855-2

Comment:

About one -- I'm a care giver. I take care of an 89 year old mother and I take care of the lady who lives across the street from her, who is 84 years old. They live -- both live on Oak Street.

And the poor things at night have a hell of a time sleeping with all the racket that comes. And it's mostly, I think, the cargo planes or the ground noise. I'm not sure what it is, but the poor dears both stagger around during the day because they get no sleep at night, you know, complaining.

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.

PC01855-3

Comment:

I hear them. I'm a night person and I hear the cargo planes start about 1:00 in the morning and I hear them until about 2:30 in the morning, initially.

Response:

Comment noted. Nighttime operations are not exclusive to cargo operations, but many cargo flights do operate at night. For more information please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC01855-4

Comment:

I play my TV at -- you know the little number volume numbers? Initially I played it at 21, I am now playing it at 48 with my sliding glass door shut, and I'm not sure I hear everything.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels and Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

PC01855-5

Comment:

So that's primarily my complaint. I would hate to see them close Pershing. I think that would be catastrophic as far as traffic goes coming through El Segundo.

Response:

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

PC01855-6

Comment:

And the dirt. The dirt from the planes is annoying. The outside of the house gets filthy, the windows get filthy, the carpeting gets filthy, and it would be wonderful to breathe fresh air again.

Response:

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

PC01856**Bruggman, Dennis****None Provided****5/31/2001****PC01856-1****Comment:**

Dennis Bruggman, 4124 Via Lado, Torrance, California. 90505.

L.A.X. has reached its environmental limit. When I first went to Inglewood in about '78, they had one plane every 15 minutes. In the '50s, they had one plane an hour. Now there is one plane a minute. That's too many for Inglewood.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01856-2**Comment:**

In my present place in Torrance, they've recently started over-flights. They are totally unresponsive, showing that they will degrade property in the same way that they did in Inglewood. And they do this over the entire South Bay at -- they have opened up flight paths. They have claimed that these are historical roots, but they are not because the former western regional director of the FAA lived next to me and he stopped over-flights years ago. So the L.A.X. will be unresponsive, increase flights without regard to the law.

Response:

There is no scatter pattern for flight paths anticipated in the noise modeling of any future alternatives. The reduction of the area within the 65 CNEL contour is a function of the phase out of older, louder aircraft from environmental baseline levels and their replacement with newer, quieter airplanes. It has nothing to do with a broad redistribution of flight paths over neighboring communities. Each alternative calls for the development of instrumented departure procedures to better constrain the locations of aircraft during departure. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6, in particular TR-N-6.2, and Topical Response TR-N-3, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.3 for further discussions of increased noise with increased air traffic.

PC01856-3**Comment:**

Okay. And one of our major needs is to have no fly zones; and restricted air travel to L.A.X., moving the volume back to 1998 levels; and having no expansion because of the environmental impact.

Response:

Comment noted. The role of FAA is to ensure the safe and efficient use of navigable air space. The role of the local airport sponsor is to provide a location for aviation activity and for airlines to conduct business. There is no federal law or regulation that would permit the FAA or a local airport sponsor to prohibit the use of a public use airport. Please see Response to Comment PC02357-3 regarding access restrictions, Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. It should also be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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

PC01856-4

Comment:

And the nonresponsiveness of the government and listening to the people from El Toro -- from the airport community, I've heard them say that it is illegal for people to control the flights like they are doing in Orange County. And it's my response that no one is above the law. These people think they are above the law, and they are ruining the ambiance of the communities without regard to the communities. And they are so arrogant that they will refuse to respond.

Response:

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

PC01856-5

Comment:

I want to -- we're bothered very much by turbo propeller airplanes. And we want to see the FAA and government make no fly zones over our area for both these turbo propellers and the jet aircraft. And we want to see the utilization of the offshore region. And we want to see establishment of straight flight paths where the airplanes can't egress and ingress out of the flight path within a reasonable distance, like 20 miles is reasonable for us.

Response:

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

PC01856-6

Comment:

And also we want to make the point that there is more economic damage done by the airplanes because what happens is they cause a loss of productivity. As they go over, you stop talking, you lose your concentration. And that has direct economic impact. And it's classified as loss of activity.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01856-7

Comment:

And we also support the restriction of physical facilities at L.A.X. and 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.

PC01857

Lee, Lillie

None Provided

5/31/2001

PC01857-1

Comment:

Lillie Lee, 1205 Oak Avenue, Manhattan Beach, California, 90266.

My comment is that we already are hearing tremendous ground noise from L.A.X. which we've not had to listen to before in the past. It all began January 1st of 2000. And it is so loud and obnoxious that it

penetrates the whole house. And we already have soundproofing. And it will go on four and five days at a time, sometimes 24 hours around the clock. Especially 11:00 o'clock at nighttime, 1:00 o'clock in the morning, huge ground noises and take-off noises from L.A.X.

We've lived in our house 27 years. We never had to listen to this before. Sometimes the noise is so loud and intrusive that it burns your ears, makes your ears hurt. You can't be out and around on your property. And my whole contention is that you call 64-NOISE, they ignore you, they send you letters not related to what you were complaining about making excuses.

Response:

Ground run-ups are not allowed at night between 11 p.m. and 6 a.m., but they do occasionally occur. When that happens, Airport Operations personnel are authorized to shut down the run-up on the spot. According to Scott Tatro of the Environmental Management Bureau, abuse of the restriction may be turned over to the City Attorney's office for action in accordance with violations of the users operating agreement. LAWA plans to seek approval to make the over-ocean procedures mandatory when they are in effect. See Topical Response TR-N-7 for more information, particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-7.2. Additionally, 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 and particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-5.3 regarding night run-up activity. In addition, see Section 4.1, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. And Appendix D and Appendix S-C1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

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 and entering the Noise Management section community members can specifically identify LAX operations that cross their community.

Please see Section 4.1, Land Use, and Section 4.2, Noise, 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; and noise impacts on nighttime awakenings. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6, particularly Subtopic Response TR-N-6.1 regarding existing and future noise levels and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC01857-2

Comment:

If it's this bad now, what is it going to be like with L.A. expansion? It isn't only going to be this horrible ground noise we're having to endure. I think planes are going to be flying directly over us, taking off and landing, if they get this expansion in.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1, and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.2.

PC01857-3

Comment:

And I'm very concerned about this because already I've seen in a year and a half our quality of life, it's not there anymore. When you have to come in out of your own yard or go quickly from your car to the

3. Comments and Responses

house because the noise is so intrusive that it hurts the ears and makes little kids cry, then there is a problem.

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

PC01857-4

Comment:

And I'm totally opposed to the L.A. expansion, and I want something done about the problem they already dropped on us in the year 2000, in January, that they keep ignoring us about. We understand now, right. I knew they were raising the noise level to justify the ends by the means, but not all of us are stupid.

Response:

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

PC01858 Bruggman, Debbie None Provided 5/31/2001

PC01858-1

Comment:

My name is Debbie Bruggman, address 4124 Via Lado in Torrance.

And my comment has to do with the -- first of all, the El Toro Air Force base -- I mean airport. I just wanted to make sure that -- I'm concerned about over-flights from other airports coming over Torrance because of the noise. I've noticed a lot more increasing over-flights. A lot of propeller props are coming out of L.A.X. and flying over the Hollywood Rivera part of Torrance, and they're commuter flights and so they make a lot of noise and they are coming in at two or three minute intervals for a good two or three hours over busy commuter times, making a lot of noise. And that is a change because they never used to fly over Torrance until the FAA allowed them to about a year ago.

So my concern would be that the FAA needs to change its rules again. The solution is very simple, all they have to do is loop out a little bit over the ocean and then swing in. There is no need for them to fly over such a populated area. It would probably only add about another -- a minute to their flights.

Response:

The commentor references the El Toro Draft EIR which is not a comment on the contents of the LAX Draft EIS/EIR. The commentor is correct in that during peak periods of the day there will be an increase in flights at LAX. Recent changes to FAA operating procedures are not a part of the proposed actions of the Master Plan. However, turns over the Torrance area are addressed in Topical Response TR-N-3 which discusses aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay.

PC01859 Uchima, Ansho None Provided 5/31/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00002; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC00002.

PC01860 **Jurkiewicz, Edmund None Provided** **8/1/2001**
& Pauline

PC01860-1

Comment:

Los Angeles Airport (LAX) has already reached a size producing the maximum disturbance that the living neighbourhood can possibly tolerate.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed 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.

PC01860-2

Comment:

Late airplane arrivals 11:00 pm and early departures starting at 5:00 a.m. generate a noise level which is totally unacceptable.

Response:

Comment noted. For information regarding nighttime operations and the noise levels associated with them, please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, Appendix SC, and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, as well as Topical Response TR-N-5.

PC01860-3

Comment:

In addition, the amount of corrosive fuel dumped during the take-off and landing exceeds levels generated during the early industrial explosion in the 1920/30s.

Response:

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

PC01860-4

Comment:

The existence of the airport is to enhance the quality and convenience of the life in the communities and NOT to create a condition of perpetual nuisance and health hazard. If future traffic expansion is to be considered than other surrounding areas and airports must be prepared to participate to share the consequences.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 14a and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01861 Berghammer, Arich West Hollywood Chamber of Commerce 7/24/2001

PC01861-1

Comment:

Regretfully, we are unable to take a formal position of support for the current plan, as proposed. We believe that significant key elements are left unaddressed by a woefully incomplete EIR and EIS.

It is our recommendation that the current proposal be rejected for lack of completeness, and that a thorough and more inclusive EIR/EIS be demanded.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01861-2

Comment:

The current EIR/EIS is severely deficient both in addressing the entire regional component necessary for a comprehensive air transportation plan, as well as in acknowledging the economic benefits and impediments created by a plan that truly focuses on one major hub airport in a region as large and congested as ours.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to 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.

PC01861-3

Comment:

The ground transportation and circulation plans also demonstrate a lack of insight.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01861-4

Comment:

Once this new EIR/EIS is completed; the document and any accompanying proposal should again be opened for not less than 180 days of public comment and hearing. At this time, we will again review information on both sides of the issue, and take a position as appropriate to protect the interests of businesses in West Hollywood and the entire west side of Los Angeles.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review.

PC01862 Ingham, Mary None Provided 8/1/2001

PC01862-1

Comment:

I oppose the LAX expansion alternatives A, B and C. I therefore request that the FAA, LA World Airports (LAWA) and Southern California Assoc. of Governments (SCAG) terminate the expansion of LAX. I also request that the No Action/No Project alternative for LAX Master Plan be approved.

Response:

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

PC01862-2

Comment:

Clearly, a Regional Solution must be developed for airline passengers and cargo. Centralizing all to LAX is an unbelievable and impossible alternative. The LAX impact statements noted above do not address at all the real consequences of expansion. Each region should develop/plan for its own passengers and cargo. I travel extensively in Europe and, as you might know, regionalization is the reality for Europeans. No longer are large mega-airports reasonable.

Response:

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

PC01862-3

Comment:

Ring roads do not reduce congestion, nor do they make travel any easier. The Ring Road plan, the Arbor Vitae Interchange and the Airport Boulevard Connector Road options are not realistic alternatives, because they will destroy the residential communities of Westchester, Inglewood and Westport Heights and not at all facilitate better access to an already overloaded airport.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01695-6 regarding Airport Boulevard, Response to Comment PC01135-4 regarding the access plan impacts, and Responses to Comments AL00008-8 and AL00027-10 regarding the Arbor Vitae interchange with I-405. 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. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01862-4

Comment:

Several points in the Impact statements noted above deserve comment:

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC01862-5 through PC01862-12.

PC01862-5

Comment:

1. Traffic congestion is not adequately addressed by the EIR. The San Diego Freeway (405) is congested far longer than 5 hours per day. Residents of this area know well that this freeway is congested from as early as 6:00 am until 11:30 am and from 2:30 pm until well after 7:00 pm. The expansion of LAX would only congest an already difficult situation. Currently, LAX is already beyond what it was built for. Built for 40 million passengers and one million tons of cargo, it currently handles 67 million passengers and 2.4 million tons of cargo.

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.

PC01862-6

Comment:

2. Health issues are not adequately dealt with by the EIR. Air pollution from the air traffic (passenger and cargo) along with additional freeway traffic will only worsen. Anyone living near LAX has a potential legal basis for suits relative to cancer and respiratory ailments.

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. 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.

PC01862-7

Comment:

3. Noise pollution is not adequately addressed by the EIR. The limit of the study of noise levels to 65 db was inadequate. Levels exceed 65 decibels in all surrounding communities, and some (like Westport Heights) experience it round the clock.

Response:

Section 4.1, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. And Appendix D and Appendix S-C1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR were completed under the guidelines set forth

by FAA Orders 5050.4A and 1050.1D and state regulatory documents. The commentor is a resident of Westchester and is correct in identifying that certain portions of Westchester are identified in the 65 dB CNEL contour. For information about extending the analysis to areas beyond the 65 CNEL contour, please see Topical Response TR-N-2, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-2.2. 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.

PC01862-8

Comment:

4. The EIR does not adequately address the issue of safe air space. Based upon FAA findings, LAX is among the worst US airports for near-miss collisions (33 in the past four years). Common sense tells us that only so many aircraft can be in the air at any given time. Increasing the number will increase the risk of fatal accident.

Response:

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

PC01862-9

Comment:

5. The EIR did not address the risk of earthquakes at LAX. This is a real danger and, alone, would be a good argument for regionalization of air travel for the entire LA-San Diego area. It is irresponsible to think that all air travel can be so localized in one area. All this area would need is one Northridge type earthquake to paralyze the entire Southern California region and economy.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed geologic hazards, including earthquake-induced hazards, in Section 4.22, Earth/Geology, with supporting technical data and analysis provided in Technical Report 12 of the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, which calls for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC01862-10

Comment:

6. The area near LAX is already under development: the Howard Hughes Project, Playa Vista, Ballona Creek and Marina Del Rey developments all have current environmental impact on the area. The EIR did not even address these other developments in its considerations about how LAX expansion would affect the 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. Regarding Ballona Creek, it is believed that the commentor is referring to the Playa Vista project. The Playa Vista project, Howard Hughes Center, and Marina del Rey development were accounted for in the cumulative impacts analysis of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01862-11

Comment:

7. The LAX Master Plan did not consider the cost of demolishing the Westchester and Inglewood areas prior to any building Palmdale and Ontario airports already belong to LAWA. Why not invest in their development? There would be no monies lost in demolition.

Response:

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

PC01862-12

Comment:

8. Finally, Orange County (which includes El Toro airport), San Diego and the inland empires should bear their own responsibility for their citizens and their air travel needs. This includes passengers as well as cargo.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC01862-2 and PC01862-11. 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.

PC01862-13

Comment:

I trust that Mayor Hahn will keep his promise and stop the expansion of LAX. The FAA, LAWA and SCAG all have a fiduciary duty to address these concerns. The regional airport approach is the only sensible and responsible solution. Stop the plan to expand 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.

PC01863

Lewis, D.

None Provided

7/20/2001

PC01863-1

Comment:

As a South Bay resident, I'm listing a few of my concerns regarding the draft EIR, airport operations, changes and proposed expansion.

- Current & future rogue / outlaw overflights of the South Bay cities: The proven existence of these flight operations illustrates the noncompliance with existing guidelines and agreements and with prior EIRs, and Los Angeles having pushed through non-approved airport changes. It is proof of the bad

faith, "bad-neighbor" mentality under which LAX is sure to continue to function, much to the degradation of communities which were in place before the existence of LAX.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, including the issue of flights over South Bay cities.

PC01863-2

Comment:

- Current aircraft noise from ground operations, especially at night, and indications that this will continue and intensify: The DEIR will surely not mitigate these frequent and prolonged engine howling noises of taxiing (and testing) which are sustained and disruptive of peace and quiet. At 3 miles, an individual engine can be heard for a quarter of an hour or more. These noise cycles often repeat for an entire afternoon and evening. These are not sounds of the "new generation," quieter engines, nor engines at idle. These noises never existed in our towns until the last few years. The DEIR provides no assurance that this will be eliminated or even acknowledged.
- Aircraft landing operations, with excessive and often violent thrust reverser noise, again especially at night: This unexpected, sudden noise is frightening.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-5, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-5.3 for a discussion of how 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. In addition, see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR with supporting technical data and analyses in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, and Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use, Appendix SC, and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding nighttime single event noise.

PC01863-3

Comment:

- Air quality: I'm concerned with the DEIR's failure to address the longstanding underlying intentions preceding the recent Supreme Court ruling on the EPA's 1997 smog and soot standards.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-94 regarding the eight-hour ozone NAAQS and the PM2.5 NAAQS.

PC01863-4

Comment:

I have many other concerns about LAX, including safety, but would appreciate your response to the above.

Response:

Responses to individual comments included in this comment letter are provided above. 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01864 Brown, Laura None Provided 7/16/2001

PC01864-1

Comment:

It is with great concern that I'm writing to you to express my feelings about the recent LAWA Plan/EIR. I feel the EIR falls short of addressing some key problems facing all of us in our daily living with LAX. Following are some issues I think need investigating.

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.

PC01864-2

Comment:

The traffic congestion on the 405, Sepulveda Blvd. and other arterials, is already creating unhealthful, stressful, and debilitating commute and travel times. I feel the EIR does not deal with the increase of traffic in the proposal. I know this problem is only going to get worst. Eventually business will ground to a halt all along the South bay and we will all deal with higher levels of road rage, nasal/sinus problems and neck injuries.

Response:

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

PC01864-3

Comment:

The increased levels of diesel emissions from an increase of truck traffic will further irritate my families' allergy to diesel fumes.

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.

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-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

PC01864-4

Comment:

The entire basin will suffer from the increase in NOx emissions and the LAWA plan only has mitigation efforts included for 30% of emissions. What about the other 70%?

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 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).

PC01864-5**Comment:**

Where are the regional airport solutions? This EIR does not deal with that issue either. Obviously this report does not thoroughly address serious matters that require your attention.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to 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.

PC01864-6**Comment:**

Finally, the numbers of projected passengers is not an accurate or fair picture of future volume. The current size of the airport is designed for a volume of 40 million passengers per year and is currently serving 67 million. The report does not address the impact of higher volumes of passengers.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels at LAX and the belief that LAX is designed for 40 MAP.

PC01865**Berg, Barbara****None Provided****8/3/2001****PC01865-1****Comment:**

In neither the Draft Master Plan nor the Draft EIS/EIR, is the issue of air safety adequately addressed: from my residence, I watch the "go-arounds," "wave-offs," "fly-overs," or whatever you want to call these. They occur weekly, often daily. I have seen near misses, both in the air and on the ground. Just last week I watched a Southwest 737 head straight for my street before banking wildly at the last 45 seconds and reaiming for a runway. Increasing air traffic by ANY amount necessarily implies increasing the number of airplanes per cubic mile, which, in turn, NECESSARILY means more probability of near misses - and LESS ROOM IN WHICH TO RECOVER SAFELY. LAX is already an air safety nightmare. No matter how many ground mitigations occur, the air safety will not improve until fewer airplanes are crammed into the airspace above LA.

Before any increase in aircraft is approved, the residents of the greater LA area and all passengers flying into LAX MUST see HARD EVIDENCE that their safety is ensured. Increased air traffic (resulting in more money for many) must not occur at the expense of HUMAN LIFE.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC01865-2

Comment:

We need an independent analysis of the airspace above LA, prior to any expansion approval.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding airspace capacity in the Los Angeles basin. The National Airspace Redesign (NAR) undertaken by the FAA in 1997 has as its focus the enhancement of aviation system efficiency while ensuring safety. Within the Western-Pacific Region several projects are ongoing, including a review of routes between the Los Angeles and San Francisco Bay areas.

PC01866

Knox, Miriam

None Provided

7/16/2001

PC01866-1

Comment:

I am against LAX expansion. Removing part of Westchester's shopping area and homes is not an acceptable solution. There is enough noise and congestion from the airport 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. 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 residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester business district. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01866-2

Comment:

Set a limit of the number of planes allowed to land and let other airports take up the rest.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01018-29 regarding the authority of FAA and LAWA to limit future activity at airports. As described therein, Alternative D-Enhanced Safety and Security Plan is designed for an activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01866-3

Comment:

LAX is large enough. To increase its size would have a negative impact on the community in which I live with my husband and two children. We have been here for 19 years and want to continue living here. Don't destroy the Westchester Community. Please don't.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed 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.

PC01867 **Stewart, Stephen R. None Provided** **8/1/2001**
& Diane Rene

PC01867-1

Comment:

We have lived in our home on the south side of the Palos Verdes Peninsula since 1973. Up until 1997, we had airplane noise from the occasional training plane or helicopter. Since approximately November, 1997 we have experienced an unacceptable level of jet airplane noise as the jets fly closer to the coast and turn in at a lower altitude and closer to the Peninsula than ever before. I understand that the problem is generated by pilots not correctly flying the Daggett Loop procedure.

Response:

Recent changes to FAA operating procedures are not a part of the proposed actions of the Master Plan. However, turns over the Palos Verdes Peninsula area are addressed in Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1.

PC01867-2

Comment:

We are extremely concerned about the gross increase in noise pollution which affects our well being and way of life.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase. Additional information on noise can be found in the Draft EIS/EIR Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical 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. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC01867-3

Comment:

Please give serious consideration to regional airport expansion and no further LAX traffic or expansion.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC01868 Shore, Kelley None Provided 7/31/2001

PC01868-1

Comment:

As a resident of Venice for 5 years the Santa Monica Airport has become unbearable. Please stop all of the additional air traffic. It is out of control. There are times when we can not hear ourselves over the noise.

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.

PC01868-2

The remainder of this comment letter is identical to form letter PFF; please refer to the responses to form letter PFF.

PC01869 Aliuquegtianh, Irino None Provided 8/1/2001

PC01869-1

Comment:

Regarding safety: who is responsible if there is an accident at unsafe airports like the Santa Monica airport?

Regarding property values: who will reimburse residents for the inevitable drop in property values if the LAX Master Alternatives is agreed to?

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-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

PC01869-2

The remainder of this comment letter is identical to form letter PFF; please refer to the responses to form letter PFF.

PC01870 Pulver, Jennifer None Provided 8/7/2001

PC01870-1

Comment:

I support this 100%.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01870-2

The remainder of this comment letter is identical to form letter PFF; please refer to the responses to form letter PFF.

PC01871	Toia, Sam	None Provided	7/19/2001
----------------	------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01871-1

Comment:

After being a homeowner in Westchester for 49 years I cannot believe that the airport does not consider the damage that an expansion will do to our neighborhood. The noise has already increased, the black gunk on my cars & outside property has increased, the smog has increased, the traffic has increased - what more damage do you want to see done. At least consider us who have been here so long, raised our children & grandchildren here.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential impacts to the community of Westchester, Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition, and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PC01872	Rock, Daniel	None Provided	7/21/2001
----------------	---------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01872-1

Comment:

The plans as they are being proposed do not address the following issues:

- A - Traffic mitigation
- B - Noise pollution
- C - Air pollution
- D - Health quality
- E - Disruption of a community.
- F - Property value decrease as a result of the above A-E items.
- G - Decrease of local/community business.

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, human health and safety in 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socioeconomics. 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-ES-1 regarding residential property values and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01872-2

Comment:

As the plans are described, they are not acceptable offers for our community. A community plan must be established before the airport can fit in the plan.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed consistency with applicable local plans in Section 4.2, Land Use.

PC01873 Rody, Raymond None Provided 7/23/2001

PC01873-1

Comment:

Already the noise levels are too high. The soot is great. Already my furniture outdoors is ruined by the black matter falling on them. The traffic is bad. You need to stop this expansion.

Response:

Noise and air quality impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition. It should be noted that Alternative D-Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, added subsequent to the publication and public review of the Draft EIS/EIR, 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. 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 was 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. 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.

PC01874 Grace, Mary None Provided 7/21/2001

PC01874-1

Comment:

(1) In 2 maps Westchester Square is listed as vacant land and in 2 other maps as cargo facilities. Nowhere in the report does the plan speak to the issue of there being current residences with no future plans to move

Response:

The comment appears to be in reference to Manchester Square, since this area is shown as vacant for the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative A on Figures 3-6 and 3-7, respectively; and as cargo facilities for Alternatives B and C on Figures 3-11 and 3-15, respectively, of the Draft EIS/EIR. As stated in Section 4.2, Land Use, and Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences and Businesses of the Draft EIS/EIR, Manchester Square and Belford are being acquired through an existing program that was instituted based on the area's high noise levels and a high level of interest from those who reside in the area to have their properties relocated. Please see Topical Response TR-MP-3 for additional discussion of the Manchester Square and Airport/Belford Voluntary Acquisition/Relocation Program including estimated timeframe for completion and current status of residential acquisition. Under the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative A Manchester Square is assumed to be vacant through 2015. The effects of this acquisition were assessed in Section 4.2.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR under the No Action/No Project Alternative. Furthermore, a Mitigated Negative Declaration that addressed the

potential impacts of the Manchester Square and Airport/Belford Voluntary Acquisition Program was approved by the City of Los Angeles.

Also see Table S4.2-20 in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR which notes that for Alternatives B, C, and LAWA Staff's new preferred Alternative D, residential acquisition within Manchester Square may be required through voluntary acquisition, leasing, and/or public condemnation, should acquisition and demolition under the current program not be completed prior to Master Plan construction in the Manchester Square area.

PC01874-2

Comment:

(2) Many summary statistics are not valid such as: an increase of 14 million passenger yet a 16 million origin & destination increase. How does that figure?

Response:

The content of this comment is similar to comment PC01881-178. Please see Response to Comment PC01881-178 regarding the increase in origin and destination passengers from 1996 to 2005.

PC01874-3

Comment:

(3) The report is made deceptive & useless. Where in the whole report is the word "significant" defined?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01835-10 regarding an explanation of thresholds of significance and where thresholds of significance were identified in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01874-4

Comment:

(4) How does the math figure in your design day and design day passengers. Why is design day used instead of average day operations?

Response:

A design day schedule is used rather than an average day schedule in the Master Plan because the planning process traditionally uses a schedule that reflects activity higher than 80 percent of the days, or above the 80th percentile. An average day would indicate that the design day is not peaked. The baseline design day schedule was selected by looking at daily activity counts. The peak month for activity was selected and a look at the average weekday versus the average day in the month was made. Average week day activity for the peak month yielded a schedule with the activity volume to be above the 80th percentile for the year. A Thursday was selected as the design day because Thursdays have a good representation of international activity and are not likely to be affected by potential peculiar service patterns such as Monday or Friday. The ratio of annual-to-design day is computed by dividing the annual operations by the design day operations. Because the design day is typically higher than the average day, the annual-to-design day ratio is usually lower than 365. For further discussion regarding the methodology, development, and activity of the design day schedule please see Chapter II, Section 2.3.7 of the Draft LAX Master Plan.

PC01874-5

Comment:

I am in complete opposition to the plans as they are proposed.

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.

PC01875

Sweeney, Jesse

None Provided

7/20/2001

PC01875-1

Comment:

I find the airport expansion to be highly objectionable. The additional congestion it will bring into my neighborhood and surrounding areas is not acceptable. The added amount of pollution and noise will be a nuisance. The traffic that will be increased from the expansion will be a disturbance to homeowners. This area should not be burdened by the new expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; noise 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-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.

PC01876

Kuehne, Elizabeth

None Provided

7/23/2001

PC01876-1

Comment:

General objection to expansion without comprehensive traffic mitigation and noise reduction.

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. Comprehensive traffic and noise mitigation plans were prepared and were part of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Sections 4.3.2.9 for the off-airport traffic mitigation plan and Section 4.1.8 for the noise mitigation plan.

PC01876-2

Comment:

Alamitos Corridor should be used to handle freight via rail.

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.

PC01877 Olson, Reid None Provided 8/2/2001

PC01877-1

Comment:

After viewing the LAX Master Plan web site - I support the staff recommended alternative C. I would also support either alternative A or B.

I believe LAX needs to expand to handle future traffic.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01878 Fritts, Douglas None Provided 7/26/2001

PC01878-1

Comment:

THIS LETTER IS OF CONCERN THAT I HAVE ABOUT THE POSSIBLE EXPANSION OF THE LOS ANGELES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT.

OUR CITY AND ITS RESIDENTS ARE ALREADY EXPOSED TO TOO MUCH POLLUTION, NOISE AND CONGESTION CAUSED BY LAX, AND I STRONGLY FEEL THAT IT IS UNFAIR TO EXPECT US TO BE SUBJECTED TO EVEN MORE OF THE SAME.

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-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.

PC01878-2

Comment:

IT IS HIGH TIME THAT THE SURROUNDING OUTLYING COMMUNITIES ASSUME THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THIS BURDEN, INSTEAD OF EXPECTING OUR COMMUNITY TO BEAR THE BRUNT OF IT ENTIRELY.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to 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

PC01878-3

Comment:

WHEN LAX CANNOT FOLLOW THE CURRENT GUIDELINES AND CURFEWS BECAUSE OF ATMOSPHERIC AND WEATHER CONDITIONS, WHY IS ANY EXPANSION THERE EVEN BEING CONSIDERED AT ALL?

Response:

Please see Topical Responses TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures and TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations. It should be noted that Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan - added subsequent to the publication and public review of the Draft EIS/EIR, 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. 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.

PC01878-4

Comment:

EXPANSION OF LAX IS BEYOND RIDICULOUS AND NOT FAIR TO ITS NEIGHBORS. IT SHOULD BE OUT OF THE QUESTION ENTIRELY. NO WAY SHOULD IT EVEN BE UNDER CONSIDERATION.

THE CITY GOVERNMENT OF INGLEWOOD SHOULD DEMAND AN END TO ANY LAX EXPANSION WHATSOEVER AND SHOULD WE NOT PREVAIL, THEN WE SHOULD TIE IT UP IN COURT UNTIL THE LAX FORCES LOSE INTEREST AND GO SOMEWHERE ELSE.

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.

PC01879

Vertucci, Michele

None Provided

7/25/2001

PC01879-1

Comment:

Pollution - Pushing emissions west into the ocean will not help mitigate increased emissions from increased cars, trucks going to LAX, increased planes idling on the ground & jet fuel emissions. Where are the plans to mitigate the five major air pollutants including particulate matter, NOx emissions, CO, SO2 emissions?? The report predicts an increase in all 5 pollutants.

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided an enhanced discussion of air quality mitigation measures in Section 4.6.8 and in Appendix S-E Section 2.3.

PC01879-2

Comment:

Our health will be & already is affected by the pollution from the airport.

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.

PC01879-3

Comment:

Where is a report on the health affects of today's pollution?

Response:

A comprehensive evaluation of air pollution from all sources in the Los Angeles Basin is outside the scope of the assessment. Please see Topical Response TR-HRA-1 regarding the baseline used for the human health risk assessment included in Section 4.24.1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also refer to Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for an analysis of potential cancer risks, non-cancer health hazards and cumulative impacts associated with implementation of Master Plan alternatives.

PC01879-4

Comment:

Noise -

With increased air traffic at LAX the noise of planes will increase. The noisest time is with planes idling & taking off.

Response:

For information regarding increased noise levels see Topical Response TR-N-6, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.2 regarding the relationship between air traffic and noise. The commentor may be hearing nighttime arrivals in over-ocean operations as they are crossing Santa Monica in a westerly direction at 8,000 feet. The aircraft go out 7-10 miles then turn around and land on the north complex. The commentor may also be hearing reverse thrusters during braking action to lower ambient noise levels. Topical Response TR-N-5 addresses nighttime aircraft operations. Please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Noise, 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.

PC01879-5

Comment:

And I don't know about you, but I've been woken many an early morning at 3 AM from planes taking off from the airport.

Response:

An evaluation of sleep disturbance caused by single event noise was reported in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting information in Appendix SC and Technical Report S-1. The 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01879-6

Comment:

The averaging over a 24 hour period in the report regarding the CNEL's was a bit outrageous. The data was old (1996) & did not reflect actual noise data taken over a per hour basis. When averaging is done, you miss the actual noisiest times.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR used methods and practices appropriate to this project. The documents used not only 1996 data, but also 2000 and out years as well. This difference is acknowledged and described in Topical Responses TR-N-1 and TR-N-2. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-87.

PC01879-7

Comment:

Have you ever been at Paseo del Rey elementary school, at a school function, & all stops when a plane takes off at LAX?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00038-6 regarding LAUSD facilities that experience significant high noise levels under 1996 baseline, noise impacts that would occur on these facilities from development of the Master Plan alternatives, and mitigation provided for LAUSD facilities under the "Settlement Agreement." As concluded in Response to Comment AL00038-6, the only significant noise impact to LAUSD facilities would be under Alternative B. See also Topical Response TR-LU-5 for a discussion of how aircraft noise impacts on schools are determined and mitigated.

Based on information provided in Table 14 of Technical Report 1, Land Use Technical Report, in the Draft EIS/EIR and Table S9 of Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Paseo del Rey Elementary School is exposed to significant noise levels (defined by the 65 CNEL noise contour) and significant single event noise levels that result in classroom disruption under 1996 baseline conditions. In addition, Paseo del Rey Elementary School would not be newly exposed to these noise levels as a result of development of any of the Master Plan alternatives.

See also Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC01879-8

Comment:

With more planes planned for the future - where will the noise go??

Response:

For information about the relationship of future noise levels and increasing aircraft operations frequencies, please see Topical Response TR-N-6. 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.

PC01879-9

Comment:

Where did you get the 20,000 residential units data that are impacted by noise? There are over 80,000 residential units affected by noise.

Response:

It is not clear from the comment where the referenced information was obtained. The number of schools exposed to noise levels of 65 CNEL or greater under the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program and 1996 baseline conditions are presented in the Land Use Technical Report of the Draft EIS/EIR. As shown in Tables 11 and 13, in Technical Report 1, Land Use Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR, approximately 24,900 dwelling units are located within the ANMP boundary which was established based on the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL contour and used to define the boundaries for residential uses eligible for sound insulation. As also presented in the Land Use Technical Report 16,973 dwelling units are exposed to noise levels of 65 CNEL or greater under 1996 baseline conditions. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

PC01879-10**Comment:**

Traffic -

With increased cargo volume being projected for LAX there will be increased 18 wheeler heavy duty trucks coming to the airport. This will severely impact traffic in the neighborhoods around LAX & also increase air pollution. Creating a LAX Expressway & ring road to mitigate the increased traffic is a pie-in-the-sky plan. Already the 405 is a moving parking lot & just adding another road will create traffic on that Expressway & ring road. Drive around the airport today and project more cars, buses, shuttles, vans etc (because of increased MAP #'s) & your Expressway & ring road will look just like the airport road today. Increasing passengers will increase traffic no matter what new roads are built. So spread the passengers, cargo to other airports. And we won't have to be concerned about more traffic, construction debacles & increased blood pressure.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic. Alternative D, which was addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, would not increase cargo handling facilities at LAX. As indicated in Table S3-2 (page 3-23) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, cargo operations are projected to increase to about 3,120,000 tons/year at LAX by 2015 under the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative D. The traffic impacts of this level of cargo activity were described in Section 4.3.2.6.1 (beginning on page 4-293) of the Draft EIS/EIR. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or the Ring Road.

PC01879-11**Comment:**

So - with the LAX Expressway & ring road - homes will be destroyed, businesses will be destroyed by construction of these roadways. How do you mitigate loss???

Response:

Mitigation for the acquisition and relocation impacts associated with Master Plan implementation was provided in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses (subsection 4.4.2.8), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Additional mitigation specific to the LAX Expressway 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. Compliance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, its implementing regulations, state and local regulations, and FAA Advisory Circular 150/5100-17, ensured through implementation of Master Plan Commitment RBR-1, Residential and Business Relocation Program (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), would also reduce or avoid significant relocation impacts.

PC01879-12**Comment:**

We need a regional airport solution instead of LAX expansion. Coordination among communities & the airport (LAX) & regional airports needs to begin to come up with a fair, equitable regional aviation

3. Comments and Responses

system. The burden of pollution, noise, traffic needs to be shared among the communities of Southern California. I'm sure Palmdale & Ontario would be eager to get more business just to name a few airports. I'm sure people who live in San Gabriel Valley, Inland Empire would rather fly out of Ontario than drive all the way to LAX.

Response:

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

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.

PC01880 Therrattil, Anthony, None Provided 7/15/2001
Theresa & Family

PC01880-1

Comment:

LAX - as a major international Airport is almost unique in that, it is surrounded by 'desirable' residential communities.

The residents have been subjected to undesirable decibels of noise levels. Why should we be subjected to more noise levels - when there are better alternatives?! Let other communities share a bit of this burden. The residential communities surrounding LAX have enough traffic congestions to deal with. Let other communities also share the traffic 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 and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts. 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.

PC01881 Hefner, Roy Los Angeles Intl. Airport Area 7/16/2001
Advisory Committee

PC01881-1

Comment:

The Los Angeles International Airport Area Advisory Committee would like to thank you for making available to us the 'Executive Summary' of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report and the EIS/EIR compact disks. The majority of our members have computers but several do not have computers. Hard copies were placed in many libraries and the 'Proud Bird

Restaurant'. Although they are available it is not realistic to say someone could afford the time to digest all 12,000 pages of the documents at these locations.

We also appreciate the 180 day comment period you created to allow the opportunity to better evaluate the EIS/EIR and the Master Plan.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review.

PC01881-2

Comment:

While we understand you desire to improve the regional airports development, we feel that these documents did not make a fair presentation of the issues at hand. It is almost impossible to see what the true impact of the proposals because the EIS/EIR lacks a true environmental baseline for comparison.

Response:

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

PC01881-3

Comment:

Why didn't the Summary of Environmental Impacts in the Executive Summary include the No Action/No Project scenario? There will certainly be some environmental impacts if the No Action/No Project Plan is the one adopted.

Response:

The Executive Summary Overviews, which summarized the key findings of the Draft EIS/EIR environmental analysis, included the No Action/No Project Alternative's impacts in comparison to those of the build alternatives - Alternatives A, B, and C.

PC01881-4

Comment:

The dates used do not satisfy the baseline for comparison to be as of the time that the EIS/EIR was submitted. Your baselines, in most part, were outdated at the time you completed the EIS/EIR on Nov. 7, 2000 and released on Jan. 18, 2001.

Response:

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

PC01881-5

Comment:

The Los Angeles International Airport Area Advisory Committee has reviewed the proposed Alternatives A, B, C, and the No Action/No Project plans and many of the plans that were not finally selected for the expansion of LAX as contained in the draft EIR/EIS. As representatives of the residents of our communities we must oppose the expansion plans as proposed. We feel the Master Plan - EIS/EIR is fatally flawed.

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,

3. Comments and Responses

instead, shifts the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provides 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.

PC01881-6

Comment:

We agree with you that a regional approach to airline accommodation is needed. We also feel the expansion of LAX will hinder the regional approach.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to 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.

PC01881-7

Comment:

There are unavoidable adverse impacts on our communities as your Executive Summary indicates..

Far too many EIS/EIR exercises end with a full acknowledgment of negative environmental impacts and admissions that there is no mitigation available. These impacts are then blatantly ignored in favor of what is termed "overriding economic concerns." The economic benefits from expansion at LAX would mainly go to large companies often headquartered elsewhere, to stock shareholders who could reside anywhere in the country or world, and to regional areas (such as Orange County) which would not then be required to create facilities to handle their own air travel demand. The negative environmental, health, and economic impacts, however, fall almost exclusively on those who live or work in the communities immediately surrounding the airport and constitute an undue hardship and burden on them.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01881-8

Comment:

Although the EIS/EIR pays lip service to a regional approach to air traffic demand concepts, there is very little or nothing included in the document to foster a regional approach. At the very least, a phasing structure should be included which would limit LAX development until and unless there is adequate development of airports in other areas (Ontario, El Toro, John Wayne, March, George, and 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. 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.

PC01881-9

Comment:

The assumptions that all projected air traffic demand must be met and that LAX must be expanded to meet projected demand are incorrect. Much of the projected growth and demand comes from other areas, especially Orange County, the Inland Empire and northern L.A. County.

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.

PC01881-10

Comment:

Since the airlines would be the major benefactors of meeting this supposed air demand, the airlines should shoulder responsibility for meeting the demand by working with other communities to develop and/or expand their own airports. Airlines should also voluntarily accept a system of fines and restrictions for violating noise, air pollution, and traffic regulations at LAX. The EIS/EIR should include airline participation in expanding airports in other areas and participation in redress for violations of regulations.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-2 regarding airline response to market demand and deregulation.

PC01881-11

Comment:

The manner in which Environmental Justice is addressed, we believe, is completely inadequate. Requirements to mitigate Environmental Justice are not firmly stated, rather the approach is that it is an issue to be handled later. Therefore, it is impossible to determine whether or not Environmental Justice mitigation is adequate.

Response:

Extensive mitigation measures were provided in the Draft EIS/EIR, as found throughout Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures, and as provided in the Executive Summary, and in Chapter 5, Environmental Action Plan. Many of these measures apply to minority and low-income communities, as well as other potentially effected communities. While a number of these

3. Comments and Responses

mitigation measures were accounted for and discussed in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR, the reason the section did not include a program with mitigation measures and benefits fully reflective of community input, was because the preliminary findings on environmental justice were not known until the document was finalized. It was appropriate, and a clearly stated intent in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (page 4-433), that the Environmental Justice Program would be further developed and implemented in coordination with affected minority and low-income communities and their representatives in order to ensure that their unique issues and needs would be fully accounted for.

As stated on page 4-337, in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA received a substantial number of recommendations for mitigation measures and other benefits relating to environmental justice concerns from environmental justice workshops, comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR, and subsequent community outreach. All recommendations were thoroughly evaluated against such criteria as whether the recommendation had a nexus or connection with the environmental effects of the proposed LAX Master Plan, or whether it would be feasible for the FAA and/or LAWA to fund and implement. Those recommendations that best met the criteria were instrumental in defining the Environmental Justice Program included in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As further described in Topical Response TR-EJ-2, public input was also received in association with public circulation of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, through additional environmental justice workshops, public hearings, and comments on the EIS/EIR. Furthermore, environmental justice outreach was conducted more recently through meetings with local organizations, environmental groups, and civic, religious, and business leaders in adjacent communities. This additional input was considered and evaluated through a process similar to that undertaken prior to circulation of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The final Environmental Justice Program is presented in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of this Final EIS/EIR, with supporting information provided in Appendix F-A, of this Final EIS/EIR.

PC01881-12

Comment:

Furthermore, there is no comparison between the options presented and an alternative for the development of regionalized expansion of areas throughout the Los Angeles basin. This is a glaring flaw in the document because the regionalized airport approach should be presented as an alternative for discussion, and should also be evaluated relative to the comparative impact on Environmental Justice.

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.

Also please see Topical Response TR-EJ-3 regarding environmental justice and regional context and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

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 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.

PC01881-13

Comment:

Additionally, in terms of Environmental Justice, there should be an analysis of the degree of usage of LAX by Lennox residents, as well as the surrounding communities, to determine the degree to which use of the airport is serving the needs of its most immediate neighbors, as opposed to meeting the needs of others who do not feel the impact of the environmental concerns associated with the airport.

Response:

Section 4.4.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed Environmental Justice pursuant to Executive Order 12898 and other relevant guidance with emphasis on identifying and addressing disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority and low-income populations. While Department of Transportation Order 5610.2 indicates that offsetting benefits may be taken into account in making determinations on whether an action would have a disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effect on minority or low-income populations, it is beyond the scope of the EIS/EIR to undertake an evaluation of airport service demand in various communities. It should be noted however, that the purpose of the project is one of providing transportation infrastructure to serve needs throughout the region, including those in close proximity to LAX. Please see Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of this Final EIS/EIR regarding benefits and mitigation measures that address the disproportionately high and adverse effects of the project. Please see Topical Response TR-EJ-3 regarding environmental justice and regional context.

PC01881-14

Comment:

During our attempts to study the materials provided by LAWA, we had many difficulties. In many cases the materials, Executive Summary, the compact discs, and the 21 volumes, were not in sync. Accordingly cross comparisons were impossible. This was also true when we were comparing the appendices to other chapters. At the least this might be considered sloppy and at the worst an overt attempt to stifle (refer to Archie Bunker) analytical evaluation. As a result of organization and presentation and inaccessibility the document is inadequate and does not meet requirements for public dissemination.

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. Additional information is included in appendices and supporting documents

PC01881-15

Comment:

Tables and figures are not near the references in the text. The colors used on many figures did not reproduce clearly when copies were printed from the Internet. It was particularly difficult to distinguish between the shades of color. More attention should have been paid to display by using techniques that would reproduce clearly. Technical reports and appendices were not available for review or downloading on the Internet. Some tables were reduced to illegibility, such as Table 4.3.1-5, when there was no need to make them so small.

Response:

Comment noted. Production, publication, and distribution of the Draft EIS/EIR was conducted in accordance with CEQA and NEPA requirements. Please also see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01881-16

Comment:

Since Alternative C is the LAWA "preferred" plan, then information that was shared with Alternatives A and B should have appeared in the C section. Reviewers of Alternate C were constantly referred to A and/or B to obtain information. The impression was clearly one of an attempt to obscure information, not disseminate it.

Response:

The cross-referencing of information pertaining to Alternative A or B when addressing the impacts of Alternative C was intended to avoid repeating the same previous discussions and avoid further enlargement of the document.

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, would shift 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. Alternative D is now the LAWA staff-preferred alternative. 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.

PC01881-17

Comment:

Any capacity figures that have been used in these documents or any other documents are not valid. We have learned from the 1978 EIR to expand LAX UNTIL 40 MAP was reached was deceptive. The capacity numbers for all four proposals are also deceptive numbers. What plans do you have to stop the growth of the airport in terms of cargo and passengers?

Fifteen years have passed since LAX surpassed the EIR of 1978 which limited the growth of LAX along with the development of Palmdale. What plans did you have to limit the passenger utilization of LAX to 40 MAP?

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding the 40 MAP activity level and the control of activity levels at LAX. Alternatives A and B would accommodate the projected demand of 97.9 MAP by 2015. Alternatives C and D would not be able to accommodate the projected 2015 unconstrained demand due to constraints in their facility design. For Alternative C, these facility constraints are related primarily to the capacity of the four-runway configurations. Under Alternative D, an added constraint is the limited number of aircraft gates.

PC01881-18

Comment:

A SHORT CHRONOLOGICAL REVIEW OF THE 'MASTER PLAN' FOR LAX

1. After two years of public meetings and discussions the BOAC adopted, in 1978, the EIR placing a limit of 40 MAP for LAX along with the development on Palmdale Airport.
2. Approximately 14 national, state, and local policies, programs, and plans included 40 MAP as a basis for their plans and operations.
3. In December of 1986, 40 MAP exceeded 40 MAP.

4. In January of 1988, the Board of Airport Commissioners published their EIR 2000 to allow an increase of MAP to 65 MAP by the year 2000.
5. Shortly thereafter the City Council of L.A. requested that any LAX plan be included as part of the master plan of the City of Los Angeles.
6. In March of 1989, the L.A. City Council approved that proposal.
7. In June of 1990, the L.A. Council approved the Planning Depts. LAX Master Plan work program.
8. In January of 1992 three public forums were held in 1.) Westchester, 2.@ L.A. Chamber of Commerce, 3.) The San Fernando Valley.
 - A. 60 to 70 local residents plus a few aviation related individuals and government agencies attended the Westchester meeting.
 - B. Many prospective consultants and business people attended the chamber meeting.
 - C. About 5 citizens attended the valley meeting.
9. After a few years of almost no action on the part of the L.A. Planning Department the Department of Airports took over the financing and operation of the LAX Master Plan in the 1993-1995 time frame.
 - A. Several consultants were hired to gather information about traffic, noise, air pollution, urban design, parking, new terminals, satellite terminals, runway expansion, people mover, etc.
 - B. Four concepts were suggested for the expansion of LAX.
 - C. Public meetings were held in Westchester, Inglewood, Lennox, and possibly, El Segundo. In 1995 these concepts were presented to the public.
10. In July 1997, a 'Scoping' process took place at the Proud Bird Restaurant. (Alternative C and No action/ No Project were not included in the scoping process.)
11. Two of those concepts were deleted and eventually two more concepts Alternatives 1,2,3, plus No Action/no project) were added. Alternative three was never involved in the 'scoping' process.
12. Today we know these as No Action/No Project, Alternatives A, B, C.
13. WE HAVE TRAVELED FOR 15 YEARS PAST THE 40 MAP LIMITATION. LAX IN THE YEAR 2000 HANDLED 67,600,000 PASSENGERS plus a marked increase in cargo without an EIR/EIS. Is this Draft EIS/EIR representative of the concerns of LAWA to meet the environmental requirements of federal and state law? We assume so and are very disappointed.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding the issue of 40 MAP at LAX.

PC01881-19

Comment:

There can not be any legitimate evaluation of noise or air quality impact until the FAA delineates flight paths for all the alternatives. This EIS/EIR does not supply complete or adequate information for these analyses.

The FAA information must include flight paths, climbout/landing angles and speeds, and minimum and maximum altitudes at specific points along the flight paths (at least every 100 feet from the end of the runway) for both easterly and westerly field operations, for day and nighttime operations, and for different weather conditions.

Response:

Section 4.1, Noise, and Appendix D, Aircraft Technical Noise Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR were completed under FAA Orders 5050.4A and 1050.1D. Modeling aircraft operations for every known or potential flight situation would be burdensome and impractical. Hence, average annual conditions were used. For additional information on flight track utilization, noise

3. Comments and Responses

screening of track changes above 3000 feet, and location impact analysis please see Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01881-20

Comment:

Information on individual noise footprints for each aircraft (as has been done at SFO) is necessary for complete public review and would serve to pinpoint impact areas. These noise footprints must be listed for all weather conditions (such as inversion layers), rates of ascent/descent (e.g., power climb-outs), and at all altitudes.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC01835-15; please refer to Response to Comment AL01835-15.

PC01881-21

Comment:

Escape corridors for aborted landings must be clearly defined for all conceivable conditions. Of particular concern is allowing sufficient space for aircraft (probably the heaviest, least maneuverable) which must be waived off from 24R/6L and 25L/7R -these runways are currently the outboard runways, but become "middle" runways if additional runways are added. As pressure is put on airlines and the tower for increased through-put, more aircraft will be unable to keep up with the "rammin-and-jammin" and have to use escape corridors after being waived off. Because most of these (if not all) escape corridors would be over residential areas, they need to be studied, evaluated, and mitigation measures for the negative impacts included in the EIR/EIS study.

Response:

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. To address all conceivable conditions would be unrealistic. Adding a third runway and increasing other runways would maximize the operational efficiency of the airfield by reducing delays between heavy and light aircraft. By increasing the numbers of approaches available through Alternatives A and B, the number of missed approaches should actually decrease. Alternatives C and D do not add substantial numbers of operations to the levels currently experienced, so there should be no projected increase in missed approaches under those alternatives. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.4, regarding standard missed approach procedure.

PC01881-22

Comment:

LAWA's claims that noise would be reduced although operations would increase, may be due, in part, to LAWA's hoped- for "scatter" pattern for flight paths; i.e., aircraft would approach/take off over many portions of the surrounding communities, thus spreading the noise impact over the entire communities at a 63 or 64 dB CNEL level, instead of over a specific, narrow area at 65 or above dB. This scatter approach is curiously out of sync with current technology (such as the GPS system) which can define and guide aircraft to stay within much narrower flight paths than previously possible.

Response:

There is no scatter pattern for flight paths anticipated in the noise modeling of any future alternatives. The reduction of the area within the 65 CNEL contour is a function of the phase out of older, louder aircraft from environmental baseline levels and their replacement with newer, quieter airplanes. It has nothing to do with a broad redistribution of flight paths over neighboring communities. Each alternative calls for the development of instrumented departure procedures to better constrain the locations of aircraft during departure. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PC01881-23**Comment:**

Alternatives A, B, and C would impose undue economic, environmental, and health burdens on the areas surrounding LAX, especially on the Westchester/Playa del Rey, El Segundo, Lennox, and Inglewood areas.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socioeconomics, and health and safety impacts in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 5 and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-3 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 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.

PC01881-24**Comment:**

The Westchester Central Business District has only recently recovered from the customer-base loss created by the LAX land/residential homes acquisition in the 1970s. There would not be enough room in LAX Northside to relocate all the businesses that would be demolished by the ring road and its proposed connections. Additionally, since there has been no construction in the LAX Northside area (although an EIR was approved for development in the 1980s), no accommodations would be ready for relocating businesses.

Response:

The Master Plan is considered separate from growth and expansion that has occurred at LAX in the past. Please see Response to Comment AL00018-1 regarding commercial property acquisition within the Westchester Business District. Also see Response to Comment AL00033-123 and Response to Comment PC00013-5 regarding phasing of and development within LAX Northside/Westchester Southside. It should be noted that, in contrast to the other build alternatives, Alternative D would not involve acquisition within the Westchester Business District.

PC01881-25**Comment:**

Playa del Rey and El Segundo suffer from early turns during normal daily operations and over-ocean operations with the present airport configuration and level of traffic. With the extensions of runways, the probable increase in early turns, whether tower or pilot initiated, would cause severe noise impacts in the communities adjacent to LAX. By lengthening runways, the smaller aircraft will be even more tempted to make early turns. Moving 24R/6L 350 feet north would entice commuter aircraft to cut across east Westchester. Early turns on take-off and landing need to be studied, evaluated, and regulations with fees and penalties for violations need to be included in the EIR/EIS study.

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 by posting signs at the end of each runway calling for flight to the coastline prior to turns, but occasional deviations from the procedure continue to occur. A part of the reason is the alignment of the runways relative to the community. The west end of the runways nearest El Segundo are closer to the community than the east ends (the runways are aimed more toward the community's west end), while the north runways are both farther away (except in Alternative A) and aimed away from the community. Consequently, with the present runway configuration, it is much less likely that Westchester will be affected by early turns than El Segundo, particularly by aircraft that follow or attempt to follow the flight to the coastline procedure before turning. The development of Alternative

3. Comments and Responses

A could result in additional takeoffs nearer Westchester, but the new northernmost runway in the north runway complex is planned for arrival use only. Therefore it is less likely that small aircraft departing either runway in the north complex would turn across the landing course of aircraft using the new north runway. The same concept applies to aircraft departing in the south runway complex and crossing the extended approach path. For further information, 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 LAX. In addition, potential noise abatement measures were addressed in Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, in particular Sections 7.1.1.3, Noise Abatement Flight Routes, and 7.1.2, Airport Regulation Changes.

PC01881-26

Comment:

Lennox, Inglewood, and east Westchester would be subjected to much higher levels of noise and air pollution due to the extension of runways to the east. This would mean that aircraft would be much lower in altitude in approaches from and take-offs to the east. These impacts would cause an undue environmental burden on these areas.

Response:

Runway length requirements at LAX were assessed to ensure that a future runway system would provide adequate length to serve the forecast fleet mix. Based on the Master Plan Runway Length Requirements, a minimum of one 12,000-foot runway is recommended at LAX for takeoffs. The remaining air carrier runways should be between 10,000 and 12,000 feet in length for takeoffs and between 9,000 feet and 10,000 feet for landings. Although total exposure would drop for three of the Master Plan alternatives (Alternatives A, C, D), the 65 CNEL contour would shift in various ways for each alternative due to runway extensions or additions. As a result of this shift, each of the build alternatives would expose some people to 65 CNEL that had not been previously exposed. Some others who live within the 65 CNEL noise contour would be exposed to a 1.5 decibel or greater increase in noise levels. A much more substantial shift in flight patterns under Alternative B would create much greater noise impacts than any of the other conditions studied. For more information on noise and noise related land use impacts, please see 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. For more information on air quality, please see Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and the related appendices. Please see Topical Responses TR-N-6 regarding noise increase and TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC01881-27

Comment:

LAWA officials have stated that there would not be any mid-runway (intersection) take-offs/ landings (in effect having two operations per runway at the same or almost same time) even if/when the runways are extended. Is there any guarantee in the EIS/EIR that the communities would have this protection? This seems to be an FAA decision; therefore, the proposals can not be legitimately evaluated until the FAA comes forth with this information.

By extending runways to the east, aircraft would be at lower altitudes when landing/taking off from/to the east. This will cause even more noise impact in east Westchester, Inglewood, and Lennox. Again without FAA's delineation of flight paths, the noise and air quality impacts can not be legitimately evaluated. How does this resulting increase in noise affect the LAX noise variance process?

Response:

The relocation of all or a portion of departure traffic to an intersection of the departure runway and a taxiway located along the runway is occasionally used to shift noise away from sensitive areas near the runway end. Normally, if sufficient runway exists this measure is sometimes used when the intersection departure point is adjacent to compatible areas and the runway end is noise-sensitive. At LAX, Runway 24R would be extended to the east under all development alternatives to provide takeoff length in the north airfield complex for heavy aircraft, comparable to that available on the south runways. The length of runway remaining west of the current runway end (between 9,050 and 9,350, dependent upon the alternative) would be adequate for most narrow-body and many wide-body aircraft takeoffs. These

aircraft could be assigned takeoffs at the location of the existing runway end and aircraft requiring longer takeoff rolls could be assigned the full length, but this is not a recommended noise abatement measure. In no manner does this equate to the use of the runway by two aircraft at the same time. This measure is more fully evaluated in Section 7.2, Alternative-Specific Abatement Opportunities, located in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.6. The commentor is accurate in stating that the relocation of the landing threshold to the east would lower the altitude of aircraft during their approach from the east. This change is reflected in the extension of the noise contours for the future development alternatives by a few hundred feet east of the no action alternative contours. Single event noise levels at locations under the approach would increase by 1-3 decibels as a result of the eastward threshold relocation. The LAX variance process would be affected in so far as the area subject to Title 21 for mitigation would be changed to incorporate any area which becomes newly impacted by noise above 65 CNEL as a result of any of the proposed actions. Consequently, areas newly exposed to noise above 65 CNEL would become eligible for participation in the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

PC01881-28

Comment:

Safety for air passengers, air transport and airport employees, and people living and working near the airport or under the flight paths, should be of prime concern. This must include regulations protecting the health of these people from noise, traffic, and air pollution impacts and setting limits (with fees and penalties for violations) for exceeding the regulations.

Response:

Comment noted. Human health risk and aviation safety were addressed in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, of the Draft EIS/EIR and 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 awakenings in homes and classroom disruption 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. The Draft EIS/EIR also addressed the health effects of noise in Section 4.24.2, Health Effects of Noise, with supporting information in Technical Report 14b. 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-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures and enforcement and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PC01881-29

Comment:

Protection for the El Segundo Dunes and Blue Butterfly areas must be preserved and enhanced. Comprehensive and specific information on the noise and air quality impact the increased air and ground traffic would have on air pollution on that area must be included in the EIR/EIS study. Without specific information on the proposed ring road and the access, ingress/egress to and from it defined in the EIS/EIR, the document is inadequate, incomplete and flawed.

Response:

Potential impacts to the El Segundo Dunes and the El Segundo Blue Butterfly Habitat Restoration Area were addressed in Section 4.11, Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Potential impacts related to air quality and traffic were addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the subject documents.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01881-30

Comment:

Shifting 24R/6L 350 feet north closer to the Westchester community (as outlined in Alternative C) places an undue burden on the community and is not necessary to accommodate wider wingspan aircraft. Judicious phasing of arrivals and departures throughout the daylight hours could accommodate the aircraft.

Response:

The content of this comment is essentially the same as comment PC01835-23. Please see Response to Comment PC01835-23.

PC01881-31

Comment:

Concentrating air service at one large airport has severe safety drawbacks. In the event of a catastrophic natural event, such as an earthquake, all air service for Southern California, including emergency and relief efforts, could be severely damaged. It was recently revealed that a terrorist had targeted LAX for a bombing attack. Again all air service for Southern California, including emergency services and federal policing efforts, could be severely damaged.

Response:

Comment noted. Master Plans for growth are underway at LAWA's other two air carrier airports, Ontario and Palmdale. Security measures to protect LAX, as developed by the Transportation Security Administration, are in place and expanding. Alternative D, Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, as described and evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, includes additional security and improvement considerations but does not involve airport expansion. See Appendix S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for additional information. Finally, please refer to Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security issues.

PC01881-32

Comment:

The EIS/EIR must contain a complete analysis of the environmental impacts of the ring road. Ingress and egress intersections must be defined and analyzed. If there is an access that would allow traffic to flow from Vista del Mar and/or Culver Blvd in Playa del Rey, there would be profound and irreparable damage to the coastal road and wetlands. Similarly, traffic flow from Vista del Mar and/or Imperial would encourage airport traffic onto those streets. Access from these points would create immediate traffic gridlock coming north from the South Bay cities and south from the Westside to access LAX. It would create a tremendous traffic impact on roads not equipped to handle the level of traffic currently on them. If the access points remain at Falmouth and Loyola Blvds, the impact would also increase at those points. The Ring-Road would not mitigate traffic. It would shift it to areas and roadways not able to withstand the impact. The Ring-Road would not function as advertised to reduce traffic. Without specific information on the design of the road, no analysis of its impact or mitigation capabilities can be legitimately performed. The EIS/EIR is inadequate and incomplete in this area. What are the design specifics for the proposed LAX Ring-Road?

Response:

This comment is similar to comment PC01835-30. Please see Response to Comment PC01835-30.

PC01881-33

Comment:

The economic impact the ring road and its connections would cause for communities and businesses along Arbor Vitae and in the Westchester Central Business District constitute an undue economic burden. It may also divert business from the airport-related commercial businesses along Century Blvd.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC01835-31 regarding the ring road.

PC01881-34

Comment:

Description of Fully Evaluated Alternatives, Summary of Activity, Comparison of Alternatives (page ES-9):

The difference in level of activity (comparing No Action/No Project to Alternative C) is very slight; in fact, often the NA/NP is close to, or better than, c. The slight differences do not warrant the expenditure of funds and impact to the local communities that Alternative C would entail. The increase in MAP seems to be based on the assumption that airlines would purchase and operate larger-capacity aircraft; a circumstance entirely outside LAWA's control.

Total aircraft operations show less than a 2% increase between NA/NP and C. All weather peak hour operations would be 144 for NA/NP and only 145 for C. Three-hour average operations would be 140 for NA/NP and (a loss of 2!) only 138 for C. Total MAP is projected as 78.7 for NA/NP and 89.6 for C, a difference of 13.85%; while passengers per departure are projected as 127.47 for NA/NP vs. 145.09 for C, a difference of 13.82%.

Response:

Due to its constrained airside and landside capacities, the No Action/No Project Alternative would fail to serve the growth faced by LAX and the region over the next 15 years. The No Action/No Project Alternative would not serve the level of international activity that could be served by Alternative C, and there is no other airport that could be expanded to fill this potential void between now and 2015. It also would not provide for the cargo capacity needed to meet the projected demand for air freight shipping in the most densely populated area of the region. On the other hand, the only airport constraint for Alternative C would be the runway system and it does have the ability to provide needed landside capacity to accommodate more passengers and satisfy forecast cargo demand in 2015. Alternative C is superior to the No Action/No Project Alternative in meeting both the economic and environmental goals of the Master Plan by preserving LAX as the region's international gateway and serving the passenger and cargo demand with fewer impacts. See Chapter V, 3.3.3 of the Master Plan for a summary of final iteration alternatives analysis. Without any improvements at LAX (represented by the No Action/No Project Alternative), the consequence would be the loss of potential air service and the resulting economic benefits to other regions in the nation.

Please see Responses to Comments PC00599-7 and PC00593-1 for a discussion on the fleet mix assumptions used in the development of the alternatives.

The loss of two operations in the peak three hour period for Alternative C compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative stems from the fleet mix differences between the two alternatives. Alternative C has a heavier fleet mix than the No Action/No Project Alternative. (The design day enplanements/departure ratio with Alternative C is 145.09 versus 127.47 in No Action/No Project.) There are more "heavy" aircraft (aircraft with takeoff weights of more than 255,000 pounds) in the Alternative C activity profile than in No Action/No Project Alternative, resulting in greater required separations between aircraft due to wake turbulence. The greater separation reduces the number of aircraft take-offs or landings on the runway system in a given period time, therefore the average hourly capacity would be lower, but more passengers could be served.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01881-35

Comment:

Description of Fully Evaluated Alternatives, Summary of Features, Comparison of Alternatives (pages ES-9 to -11).

Total public parking stalls as compared to MAP are unrealistic: There is a projected increase of almost 55% (31.6 MAP) in passengers between the baseline and Alt. C, yet an increase of only 16.4% (5,565) in public parking stalls. It also shows an increase in public parking of 10.89% (3,879) from NA/NP to C, yet there is a projected increase of 13.9% (10.9) in MAP between NA/NP and C. This is a total of 39,491 public parking stalls for 89.6 MAP in Alt. C; compared to a total of 35,612 public parking stalls for 78.7 MAP in the NA/NP, and a total of 33,926 public parking stalls for 58.0 MAP in the baseline.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01835-36.

PC01881-36

Comment:

How many passengers does LAWA expect to use the Green Line? Other airport communities have found that passenger usage of train service is difficult to create and that it takes a long time to build confidence in train availability and dependability. When is the Green Line expected to be completed? How is it going to be funded?

Response:

The percent of air passengers forecast to use the Metro Green Line extension was kept conservatively low (5 percent or less) in the technical analysis for the LAX Airport Master Plan. This comment is similar to Comment AL00017-26 regarding funding. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-26. Also, please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail and transit plan for more information.

PC01881-37

Comment:

Other transit methods are mentioned in the EIS/EIR, but no specifics are listed as to location, routes, or capacity. Is LAWA expecting the non-parking passengers to use non-existent transit? How many more parking stalls should there be for this level of MAP? How many cars will be spilling into the surrounding communities searching for parking?

Response:

This comment is similar to comment PC01835-38. See Response to Comment PC01835-38.

PC01881-38

Comment:

Employee parking stalls, however, increase by 111% comparing the NA/NP and baseline to C. This is out of proportion; LAWA has had active ride-sharing, van service, and 9-80 work plans to reduce employee parking needs. Is LAWA planning on discontinuing these efforts? Is there no expectation that employees would utilize the Green Line?

Response:

The parking impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The analysis of employee parking requirements has used somewhat conservative assumptions, although such assumptions are not unique in comparison to other airport master plans in North America. Providing employee vehicle parking still remains a high priority for LAWA. Employee parking forecasts and

impacts for each of the Master Plan Alternatives were discussed in Sections 4.3.1.6.1, 4.3.1.6.2, 4.3.1.6.3 and 4.3.1.6.4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 4.3.1.6 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. With regard to employee travel to and from the airport in high occupancy transport modes, the analysis process incorporated the thinking of many planning agencies and authorities in the forecasting of how such modes would be used in the future. LAWA encourages means to reduce traffic generated by employees and plans to continue these efforts in the future. Reductions in vehicle trips were assumed as a result of the completion of the Green Line; however, historical data from other airports served by rail systems in the United States show, relatively speaking, the mode shift to rail is small and accounts for only a small reduction in vehicle trips.

PC01881-39

Comment:

Airline Administration and Maintenance are almost 76.8% (295 acres) of the total of 384 ancillary acres in the baseline and NA/NP, yet only 25.5% (24 acres) of total acreage in C (94 acres). Airline administration is certainly a usage that could mainly be moved off-airport under the NA/NP.

Response:

The No Action/No Project Alternative envisions no changes to the existing ancillary facilities other than airfield projects that have environmental approval and that are on the airport's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) in addition to some projects classified as maintenance or rebuilding as described in Chapter V, Section 3.3.1.1 of the Master Plan. On the other hand, Alternative C in 2015 shows a reduction in the amount of ancillary space needed. Alternative C could accommodate all of the ancillary support facilities on-airport on 164 acres (87 acres would be allocated to Airline Administration and Maintenance).

Ancillary facilities serve an essential role in maintaining airport and airline operations. The nature of ancillary functions enables support facilities to be sited at various locations on-airport without impeding the service provided. The majority of the Airline Administration and Maintenance space consists of hangars for aircraft maintenance. This function needs to be on-airport in order to serve aircraft.

PC01881-40

Comment:

Land acquisition:

Because both Manchester Square and the Belford Area are listed as vacant and because land acquisition is currently ongoing in those areas, the acreage should be included in both the baseline and NA/NP columns.

Response:

Manchester Square is shown as vacant in the No Action/No Project and Alternative A because under the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP), LAWA will acquire the Airport/Belford and Manchester Square Areas east of and adjacent to the airport. These properties are heavily impacted by noise, traffic and incompatible land uses. Residents in those areas approached the airport and requested that their properties be acquired rather than soundproofed.

The Manchester Square acquisitions are under a pre-existing and independent voluntary land acquisition program and therefore not listed as acreage required for expansion. Should the ANMP land acquisition for the Airport/Belford and Manchester Square areas not be completed by the time the Master Plan is approved, the City of Los Angeles will use the most appropriate and practical measures available (e.g. voluntary acquisition, leasing, and/or public condemnation) to ensure that the designated areas are vacated consistent with the Construction Sequencing Plan. These measures would be available to be used for all of the build alternatives to pursue any needed acquisition that cannot be obtained through negotiations. Manchester Square is not being used for aviation-related uses in the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative A. Manchester Square is proposed to be used for aviation-related uses in Alternative B.

3. Comments and Responses

LAX Northside comprises 340 acres, Westchester Southside 210 acres; the 130-acre difference is due to airfield improvements to the north runway complex resulting in reduced land area available for development in the Westchester Southside plan.

PC01881-41

Comment:

Why is existing Parking lot C not included for remote parking in the baseline and NA/NP columns?

Response:

The 8,147 parking stalls in Parking lot C were included in both the environmental baseline and No Action/No Project Alternative capacities.

PC01881-42

Comment:

The Unconstrained Forecast needs to be defined. On what projections are these figures based? This column does not add any information to the EIS/EIR and seems to be here just to confuse and shock reviewers.

Response:

A discussion of the methodology and data used to develop the unconstrained forecast can be found in the Draft LAX Master Plan, Chapter III. Please see Chapter IV of the Draft LAX Master Plan for a discussion of the unconstrained activity levels and the design day activity levels.

PC01881-43

Comment:

No Action/No Project Alternative (page ES-11) : "...current plans", " . continuation of existing plans. .." and "Improvements that are currently approved, in the planning states, or underway. .." must be completely defined and listed.

On-Airport Surface Transportation (page ES-23): There is no reason measures such as consolidating shuttle services could not be used now at LAX; therefore, the traffic congestion under NA/NP would be much less.

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.

PC01881-44

Comment:

Off-Airport Surface Transportation (page ES-24): Even though there would be more available land for development in the LAX Northside area under NA/NP, it does not have to be as densely developed as the EIS/EIR suggests.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-7 regarding Westchester Southside.

PC01881-45**Comment:**

4.3 SURFACE TRANSPORTATION 4.3.1 Overview On-Airport Surface Transportation, Overview

Key Conclusions, Dispersal of Congested Traffic: Constructing a West Terminal and Ring Road would merely create a new location for the same congestion of traffic. The lack of adequate nearby short and long-term parking would create panic in car drivers, with the distinct possibility that drivers would recirculate the loop looking for parking and/or cars would be abandoned in traffic lanes. The West Terminal and Ring-Road have not been demonstrated to be LAX traffic mitigators.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment PC01835-46. Please see Response to Comment PC01835-46.

PC01881-46**Comment:**

Key Conclusions; Effect of Master Plan Improvements and On- Airport Parking: The number of parking stalls for Alternative C does not seem adequate; while MAP increases by 13.9% (from NA/NP to C), the number of parking stalls increases only 10.9%.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01835-47.

PC01881-47**Comment:**

Key Conclusions, Consolidated Rental Car Facility/Reduced Shuttles: Consolidating rental car facilities could be explored in the existing airport configuration -there are possible areas where cargo buildings have been proposed or in the area bounded by Sepulveda on the east, the Century entrance on the south, the 96th St. exit on the west and north (currently a commercial parking area). The shuttle vans should have been consolidated long ago into a common bus service and could certainly be done now in the NA/NP plan which would lower the trip-generation figures for NA/NP.

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. Also, a new consolidated rental car facility would constitute a new project, and could not occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative. Therefore, a No Action/No Project Alternative with projects such as a new consolidated rental car facility was not evaluated.

PC01881-48**Comment:**

4.3.1.2 General Approach and Methodology:

It is unclear what year the on-airport surface transportation analysis was conducted (only "August" is indicated). Technical Report 3a, "On-Airport Ground Transportation Report" was not available on the Internet. It is very difficult to analyze data; some are from 1995, some 1996, and some from 1997.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology and results, in particular Subtopical Response TR-ST-2.2 regarding definition of baseline scenarios and incorporation of local/regional plans and programs.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01881-49

Comment:

4.3.1.2 Roadways and Curbfront:

On what basis was the 25% increase in constant hourly curb demand used to determine the peak hour demand? Table 4.3.1-1, Roadway Capacity and corresponding Free Flow Speeds, indicates the designed capacity, but there is no table showing a comparison between all the alternatives indicating projected traffic.

Response:

The 25 percent figure was used to increase the peak hour demand to account for peaking within the peak hour, as often occurs when the passengers on several large jets exit simultaneously. This figure was used based on past experience at LAX and other airports. A comparison table for project traffic is provided as Table 4.3.1-5 in Section 4.3.1 of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01881-50

Comment:

4.3.1.2 Parking:

The figures here do not seem to correlate to the information in the Executive Summary, Comparison of Alternatives (page ES-10). This needs to be clarified.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment PC01835-51. Please see Response to Comment PC01835-51.

PC01881-51

Comment:

4.3.1.2 Transit Systems:

Given the length of time and cost of this EIS/EIR, a more current survey on LAX air passengers should have been included. The 1993 study is 8 years out of date.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology, in particular Subtopical Response TR-ST-2.2 regarding the definition of baseline scenarios and incorporation of local/regional plans and programs. A discussion of the conditions under an updated baseline scenario was included in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01881-52

Comment:

4.3.1.2 Pedestrians/Inter-Terminal Circulation:

An automated people mover system should have been installed years ago and certainly could be done with the present airport configuration.

Response:

A people mover system has been evaluated in the past, but to retrofit the existing terminals with a new people mover would be cost-prohibitive. It is much more cost-effective and would result in less impacts to the existing terminal operations to continue operating a shuttle service.

PC01881-53**Comment:****4.3.1.3 Affected Environment/Environmental Baseline:**

Central Terminal Area congestion could be alleviated now by emphasizing systems such as the Van Nuys FlyAway, with the added advantage of remote baggage check-in. This feature would greatly enhance the attractiveness of transit systems. It is noted that CTA traffic is compounded by passengers being dropped off and picked up by a non-passenger (making two trips into the airport). If curbside check in and baggage return were faster and more efficient, there would be less congestion in front of terminals.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01835-54.

PC01881-54**Comment:****4.3.1.6 Environmental Consequences, 4.3.1.6.1 No Action/No Project Roadways**

There could be more improvement in timing of traffic lights, both on and off airport. Signage could be greatly improved. As people approach the airport, they need to have more information about what lanes to be in and the locations of airlines. Several people have commented that the pylons of color along Century leading into LAX may be attractive, but they do not provide airport information -and that is what drivers entering the CTA want.

Since airlines wish to increase air traffic, they should be encouraged to stagger arrivals and departures, thus alleviating peak travel hours with the present airport configuration.

Response:

Staggering of airplane arrivals and departures is already assumed in the analysis, as described in Technical Report 3a. Coordination of traffic signals is an important part of the mitigation program for LAX, with both ATSAC and ATCS signal control systems being recommended. Signage plans would be developed during the design stage after the LAX Master Plan is approved. Please also see Response to Comment PC01835-55.

PC01881-55**Comment:****Curbfront**

Much of the congestion is due to slow baggage check in for departing passengers and much slower baggage delivery for arriving passengers. Why was improving these services not explored? While this is mainly an airline responsibility, was any kind of incentive/ standard/fee system explored for getting them to improve?

Was any consideration given to triple-decking the existing CTA? If not, why not?

Remote baggage check in for new transit systems (similar to the Van Nuys FlyAway) would also alleviate curbside congestion and could be done with the existing LAX configuration. What systems were examined, in what locations. If none were, why not? New approaches to transit could and would reduce curbside and CTA congestion and reduce trip generation.

Will you construct Flyaway locations throughout the region? If so, where will they be located? Will you be able to purchase airline tickets at those location? Will you be able to check your luggage at those locations? Would there be adequate parking at these locations? Remember, it took a long time before

3. Comments and Responses

the Van Nuys Flyaway became a profitable service. Wouldn't this type of a program,(Flyaway locations, construction, parking, financing) markedly reduce surface traffic at LAX? Why not develop a downtown LAX remote check in system?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01835-54 regarding baggage check-in. Also, triple-decking the existing CTA was not considered due to capacity limitations of the on-ramps and off-ramps entering and exiting the CTA. The alternatives studied reduce the demand on the CTA roads and curbs by spreading the traffic to the proposed new West Terminal, or to the Ground Transportation Center (GTC) in Alternative D.

Remote check-in locations such as the Van Nuys FlyAway were given emphasis within the LAX Master Plan Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01881-56

Comment:

Public Parking: The NA/NP parking would be adequate especially by adding parking structures to increase capacity in locations such as Lot C. Was this considered in the EIS/EIR? If not, why not?

Response:

New parking structures were included in the project alternatives. By definition, any new parking structures would constitute a project, and could not occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative. Therefore, a No Action/No Project Alternative with projects such as new parking structures was not evaluated.

PC01881-57

Comment:

Employee Parking (Table 4.3.1-8)

The number of daily employees in Table 4.3.1-8 is listed as 60,400 for NA/NP and for all three build alternatives for 2005. The daily employees for 2015 for NA/NP and all three build alternatives is listed as 71,360. These figures appear to be grossly inflated for NA/NP.

According to Table 4.3.1-8, under the Environmental Baseline there were 51,700 employees and 8,990 parking spaces and the capacity met the demand.

Compared to the baseline, for NA/NP and all three build alternatives, 60,400 employees are projected for 2005 an increase of 16.82%. However, the projected number of needed parking spaces increases by 26.52%.

Compared to the baseline, for NA/NP and all three build alternatives, 71,360 employees are projected for 2015 an increase of 38.02%. However, the projected number of needed parking spaces increases by 58.67%.

This is completely out of proportion; LAWA has had active ride-sharing, van service, and 9-80 work plan to reduce employee parking needs. Why is there an apparent expectation that the new employees would not participate in these programs? Is LAWA planning on discontinuing these efforts? Is there no expectation that employees would use the Green Line? Is there any consideration of adding parking structures to employee parking lots? If not, why not?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01835-58.

PC01881-58

Comment:

Consistency with Adopted Plans: Specify what transportation plans were reviewed and include what are the adopted or revised dates of the plans and the agencies responsible for the plans. List what and how components of the three build alternatives and NA/NP comply and which components do not comply with these plans.

Response:

Consistency with regional and local transportation plans was presented in Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, pages 4-305 (Alternative A), 4-311 (Alternative B), and 4-317 (Alternative C). As stated, no component of any project alternative conflicts with the plans. Some of the plans need to be updated, however, to reflect current and future traffic conditions. The analysis for Alternative D, summarized in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, was identical.

PC01881-59

Comment:

4.3.1.7 Construction Impacts

4.3.1.7.1 No Action/No Project Alternative: As noted, whatever construction that would take place in LAX Northside and Continental City would have little impact on the CTA. Also, the construction deliveries could be scheduled for non-peak traffic hours and, especially for Continental City, some construction could take place at night. There is no requirement that either of these sites be fully or densely developed; in fact, there is a golden opportunity to create open space and green belt areas at these sites.

4.3.1.7.2 Alternatives A, B, and C: Continental City does not seem to be slated for much development in Alternative C, but there could be as much commercial development at that site in the build alternatives as is noted for NA/NP. Therefore, construction impacts from development at Continental City should be the same for A, B, C, and NA/NP. Actual construction traffic always has far more than a minimal effect (e.g., traffic at Lincoln and Jefferson due to construction at Playa Vista).

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR analyzed impacts for the build alternatives. It did not analyze impacts of the No Action/No Project Alternative, which is the only alternative that includes the LAX Northside and Continental City developments. The impacts of both of those projects were determined in prior environmental studies.

Construction impacts from the Continental City site were fully analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR for Alternatives A, B, and C, and in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for Alternative D.

PC01881-60

Comment:

4.3.2 Off-Airport Surface Transportation

Overview

Key Conclusions:

The intersections that would be heavily impacted by the ring road were not included in the analyses for the build alternatives; therefore, the EIS/EIR is inadequate and incomplete. The statement: "In Fact, in many cases, airport-related traffic impacts would be reduced on off-airport streets and freeways compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative in 2015" is not substantiated due to this lack of data on traffic loads on streets such as Vista del Mar, Imperial Highway, Main St, Pershing, Culver Blvd, Jefferson Blvd, Falmouth Ave, Loyola Blvd., and intersections such as: Vista del Mar/Rosecrans, Vista del Mar/Grand Ave, Vista del Mar/Pershing, Main/Imperial, Pershing/Nicholson, Vista del Mar/Culver

3. Comments and Responses

Blvd, Culver Blvd/Jefferson, Manchester/Falmouth, Loyola/Lincoln. Without complete traffic figures for these streets and intersections, the potential environmental impact to the coast, beaches, recreational areas, wetlands, and Blue Butterfly Preserve can not be determined.

Response:

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

PC01881-61

Comment:

Projected Growth: Claims of great economic benefits for the whole Los Angeles region are made based on growth of passenger and cargo traffic at LAX. This growth leads to regional population growth yet LAWA wishes to take no responsibility for the tangential traffic, noise, and air pollution due to that growth. If these related environmental and health burdens are not to be attributed to LAX growth, then the broad claims of economic benefit are null and void.

Response:

The environmental consequences associated with each of the expansion alternatives (Alternatives A, B, and C) were addressed throughout Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR. 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 comprehensive analysis of Alternative D and was circulated for public review and comment.

PC01881-62

Comment:

Vehicle Trip Generation: The unnumbered graph shown in this section blatantly states that the trip generation figures inflate the NA/NP column due to more extensive LAX Northside development. The amount of development in LAX Northside is entirely within LAWA's and the City of Los Angeles' control. There is no need for high density commercial development at this site. There would be no undue economic burden to LAWA or Los Angeles if this site would be low-density development geared towards businesses that could generate off-peak hour traffic. The vehicle trip generation attributed to NA/NP is inflated and the EIS/EIR assumptions are erroneous and must be corrected.

Vehicle Trips: Alternative C is projected to accommodate lower passenger activity levels during the peak commuter hours. However, this would depend largely on the airlines' cooperation. The EIS/EIR does not seem to include any agreements/incentives/ requirements for the airlines to limit flight schedules. How would this lower passenger activity be achieved without airline cooperation?

Congestion: Because the streets and intersections noted above that would be seriously impacted by the ring road were not included in the EIS/EIR traffic study, all the claims for reducing traffic on arterial streets and improvement of LOS F intersections are unsubstantiated and must be reconfigured. Also the effect of LAX traffic was not carried out to a large enough area in the surrounding communities. This also must be corrected.

Response:

The airlines' response to the future conditions was estimated in the analysis, with the airlines' oversight and concurrence. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-7 regarding Westchester Southside, and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding trip generation and study areas.

PC01881-63**Comment:**

Environmental Action Plan

Design/Planning:

The proposed expressway would cause undue environmental, economic, and historical burdens on the Osage area of Westchester. Since SCAG has not included this in the planning for the area, funding would have to come from other sources. Is LAWA prepared to fully fund this? How could airport funds be used to create a roadway that could and would be used by other than airport-related traffic? Rather than relieve traffic for the airport, it seems to be an attempt at traffic mitigation for the Howard Hughes Center and Playa Vista. The incomplete and inadequate information about the potential hazards and traffic impacts of the ring road have not been addressed in the EIS/EIR.

Mitigation Measures: The two Intelligent Transportation System Mitigation Measures (an Adaptive Traffic Control System, and Automated traffic Surveillance and Control) could be (and should have been) installed with the present airport configuration.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. The LAX Master Plan proposes to provide major investments that would greatly improve operations on the freeway system. These proposed improvements would receive airport funding only if the LAX Master Plan is approved. Also, protecting neighborhoods is one of the four principles guiding the development of the Ground Access Plan. The Neighborhood Protection program is summarized in Topical Response TR-ST-2. The Ring Road would be reviewed in additional detail in a future project-level EIS/EIR that would be prepared for that project after approval of this program-level Draft EIS/EIR. As described in Subtopical Response TR-ST-4.3, LAWA has been prohibited by federal law from implementing the ATCS and ATSAC mitigation measures. Adoption of the LAX Master Plan would make it possible for LAWA to contribute to improvements such as those referenced in the comment.

PC01881-64**Comment:**

Pedestrian/Inter-Terminal Circulation:

A pedestrian conveyance system could and should be added to the present airport configuration.

Response:

This comment is identical to comment PC01835-59. Please see Response to Comment PC01835-59.

PC01881-65**Comment:**

4.3.1.6 Environmental Consequences; 4.3.1.6.4 Alternative C:

The numbers used in tables for number of passengers and parking spaces are exaggerated for NA/NP and grossly underestimated for all the build alternatives. The estimates of curbfront congestion are far too high for NA/NP and far too low for the build alternatives. The economic and environmental burdens and LOS impact for the West Terminal and Ring Road are enormously underestimated. They must be revised.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment PC00248-3. Please see Response to Comment PC00248-3. Also, the curbfront analysis and economic and environmental analyses of the west terminal and ring road

3. Comments and Responses

were fully detailed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.3.1.6. Please note that Alternative D does not include the Ring Road.

PC01881-66

Comment:

Roadways

All the traffic and transportation computations and forecasts must be redone to reflect the corrected number of employee trips for NA/NP and corrected parking impact for the build alternatives.

Response:

The employee trips and parking impacts are correct, as explained in Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.3, Surface Transportation.

PC01881-67

Comment:

The assumption is made that the Green Line extension would be in place by 2015. However, there is no information given as to how this would be accomplished. Would LAWA fund it? What process would be required to obtain state authorizations? Is all of the extension planned on airport property?

Response:

The extension would be both on airport property and within the right of way of Imperial Highway. Please note that Alternative D would connect the people mover to the Green Line without a Green Line extension. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-26 regarding funding. Also see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail and transit plan for more information.

PC01881-68

Comment:

What trip numbers were used to arrive at the LOS levels given in Table 4.3.1-5? Why are so few intersections listed? The airport traffic impacts a very large part of the area, especially in Westchester, Inglewood, and El Segundo.

The ring road and West Terminal would create LOS F at many Playa del Rey intersections. Why is this not evaluated?

Response:

This comment is similar to comment PC01835-63. Please see Response to Comment PC01835-63.

PC01881-69

Comment:

Public Parking (Table 4.3.1-7)

The NA/NP and all three build alternatives are listed as having the same number of Originating Daily Passengers (84,847) for 2005, which is too high for NA/NP.

However, even though NA/NP and Alternates A, B, and C all have the same number of Originating Daily Passengers for 2005, the Daily Demand for NA/NP is listed as 29,600 vs. 29,288 for A, B, and C-yet the main change in demand for spaces seems to be the Green Line, which would not be operational in 2005.

In 2015, the projected number of Originating Daily Passengers for NA/NP is 87,280 and daily demand is 36,600. For A, B, and C, the 2015 projected Originating Daily Passengers number is more than

108,000, yet the daily demand is only 36 spaces more than that of the NA/NP. This is a difference of 24% in passengers and 0.09% in spaces. The assumption is apparently that more than 20,000 people will use the Green Line which would probably not yet be installed: this is blatantly overly optimistic.

Employee Parking

The number of daily employees in Table 4.3.1-8 is listed as 60,400 for NA/NP and for all three build alternatives for 2005. The daily employees for 2015 for NA/NP and all three build alternatives is listed as 71,360. These figures are grossly inflated for NA/NP.

According to Table 4.3.1-8, under the Environmental Baseline there were 51,700 employees and 8,990 parking spaces and the capacity met the demand.

Compared to the baseline, for NA/NP and all three build alternatives, 60,400 employees are projected for 2005 an increase of 16.82%. However, the projected number of needed parking spaces increases by 26.52%.

Compared to the baseline, for NA/NP and all three build alternatives, 71,360 employees are projected for 2015 an increase of 38.02%. However, the projected number of needed parking spaces increases by 58.67%.

Again this is completely out of proportion; LAWA has had active ride-sharing, van service, and 9-80 work plan to reduce employee parking needs. Why is there an apparent expectation that the new employees would not participate in these programs? Is LAWA planning to discontinuing these efforts? Is there no expectation that employees would use the Green Line?

Response:

This comment is similar to comments PC00248-3 and PC01835-58. Please see Response to Comment PC00248-3 regarding No Action/No Project public parking demand. Also, please see Response to Comment PC01835-58 regarding employee parking.

PC01881-70

Comment:

LAX under the No Action/No Project option is projected to serve 78.7 MAP. With 165 gates, this equates to 477,000 passengers/year/gate on average. Currently some gates at LAX serve more than 800,000 passengers/year. If all current gates could handle this passenger volume, LAX would be serving 132 MAP. Granted, the existing roads, runways and support services may not be capable of handling 800,000 passengers/gate/year, and the terminals won't have the space to accommodate these passengers. However, in all options the terminal square footage increases by nearly double or up to 2.5 times the existing square footage. Therefore, with a ring road, remote terminals, rail access, and new gates in larger terminals, LAX is likely to serve close to 800,000 passengers/gate/year. Thus the LAX estimate, under option C, that ONLY 89.6 MAP would or could use LAX is a gross understatement.

Response:

The content of this comment is similar to comment AL00027-5. Please see Response to Comment AL00027-5 regarding the passenger capacity of gates. The ring road, West Terminal, rail access, and additional terminal square footage improve the level of service for the passengers while at and getting to the airport; they do not increase the capacity of the airport. The number of gates and how they are utilized are the constraining factor to the airport.

PC01881-71

Comment:

With no controls on the number of passengers served, LAX will soon exceed 89 MAP just as it has exceeded the 40 MAP estimated in the 1978 EIR. LAX is currently accommodating 50% more passengers than that previous estimate. If allowed to proceed in constructing Alternative C (or A or B) LAX will soon exceed 100 MAP. Therefore, the EIR does not adequately address the transportation

3. Comments and Responses

loads on our streets, nor the pollution loads placed upon our land, water and air. We urge LAX to be more realistic in its estimates and revise the EIR/EIS accordingly.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding the 40 MAP activity level and its relationship to the anticipated activity levels associated with the four Master Plan build alternatives. Alternatives A and B would accommodate the projected demand of 97.9 MAP by 2015. Alternatives C and D would not be able to accommodate the projected 2015 unconstrained demand due to constraints in their facility design. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR accurately evaluated potential environmental impacts associated with projected activity levels.

PC01881-72

Comment:

The impact of the ring road on El Segundo and Westchester/Playa del Rey is not thoroughly examined. The closure of Pershing Drive to north/south traffic will have a significant impact upon the other north/south streets, such as Vista Del Mar, Sepulveda, and Aviation. The ring road will also impact the access to the community from Main St. and California St. It is unclear as to how the Ring Road will provide access to the northern portion of El Segundo.

Response:

Alternatives A, B, and C 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. Alternatives A, B, and C 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.

There would be a grade separation from the Ring Road to Main Street. At this location, it is anticipated that the Ring Road would be below grade, with the extension of Main Street passing overhead. On the north side of the Ring Road, the Main Street extension would curve to the east to provide access to various ancillary facilities on the north side of the Ring Road. Freeway ramps would be provided to and from the east, accommodating westbound Ring Road traffic exiting to Main Street/ancillary facilities, and providing eastbound Ring Road access for Main Street/ancillary facilities. All new construction would take place north of the existing southern right-of-way boundary of Imperial Highway. Further design details would be provided during the design process for this project. California Street access would also continue to be provided, although its exact alignment may be altered by the Ring Road. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01881-73

Comment:

Also, the increased pollution and noise from more traffic along Imperial Hgwy. will definitely have significant impacts. This includes the schools and residences along the northern border of El Segundo.

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; traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and impacts to schools in Section 4.27, Schools. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, and 17 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.

PC01881-74**Comment:**

The EIR/EIS does not provide any details as to how the airport will collect and treat the storm water runoff under Alternative C, as is required by National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and the state and local agencies which implement these regulations.

Response:

Please see Section 4.7, Hydrology and Water Quality (subsection 4.7.5), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding Master Plan Commitment HWQ-1, which will be implemented for the selected alternative. Also, please see TR-HWQ-2 for additional information regarding Master Plan Commitment HWQ-1.

PC01881-75**Comment:**

Taking advantage of reduced noise from newer airplanes, i.e. using 1996 as the baseline, is misleading. The noise reduction from these technological advances would be realized anyway. Therefore, the overall noise increase is greater than depicted in the EIR/EIS.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-1 regarding the noise modeling approach, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-1.3 regarding use of 1996 baseline noise levels from which to measure increases associated with proposed alternatives. Also, please see Topical Response TR-GEN-1 regarding baseline issues.

PC01881-76**Comment:**

Why do the 'Design Day Operations' divided into the 'Design Day Passengers'. THERE ARE NUMEROUS INCONSISTENCIES IN THE PROJECTIONS ON PAGES ES 9 AND 3-15

- | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|----------|---|---|---|---|
| a. In the Environmental Baseline = 83.45 passengers instead of 90.76 passengers per departure? | | | | | | | |
| b. In the Unconstrained Forecast = 111.74 | " | " | " 122.98 | " | " | " | ? |
| c. In the No Action/No Project = 115.11 | " | " | " 127.47 | " | " | " | ? |
| d. In alternatives A & B = 120.02 | " | " | " 133.09 | " | " | " | ? |
| e. I alternative C = 128.76 | " | " | " 145.09 | " | " | " | ? |

Response:

The numbers of passengers per departure listed in ES 9 and 3-15 of the Draft EIS/EIR are correct. The passengers per departure ratio isn't taken from the design day total number of operations, but the design day total number of passenger operations. Domestic carrier, commuter and international operations are considered passenger operations. For example, in the No Action/No Project Alternative, the total number of design day operations is 2,279, however the total number of passenger operations is 2,058. The 2,058 design day passenger operations divided into 262,329 design day passengers equals 127.47 passengers per operation. Please see Chapter V, Table V-3.35 of the Draft LAX Master Plan for a listing of design day operations and passengers for the Master Plan Alternatives broken out by type of operation and passenger.

PC01881-77**Comment:**

Why don't 'Design Day Passengers' times 365 days equal:***

- In the Environmental Baseline = 68.07 MAP instead of 58 MAP as stated in the charts?
- In the Unconstrained Forecast = 119.13 MAP instead of 97.9 MAP as stated in the charts?
- In the No Action/No Project = 95.75 MAP instead of 78.7 MAP as stated in the charts?

3. Comments and Responses

d. In alternatives A & B = 119.11 MAP instead of 97.9 MAP as stated in the charts?
e. In alternative C = 108.98 MAP instead of 89.6 MAP as stated in the charts?
(Your Alternative C MAP estimate would be over 145 MAP instead of the 89 MAP if the over 40 MAP capacity percentage were to be followed. Why? It appears your Draft EIS/EIR was created with the idea of advocating Alt. C.)

Response:

Comment noted. The environmental baseline design day schedule and design day passengers are based on a peak month average week day in order to obtain a schedule above the 80th percentile. An average day schedule would not be adequate for planning purposes. The actual annual passengers for the environmental baseline were divided by the design day passengers to obtain a design day to annual passenger ratio. This passenger ratio was then maintained for each group of passengers (air carrier, commuter, Hawaii, and international) in each of the unconstrained forecast design day passenger levels. Each of the Master Plan alternatives used the unconstrained forecast passenger ratios to develop peak month average design day schedule passengers rather than an average day schedule, which could be found by taking the annual passengers and dividing it by the days in a year. Please see Response to Comment AL00008-12 regarding the passenger limit of Alternative C. Please also see Response to Comment PC01874-4 regarding the selection of a design day schedule.

PC01881-78

Comment:

Why don't the total MAPs for the year divided by 365 days***
a. In the Environmental Baseline =158,904 instead table 3-2 figure of 186,512 passengers per day?
b. In the Unconstrained Forecast =268,219 instead table 3-2 figure of 326,329 passengers per day?
c. In the No Action/No Project =215,616 instead table 3-2 figure of 262,329 passengers per day?
d. In Alternatives A & B =268,219 instead table 3-2 figure of 326,329 passengers per day?
e. In Alternative C =245,479 instead table 3-2 figure of 298,588 passengers per day?

Response:

The content of this comment is similar to comment PC01881-77. Please see Response to Comment PC01881-77 regarding the design day to annual passenger ratio.

PC01881-79

Comment:

Why don't the Total Annual Aircraft Operations divided by 365 days
a. In the Environmental Baseline = 2093 Design Day Operations instead of 2235?
b. In the Unconstrained Forecast = 2752 Design Day Operations instead of 2921?
c. In the No Action/No Project = 2146 Design Day Operations instead of 2279?
d. In Alternatives A & B = 2562 Design Day Operations instead of 2719?
e. In Alternative C = 2184 Design Day Operations instead of 2319?

Response:

The environmental baseline design day schedule was developed based on a peak month average week day in order to obtain a schedule above the 80th percentile. An average day schedule would not be adequate for planning purposes because it would indicate that the schedule is not very peaked. The actual annual operations for the environmental baseline were divided by the number of design day operations to obtain a design day to annual operations ratio. This operations ratio was then maintained for each type of operation (air carrier, commuter, Hawaii, international, cargo and general aviation) in each of the unconstrained forecast design day operational levels. Each of the Master Plan alternatives used the unconstrained forecast operations ratios to develop a peak month average design day schedule rather than an average day schedule, which could be found by taking the annual operations and dividing it by the days in a year.

PC01881-80

Comment:

Why don't Design Day Operations times 365 days

- a. In the Environmental Baseline = 815,775 Total Annual Operations instead of 763,866?
- b. In the Unconstrained Forecast = 1,006,165 Total Annual Operations instead of 1,004,591?
- c. In the No Action/No Project = 831,835 Total Annual Operations instead of 783,430?
- d. In Alternatives A & B = 992,435 Total Annual Operations instead of 935,140?
- e. In Alternative C = 846,435 Total Annual Operations instead of 979,249?

The figures are either inaccurate or a different basis was used to summarizing a Design Day Operation from an average day operation. If it is the latter, it would appear to be an intentional deception. At a minimum the Design Day Operation figure should match up with the Design Day Passenger and the passenger per departure figures.

Response:

The content of this comment is similar to comment PC01881-79. Please see Response to Comment PC01881-79 regarding the design day to annual operations ratio.

PC01881-81

Comment:

How do you explain the difference in the number of dwelling units and population between your 1996 quarterly report and you EIS/EIR TABLE 4.1-2 OF OVER 15,000 dwelling units and almost 37000 population,?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-1 regarding noise modeling. Also, please see Section 4.1.3.1.2, Comparison of Caltrans Title 21 CNEL Contours, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01881-82

Comment:

We should be able to take any of the following: 1. MAP, 2. Design Day passengers, 3. Design Day Operations, 4. Total Annual Operations and be able to divide or multiply by 365 to get a consistent answer for each category to match another category. Why wasn't it done so that (EX. if you were multiply 2279 by 365 it would equal 831,835 instead of 783,430) anyone could comprehend the Executive Summary page of Table 3-2?

Response:

The content of this comment is similar to comments PC01881-77 and PC01881-79. Please see comments PC01881-77 and PC01881-79 regarding the use of design day to annual passenger and operation ratios.

PC01881-83

Comment:

Frank Sweeney, from the FAA Control Tower at LAX indicated at a LAX Roundtable meeting on December 13, 2000, and May 9, 2001, that LAX has more than 2200 average operations a day in 1999 or 68,200 operations for the month. The LAX Air Traffic Control Tower Traffic Count Worksheets for December 1999 indicated LAX had 2374 average operations a day or 73,594 operations for the month. The Los Angeles World Airports Traffic Comparison (TCOM) for LAX indicates there were 2166 average operations a day for December 67,155 operation for the month. Here are three reliable sources each having a different number of operations for the month of December, 1999. Did the EIS/EIR use any of

3. Comments and Responses

these sources to determine your estimates for number of operations of any of the four alternatives for the LAX Master Plan? Which figures are correct?

Response:

The FAA control tower logs count operations occurring in the airspace adjacent to LAX as well as the airport operations, while LAWA counts only the landing and takeoff operations at the airport. LAX Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT) monthly airport operations, the Official Airline Guide (OAG) published schedule of arrivals and departures, August 1994, the Los Angeles Noise Management Bureau (NMB) [SIC] Do Daily Operations records, August 1994, and LADOA's monthly air traffic operations records by carrier, August 1994 were used to develop the 1994 baseline schedule. For a discussion of the methodology used to develop the baseline, please see Chapter II, Section 2.3.7.1 of the Draft LAX Master Plan. Please see Appendix F of the Draft LAX Master Plan for a discussion of the 1996 baseline airside simulation assumptions and results.

Included in the development of Alternative D, the baseline was updated to reflect the Year 2000. Appendix A of the LAX Master Plan Addendum discusses the differences in activity levels between 1996-1997 and the Year 2000. For the baseline update, ATCT daily activity counts from January through December 2000, Do Daily Operations records, and OAG published schedule of arrivals and departures for August 2000 were used.

PC01881-84

Comment:

It is almost impossible to see what the true impact of the proposals because the EIS/EIR lacks a true environmental baseline for comparison. The dates used do not satisfy the baseline for comparison to be as of the time that the EIS/EIR was submitted. Your baselines, in most part, were outdated at the time you completed the EIS/EIR on Nov. 7, 2000 and released on Jan. 18, 2001.

Response:

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

PC01881-85

Comment:

Air space Gridlock - airspace gridlock is a real and present danger. To enable the public to review the different plans proposed for the LAX Master Plan, the following items need to be fully delineated and cover all runways on all plans for both east-to-west and west-to-east operations:

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, limiting the increase in the number of future operations that might contribute to airspace gridlock. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding the different noise contours, specific flight paths, escape corridors and early turns proposed in the LAX Master Plan.

PC01881-86

Comment:

1. Noise contours. The increase in air traffic will, inevitably, lead to more noise. LAX led the nation in the fight to convert to stage 3 engine aircraft, and this change did reduce the noise temporarily. With the proposed Alternative C and the realignment of runways and increase in air traffic, the noise contours will again expand. What are the noise impacts from realigned and/or new runways in areas such as Lennox? What are the individual noise footprints for each aircraft (as has been done at SFO) would serve to impact areas.

Response:

For information regarding increased noise levels see Topical Response TR-N-6, particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-6.2. As a result of the Stage 2 phase-out there was an improvement in noise impact areas. The impacts on Lennox from Alternative C were identified in detail in Section 6.4, Alternative C-No Additional Runway, in Technical Report 1, Land Use. Noise footprints for a variety of aircraft were identified in Figures 22-26 that are located in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report.

PC01881-87

Comment:

2. Specific flight paths with elevations and rate/angles or accent/decent. Of special concern are the approach and take-off flight paths for the proposed new runways. For instance, approach/take-off paths for the commuter runway proposed in Concept 1(now alt A) adjacent to Playa del Rey residential area would be low over Westchester/ Playa del Rey. How would these lower flight paths affect contiguous jurisdictions?

Response:

The new 6,700-foot runway in Alternative A is proposed to accommodate arrival operations (not departures). Departing flights will use the existing runways. Thus, the departure impacts to Westchester/Playa del Rey would be similar to what is experienced today. During instrument conditions, arrivals to the proposed runway would execute a standard instrument approach, which may be an ILS or LDA. During visual weather conditions, the aircraft may execute a visual approach, whereby the pilot having received an air traffic control clearance, navigates to the airport visually. This visual maneuver would be defined in a graphic presentation such as the Stadium Visual RWY 24L/R that is employed today. The procedure, when developed, will conform to all applicable Federal Air Regulations and LAWA noise abatement procedures which require aircraft to remain at or above, 3,500 feet Mean Sea Level (MSL) and to turn base leg east of the Harbor Freeway and to turn final above 2,000 feet MSL and east of Hollywood Park Race Track.

PC01881-88

Comment:

3. Escape corridors. Escape paths for aborted landings or take offs may have to go over residential areas. These paths must be clearly defined for all conceivable conditions.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01881-21.

PC01881-89

Comment:

4. Early turns. There continues to be numerous early turns, primarily by commuter aircraft, especially on the south side of the airport. The commuter airline runway being proposed for the north side of the airport in three of the four concepts would be located very close to the Playa del Rey residential area. Therefore, early turns must be addressed as part of the discussion on the plans.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2 regarding early turns over areas north and south of the airport.

PC01881-90

Comment:

We have many additional questions and comments pertaining to the Draft EIS/EIR. Some of these questions might be answered in the full document. We were unable to find the answers for what-ever

3. Comments and Responses

the reason. Please do not respond to a comment or question by just saying it is in the Draft EIS/EIR. Please give as much information as possible, i.e., volume number, page number, etc.

Response:

Comment noted. Responses to comments provided on the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR are individually tailored to address the issue(s) raised in the comment, including necessary information and analysis.

PC01881-91

Comment:

Although the EIS/EIR answers many questions about the proposed expansion. It also avoids the necessary information to acquire a substantial understanding of the particulars of the expansion.

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.

PC01881-92

Comment:

The following is a direct quote from page 55 of the 4.1 noise element of the EIS/EIR LAX Master plan web site. However it is page 4-71 of the hard copy. This is not an isolated case of confusing page numbers.

"By 2015, Alternative C would relocate Runway 6R/24L northward by 500 feet from its current centerline. Other redevelopment plans call for a southward shift in the centerline of Runway 7R/25L by 50 feet. Existing Runway 7L/25R would not be relocated. To continue the noise abatement techniques assumed for the year 2005, new/replacement procedures are assumed for westerly departures from each relocated runway end to ensure that aircraft reach the coastline before making turns. No additional operational measures that would reduce noise levels while maintaining operational efficiency were found."

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01881-93

Comment:

Pages D-318, 4-71

We found two instances where it stated that "by 2015, Alternative C would relocate Runway 6R/24L northward by 500 feet from its current centerline." just as it stated in the first line of the above paragraph. (This must be a mistake. but..) Please explain this inconsistency with other parts of the Draft EIS/EIR.

Response:

The typographical error is noted. In response, Section 4.1, Noise, of the Final EIS/EIR incorporates the corrected text and Appendix F-C, Errata to the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, of this Final EIS/EIR reflects the correct information for Appendix D.

PC01881-94

Comment:

Page ES 23 line 11-
Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significantly' as it is used in this section.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01835-10 regarding an explanation of thresholds of significance and where thresholds of significance were identified in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01881-95

Comment:

Page ES-25 First Paragraph under Employment/Socio-economics. Why is it that every economic analysis of the importance of LAX neglects to include in the analysis the negative economic impacts of LAX? It must include the negative economic impacts in order for it to be a more accurate report.

Response:

As was discussed in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics (subsection 4.4.1.2), and Technical Report 5, Economic Impacts Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR, the economic impact analysis was based on computerized econometric models that account for the complexities of the economic interactions between LAX and the regional economy over time. Analysis using the models was supplemented with a wide range of data assembled from historical records, surveys, and interviews in order to establish statistical economic relationships. Certain economic effects which could be construed as negative, such as productivity increases (which in turn cause employment decline) were taken into account in the modeling process. Other negative impacts, such as the need for relocation of local residents and businesses and associated effects on employment and tax revenues, were addressed in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Since 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. Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics (subsection 4.4.1.6), therein acknowledged that implementation of Alternative D would result in net job loss and substantially less economic growth than the other build alternatives.

PC01881-96

Comment:

Page ES-26 "Over 2500 houses and apartments in the Manchester Square and Belford residential areas may be acquired..... " No Action/No project and Alternative A MAPs show that land as vacant. Many of those residences may not be acquired. What then?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02401-106 regarding land acquisition in the Manchester Square and Airport/Belford Areas.

PC01881-97

Comment:

Page ES-27 The 'Acquisition and Relocation Overview Comparing the Alternatives'

3. Comments and Responses

First, the No Action/No Project alternative is not listed. Second, The Alternative C dwelling units list that number as 84 whereas the total number of dwelling units in Alternative C on page ES-10 combines 57 single dwelling units with 89 multifamily dwelling units for a combined amount of 146. Why the discrepancy?

Response:

The omission of the No Action/No Project Alternative in the above-referenced table on page ES-27 in the Draft EIS/EIR is noted. The indication that Alternative C would result in the acquisition of 89 multifamily dwelling units, as listed in the table entitled "Summary of Features Comparison of Alternatives" on page ES-10 of the Draft EIS/EIR is incorrect. The correct number of units is 27, similar to Alternatives A and B. The subject correction has been incorporated into the Executive Summary of the Final EIS/EIR. Furthermore, the correct number of units were indicated in the analysis of acquisition impacts associated with Alternative C provided in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01881-98

Comment:

Page ES-28 First paragraph.

Why wait until after the fact to fully inform those people to be relocated? Should they be informed before the fact of any of the alternatives?

Response:

Until such time as the LAX Master Plan is approved, the plan is considered a proposal that may or may not ultimately be developed. With four different build alternatives that could potentially be constructed, acquisition impacts would vary widely. For example, LAWA staff's new preferred alternative, Alternative D, involves the acquisition of far fewer businesses than the other alternatives and does not involve the acquisition of any residences.

PC01881-99

Comment:

Page ES-28 Environmental Justice -

Public Involvement - Why wasn't the LAX Area Advisory Committee, an official advisory body to Lax, included in the participation process?

Page ES-29 Same question for the Environmental Justice Task Force?

Response:

As further described in Topical Response TR-EJ-2, the public outreach program for environmental justice focused on outreach in minority and low-income communities, to inform residents and community representatives of the LAX Master Plan, the potential impacts associated with its implementation, and to gain input regarding possible mitigation measures and off-setting benefits. The primary effort involved a series of environmental justice workshops that were held during the public circulation periods for the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. These workshops were widely noticed to engage the input of potentially effected residents. There was no intention to exclude members of the LAX Area Advisory Committee from the public participation process. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 for information about the public involvement efforts undertaken by LAWA.

PC01881-100

Comment:

Page ES-31 - On-Airport Emissions

"Under any of the alternatives, the three Master Plan alternatives and the No Action/No Project Alternative, activity levels would increase due to the projected increased demand for aviation services and the resulting increased activity at the airport."

Page ES-31 Environmental Action Plan (same page):

"The three Master Plan build alternatives include features that would substantially(Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'substantially' as it is used in this section.) reduce potential air pollutant emissions due to increased airport activity levels." Please explain how activity increased levels would result in reduced emissions.

Response:

The long-term potential emissions from on-airport operations associated with any of the build alternatives would, in general, be less than those associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative. This is due to the design improvements of the build alternatives which would decrease delays and congestion both on the airfield and on airport and nearby roadways, promoting reduced emissions when compared to not making the improvements (the No Action/No Project Alternative). Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding increased air pollution. 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. Air quality impacts associated with Alternative D were provided in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01881-101

Comment:

Page ES-32: Some methods to control emissions from sources within LAWA' S control include nine items that could be implemented regardless of which of the four alternatives may be implemented. Is that true?

One of the methods states, "Create incentives for airlines to replace older aircraft engines with cleaner ones." This is a wonderful idea. How will it be done?? Preface page 1 - ".....individual airlines have been responsible for determining which airports and routes to serve." "Under federal law, neither Los Angeles City nor the State of California may restrict the operation of most commercial aircraft without FAA approval." How are you going to do it?

Response:

The USEPA sets aircraft emission standards for all US-generated aircraft. In addition, the international civil aviation organization maintains an additional set of emission standards for aircraft based in other countries. The standards are based on model years and type of aircraft and become more stringent with each future year's model. The standards apply to the following pollutants: carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, oxides of nitrogen, and smoke. Neither LAWA nor FAA has any direct control over aircraft engine standards.

See Appendix S-E of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a detailed aircraft emission analysis. For additional information, see EPA's fact sheet for aircraft engines: <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/regs/nonroad/aviation/aircr-fr.pdf>.

There are currently no specific incentives in place to encourage airlines to replace older aircraft. Airlines gradually replace older aircraft with newer models meeting the latest federal and international emission standards.

PC01881-102

Comment:

ES Preface - Page 2 - "The Draft EIS/EIR is an overall program-level document, and is intended to serve as the environmental document for all actions associated with the LAX Master Plan development."

3. Comments and Responses

The EIS/EIR fails to comply with the cornerstone element of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) -that an EIS/EIR must describe a reasonable range of alternatives that would feasibly meet objectives, but would avoid or lessen significant effects of the project. In terms of ability to reduce significant effects for key impact categories such as noise, land use, environmental justice, and air quality, there is no substantive difference among the alternatives. The stated project identifies only three expansion alternatives for the Master Plan which is unusually limited for a project of this scale. The objectives omit any mention of environmental goals, such as enhanced access, or improved quality of life.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding the range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Response to Comment AL00022-3 regarding the comparative impacts of the Master Plan build alternatives and environmental goals of the Master Plan.

PC01881-103

Comment:

Most significantly, the preferred Project Alternative C has more significant unavoidable adverse effects than either of the other two Alternatives, yet fails to meet the projected demand, as do the other Alternatives. In effect, LAWA is recommending approval of the alternative that would cause the greatest number of serious impacts, while meeting the fewest number of project objectives. A full discussion of how and why Alternative C became the preferred alternative, recognizing that it offers fewer benefits than the remaining alternatives without any substantive reduction in adverse impacts, is necessary to justify its utility as the Preferred Project Alternative.

Response:

This comment is identical to comment AL00022-4; please see Response to Comment AL00022-4.

PC01881-104

Comment:

ES Preface- Page 2 - " LAX is bordered by the community of Westchester.. . . . " How can you be bordered by a community of which you are a part?

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01881-105

Comment:

ES Preface - Page 5 - "These were completed in the anticipation of the 1984 Summer Olympics in Los Angeles and were the last major improvements undertaken at LAX?" How did LAX grow to 67.6 MAP if the cumulative improvements didn't allow it past 40 MAP? Please list the minor improvements that took place to allow this growth.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-121 regarding the mitigation of impacts to the community from activities at LAX, and Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding growth in activity levels at LAX.

PC01881-106

Comment:

ES Preface Page 6 - "The LAX Master Plan and EIS/EIR Study was initiated by the Board of Airport Commissioner in 1995. " Doesn't the law require you to have an EIR before any expansion takes place? What happened between 1986 when 40 MAP was reached and 1995 when LAX assumed the work for the Draft EIS/EIR?

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding growth in activity levels at LAX and Response to Comment AL00018-19 regarding LAWA's assessment of the project's impacts in conjunction with past, present, and probable future projects in the area.

PC01881-107

Comment:

Why did it take five+ years for your consultants to complete the documents? How accurate is the information in the documents if many of your base years are five years old?

Response:

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

PC01881-108

Comment:

Appendix D. Aircraft Noise Technical Report

"At LAX, noise berms or walls would be largely ineffective for attenuation of aircraft overflight noise. However, given the location of the residential areas immediately adjacent to the runways in El Segundo, and to a lesser extent to the north in Westchester, noise walls or berms may be effective at reducing noise from ground operations and from aircraft takeoff roll. Because noise levels at LAX are so dominated by the noise of aircraft in flight, the reductions of ground noise single-events by berms is not considered effective for noise abatement." [Refer above]

LAWA should not eliminate berms as a tool to reduce noise. Didn't the berms and wall built on 88th street west of Emerson Ave. reduce the noise equivalent to the houses that were removed between the residences and the old LAX boundaries?

Response:

Comment noted. The Westchester Wall was built prior to 1980, and is as effective today as it was when it was built. It attenuates only the first two rows of houses inside the wall - the same amount of houses that were removed as stated by the commentor. The LAX Part 150 took into account existing barriers (on the north) and focused its recommendations on the evaluation of benefits and costs associated with barriers on the south along Imperial Hwy. Funding from the FAA and LAWA was used to perform these evaluations from 1991-93. Based on these studies, the City of El Segundo decided that the placement of sound barriers would not provide the desired and needed sound attenuation benefit to its communities and recommended termination of the sound barrier efforts in September 1993. 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.

PC01881-109

Comment:

7.2.1 No Action/No Project Alternative

"Several noise abatement actions are expected to be put in place during the next decade, regardless of the disposition of the master plan alternatives. [What specific noise abatement actions?] These include the continuation of existing procedures and the development of additional measures that carry forward the intent of current procedures, although applied to other runways. [Are there any other noise abatement actions expected?]

Response:

A list of potential noise abatement methods was provided in Section 4.1, Noise (particularly subsection 4.1.8), of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, and in Section 7.0 (particularly subsection 7.2) in Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR. The sections referenced above discuss the feasibility of the various methods and propose several measures for adoption with implementation of

3. Comments and Responses

each alternative. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement.

PC01881-110

Comment:

Current mitigating flight and air traffic control procedures include mandated over-ocean operation of aircraft arrivals and aircraft departures during the sensitive late night hours from 11 :00 PM to 6:30 AM;" (Shouldn't the time be from 12:00 AM to 6:30 AM?) preferred use of inboard runways at night between the hours of 10:00 PM to 7 :00 AM; and aircraft climb-out on runway headings after departure to the west until beyond the coastline before turning on course to their destinations.

Response:

The commentor is correct in that the time of application for over-ocean procedures is midnight to 6:30 a.m. which is stated on page 4-37 of the Draft EIS/EIR; however, these procedures are not mandatory. They are generally used when practicable, but not at the expense of safety. LAWA will be pursuing Federal approval of a restriction to alleviate that situation by making over-ocean procedures mandatory when they are in effect between midnight and 6:30 a.m. Please see Mitigation Measure MM-N-5. For further information on this topic, please see Topical Response TR-N-7.

PC01881-111

Comment:

These current operational mitigation actions will continue and have been incorporated into the assessments of noise contours and location analyses presented in this EIR/EIS. [Is our assumption correct that the FAA and not LAWA, is going to enforce these measures? How do we ensure the FAA will enforce these rules and regulations?]

Response:

The operational mitigation actions establish a set of preferred operating conditions, each of which is subject to a variety of exceptions. FAA has the responsibility to use the procedures it has agreed to accept, subject to safety and operational efficiency. Unless otherwise specified as to how compliance will be improved, the present levels of compliance are used for future noise modeling. Please see Section 7, Noise Mitigation, of Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR, which describes this process in greater detail. 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 SC and Technical Report S-1.

PC01881-112

Comment:

The proposed project includes no noise mitigation recommendations. While LAWA has an ongoing noise mitigation program, it is not clear why the proposed project does not address any new noise mitigation programs. Several are discussed but not recommended.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-5 and TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation. Aircraft noise mitigation was described in Section 4.2.8 of the Draft EIS/EIR beginning on page 4-216. Mitigation measures for road traffic, construction equipment, and automated people mover noise were provided in Section 4.1.8 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR beginning on page 4-78. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR also provided mitigation measures for aircraft noise in Sections 4.1.8 and 4.2.8.

PC01881-113**Comment:**

In addition, the expansion of the sound insulation program to homes within 60 CNEL contour should be given consideration. Because community concerns about the impact of aircraft noise goes so far beyond the boundary of the 65 CNEL contour, consideration of expanding the program should be given a thorough evaluation in the EIS/EIR. Such a program may not qualify for traditional Federal funding but other opportunities may exist.

Response:

Comment noted. Refer to Topical Response TR-N-2, Subtopical Response TR-N-2.2, regarding why the expansion of the ANMP under the LAX Master Plan would not be extended to include the 60 CNEL. As stated in that response, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included an analysis of single event noise levels that may result in nighttime awakenings. As stated in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.8), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the ANMP would be revised to include areas newly exposed to these noise levels (defined by the 94 dBA SEL noise contour).

PC01881-114**Comment:**

Operating procedures are continually reviewed in light of changing technology to identify opportunities for improvement. Use of definitive departure procedures, which specify climb gradients and power settings are precluded by federal action in the establishment of AC-91-53A noise abatement departure procedures, are already incorporated into the noise model. (Is our assumption correct that the FAA and not LAWA, is going to enforce these measures?) What do the citizens do if the FAA doesn't enforce these procedures?(They have a history of doing that on occasion.)

Response:

Operating procedures used by airlines are reviewed by the FAA for safety, but are not reviewed on an operation by operation basis to assure compliance with specific procedural techniques. The operation of any aircraft is ultimately in the hands of its pilot and that pilot has the mandate to maintain safe operation above all other considerations. The FAA will not enforce specific operating procedures. To change this policy, citizens would have to petition Congress, which would then have to assume liability for the safety of the operation. See Topical Response TR-N-3, particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-3.7 regarding SNA departure procedures and Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement

PC01881-115**Comment:**

"As part of its good neighbor policy, the Airport, in conjunction with the FAA and the airlines, formed the Southern California Task Force in 1998 to address the impacts of current airport operations on the community and to work with community representatives to develop and implement new air traffic control procedures to further mitigate aircraft overflights. A key element of the Task Force effort, the LAX Fly Quiet Program, was aimed at delineating LAX specific procedures and creating an awareness about these flight mitigation procedures with the pilots and air traffic controllers who implement them in day-to-day operations at LAX."

While air traffic actions that might accomplish mitigation of the 65 CNEL noise impacts associated with the full development of the alternatives are limited in close proximity to the airport, new procedures implemented under the LAX Fly Quiet Program-include the following:

".To eliminate the impacts of early turns of departing aircraft over El Segundo and Playa Del Rey, a new "Angel 2" departure procedure for jet aircraft leaving LAX to the west was implemented. This is a very accurate departure route over the ocean that allows pilots with new computer technology in their aircraft to precisely follow the procedure and avoid early turns over El Segundo and Playa del Rey."

3. Comments and Responses

As you are reading this comment today there will be aircraft flying over El Segundo and Playa del Rey. How can this take place if it is such an accurate departure system? Are the pilots and/or the air traffic controllers not observing the LAX Fly Quiet Program and the new "Angel 2" departure procedures? What happens to the pilot and/or the air traffic controller that violate the Fly Quiet Program? How will LAX be able to control the Fly Quiet Program if it is under the jurisdiction of the FAA? How effective will the Fly Quiet Program be in Alt. A, Alt B, or Alt. C and the No/action/No Project proposals? The aircraft must have the new 'computer technology' for this to be effective. How many aircraft that use the "Angel 2" departure procedure have the new computer technology and how many use it?

Response:

The LAX Fly Quiet Program as referenced in the Draft EIS/EIR was to "delineate LAX specific procedures and create an awareness about these flight mitigation procedures with the pilots and air traffic controllers who implement them in day-to-day operations at LAX. The nuclei of the LAX Fly Quiet Program are the procedures contained in the Aircraft Noise Abatement Operating Procedures and Restrictions which is a set of informal noise abatement, flight and runway use procedures. Beyond the requirements of the Aircraft Noise Abatement Operating Procedures and Restrictions, efforts were undertaken to develop new departure procedures using the FMS and RNAV technology to more precisely position aircraft offshore. The Angel 2 departure was developed to meet this goal. Larger jets such as the Boeing 737-500, 737-700, the 757 and Airbus series of aircraft are equipped with FMS technology, while most propeller-driven aircraft are not yet so equipped. The Angel 2 procedure was originally developed as a "Special" procedure and only available to airlines that signed up to participate. The Angel 2 was enhanced and ultimately issued as a public procedure eligible for assignment by air traffic control to all aircraft properly equipped. Exact numbers for total operations using the former Angel 2, now the Holtz departure procedure are not kept. See Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2 regarding early turns over areas north and south of LAX. In addition see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement.

PC01881-116

Comment:

How can the EIS/EIR show 'Manchester Square' as vacant on the two pages following ES 12, NA/NP, Alt. A, when Manchester Square is not vacant? Two pages before ES 21 (Alternative B - 2015 Additional Runway - South) and one page before ES 21 (Alternative C - 2015 No Additional Runway) has the Manchester Square area used for air cargo.

Why isn't Manchester Square listed as acreage required for expansion? Don't you plan to use eminent domain as a tool to take the properties that the owners are not willing to voluntarily sell to LAWA?

The "Westchester Southside" is a misnomer because it is not located in the southside of Westchester. LAX Northside begins 1.7 miles from the northern boundary of Westchester at Centinella and Sepulveda. From imperial Ave. and Sepulveda, the southern most boundary of Westchester, it is 1.9 miles to the end of 'Westchester Southside'. Don't you think these measurements would constitute a name of either LAX Northside or Westchester Central? Isn't It very misleading to call it Westchester Southside"?

LAX Northside EIR has 340 acres. 'Westchester Southside' has 260 acres. Wouldn't the 80 acres difference benefit potential uses of the Northside development? Wouldn't the NA/NP concept allow for a greater utilization of the 340 acres?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02401-106 regarding land acquisition in the Manchester Square and Airport/Belford Areas.

PC01881-117

Comment:

Noise 4-11

What is the base year you used to determine that there would be a reduced noise exposure level in Alt. A and C? Is the base year 1996, 1997, or 2000? LAWA indicated that the base year they used was 1996. However for various statements, it was obvious by reading the EIR/EIS that data were assimilated from 1996, 1997, as well as 1994. Please explain.

The EIR/EIS was made public on January 18, 2001. By January 1, 2000 all aircraft over 75,000 pounds were Stage 3 certified aircraft that operated at LAX. If you used the base year of 2000 would there be a reduction of total noise exposure? Would it be "significant" or less than "significant" if the base year was 2000? Please quantify, define, and explain?

Response:

1996 is the environmental baseline year. The data that was included in Section 2.1.6, Aircraft Ground Activity, of Draft EIS/EIR Appendix D, included references to studies conducted or data collected in 1994 and 1997. The Year 2000 noise levels and comparisons to 1996 baseline, and 2015 future alternative conditions were detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As a result of ANCA, aircraft over 75,000 lbs were to be certified Stage 3. Please see Topical Response TR-N-1 regarding the noise modeling approach for additional information.

PC01881-118

Comment:

How have the recent population changes reflected in the 2000 census impacted the Master Plan assumptions?

Specifically, how has 69.5% growth in Palmdale affected the assumptions about the Palmdale airport in the Master Plan?

Where is the "evidence from other regions and nations [that] indicates that attempts to relocate activity from an established airport to new facilities may result in failure and a loss of millions of dollars?" (P. 2.2)

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR incorporated 2000 Census data. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding the transfer of LAX operations to Palmdale Airport.

PC01881-119

Comment:

NOISE
Page 4-36. We quote from various sections of the EIS/EIR here and add our comments in bold.

4.1.5 Master Plan Commitments

"The airport has a long history of addressing the problems of aircraft noise. Many of these were dealt with in the airport's adopted Part 150 Noise Compatibility Program of 1985. The program includes 28 measures approved by the FAA. Of these, seven are directly related to the abatement of aircraft noise levels. The remaining 21 measures relate to the implementation of a program to monitor flight operations; provide for programs to mitigate noise in residences and other noise-sensitive uses; propose land use management measures to enhance compatibility; and call for further study of funding mechanisms or airfield modifications. This section addresses only those measures that are directly related to the" abatement of aircraft noise through operation or source noise control. Mitigation of impacts at the land uses is discussed in Section 4.2, Land Use. The airport also has implemented noise Mitigation Measures that predate the 1985 Part 150 program. The operational elements of the current noise abatement program are:

Response:

The commentor accurately describes a portion of Section 4.1.5, Master Plan Commitments, provided in the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01881-120

Comment:

Page 4-37

1. Use preferred inboard runways for departures and arrivals and interior parallel Taxiways K and U during the hours between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. This measure is intended to move nighttime noise to the interior of the airfield and away from noise-sensitive areas adjacent to the airport to the north and south. WHAT ARE THE EXCEPTIONS TO THESE RULES? WHAT WILL BE THE EXCEPTION TO THESE RULES?

Response:

Exceptions to the preferential use of the inboard runways at night include periods when they are closed for maintenance or construction. For further information about the exceptions to the various noise rules, please see Subtopical Response TR-N-7.1 and Subtopical Response TR-N-7.4.

PC01881-121

Comment:

2. Weather permitting, between the hours of midnight and 6:30 a.m., use over-ocean procedures. These procedures call for arrivals to be made from the west and departures to the west over Santa Monica Bay during the most sensitive night hours. WHAT ARE THE EXCEPTIONS TO THESE RULES? WHAT WILL BE THE EXCEPTION TO THESE RULES?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-7.1 and Subtopical Response TR-N-7.4. The noise abatement procedures clearly state the required conditions for westerly approaches and for easterly takeoffs during over-ocean procedures. These exceptions are based on tailwind components exceeding 10 kts., adverse weather conditions, and for landings, poor visibility west of the airport. Additionally, Section 1.a of the procedures indicates that deviations may occur for reasons of aircraft emergency, adverse weather, field construction, or maintenance. Finally, Section 1.b recognizes the authority of the pilot in command to request another runway for reasons of safety. Mitigation Measure MM-N-5 calls for LAWA to initiate a 14 CFR Part 161 study to seek Federal approval on a locally-imposed restriction on departures to and approaches from the east when over-ocean procedures are in effect.

PC01881-122

Comment:

3. Conduct departures to the west along the runway heading until reaching the coastline. In the environmental baseline, this measure was implemented by the assignment of headings and visual determination that the coastline was crossed before turns were initiated. The measure has been the subject of continuing concern to assure better compliance to achieve the desired effect. WHAT ARE THE EXCEPTIONS TO THESE RULES? WHAT WILL BE THE EXCEPTION TO THESE RULES?

Response:

Aircraft departing to the west are requested to maintain runway heading until reaching the coastline before initiating turns. This is not a rule, but rather an operating procedure. When the safety of aircraft in flight demands deviation from the preferred procedure, the air traffic controller responsible for the flight is authorized to have the pilot turn early. That is an exception and will remain an exception to the rule. Other exceptions to the procedure calling for flight to the coastline before turns includes the Missed Approach Procedure for landings on the south runway complex. When Radar Navigation (FMS or GPS) procedures are developed for implementation during future years, the precision of the departure procedure will be improved by application of instrument guidance rather than pilot guidance to turn positions. For further information on the noise abatement measures and exceptions to them, see Subtopical Responses TR-N-7.1, TR-N-7.4, TR-N-3.2, and TR-N-3.4.

PC01881-123

Comment:

4. Ban the use of Super Sonic Transport (SST) aircraft at the airport. This measure was originally adopted to eliminate the potential use of the airport by the Concorde and other proposed SST aircraft. THIS WAS DONE LONG BEFORE THE 1985 PART 150 PROGRAM.

Response:

The commentor is correct. The measure quoted is from a listing of Part 150 actions that were adopted during the early 1980's and recommended for continuation through the planning period as part of the overall abatement plan for the airport. Subsequent to the publication of the 2001 Draft EIS/EIR, British Airways and Air France, the only airlines that currently operate the Concorde, decided to retire these aircraft from use.

PC01881-124

Comment:

5 .Restrict run-up activity between 11 :00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. unless specific approval is granted by airport management. WE THOUGHT THERE WOULD BE NO RUN-UP ACTIVITY. PLEASE EXPLAIN. THIS IS ONE OF THE FEW NOISE ABATEMENT PROGRAMS LAWA HAS THE AUTHORITY TO ENFORCE. WHY DOESN'T LAWA DO IT?

Response:

Ground run-ups are not allowed at night between 11 p.m. and 6 a.m., but they do occasionally occur. When an unapproved ground run-up happens, Airport Operations personnel are authorized to shut the run-up down on the spot. At times, aircraft operators need to do a maintenance run-up in order to avoid flight delays of a scheduled flight. They must get prior approval to do so. Normal over-ocean operations during nighttime hours has departures off of runway 25R. When a tenant requests a mounted engine run-up during curfew hours, staff will coordinate with the LAX Air Traffic Control Tower to take the aircraft to the approach end of 25R for the run-up procedure. The noise signature would be no different than for departing aircraft and would be directed at the industrial areas of Inglewood, Lenox and El Segundo. Staff will approve idle runs at the gate due to the fact that the noise signature is no different than activity that is being conducted. According to Scott Tatro of the Environmental Management Bureau, abuse of the restriction may be turned over to the City Attorney's office for action in accordance with violations of the users operating agreement.

PC01881-125

Comment:

6. Allow the use of reduced thrust departures during west flow operations. Reduced thrust departures are takeoffs conducted with less than maximum power settings during the takeoff roll and initial climb portion of the operation (until the aircraft reaches approximately 1,000 feet altitude). The intent of this measure is largely one of reducing the noise of aircraft to the sides of the airport while the aircraft is on the ground or in the first stage of climb. THERE IS NOTHING WRONG WITH THE INTENT OF THIS MEASURE; IT IS THE APPLICATION THAT IS LACKING. ISN'T THIS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE FAA?

Response:

The application of thrust during departure procedures is the responsibility solely of the pilot in command. Each air carrier has noise abatement departure procedures that are available for use over noise sensitive areas, as well as a maximum climb procedure. The noise abatement procedures reduce noise close to the airport and increase it farther away, while the maximum climb procedure increases noise close to the airport and reduces it farther away. The most beneficial procedure for use from an airport is determined by a combination of runway layout and land use distribution in the airport environs. To maximize effectiveness at LAX, the noise abatement departure procedure is recommended for

3. Comments and Responses

westerly departures, but not recommended for east departures. Also, please see Subtopical Responses TR-N-7.1, Subtopical Response TR-N-7.2, and Response to Comment PC01881-114.

PC01881-126

Comment:

7. Discourage (HOW?) the use of reduced thrust departures during east flow operations. Encourage (HOW?) the use of departure cutback procedures in accordance with FAA Advisory Circular 91-53 (now 91-53A). Thrust cutback procedures are techniques that initiate thrust reductions from takeoff power to a lower level (maximum climb thrust or less) during the climb between 1,000 and 3,000 feet of altitude. The intent of the measure is to reduce the loudness of aircraft in the off-airport areas most severely affected by aircraft noise. THIS IS JUST ONE OF MANY ITEMS IN THE PART 150 NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM OF 1985 THAT LAX HAS NO AUTHORITY TO ENFORCE. IS THIS STATEMENT CORRECT?

Response:

LAWA has no authority to enforce the use of operating procedures in the cockpit of aircraft. Carriers were encouraged by the Part 150 study to use maximum climb procedures when departing to the east, and thrust reduction procedures when departing to the west to take advantage of land uses nearest to and/or adjacent to the overflight ends of the runways. The policy remains on the books as information for interested carriers, but the responsibility for implementation lies solely in the hands of the pilot in command. However, LAWA can, and does, provide noise abatement information to requesting air carriers in an attempt to assure the application of all of its preferred noise abatement procedures. LAWA is also in the process of updating its website to provide available noise related and noise abatement data to all interested parties. For additional information on this topic, please see Subtopical Response TR-N-7.1 and Subtopical Response TR-N-7.2.

PC01881-127

Comment:

8. Continue the use of tug and tow procedures in the Imperial Terminal area. The Imperial Terminal is a small area west of Sepulveda Boulevard, north of Imperial Highway. The use of engine-off procedures are expected to be continued under all future alternatives where applicable. HOW MANY FLIGHTS ORIGINATE AT THE IMPERIAL TERMINAL IN AN AVERAGE DAY?

Response:

The Master Plan cargo analysis did not forecast specific operations at the Imperial Cargo facility. Cargo at the airport is either transported in the belly of passenger aircraft or dedicated all-cargo freighter aircraft. All cargo operations represent only the activity of freighter aircraft which consist of scheduled air carrier and commuter cargo aircraft and non-scheduled air carrier and commuter cargo aircraft. The forecast of air cargo operations is based on tonnage of cargo carried on all-cargo aircraft. While LAWA maintains records of total domestic and international cargo tonnage by freight, mail and express, it does not record how the tonnage was transported (i.e. on all freighter aircraft or in the belly of passenger aircraft). Therefore, estimates of the percentage of cargo carried by freighter aircraft were made on an airline-by-airline basis. Mail was not included in the analysis as virtually all air mail is carried in the belly of passenger aircraft. Additional cargo related information is discussed in Topical Response TR-MP-1.

PC01881-128

Comment:

9. Retain acoustical barrier along the north side of the airfield adjacent to 88th Street in the Emerson Manor community. DOES THIS MEAN YOU ARE NOT GOING TO TEAR IT DOWN OR REMODEL THE BARRIER? THIS WAS BUILT BEFORE THE 1985 PART 150.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01881-108 regarding the Westchester Wall. At this time LAWA staff is not aware of any plans to remodel the barrier. If so, this would be purely a beautification project, and not a noise issue.

PC01881-129

Comment:

The FAA and every other responsible aircraft, airline, airport industry says a Part 150 Program should be revised every 5 to 7 years. The State Noise Variance negotiators requested this to be done in the 1990- 1993 negotiations without success. Your Part 150 Program is 16 years old and obviously outdated WHY?

Response:

As part of the Memorandum of Understanding that the City of Los Angeles signed with the City of Inglewood in 2001, LAWA will consider publishing noise exposure maps and initiate a new Part 150 study to obtaining compliance with the over-the-ocean takeoff requirements particularly at night. This issue is currently part of the LAX Community Round Table Program.

PC01881-130

Comment:

All of these ongoing noise abatement measures would be continued with the Master Plan. Therefore, the following commitment would be adopted for noise:

.N-1. Maintenance of Applicable Elements (What are the applicable elements) of Existing Aircraft Noise Abatement Program.

All components (What are these components?) of the current airport noise abatement program that pertain to aircraft noise would be maintained. Your noise abatement program has been, is and will be basically controlled by the FAA. Therefore, how can you enforce your own Noise Compatibility Program??
(ES-4-2)

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included the noise abatement components of the Part 150 Noise Compatibility Program in Master Plan Commitments in Section 4.1.5. The airport does not have jurisdiction to enforce any operating procedures on aircraft in flight. This authority is vested solely in the FAA through its responsibility for the safe and efficient operation of the nation's air space. When a Part 150 Noise Compatibility Program has been accepted by the FAA, there is an implied agreement to implement the various measures for which the FAA has responsibility. When locally preferred procedures are in place, the FAA will attempt to accommodate the procedures subject to its primary responsibilities. For additional information on enforcement please see Topical Response TR-N-7.

PC01881-131

Comment:

How much of the reduction in total population exposed to noise above 65 CNEL of approximately 4500-4600 (or 1500-1600 more than no action) people is due to the acquisition of 84 dwelling units? (Using environmental baseline as benchmark)

Response:

As was described in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses (subsection 4.4.2.6), of the Draft EIS/EIR, acquisition and relocation of 84 dwelling units would reduce the population of the area by approximately 172 residents. Relocation impacts under LAWA Staff's new preferred Alternative D, were

3. Comments and Responses

analyzed in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences and Businesses of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please note that no residential acquisition is proposed under Alternative D.

PC01881-132

Comment:

(p. 4.2)

What is the cost of the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program expansion expected under Alternative C for the people newly exposed to noise above 65 CNEL ?

Response:

It is not practical to determine actual costs for the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP) until after approval of the LAX Master Plan, based on actual noise measurements and quarterly reporting procedures. However, the current estimated cost for future soundproofing mitigation of residential properties under Alternative C is approximately \$3.90 million and for LAWA staff's new preferred Alternative D, approximately \$3.87 million. This is based on an estimated cost of approximately \$25,500 per single family unit and \$11,000 per multi-family unit as referenced in LAWA's 2001 ANMP. As presented in Table 4.2-13 of the Draft EIS/EIR, under Alternative C, 140 single family and 30 multi-family dwelling units in the City of Los Angeles and located outside the current ANMP contour would be newly exposed to the 65 CNEL. As shown in Table S4.2-30 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, under Alternative D, 70 single family units and 190 multi-family units in the City of Inglewood and located outside the current ANMP boundary would be newly exposed to the 65 CNEL. Also, as stated in mitigation measure MM-LU-1, the properties shown as newly exposed to the 65 CNEL and outside the current ANMP boundary are only representative as they are based on modeling of future conditions. Actual adjustments to the ANMP contour and any need to expand the program boundaries would be based on measured data presented in the quarterly reports prepared by LAWA. As a result, the actual additional cost for soundproofing would not be known until measurements identify a need to expand the program boundaries. Expansion of the ANMP would be funded primarily through LAWA passenger facility charges and resale of acquired parcels. Funding may also be obtained through the Federal Aviation Administration Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 150 Noise Compatibility grants or other sources.

PC01881-133

Comment:

What people (residences) will be exposed to the 1.5 decibel or greater increase in noise levels under Alternative C?

How much greater?

Response:

Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR provided maps and estimated numbers of population and dwellings in areas exposed to increases of at least 1.5 decibels of CNEL for the environmental baseline and the No Action/No Project Alternative relative to Alternative C. In particular, please see Section 4.2.6.4, Alternative C-No Additional Runway, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR for more information. For more information on noise and noise related land use impacts under Alternative C, please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01881-134

Comment:

(p. 4.5)

"Some number of noise sensitive uses would be newly exposed to noise levels >65 CNEL." The chart on p. ES-22 shows population exposed above 65 CNEL, but does not show how much above 65 that will be. How much will that be?

Response:

The extent of increase above the 65 CNEL that would affect a given population would vary by parcel. However, the 65 CNEL threshold was established because noise-sensitive uses newly exposed to the 65 CNEL noise contour (compared to 1996 baseline conditions) would be eligible for sound insulation under the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program, as described under Topical Response TR-LU-3.

PC01881-135

Comment:

Overviews -4. Noise (p. 4.2)

Why would Alternative C have greater impacts in the short term in terms of population exposed to 1.5 CNEL than Alternatives A or B?

What would that impact be? Define short term.?

Response:

In the short term (2005), Alternative C would include the relocation of Runway 6R/24L by 350 feet to the north and the relocation of Runway 6L/24R to the east by 2,900 feet, thus shifting the noise contour pattern northward into an area not previously exposed to noise above 65 CNEL. Alternatives A and B would include the extension of Runway 6L/24R to the east, but would not relocate any runways laterally in the 2005 time frame. Only after 2005 would new runways be constructed in Alternatives A and B. Consequently, Alternative C had greater impacts in the short term, but lesser impacts in the long term when the full effects of new runways and increased traffic levels influenced the impacts associated with Alternatives A and B. Alternative D, which was analyzed in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, does not address 2005 noise levels. However, comparisons for the year 2015 population exposed to increases of 1.5 CNEL for Alternatives A, B, and C were fully addressed in Section 4.2.6, Environmental Consequences of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01881-136

Comment:

(4.6)

Why would the No Action Alternative result in the exposure of new areas to high noise levels? How much greater?

Response:

The No Action/No Project Alternative would result in some areas being newly exposed to noise above 65 CNEL and other areas experiencing noise level increases of 1.5 or more CNEL within the 65 CNEL when compared to environmental baseline conditions. This is a function of two principal components of the aircraft operating conditions. First, the number of heavy, louder aircraft doubles (from 351 to 706) between 1996 and 2015. Secondly, the percentage of large aircraft using the north runway complex for approaches increases substantially between the two years. Therefore, although the noise contours might shrink in many areas as a result of other factors (such as the Phase out of Stage 2 jets weighing more than 75,000 pounds) the area under the north approach would be newly exposed to significant noise level increases.

PC01881-137

Comment:

Appendix D -Noise Technical Report

Given the dramatic change in ground run-up activity between 1994 and 1997 (decline of 36%), what validity is there to using 1997 data in 2001? Has the ground run-up activity changed yet again?

Response:

The 1997 survey data as identified in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, Section 2.1.6, Aircraft Ground Activity, of the Draft EIS/EIR was used to complement the 1996 environmental baseline and at the time it provided the most up to data to use for future forecast run-up activity. There is no reason to expect that such pre-1994 activity would be recaptured at LAX. Please see Section 2.1.6,

3. Comments and Responses

Aircraft Ground Activity, and Section 3.1.4, Alternative D Run-up Noise, located in Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding ground activity, run-up activity, and fleet mix in use during the Year 2000.

PC01881-138

Comment:

p. 15

Given that INM noise contours do not include aircraft ground noise or noise generated by military aircraft, to what extent are results generated using INM noise, contours understated?

Response:

Ground noise is incorporated into the INM. Military operations were performed principally by helicopters operated by the Coast Guard located on the Airport. While the FAA reports approximately 2,200 annual military operations, no detailed records of military operations are maintained by the Airport. Noise Management Bureau officials report that helicopters, which operate almost exclusively over the Airport or over the ocean, account for approximately 90 percent of the military activity, while the remaining operations are distributed among a wide variety of aircraft types. The noise energy contributed by each military aircraft type to the CNEL contours is masked by civilian operations. Given the relative noise levels associated with military helicopters and civilian jet aircraft operating over the same land surface, there is little expectation that the noise contours would change at all inclusion of the limited number of helicopter operations on the average annual day.

PC01881-139

Comment:

p.55

Why is it assumed that under Alternative C heavy jets will comprise 5% more of the mix than under No Action (38% v. 33%).?

Response:

The content of this comment is similar to Comments PC00599-7 and PC00593-1. Please see Responses to Comments PC00599-7 and PC00593-1 for a discussion on the fleet mix assumptions and operational levels used in the Master Plan Alternatives.

PC01881-140

Comment:

p.277

Tables A5,10, A5,11, A5,12 do not appear to be included in the Appendix.

Response:

The three tables referenced were inadvertently left out of the document when printed. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided the information, as well as similar information for Alternative D in its analysis of location point noise levels, Section 5 of Appendix D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01881-141

Comment:

p. 280

What are the locations ---other than the beach west of the airport ---that are exposed to Lmax levels in excess of 100+or- decibels?

Response:

Table A5-5 of Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Table S-C1-15, of the Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Noise Report, of the Supplement to the Draft

EIS/EIR list the levels greater than 100 dBA Lmax. The locations of the various points were mapped on Figures 4.1-1 through 4.1-4 in Section 4.1, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figures S8 through S10, in Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR. They include, for the environmental baseline conditions: 7 churches, 2 libraries, 5 parks and 14 schools. In the year 2005, 4 schools would be exposed to noise above 100 decibels Lmax in one or more alternatives. By 2015, no noise sensitive facilities would be exposed to noise above 100 Lmax. Nearly all of these facilities are located immediately east of the airport, under the approaches to either the north or south runway complex.

PC01881-142

Comment:

(4.7)

Where are the outdoor areas exposed to noise levels of 75 CNEL or greater?
Where and How much greater?

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed outdoor areas exposed to noise levels of 75 CNEL or greater in Section 4.2, Land Use. Please Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels for additional information.

PC01881-143

Comment:

FUEL FARM

Alternate 2 (The LAW A proposal for relocating LAX fuel form)

On-Site Utilities -electrical utilities (7.1.8)

The proposed concept dual 34.5 kilovolt ("kV") feeders are a desirable approach from a reliability standpoint. However, with each substation sized to supply only half the load, when one feed is lost, to continue operation of the fuel farm, power will have to be shut off to some operations, with load shedding and reduced operation instigated in order to operate. It would be preferable to size both 34.5 kV feeders and both substations to supply the entire load. The substations should be connected with a tie-breaker that would be closed in the event of the loss of one feeder, main switch gear or transformer. The fuel system could thus operate at maximum capacity. Doing so would raise the cost, by approximately \$40,000. What Is your opinion?

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.

PC01881-144

Comment:

Cost Estimate 7.2)

The statement that the total cost is \$201,330,000 is misleading. The cost estimate summary denotes several items that are not included. Most notably, significant costs would include the issue pipeline from Imperial into LAX and the rerouting of the existing oil company pipelines. If we assume that each of these line items would be similar to the cost of the issue pipeline from Scattergood to Imperial, these items would add over \$48,000,000 in construction cost. Considering additional engineering costs, this will bring the cost to more than \$250,000,000. What is your opinion?

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC01881-145

Comment:

Additionally, the estimate does not include inflation. The cost estimate is dated March 1998. The schedule portion of the report estimates one year for engineering and two years for construction. This means that if it were started today, the construction would not be complete for another three years. Assuming an inflation rate of 3% (19.4% compounded over the six years), inflation will add another \$48,5000,000, bringing the total cost to almost \$300,000,000. What is your opinion?

Response:

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

PC01881-146

Comment:

The \$300,000,000 still does not include the construction cost for the refueller at South on LAX and at North on LAX and the concrete utilidor for the pipelines. It does not include financing costs, or associated environmental costs. It also does not include work on the LAX property such as hydrant systems, valve vaults, leak detection. All of these are significant. What is your reply?

Response:

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

PC01881-147

Comment:

(6.1.8) On-Site Utilities

The energy costs to operate the new fueling system are estimated to be larger than the current cost, but are not estimated. Why?

Response:

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

PC01881-148

Comment:

4.3 Surface Transportation

4.3.1 On Airport Surface Transportation Key Conclusions - 3rd paragraph - last line "By contrast, under the No action/No Project Alternative, the number of peak hour trips in the CTA would increased by 22%" How can this be if your statements in others parts of the EIR/EIS are correct that state the CTA 'traffic is virtually' at its limit?. What statistics do you have to support this statement?

Response:

Detailed information regarding airport trip generation for the No Action/No Project Alternative is described in Technical Report 3b, On-Airport Surface Transportation Technical Report. Supplemental information is also provided in Topical Response TR-ST-3.

Technical Report 2a, On-Airport Surface Transportation, illustrates that several of the roadways surrounding the CTA operated at level-of-service (LOS) E and F in 1996 (Table 4-2) thus indicating that the CTA has been operating at its limit, or capacity. The reference to the traffic being "virtually at its limit" is therefore with reference to the roadway and curb frontage system operating at its capacity under existing traffic "demands", a technical term describing the number of automobile drivers who want to go to the terminals during the peak hour.

In the future scenarios of No Action/No Project, the reference to the "number of peak hour trips in the CTA would increase by 22 percent" is in fact a reference to the forecasted demand. Since the CTA is operating virtually at its capacity now, such an increase in demand could not be accommodated within the peak hour without providing additional capacity. The No Action/No Project Alternative includes approved projects, which have the potential to increase CTA capacity in future years. The additional capacity enables the CTA roadways to handle a percentage of the 22 percent increase in traffic, although many of the CTA roadways continue to operate at LOS E and F with decreases in LOS and increases in demand to capacity ratios. As a result, traffic congestion would likely cascade back onto the arterial roads in the vicinity of the CTA. Furthermore, many people who wanted to enter the CTA in the peak hour (i.e. the peak hour demand) would be delayed in their travel through the resulting congestion and many would not reach the terminal until sometime later than they had desired.

PC01881-149

Comment:

Air Quality Modeling Data and assumptions are missing from the EIR/EIS. The public must have access to this data to appropriately review the accuracy of the EIR/EIS. When will the data be provided and how long will the public comment period be extended to allow for public review of this data?

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality impacts in and around the airport in Section 4.6, Appendix G, and Technical Report 4, and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality impacts in and around the airport in Section 4.6, Appendix S-E, and Technical Report S-4.

PC01881-150

Comment:

Removal of the Pershing traffic route for commuters will cause a significant impact to residents in the adjacent communities. How will the additional traffic be addressed on Vista Del Mar and Sepulveda Blvds? How will LAWA mitigate noise and pollution in these areas?

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.

Tables 4.3.2-8, 4.3.2-11, and 4.3.2-13 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Tables S4.3.2-4, S4.3.2-8, and S4.3.2-12 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR presented traffic impacts and their corresponding mitigation measures. More detailed information regarding traffic impacts and level of service summaries at Sepulveda and Vista Del Mar is presented in the Appendix of Technical Report 3b, Off-Airport Surface Transportation Technical Report. Mitigations for Aircraft Noise, Roadway Noise, and Construction Equipment Noise were presented in Sections 4.1.8-1, 4.1.8-2 and 4.1.8-3, respectively, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, and Air Quality Mitigation was presented in Section 4.6.8 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01881-151

Comment:

We are concerned about the proposed "on and off ramps" for the north and south 405 freeway. Several important items to consider include the following:

1. Entering the 405 freeway going north is approximately one mile to the Manchester Avenue on ramp;
2. Going south on the 405 freeway and exiting the freeway from Florence Boulevard is approximately four-tenths of a mile to the on ramp, just past Manchester Avenue;
3. Going south from the on ramp to Arbor Vitae Boulevard is approximately four-tenths of a mile;

3. Comments and Responses

4. and Going south to Century Boulevard from the proposed on ramp is approximately three-tenths of a mile.

Therefore, do you consider it prudent to have an "on or off-ramp" at the planned location?

Response:

Subsequent to publication of the 2001 Draft EIS/EIR, FHWA withdrew its support for a half interchange at Arbor Vitae. FHWA policy is to only consider full proposed interchanges, not partial ones. This half-interchange is not a mitigation measure for the LAX Master Plan, nor is it an element of the plan itself. Please refer to Response to Comment AL00008-8 for a discussion of this half-interchange. The design of the half-interchange at Arbor Vitae is currently being reviewed by Caltrans and the FHWA. Please see also Topical Response TR-ST-2 for information on the Arbor Vitae Interchange.

PC01881-152

Comment:

What agency will pay the costs associated with the construction of the ramps? It is our understanding that CalTrans is experiencing financial uncertainties at this time.

We are curious to know who will be responsible for the costs incurred for enlarging Arbor Vitae Boulevard (from Prairie Avenue in Inglewood to Sepulvada Boulevard in Westchester).

It is our opinion that several crucial factors have been overlooked. Something that took place after the release of the Draft Master Plan EIS/EIR is the action on the part of the Southern California Association Of Governments (SCAG) not to include the Arbor Vitae off-ramp as part of the 'Regional Transportation Plan'. This may have a negative impact on the financing of the project and thus affect the entire 'ring road' concept.

How can LAWA pay for the road work from the Arbor Vitae off-ramp to airport property if Federal money can be used only for airport related services?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00008-6 regarding funding.

PC01881-153

Comment:

On a different topic related to the issue of noise, we were not able to find in the report any analysis of single-flight noise, and only the average calculation of CNEL noise effects is utilized. This, once again, is a glaring error in that single-flight noise levels do have a tremendous impact on Lennox residents and students within the Lennox School District. This analysis should be a part of the Draft Report.

Response:

The Lmax of Single Event Levels in Table A5-5 are located in Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR. Tables A5-6 through A5-9 provided information related to the duration of time that each noise sensitive facility in the airport environs would be exposed to single event noise above 65, 75, 85, and 95 decibels on an average annual day. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR prepared for this project extensively addressed the effects of single aircraft events on nighttime awakenings and on school disruption (see Appendix S-C1 and Section 4.1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR).

PC01881-154

Comment:

Why do you shorten runway 24L, on the western end 1185' in Alt. C but lengthen 24R 500'?

Response:

Runway 6R/24L would be shortened 1,185 feet on its western end in order to accommodate the new entrance roads to the West Terminal Area (WTA) and satisfy the required runway safety area based on Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) standards. The existing runway safety area for Runway 6R/24L extends into the El Segundo Dunes and the El Segundo Blue Butterfly Habitat Restoration Area. In light of the re-weighted goals with higher priority on environmental and community objectives over economic and air service objectives, the decision was made that no development into the El Segundo Sand Dunes and the El Segundo Blue Butterfly Habitat Restoration Area would be considered; therefore, the west end of Runway 6R/24L was shortened 1,185 feet. Runway 6R/24L then extends 2,900 feet to the east to a total length of 12,000 feet to allow departures by the largest aircraft. The increase in length would reduce airfield congestion and eliminate excessive coordinated crossings in the air, thus reducing departure delays. Please also see Response to Comment AL00022-188 for a more detailed discussion.

Runway 6L/24R extends 500 feet to the west to a total length of 9,400 feet in Alternative C in order to gain the required runway landing length to accommodate all aircraft landings in the current fleet as well as in the future fleet. Please also see Response to Comment PC00381-13 for a discussion on the need of Runway 6L/24R extension.

PC01881-155

Comment:

Why doesn't your No action/No Project Alternative have as its base year 1986 or 1987? That was the time the last 40 MAP EIR was surpassed.

Response:

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

PC01881-156

Comment:

Your listing of the potential businesses removal should be updated for greater accuracy. We feel there are approximately 400+ businesses that will be displaced or replaced. What businesses will be moved into Southside, Northside for any of the proposals? The Westchester/LAX/Marina del Rey Chamber of Commerce may agree with our estimate.

Response:

Appendix P to Chapter V of the Master Plan, Preliminary Property Acquisition and Relocation Plan, includes parcel-level detail for the properties proposed for acquisition under Master Plan Alternatives A, B, and C, including property information obtained from the Los Angeles County Tax Assessor's Office for use in the Draft EIS/EIR. The land acquisition data has been updated within Chapters 2.7 and 2.8 of the Master Plan Addendum for use in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and reflects parcel data as of October 2002. Any land use changes that occurred following publication of the Draft EIS/EIR did not represent a material difference relative to the overall uses in the acquisition areas analyzed under Alternatives A, B, and C in the Draft EIS/EIR. The business relocation analyses provided in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR were based on a worst case scenario in which all buildings to be acquired were assumed to be fully occupied and all occupant businesses were assumed to require relocation, as described in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses (subsection 4.4.2.2), of the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternatives A, B, and C would necessitate the relocation of 330, 323, and 239 existing businesses, respectively, located near LAX, and Alternative D would involve the relocation of 38 businesses.

As discussed in Appendix P to Chapter V of the Master Plan, until the Relocation Plan is finalized it is impossible to predict precisely which businesses would relocate to LAX Northside/Westchester Southside. However, those businesses that have been targeted for relocation on the airport or within LAX Northside/Westchester Southside, as well as those that are expected to be absorbed by the local market were identified in Table A-3, Parcel Detail of Acquisition Areas Alternative A, Table B-3, Summary Statistics of Acquisition Areas Alternative B, and Table C-3, Summary Statistics of Acquisition Areas Alternative C, in Appendix P to Chapter V of the Master Plan, and in Table 2.7-2, Alternative D - Parcel Detail of Acquisition Areas, in Chapter 2.7 of the Master Plan Addendum.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01881-157

Comment:

Will the elimination of 'avigation easements' be part of your mitigation program to reduce noise in the impacted communities?

Response:

Please see Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.13 regarding avigation easements.

PC01881-158

Comment:

What will be the estimated cost for each major element of any and all alternatives?
What percentage of the costs do you anticipate the Federal Government will contribute?
What percentage of the costs do you anticipate the Passenger Facility Charges will contribute?
What percentage of the costs do you anticipate bonds will contribute?
What percentage of the cost do you anticipate the airline businesses will contribute?

Response:

As discussed in Section 2.8 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the proposed funding includes a combination of FAA Airport Improvement Fund grants, passenger facility charges, general airport revenue bonds, airline fees, and other state/federal grants. No taxpayer dollars would be used to pay for any of the proposed improvements.

Before precise funding can be identified, the preferred alternative must be decided upon by the FAA, design must be taken to the next level, and phasing issues must be finalized.

PC01881-159

Comment:

Don't many of the delays attributed to LAX in the Draft EIS/EIR originate at other airports or other regions because of weather-related problems? How many delays of flights are actually caused by problems at LAX alone and are not connected with other airfields or weather problems?

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AR00003-10. The delays developed in the airside simulation analysis in the Draft EIS/EIR were all based on LAX capacity alone and were not connected with other airfields or weather problems. The airside capacity assessment focused on the LAX operating environment, which included the airside facilities, operating procedures, and demand at LAX. It was assessed independently of broader regional airspace constraints or opportunities. However, the Los Angeles basin airspace was reviewed to identify potential constraints that may impact LAX's existing or future airside capacity. Please see Section 2 of Chapter 11 of the Master Plan for more information.

PC01881-160

Comment:

What are the access and egress roads and streets to the ring road from the Arbor Vitae off ramp around the ring road to Sepulveda and the 105?

Response:

The Ring Road was presented in detail in Section 3.3, Final Iteration Alternative Development and Refinement, of the Master Plan, which was part of the Draft EIS/EIR documentation. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road.

PC01881-161**Comment:**

Will the Green line cars have space to store luggage? Will there be off airport parking for green line customers to park their cars at various locations? Will MTA finance the extension to the west end or will LAWA finance it?

Response:

At present, no Green Line car interior configurations exist for accommodating luggage. However, such configurations might be included in the specifications for future car purchases. At this point in the process, no detailed funding studies for the extension have yet been performed. It is likely that some type of shared funding for the extension would be developed with LAWA participation. Parking at Green Line stations is controlled by the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA). Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

PC01881-162**Comment:**

Schools

How do you mitigate learning hazards such as noise and air pollution. In reality they can be called man-made learning disabilities. Students study at home as well as at school. Homework is an integral part of the educational process. Noise and air pollution don't stop when the school day is over.

Test scores are hampered by noise and air pollution which will increase if LAX expands. How do you mitigate the financial cost to the school district when they are denied additional financial aid because of poor test scores? The 65 CNEL is considered an unhealthy noise level for many land uses that include residential dwellings, schools, and outdoor recreation.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to nighttime awakenings and school disruption associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative and all four build alternatives in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts associated with air pollution.

PC01881-163**Comment:**

The impact of pollution on the health and academic achievement of students in the area is only now coming into clear focus. For the past eight years, the UCLA School of Medicine has conducted Health Fairs at several schools. During this time, medical professionals have screened more than 3,500 students and adults. One consistent finding has been a high incidence of children demonstrating asthma and allergy symptoms. The medical evidence clearly suggests aberrations in the immune system.

Response:

The content of this comment is essentially the same as comment AF00001-36; please refer to Response to Comment AF00001-36.

PC01881-164**Comment:**

The Executive Summary of the Draft EIR, on page ES-28, recognizes the necessity to have the impact of Environmental Justice adequately addressed the report indicates that the FAA will make the final

3. Comments and Responses

determination of whether the Master Plan has a disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effect on minority or low-income populations. This is abundantly obvious in areas east of LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. 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.

PC01881-165

Comment:

However, in contradiction, on page 4-67 the report indicates that some of the schools would be exposed to outdoor noise levels that would remain significant after mitigation, yet, no mitigation measures are required since "enrollment impacts are considered less than significant." This analysis is logically flawed and totally unacceptable. What type of enrollment does a school need for it to be significantly impacted?

Response:

The comment links two different issues together. The paragraph referenced by the commentor (which is on page 4-1233 of the Draft EIS/EIR) states that one public school in the Lennox School District would be exposed to significant outdoor noise levels that would remain significant after mitigation. This is a conclusion regarding non-enrollment impacts. The impact to the school in the Lennox Elementary School District would result under Alternative B. This was discussed on page 4-423 of Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, in the Draft EIS/EIR. The discussion under Environmental Action Plan on page 4-1219, of the Draft EIS/EIR, which states "No mitigation measures are required since enrollment impacts are considered less than significant with the required payment of school impact fees" is regarding project impacts to school enrollment. The analysis regarding impacts to enrollment concludes that with the required payment of school impact fees, the project would not result in a significant impact. However, as discussed on page 4-423 of the Draft EIS/EIR, although mitigation (through sound insulation or acquisition) is expected to address the majority of aircraft noise impacts on schools not already subject to an aviation easement, under Alternative B one public school within the Lennox Elementary School district would be subject to outdoor noise levels that are considered significant and unavoidable.

Section 4.2, Land Use (subsections 4.2.6 and 4.2.8,) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included additional analysis of schools that would be subject to high single event and cumulative noise levels that would result in classroom disruption and included analysis of a new Alternative D. A listing of schools newly exposed to high single event and cumulative noise levels under Alternatives A, B, C, and D, were presented in Tables S4.2-11, S4.2-15, S4.2-19, and S4.2-28, respectively. Schools without aviation easements that are determined to be subject to significant aircraft noise impacts are eligible for mitigation. Mitigation Measures MM-LU-1, MM-LU-3 and MM-LU-4 were provided to address these impacts, excluding those schools with aviation easements.

As concluded on page 4-767 of Section 4.27, Schools, in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, impacts on schools newly exposed to high single event noise levels would remain significant after mitigation when classroom activities take place outdoors. See also 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.

As stated on page 4-764 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, enrollment impacts for Alternative D are also considered less than significant with required payment of school fees.

PC01881-166

Comment:

Although schools have implemented sound attenuation programs of school buildings, that process does not fully mitigate against negative impacts. Students residing in these areas are compelled to attend the schools and spend approximately one and a quarter to one and a half hours per day while at school outside these buildings.

Clearly, the nature of the normal school day requires students to have physical education activities, recess, classroom passing periods, and a number of other activities outside the protection of sound-proof buildings. It is clearly evident that over-flights and near over-flights interrupt instruction and activities.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels. As stated in this response, significant outdoor noise impacts are identified for schools exposed to the 75 CNEL or greater noise contours. In addition, outdoor noise levels within the 65 to 75 CNEL noise contour range could affect outdoor speech and the quality of outdoor activities (although this effect is not considered to be significant). As shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR, and Figure S4.2-2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, no schools are located within the 75 CNEL or greater noise contour under 1996 baseline or Year 2000 conditions. As stated in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.9.1), of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, significant unavoidable noise impacts were identified where classroom activity takes place outdoors within areas newly exposed to outdoor noise levels of 75 CNEL. An analysis of single event and cumulative aircraft noise levels that result in classroom disruption was presented in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR with supporting technical data and analysis presented in Appendix SC-1 and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01881-167

Comment:

A recent 1997 study published in the Journal of Environment and Behavior, Gary W. Evans and Lorraine Maxwell, Cornell University, found that children who attend schools that are beset by frequent airport noise do not learn to read as well as children who attend quiet schools. A major study at Cornell University shows over 10-million American Schoolchildren are harmed by aircraft noise.

Some district staff members, such as physical education teachers and gardeners, literally spend their entire work day outside school buildings. These employees are exposed to noise beyond acceptable levels on a continuous day-long basis.

How do you plan to respond and mitigate these problems of the schools?

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. Mitigation Measures MM-LU-3, Conduct Study of the Relationship Between Aircraft Noise Levels and Ability of Children to Learn, and MM-LU-4, Provide Additional Sound Insulation for Schools shown by MM-LU-3 to be Significantly Impacted by Aircraft Noise (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR were proposed to reduce the effects of single event aircraft noise on the disruption of classroom learning environments. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels. Also, 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.

PC01881-168

Comment:

The Executive summary of the Master Plan- 2nd paragraph states:

"To ensure that Los Angeles' air transportation infrastructure continues to facilitate the region' s economic needs over the next 15 years, Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) is developing a new long-range strategic master plan; such a plan has not been updated since 1981. The last major improvements at LAX were completed prior to the 1984 Olympics.. . . ."

3. Comments and Responses

LAX should not facilitate the region's economic needs. Th region should facilitate those needs. Here it appears that LAWA is once again playing with words in stating that the last major improvement was completed prior to 1984. There must have been a great many minor improvements to allow this airport to grow from 40 MAP in 1986 to 67.6 MAP IN 2000. PLEASE INFORM THE PUBLIC OF ALL THE IMPROVEMENTS THAT WERE MADE IN THE LAST FIFTEEN YEARS at LAX.

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.

PC01881-169

Comment:

One of the Guiding Principles, Goals and Objectives (on page 1) states
."Balance LAX modernization plans with local community concerns. In particular, potential environmental impacts such as aircraft noise."

These are just words that in reality have little value. You are saying that more operations will not increase noise. Please keep in mind that LAX already has 100% compliance with the Airport Noise and Capacity Act. How are more operations going maintain or reduce the noise occurrences?

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.

PC01881-170

Comment:

Another goal is "Operate LAX in an environmentally sensitive, responsible manner. Please explain how you are going to operate LAX in an environmental sensitive and responsible manner when all aspects of noise and air pollution will increase with any and all proposals submitted in this report.

Response:

Alternative D, the Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR and is now the LAWA staff-preferred alternative. As described in Section 3.6 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, which addressed Alternative D in detail, aircraft noise exposure, traffic, air quality, and human health risk effects under Alternative D would be less than those of the other alternatives, including the No Action/No Project Alternative. As such, implementation of the Master Plan would be responsive to that goal.

PC01881-171

Comment:

ES 1 - 8

The EIS/EIR list the four basic elements that determine demand for commercial air transportation. One of these (ES 1-13) states the following. The bold italic print are our comments.

1.2.1.4 Airport Facilities

"The type and condition of facilities at an airport affect its ability to accommodate both passengers and air service. An airport's ability to accommodate existing and projected demand may be constrained by

one or more of the following conditions:" Can't it also be partially restrained by not going overseas to encourage other countries to use our facilities?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-2 regarding the role of deregulation in aviation planning regarding bilateral agreement between countries.

PC01881-172

Comment:

"Airport Infrastructure -the size and condition of the airfield, terminal, ground access facilities, cargo facilities, federal inspection services, freight forwarding facilities, fueling systems, and other physical infrastructure elements."- Will they continue to come if LAX doesn't expand? At what point will they stop coming?

Response:

The No Action/No Project Alternative represents what would happen at LAX if the airport is not expanded/reconfigured. The Master Plan analysis determined that the existing airport could accommodate 78.7 million annual passengers (MAP) under the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01881-173

Comment:

"Policy -the airport owner's policies regarding future airport development and the utilization of existing facilities." Will they continue to come if LAX doesn't expand? At what point will they stop coming?

Response:

The No Action/No Project Alternative represents what would happen at LAX if the airport is not expanded. The Master Plan analysis determined that the existing airport could accommodate 78.7 million annual passengers (MAP) under the No Action/No Project 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.

PC01881-174

Comment:

"Environmental -significant environmental considerations that may limit airport activity or future development." Will they continue to come if LAX doesn't expand? At what point will they stop coming? How bad would the environmental considerations have to be before LAX stopped expansion?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01881-173.

PC01881-175

Comment:

"Airspace - airspace limitations due to terrain or interactions with other airports Would airspace limitations be more severe at LAX if other airports would increase their facilities?

Response:

The LAX Master Plan examined the factors constraining the Los Angeles basin airspace and the analysis was presented in Section 2.2.3, Factors Constraining the Los Angeles Basin Airspace, of the Draft LAX Master Plan Chapter II. The airside capacity at LAX could be constrained if air traffic growth at other Los Angeles basin airports imposed additional restrictions on LAX air traffic. Until that point

3. Comments and Responses

there would not be any additional limitations at LAX if other airports within Los Angeles basin expanded their facilities.

PC01881-176

Comment:

"In a multi-airport system where passengers, cargo operators, and airlines have alternatives, these conditions may result in certain airports failing to capture their potential market share." Why would an airline choose to go some where else if everything they want is at LAX?

Response:

Since passage of the federal Airline Deregulation Act of 1978, the airlines make the decision about which airports they will serve. As a general rule, airlines will choose to serve the airports near the highest concentrations of conveniently located customers. Within this general framework, however, airlines must make strategic decisions about air service to maximize their investments and gain competitive advantages. For instance, in regions with multiple airports, airlines tend to concentrate their air service at a single, well-located primary airport for reasons of economic efficiency. Concentrating service at a dominant airport also facilitates connecting service, which can significantly increase an airline's market and allow even greater frequencies to more destinations. Most importantly, airlines will provide service where passenger demand and adequate airport facilities exist. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-2 regarding airline response to market demand, deregulation, and airport pricing models.

PC01881-177

Comment:

ES 1-14

"Since passage of the federal Airline Deregulation Act of 1978..... the airlines, and not government, make the decision about which airports they will serve." Why would an airline choose to go some where else if everything they want is at LAX? Will they continue to come if LAX doesn't expand? At what point will they stop coming?

Response:

This comment is similar to Comment PC01881-176. Please see Response to Comment PC01881-176.

PC01881-178

Comment:

ES 2 -4

"Total annual passengers 1997-60,142,588 -2005-74,196,000" (increase =14,053,412)"

"Annual O&D passengers 34,813,554 50,839,000" (increase =16,025,446)"

How did LAWA determine that approximately 57% of passengers in 1997 were O&D passengers and 68% of the passengers in 2005 were O&D passenger? There is a greater increase in O&D passengers than for the total increase in passengers. Please explain.

Response:

The LAX domestic O&D passengers forecast was developed by examining the region's domestic O&D passengers and their demographic and economic factors. Use of a regression analysis model projected future domestic O&D passenger activity. From 1994 to 2015 a three percent average annual growth rate for the Los Angeles region was assumed. The percent of domestic O&D passengers at LAX between 1994 and 2015 was then determined using the Regional Airport Demand Allocation Model (RADAM). RADAM incorporated statistical factors such as Air Service, Access, and Passenger Demographics, and identified LAX's share of regional domestic O&D passenger demand. A 2.1 percent average annual forecast growth rate was projected for LAX domestic O&D passengers. From 1994 to 1997 and to 2005 the region's number of O&D passengers have increased and correspondingly the

share of LAX O&D passengers have increased. From 1997 to 2005 the percent of LAX total O&D passengers increased by 46 percent (or an increase of 16,025,446 passengers). The total number of passengers from 1997 to 2005 increased by 23 percent (or an increase of 14,053,412 passengers). The increase was not as great as the increase of O&D passengers because of the decrease in domestic connecting activity. It is assumed that the increased air service at other airports in the Los Angeles region and western U.S. is expected to compete with and successfully attract a growing volume of domestic connecting passengers. From 1994 to 2015 the number of domestic connecting passengers is projected to decrease annually by .4 percent. Please see Chapter II Section 3 of the Draft LAX Master Plan, for further discussion on the passenger activity forecast for the unconstrained alternatives.

PC01881-179

Comment:

What and where are the access and egress locations on the proposed ring road for alternatives A, B, and C?

Response:

The Ring Road was presented in detail in Section 3.3, Final Iteration Alternative Development and Refinement, of the Master Plan, which was part of the Draft EIS/EIR documentation. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road.

PC01881-180

Comment:

Do you plan to extend Falmouth down to Culver Blvd.?

Response:

Falmouth would not be extended to Culver as part of the project.

PC01881-181

Comment:

Why wouldn't there be as many regional jobs created through out the region if there was a regional airport system instead of a LAX expansion system?

Response:

There is in fact a regional airport system, of which LAX is the most prominent part, as described in Chapter 1, Regional Context, of the Draft EIS/EIR. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR focused on the environmental impacts of expanding LAX under various Master Plan alternatives, and not on potential expansion of the entire regional air transportation system, nor any employment impacts that may be associated with expanding the regional system. The employment growth implications of the LAX Master Plan alternatives were addressed in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data in Technical Report 5 in the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-3 in 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.

PC01881-182

Comment:

Why didn't EIS/EIR summary of Environmental Impacts in the Executive Summary include the No Action/No Project scenario? There will certainly be some environmental impacts if the No Action/No Project Plan is the one adopted.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The Executive Summary Overviews, which summarized the key findings of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, included the No Action/No Project Alternative's impacts in comparison to those of the build alternatives.

PC01881-183

Comment:

There are, in reality no new noise mitigation measures listed in the DRAFT EIS/EIR Why?

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-5 and Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation. Aircraft noise mitigation was described in Section 4.2.8 of the Draft EIS/EIR beginning on page 4-216. Mitigation measures for road traffic, construction equipment, and automated people mover noise were provided in Section 4.1.8 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR beginning on page 4-78. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR also provided mitigation measures for aircraft noise in Sections 4.1.8 and 4.2.8.

PC01881-184

Comment:

Of the 4 concepts presented at the Scoping public hearing only forms of two appear in the Draft EIS/EIR. Alt. C and No Action/No Project were never scoped. Why?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00022-17 regarding the public notice pertaining to Alternative C. The 1997 NOI and NOP both identified and described the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01881-185

Comment:

A major problem exists with the definition of the word "significant". The definition given by the California Environmental Quality Act is a lawyers dream. The definition given in Chp. 7 of "significant" uses a synonym, "substantial" to define the meaning of the word "significant." "Significant Impact - As defined by the California Environmental Quality Act, "a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. Pursuant to CEQA, an economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant."

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01835-10 regarding an explanation of thresholds of significance and where thresholds of significance were identified in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01881-186

Comment:

Example: page ES 21 4.1 Aircraft Noise 1. "Total population/dwellings exposed to aircraft noise above 65 CNEL" How much population is significant? How many dwellings are significant? The term used "significant and unavoidable" but does not say anything other than it is "substantial".

Response:

The example given is from the Draft EIS/EIR Executive Summary. As further described in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR,

impacts due to aircraft noise are defined as those sensitive uses which would be newly exposed to high noise levels or subject to a substantial increase in noise levels. While the analyses disclosed the overall change in noise exposure compared to the 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions, significant impacts were identified solely as those noise sensitive uses that would be newly exposed to high noise levels or would be exposed to a substantial increase in noise levels compared to baseline conditions. Significant impacts, while not specifically articulated in the Executive Summary, were fully described and quantified in the above referenced sections. A summary of aircraft noise exposure can be found on page 4-61 of the Draft EIS/EIR in Table 4.1-19, Total Aircraft Noise Exposure Effects Within 65 CNEL - All Alternatives and Table 4.1-20, Significant Increase of 1.5 CNEL Within 65 CNEL of Alternatives Over Environmental Baseline Conditions. Significant unavoidable impacts were described in the referenced sections under the heading "Level of Significance After Mitigation." Please also see Subtopical Response TR-LU-5.2 for a description of noise thresholds used in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01881-187

Comment:

(Page ES-39)

Summary Comparison of Environmental Impacts From Alternatives A, B, and C

"Following is a comprehensive summary of potential impacts associated with the build alternatives. This table is inclusive of all disciplines addressed in Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures, of this Draft EIS/EIR. The table identifies all potential impacts prior to mitigation, including those that would be adverse but not significant, as well as those that would be significant. Master Plan commitments and Mitigation Measures that would reduce or avoid potential impacts are listed. The level of significance after mitigation is also identified. Where pre-mitigation impacts would be adverse but not significant, the level of significance after mitigation is noted as "less than significant." Where pre-mitigation impacts would be potentially significant, but Mitigation Measures would reduce those impacts to a less than significant level, the level of significance after mitigation is noted as "less than significant with mitigation." Impacts that would be beneficial or significant and unavoidable after mitigation are also identified. "

In order to examine the potential impacts of the four alternatives, (Alternative No Action/No Project, Alternatives A, B, and C), it is extremely important to know the definition and interpretation of words that are used in the document. One of the more important words the public needs to understand is the word "significant."

The word "significant" is used throughout the EIS/EIR Master Plan for LAX. We have come to the conclusion, after making several inquiries about the definition of the word 'significant' to high level Deputy Executive Directors of LAWA, there is no one definition capable of applying to all instances of its use. Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures, of this Draft EIS/EIR does not address the definition of "significant."

Therefore it is necessary to ask the same question about similar but different statements included in the Draft EIS/EIR. Please refer to the Executive Summary volume for titles and page numbers of the Executive Summary Tables. Please do not use words that are synonymous with 'significant' to explain define, and interpret the word 'significant' . Some of the words to avoid in explaining the definition are: important, meaningful weighty, notable, profound, pivotal, serious, momentous, substantial and other synonyms of this type. Facts, figures, noise levels, estimated values, decibels, and comparisons would be greatly appreciated. Another words, be specific.

4.1 Noise

Aircraft Noise

Page ES 41

Section

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

(Page ES 42)

Section

4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

3. Comments and Responses

Roadway Noise

Page ES 42

Section

6. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

7. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

Construction Noise

Page ES 43

Section

8. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.2 Land use

Page ES 43

Section

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

Page ES 44

Section

3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

6. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

7. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

8. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

9. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.3 Surface Transportation

4.3.1 On-Airport

Page ES 44

Section

2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

Page ES 45

Section

4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

6. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

7. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

8. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.3.2 Off-Airport

Section

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.4 Social Impacts (page ES 45)

4.4.2 Relocation of Residences and Businesses

Section

1. Please define, explain, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

2. Please define, explain, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

Page ES 46

4.4.4 Community Disruption from Alteration of Surface Transportation Patterns

Section

1. Please define, explain, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

2. Please define, explain, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.5 Induced Socio-Economic Impacts (Growth Inducement)

Section

1. Please define, explain, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

2. Please define, explain, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.6 Air Quality

Section

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
6. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.7 Hydrology and Water Quality

Page ES 47

Section

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.9 Historic, Architectural, Archaeological/Cultural Resources

Section

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section. 4.
- Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

Page ES 48

Section

6. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
7. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.9.2 Paleontological Resources (CEQA)

Section

1. Please define, explain, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.10 Biotic Communities (Including both Flora and Fauna.

Section

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

Page ES 49

Section

2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
6. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
9. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
12. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.11 Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna

Section

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

Page ES 50

Section

3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.12 Wetlands

Section

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.13 Floodplains

Section

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.14 Coastal Resources

3. Comments and Responses

Section

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
6. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
7. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

Page ES 51

4.17 Energy Supply and Natural Resources

Section

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.17.2 Natural Resources

Section

3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.18 Light Emissions

Section

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

Page ES 52

Section

4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.19 Solid Waste

Section

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.21 Design Art and Architectural Application/Aesthetics

Section

2. Please define, explain, quantify; and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

Page ES 53

Section

3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
6. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.22 Earth/Geology (CEQA)

Section

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
6. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
7. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

Page ES 54

Section

8. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.23 Hazardous Materials

Section

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
6. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
7. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
8. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
9. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.24 Human Health and Safety

Section

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

Page ES 55

Section

2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.24.2 Health Effects of Noise (CEQA)

Section

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.24.3 Safety (CEQA)

Section

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.25 Public Utilities

4.25.1 Water Use

Section

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
6. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.25.2 Wastewater (CEQA)

Section

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
6. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.26 Public Services (CEQA)

4.26.1 Fire protection

Section

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

Page ES 57

Section

2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
6. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

3. Comments and Responses

7. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

2.26.2 Law Enforcement (CEQA)

Section

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

Page ES 58

3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.26.3 Parks and Recreation (CEQA)

Section

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.26.4 Libraries (CEQA)

Section

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.27 Schools (CEQA)

Section

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

Page ES 23 line 11

-Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significantly' as it is used in this section.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01835-10 regarding an explanation of thresholds of significance and where thresholds of significance were identified in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01881-188

Comment:

What do we do if the response to our comments are not incorporated in the Final EIS/EIR? What will we have to pay for the volume(s) of the comment/responses?

To our understanding, it is required by law, that LAWA must respond to these comments in writing providing the necessary information, analysis, and as applicable, additional technical reports.(3) The written responses to the comments contained herein shall be directed to:(4)

Roy Hefner, Chairman
Los Angeles International
Airport Area Advisory
Committee
6548 W. 80th Place
Westchester, CA 90045-1404

(3) CEQA, Public Resources Code Section 21000, et. seq.

(4) CEQA, Public Resources Code Section 21092.5.

Response:

In accordance with the provisions of NEPA and CEQA, FAA and LAWA have prepared written responses to all comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, including the comments within this comment letter. The responses contain all necessary information and analysis. These responses are provided herein as part of this Final EIS/EIR. Section 21092.5 of

CEQA, cited by the commentor, requires the lead agency to provide a "written proposed response to a public agency on comments made by that agency." This provision applies only to comments received from public agencies. However, the Final EIS/EIR has been made available for public review at FAA and LAWA and through distribution to public libraries throughout the area, and is available electronically at www.laxmasterplan.org. The purchase price for the Final EIS/EIR is also provided on the LAX Master Plan website.

PC01882 Morgan, Susan None Provided 8/3/2001

PC01882-1

Comment:

I am a 26 year resident of Westchester and I urge you to consider other options with respect to the expansion of LAX. Over the years I have seen (and heard) the increase of air traffic at LAX. While I was well aware of the existence of the airport when I purchased my home, I was not aware of the increased air traffic to come.

It amazes me to repeatedly see people who have been hired to do city planning consistently underestimate the scope of their decisions. Take this opportunity and listen to what the people are saying.

1. There is no more room to expand LAX. It is bursting at the seams. I guess the City planners back in the day didn't get the whole picture...they underestimated the growth of LAX. Admit their mistakes and move on...don't destroy a community because of others miscalculations.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed 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.

PC01882-2

Comment:

2. The City owns airports in Palmdale and Ontario - develop these airports. Give LAX communities some relief and develop these airports (Palmdale and Ontario). The communities surrounding LAX have been bearing the burden of this regional airport for years. Let's have other communities that have the space begin to 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.

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

PC01882-3

Comment:

3. We continue to hear the noise, breathe the air pollution (cars & jets) and had to deal with increased traffic. Enough is enough!

4. Realize the residents of the surrounding communities are not going to take this lying down. There will be lawsuits and public relations nightmares to come.

It all boils down to this: It simply is not fair to ask the communities surrounding LAX to give up the quality of life they have in the name of LAX expansion. This is a big City with other resources--use 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. 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-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.

PC01883

**Marino, Nancy
Vernon**

None Provided

8/5/2001

PC01883-1

Comment:

LAX Master Plan Alternative C is seriously flawed and should be rejected in favor of the "No Project Alternative." First and foremost, it does not begin to solve the problem of increased passenger and freight demands for the Los Angeles region. Secondly, it places far too great a burden on those living and trying to do business in the communities surrounding LAX, with no concomitant benefit to them or to populations elsewhere. Thirdly, there is a finite amount of airspace around LAX, which is dangerously overburdened now, and expansion would increase the potential for a major air disaster beyond reasonable tolerance.

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.

PC01883-2

Comment:

1) In the matter of not solving the passenger and freight needs of the region:

A) Expanding LAX does not make practical or economic sense: LAX currently handles 93% of the entire region's air traffic, despite the fact that it is located at the extreme western edge of Los Angeles, hemmed in by the Pacific Ocean and mature communities already struggling with overcrowding, gridlock and diminishing open space. LAX is currently an onerous trip for most users, who must commute through the highest density traffic arteries of Los Angeles. It is also the farthest distance from the region's greatest growth.

Response:

As stated in Section 1.1.1, Allocation of Air Service Among Regional Airports, of the Draft EIS/EIR (page 1-1), LAX served 74.5 percent of the region's total passengers in 1997, providing all of the international service and two-thirds of the domestic air service for the region. A comparison of air passenger service and market share for the airports in the region was provided in Table 1-2 (page 1-2) 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. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC01883-3

Comment:

LAWA estimates 6,000 new jobs (plus 22,000 during construction) at LAX, along with 173,000 jobs regionally, if the Master Plan is implemented. Many, if not most, of these workers will live where housing and services are affordable and available, which won't be in the ravaged communities of Westchester or El Segundo.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding housing issues, including affordable housing. Also refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding the potential effects of the Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester.

PC01883-4

Comment:

Increasing capacity at LAX will not adequately serve the needs of any communities in the region. Unmanageable increases in ground traffic, inadequately mitigated under the Master Plan, will most affect airport-adjacent communities but will severely impede everyone trying to access the airport. More people in the eastern, growing communities will face longer and more arduous commutes (whether by private or public transportation) to access the airport, and freight will need to be transshipped ever-longer ground distances on ever-more-crowded highways. Increased travel times for all vehicular trips will result in dramatic increases in air pollution. Accelerated deterioration of roadways will increase vehicle maintenance costs and road maintenance costs, and make ground travel much more hazardous for everyone. The result will be diminished economic productivity and quality of life for the entire region.

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 traffic concerns pertaining to the cargo truck traffic plan and neighborhood impacts from trucks, please see Topical Response TR-ST-1. For details on how the future traffic demand from the Playa Vista development was incorporated in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, or traffic forecast years, or technical details on the traffic analysis methodology, please see Topical Response TR-ST-2. Regarding construction traffic issues such as haul routes, staging areas, and mitigation commitments, please see Topical Response TR-ST-3. 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. Air pollution from traffic was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR, and economic impacts were addressed in Section 4.5,

3. Comments and Responses

Induced Socio-Economic Impacts (Growth Inducement), of the Draft EIS/EIR with supporting technical data and analysis provided in Technical Reports 4 and 5. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding quality of life.

PC01883-5

Comment:

B) Air transportation demands exceed LAX's maximum viable capacity: Not only does LAX currently process 93% of regional air traffic, the Master Plan assumes that LAX will continue to be the primary airport of the region! No proposals have been offered which would increase capacity at other regional airports and maintain or reduce the demand on LAX. In other major cities where urbanization has overrun the primary airport, pushing ground traffic and air safety beyond critical limits, a new airport outside the city has proven to be the best solution for that metropolitan area's economic vitality. New York City, Washington, D.C. and Chicago built Kennedy, Dulles and O'Hare, respectively, well outside their cities when growth outstripped the capacities of LaGuardia, National and Midway airports. The newer airports have been a huge benefit to their region's economic growth, while the smaller airports continue to serve as busy ports. Denver International will accommodate growth for decades to come without destroying communities and paving over people's lives. It is time for LAWA and our public officials to recognize the need for new or expanded airport facilities located where they will best serve the needs of the region.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01883-2. 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-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC01883-6

Comment:

C) The Master Plan does not consider integrated transportation concerns: The only sure thing an expanded LAX will offer both surrounding communities and distant ones is: MORE TRAFFIC. Population growth will further clog our streets and highways even if we could freeze airport traffic at current levels. LAWA's proposal disregards all traffic impacts beyond LAX approaches, and offers inadequate "mitigation" for even those. There is no recognition of, let alone mitigation for, the traffic it will generate throughout the region, particularly on the arteries leading to LAX approaches.

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. The study area for the off-airport surface transportation analysis fulfills the requirements of the program level document, per NEPA and CEQA. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology and results.

PC01883-7

Comment:

Of the 93% of the region's air traffic coursing through LAX, nearly half is described as "commuter" hops to other California cities and flights of one hour or less, with this segment projected to have the greatest growth. Air travel time is a small fraction of overall travel time on these flights, and will continue to shrink with a single magnet airport drawing millions from long distances by road through already overcrowded

corridors. Expanding service and access at other airports in the region would relieve the gridlock and give a little more breathing space to intraregional transportation growth.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC01883-2 and PC01883-5.

PC01883-8

Comment:

High speed rail service for short-flight destinations may be a more cost-effective and safer alternative, and there has been NO consideration of this as part of a regional solution.

Response:

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

PC01883-9

Comment:

The solution is NOT to bring more people and freight into LAX; it is to put passenger and freight facilities where they can be most readily accessed by the people who use them.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01883-2.

PC01883-10

Comment:

New and expanded airport facilities distributed around the region, as well as high speed rail, will generate as many if not more jobs, and in a way that will enhance the economic viability of the entire region.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC01883-11

Comment:

2) Regarding the proposed expansion placing far too great a burden on surrounding communities:

A) LAX expansion will breach the promise made to adjacent communities following previous expansion: Parts of Westchester were "taken" by eminent domain in the last expansion of LAX (from 2 to 4 runways), with a promised cap of 58 Million Annual Passengers. LAWA estimates current use at 64 MAP (other estimates say 67 MAP), with a growth to 79 MAP by 2015--even with no project alternative. The Master Plan adds insult to injury by officially sanctioning this breach of promise--and upping the abuse to 89 MAP. Just because the Los Angeles Airport Commission changed its name to LAWA does not give it license to shirk its obligations. Shame on LAWA if it reneges on its promise and permits the further trampling of individual property rights and community interests where no compelling public need exists. The region needs more air transportation facilities elsewhere, not at LAX.

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

3. Comments and Responses

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. Alternative D is designed to 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.

PC01883-12

Comment:

B) The LAX Master Plan calls for the destruction of adjacent communities and will cause the displacement of many residents and local businesses. Why should the communities of Westchester and El Segundo be burdened with additional destruction of significant numbers of their homes and businesses to accommodate (and poorly, at that) the airport needs of communities in the San Fernando Valley, Orange County and inland valleys? Communities adjacent to and close-by LAX will not enjoy any increase in benefits, but will be asked to shoulder nearly all of the burden, including loss of private and public property, loss of housing and services, disruption of lives and businesses, loss of open space, increased air and noise pollution, increased traffic congestion and massive disruptions during construction (for the next 15 years)—in short, total destruction of their quality of life. No "Environmental Justice" program can compensate for that.

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, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and public services impacts including parks in Section 4.26, Public Services. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 16 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-3, and S-4 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, Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts to quality of life, Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, Topical Response TR-ST-3 regarding construction traffic, and Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits.

PC01883-13

Comment:

LAWA should honor its promise to adjacent communities and develop other regional airports and transportation alternatives to accommodate the excess passenger and air cargo traffic at LAX. Such an alternative will more equitably serve all the communities of the region, and more equitably spread the burdens of development.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to 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.

PC01883-14

Comment:

3) Regarding air traffic safety concerns:

A) LAX is unsafe now. One has only to look at the approaches on a clear evening—it looks like a freeway in the sky—to see that the potential for an air disaster over our city is far too great. There is not

enough airspace to handle the present volume of planes, and no amount of added runway or increased runway spacing will reduce that risk.

B) It is not true that air traffic at LAX will inevitably increase to a minimum of 79 MAP. LAWA claims that we are helpless to prevent it. NOT SO: strict enforcement of FAA rules and air traffic safety regulations, and honoring agreements with surrounding communities, would accomplish an immediate reduction in air traffic at the airport.

LAWA needs to design a safe solution to the region's air transportation demands, and Master Plan Alternative C falls far short of this absolute requirement.

Response:

The FAA is responsible for ensuring the safety of aircraft in flight. Air traffic control separation standards are strictly adhered to by the professional air traffic controllers at the Los Angeles ARTCC, Southern California TRACON, and airport traffic control towers at the several airports within the Los Angeles basin.

Market forces and the regulatory structure of the commercial air transportation industry favors and promotes the continued use of primary airports such as LAX. The airlines, not the government, dictate where air service will be provided, and the airlines tend to select airports convenient to their customers. Any agreement between LAWA and a neighboring community limiting access to the airport would be illegal. 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.

PC01883-15

Comment:

Master Plan Alternative C would be a colossal waste of taxpayer money, leading to further, enormous public expenditures to address unmanageable ground transportation demands. You simply cannot squeeze all the people of this region into one airport!

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01883-2.

PC01883-16

Comment:

LAWA must adopt a truly regional approach which takes into account ground transportation needs beyond the immediate airport vicinity, seeking solutions that improve the city as a place to live and work. We cannot "solve" our air transportation crisis by exacerbating our ground transportation crisis.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC01883-2 and PC01883-5.

PC01883-17

Comment:

It is clear that the only sensible solution is a regional plan which disperses both air and ground traffic among several hubs around the region. LAWA must take the initiative in this development because it is the predominant airport authority, and because it already controls several other smaller airports. Even the name "Los Angeles World Airports"--plural--suggests the optimum solution to our air transportation needs. LAWA must also work closely with Orange and San Bernardino counties to assure development of facilities there, and in doing so create a regional framework for growth and jobs that will assure a

3. Comments and Responses

good quality of life in all of our region's cities while maintaining our competitiveness with other metropolitan areas as a business and trade capital.

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 Response to Comment PC01883-2.

PC01883-18

Comment:

LAWA will be committing many additional millions of public money to whatever plan is ultimately chosen. Please, please, do not forsake the public trust by pouring it into one that creates more problems than it purports to solve. Choose the "No Project Alternative" for 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. It should be noted that construction of the improvements proposed by the LAX Master Plan would be funded by airport-related revenues, not through taxpayer funds.

PC01884

**Call, Norman &
Karen**

None Provided

8/6/2001

PC01884-1

Comment:

We have seen many changes in our community in the 29 years we have lived in Westchester.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01884-2

Comment:

The Ralps shopping center has been a moving force in keeping residents shopping in their community. Pleas do NOT take this away from residents.

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

PC01884-3

Comment:

In the summer time when we open windows, we hear airport noises and must increase sound level of entertainment units.

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.

PC01884-4

Comment:

Please don't increase this sound level by expanding the Airport further NORTH or changing flight patterns over residential areas versus current turnaround in ocean.

Response:

For information regarding future noise increases, please see Alternative-Specific Abatement Opportunities in Section 7.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR, Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report and in particular Section 7.2.2, Alternative A. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures and Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement.

PC01884-5

Comment:

LOOK FOR ALTERNATE SIGHTS TO EXPAND like PALMDALE EL TORO, ONTARIO.

Response:

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

PC01885	Knight, Steven	Del Rey Homeowners & Neighbors Association	8/6/2001
----------------	-----------------------	---	-----------------

PC01885-1

Comment:

FOR SEVERAL MONTHS NOW, THE DEL REY HOMEOWNERS AND NEIGHBORS ASSOCIATION HAS BEEN DISCUSSING THE PROJECT PROPOSAL AND ALTERNATIVES FOR THE EXPANSION OF LAX PUT FORTH BY THE FAA, THE CITY OF L.A. AND THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION. WE HAVE SERIOUSLY CONSIDERED THE ENVIRONMENT, THE TRAFFIC, THE NOISE, THE SAFETY AND THE ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF THE PLAN.

WE ARE APPOSED TO ANY CONSTRUCTION OR EXPANSION AT LAX. WE WANT THE AIRPORT CONSTRAINED TO IT'S PRESENT CONFIGURATION, SO THAT NEITHER IT'S PASSENGER NOR FREIGHT TERMINALS CAN EXPAND BEYOND THEIR PRESENT CAPACITY.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; safety impacts in Section 4.24.3, Safety, economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, and construction impacts in Section 4.20, Construction Impacts. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2, S-3, S-4, S-9 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.

PC01885-2

Comment:

OUR CITY IS SPREAD OUT OVER A 90 MILE AREA AND IT IS TIME WE ALLOCATED OUR RESOURCES, OUR ENERGIES AND OUR PLANNING TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF ADDITIONAL INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL FACILITIES. WE DESPERATELY NEED A SECOND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT TO SERVICE THE VALLEY, VENTURA AND SANTA BARBARA COUNTIES.

Response:

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

PC01886	Ross, Elinore	None Provided	8/2/2001
----------------	----------------------	----------------------	-----------------

PC01886-1

Comment:

I own a condo in the Playa del Rey area, and wish to say that in the 18 years that I am living here the noise and pollution have increased tremendously.

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.

PC01886-2

Comment:

Please explain to me why the current system of airports cannot grow in other areas of the region beyond L.A.X.

Response:

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

PC01887

Kozar, Yael

None Provided

PC01887-1

Comment:

My family of 4 totally oppose the LAX plan for expansion! This area is heavily populated with families who would not only lose huge amounts of \$ money if their house sold and they could not afford other neighboring cities, but also would run the risk of their own health & well being-if the airport pollution & congestion from street traffic increased!

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

PC01887-2

Comment:

A neighbor of ours almost lost her baby of 7 months due to infant botulism. The Doctor said it is popular in this area due to construction.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC01887-3

Comment:

Expanding the airport would open up the community to new and unknown health hazards not just from pollution but waste & refuse from the demolition sites themselves.

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, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality and construction impacts in Section 4.20, Construction Impacts. 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.

PC01887-4

Comment:

Please leave our community alone!

There are 24 children from corner to corner on our street that feel safe & secure in our neighborhood. They will grow up here - go to the schools - make their positive marks on the world - because they had a good sense of community throughout their lives in Westchester!

Westchester is unique! It's a very different town in relation to the rest of Los Angeles. It's not overcrowded, most of the homes have been restored and upgraded, It's a college town with lots of kids feeling safe and secure living both on & off campus, its conven't to both the Beach, LA and major arteries, its heavily populated with people who have just bought their 1st home - plus we have people who have lived here their whole lives and even their parents in their 80's. LAX expansion would do a Terrible injustice to all!

Response:

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

PC01888

Hyra, Joan

None Provided

8/7/2001

PC01888-1

Comment:

Our family is once again writing to let you know we are tired of all the pollution affecting our neighborhood from both vehicles and planes. Regional airports are the only solution. LAX cannot expand. Let other areas of Southern California do their part.

Response:

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

PC01889 Beatty, Wendy None Provided

PC01889-1

Comment:

My concerns regarding LAX expansion 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.

PC01889-2

Comment:

1) traffic - it is already "unbearable" on the 405 in either direction, anytime of day or night between Century Blvd. and La Tijera Blvd.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the Congestion Management Program.

PC01889-3

Comment:

Surface streets can only get worse, lots of children and seniors live in my city -

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and TR-ST-2 concerning the Congestion Management Program.

PC01889-4

Comment:

2) noise - during storms when planes take off to the East, the noise is deafening and windows shake - sleep becomes impossible -

Response:

Due to the prevailing winds, aircraft at LAX normally approach and depart to the west (westerly operations). When strong winds are from the east, operations are reversed, with aircraft arriving and departing to the east (easterly operations). Because departure operations use more power than arrivals, the easterly takeoffs are louder for those residing east of the airport than the landings normally are. For further information on this topic, please see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-7.1, and Mitigation Measure N-5 regarding restrictions to easterly operations.

PC01889-5

Comment:

3) air pollution - Always a concern for me. Auto's in idle on the 405, as well as surface streets, air planes waiting for take off.- Can't help but think, these troubles will increase as the airport size increases

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00801-2 regarding the air quality impacts of the build alternatives.

PC01889-6

Comment:

It's time for Long Beach, John Wayne, Palmdale and Burbank to "own" some tourist traffic in and out of LA.

Response:

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

PC01890

**Chapple,
Christopher**

None Provided

7/7/2001

PC01890-1

Comment:

Please do not add or extend runways. Divert increased air traffic to Ontario. Improve public transportation.

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-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to sense a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01890-2

Comment:

Maximize bicycle paths; extend Westchestchester parkway bike path to the beach.

Response:

The project alternatives would not hinder the ability to bike along Westchester Parkway. Where bike paths would be impacted along this route by the project alternatives, the paths would be replaced.

PC01890-3

Comment:

Do not build extra freeways, but link the existing 105 to airport and extend train into the airport. Do not destroy downtown Westchester. One freeway - not a loop road - will be sufficient.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01454-1 regarding the proposed access plan design. See also Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential impacts on the community of Westchester.

PC01891 Shannon-Chapple, None Provided 7/31/2001
Maureen

PC01891-1**Comment:**

I would like to go on record as opposing the LAX expansion plans. The plans directly threaten my neighborhood in several ways. Homes and business will be destroyed; an increase in traffic, both auto and truck, is projected; the noise pollution would increase; the air pollution from traffic and jet fuel emissions would increase (my children already have asthma); the increased likelihood of air accidents is possible with increased air traffic.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed relocation impacts in 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and human health and safety in 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester and Topical Response TR-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.

PC01891-2**Comment:**

It is time the impact of living adjacent to the airport be spread into the wider community. It makes no sense to compound problems in one area and increase traffic and freeway congestion as a result. Develop the outlying 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. 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01892 Stacey, Pam None Provided 8/7/2001

PC01892-1

Comment:

I am daily, hourly, negatively impacted by noise and air pollution from LAX and adamantly oppose any increase or expansion in air traffic, especially on the northern runways. While the airport is addressing the current noise issue with the soundproofing project, nothing is being done or communicated about 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP) and TR-AQ-1 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.

PC01892-2

Comment:

I will actively & enthusiastically oppose any 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.

PC01893 Dorn, Roosevelt City of Inglewood 6/30/2001

PC01893-1

Comment:

Good morning. I'm so pleased to see that you're here this morning. I was hoping that the place would be just jammed.

The city council - I called this meeting, and the city council gave me the authority to send out messages in every - notices in every way possible.

This meeting has probably been given better notice than any meeting that the city has ever had, because we wanted everyone to have an opportunity to come out, hear the responses that have been prepared by the experts in regard to the Draft EIS/EIR Report, and then we want the people to have an opportunity to give their input in regard to the Draft EIS/EIR Report.

Now, along with this humongous EIS/EIR response that has been prepared by the experts, we've also incorporated the comments of the South Bay Cities Council of Governments, so that the South Bay Cities Council of Governments have also been incorporated in the responses of the experts.

What we are here for today is for you to have an opportunity to hear the experts' responses to LAX's Draft EIS/EIR Report, and then we want to hear your responses to that LAX's Draft EIS/EIR Report, and then we want to incorporate your responses into the experts' responses before we send the responses to LAX.

Now, there are those that said, "Well, why did we wait so late to have this meeting?" I did not call the meeting until the reports were ready, number one, and I had received one of the reports. And then number two, I asked that the report be placed on the Internet so that anyone who wanted to download it would be able to download it.

See, we wanted to make certain that every resident had an opportunity to receive this report in order to study it at least a week before this meeting, and that's what we did. And so we feel very good about the fact that, I would say, most of the residents had an opportunity to at least download and receive our response to the EIR/EIS report.

I have read it. I think it's an excellent report. I think you will find that we are objecting to virtually everything that LAX's EIR/EIS report has submitted. And once we submit our responses, and then they respond to that, we will have an opportunity to respond again.

If this does not stop the expansion, then we won't have any choice but to file a lawsuit. But this is the first step to see that that expansion does not occur. This is the first step. If we didn't do this, then we would not be able to file a lawsuit if they proceeded. So we're trying to do everything in our power to protect the residents of Inglewood. This is our response, and this is what we intend to do.

So we want to hear from you. So with the size of the crowd, I'm sure each of you will have at least three minutes to respond. And I'm just hoping that more people show up. But if they do not show up, we were able to contact the president of AT&T Broadband, Ms. Teresa Elder.

See, when I returned from the National Mayors' Meeting, I was told that we would not have this televised, we would not have the cable people here. They said that they didn't have the people to do it, so when I heard that, I immediately called the president in Denver. And of course, she was in a meeting, but I spoke to her assistant.

And lo and behold, within 30 minutes thereafter, all of a sudden we have people here, and the cable people are here now, and it's being televised. And this meeting will be televised at a later time on our local station, and that's what it's all about.

So I want to take this opportunity to thank Teresa Elder for responding; and also the vice president that responded and said, "Yes, Mayor Dorn, we're going to do it. We agree with you. We think this meeting is important enough to be televised."

So God bless all of you. And I hope that you remain and hear this information and respond.

Response:

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

PC01894	Price, Curren	City of Inglewood	6/30/2001
----------------	----------------------	--------------------------	------------------

PC01894-1

Comment:

Good morning. Good to see so many faces here, even on a Saturday.

Over the past several months, I think every member of the council has expressed their opposition to the expansion and concern, certainly, about the EIR regarding the proposed expansion. And I'm pleased to say that the draft EIR that we have, our response to it, I think reflects the serious concerns and opposition to it. It's quite lengthy in detail, and it's thorough, and I think that is an important factor as well.

The draft report came before the council last week. Some of you who were at the meeting or saw the meeting expressed concerns that you did not have a chance to make comments prior to the draft being approved.

3. Comments and Responses

We heard those calls, we heard those concerns, and chose not to approve it until we had a chance to have some additional input from citizens, until you had a chance to more fully understand and appreciate the position that your city was taking in opposition to it.

So as the mayor pointed out, we took some extraordinary steps to get the word out. Notices were in the water bill. We did Walkman, newspapers, fliers, on the Internet, and we're here televising it on cable today. So I'm pleased that we've made an effort to get the word out, and I'm very pleased that you are here to participate in this important process.

We have experts here today to answer your questions, to provide some pertinent insight, but of course your concerns are of utmost importance, and so we look forward to hearing them, recording them, and reflecting them in the final report that we submit.

So again, I appreciate your participation, and I look forward to a productive morning.

Response:

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

PC01895 Dunlap, Judy City of Inglewood 6/30/2001

PC01895-1

Comment:

I too am pleased to be here for this event. I'm hoping that more and more residents will begin to come in as the morning progresses, because this surely is a very critical meeting for the residents to be involved in, to give input, and to listen to what the city has devised with regard to comments that we're going to be submitting on your behalf which represent you.

I'm also glad that the city did take the effort to put the word out citywide. It's very critical that everyone at least have the information available so that they can attend these very important meetings.

I'm going to save most of my time for my remarks after I too listen to some of the reports of our experts that we have here so that I may make my comments.

But I'd like everyone to know that we have, at least in my office for District 2 -- and anyone in the city is welcome to use them. I have personally made two additional books with regard to - it has all of this information, and you may check them out from my office if you'd like to personally review all of the material that the city is submitting so that you can have that to look at to evaluate before you make your written suggestions to the city, as well as to LAWA yourself.

With that, I'll close for now, and look forward to our presentation this afternoon.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01896 Fernandez, Jose City of Inglewood 6/30/2001

PC01896-1

Comment:

Good morning, everyone.

This is an opportunity for everyone to give their input. The city council is extremely important - extremely interested in what you have to say, and I am very interested in what you have to say.

We know the impact of noise in our community. It's been here since I've been born and before, and we want to make sure that this issue is an issue we begin to start to revolve. The issue of noise insulation is extremely important, and we really need to get some direction.

There's a lot of signals coming from different areas, and I think the city council needs to hear from you directly on what you'd like to see in the future.

I know that in my district, people complain over and over again that they need to have their homes insulated, that they are tired of what's going on, and I'm sure a lot of you feel the same way. So this is an opportunity for you to give input and to tell us how you feel on this very important issue.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

PC01897 Cole, Walter Congressman Maxine 6/30/2001
Waters' Office

PC01897-1

Comment:

First of all, I'd like to thank the mayor, the city council members, for inviting me here today to speak.

First of all, I have to commend the city on the wonderful job, the excellent job, you have done as far as letting the community know about this meeting. You've done a far better job than LAWA or the FAA has done in letting the community know about their meetings. So again, I'd like to thank you for doing that.

I just have a few comments. The congresswoman will also be submitting her comments in mid July, in the next week or two, and many of the same things that are in your comments we also find in ours.

First of all, this is a highly flawed document, which we have also found violates NEPA and CEQA laws in many different areas. But I'd like to go over just a couple things that we have found as far as our - the congressman's comments as far as her experts that have looked at this and what they have come up with.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01897-2

Comment:

First of all, the master plan is deceiving, in that its preferred option is entitled "No Additional Runway." This name implies that no runway is to be built. However, all four existing runways will be altered, moved, and otherwise reconstructed, thus resulting in basically four completely new runways.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative C (the No Additional Runway Alternative), which does not add any additional runways, does reconstruct three of the existing four runways by moving and extending them to improve aircraft operations, alleviate airfield congestions, and enhance safety. Runway 7L/25R would remain unchanged. In the Master Plan, Alternative C is referred to as the No Additional Runway Alternative because it does not propose any additional runways and is the only build alternative that maintains a four runway system. Alternative D, the most recent proposed Alternative will maintain LAX's existing four total runway system though three of the four existing runways would be modified if Alternative D were constructed. The only alternative that would not require altering, moving, or reconstructing any runways is the No Action/No Project Alternative. For further discussion of the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative C, please see the Master Plan Chapter V, Sections 3.3.1.1 and 3.3.1.4.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01897-3

Comment:

The environment is also a victim of the expansion. LAWA admits that low-income and minority populations will bear the largest burden from expansion. They will be exposed to increased noise and air pollution.

Response:

Comment noted. Environmental Justice related, including the potential for disproportionate effects to noise and air quality, was addressed in Section 4.4.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Topical Response TR-EJ-1 regarding potential air quality impacts on low-income and minority communities.

PC01897-4

Comment:

LAWA has instituted an environmental justice task force. Despite multiple requests from our office and from the congresswoman, we have been unable to obtain information regarding the efforts of this task force - basically, Who is on it? When do they meet? Is there an agenda item from their meetings?

Response:

As indicated in Section 4.4.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the Environmental Justice Task Force included representatives of public interest groups with experience analyzing the impacts of transportation projects on minority and low-income communities, along with LAWA staff and consultants. As further described in Topical Response TR-EJ-2, the Task Force was involved in the review of environmental justice documentation and in defining outreach efforts and possible mitigation measures to be undertaken as part of the Environmental Justice Program. The EJ Task Force met periodically in the months leading up to circulation of the Draft EIS/EIR. After release of the Draft EIS/EIR, a smaller working group continued the efforts initiated by the EJ Task Force as further described in Topical Response TR-EJ-2.

PC01897-5

Comment:

Also, the most affected populations, again, are low-income and minority populations. They have a high susceptibility to a majority of health problems such as asthma and cardiovascular diseases created by air pollution, and tend to have less adequate health care to help them deal with these issues.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-190.

PC01897-6

Comment:

The Draft EIS/EIR spends a great deal of time explaining economic benefit in jobs as a result of the expansion, but the truth is, jobs and throwing money at us does not help mitigate many of the environmental consequences of this proposed expansion project.

Response:

Comment noted. Both the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR presented a broad range of mitigation measures that were proposed to reduce or avoid environmental impacts associated with the Draft LAX Master Plan as described in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. These mitigation measures provided the basis for the mitigation measures presented in this Final EIS/EIR.

PC01897-7**Comment:**

The Draft EIS/EIR also concludes that the only way, the only way, to improve air quality in the area is to reduce airport activities, especially at LAX, of course.

Response:

With or without implementation of the proposed LAX Master Plan, the amount of air traffic, surface traffic, and airport activities would increase at LAX as compared to the environmental baseline. As a consequence of the increase in airport activities, emissions of criteria pollutants from mobile, stationary, and area sources associated with LAX are expected to increase.

PC01897-8**Comment:**

The Draft EIS/EIR also lacks studies regarding the true health effects of the toxic air pollutants released by the airport as a result of their expansion, and also lacks any analysis of this, and also lacks any remedy for this, which also in many ways violates many of the CEQA laws.

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 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.

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).

PC01897-9**Comment:**

LAWA has not completed their current noise abatement programs, and these programs should also be completed before any expansion projects are begun.

Response:

Implementation of the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP) is an ongoing process that includes both on-airport operational procedures, in-flight policies, and off-airport programs such as soundproofing and property acquisitions for noise compatibility purposes. Ongoing implementation of the ANMP would continue under any of the Master Plan alternatives including the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01897-10**Comment:**

And again, one of the most important things is the effect of noise on children and their learning abilities. And we've found various studies, some done here at LAX, that have shown that children exposed to high levels of noise on a continuous basis have poor reading skills, and may develop poor persistence in challenging tasks, when compared to children living in quieter neighborhoods.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC01897-11

Comment:

So these are just a few things, among the many, many flaws and many horrible environmental issues that will be facing us if this proposed expansion takes place.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments above. 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.

PC01897-12

Comment:

Two other items I'd like to mention is that the congresswoman, as of Thursday, submitted two bills to the House of Representatives. One will be the Airport Aircraft Noise Compensation Act, and this bill will basically require those air carriers that use LAX to provide -- to contribute funds to nonprofit organizations in the community that basically provide health services to persons living with disabilities and hearing impaired persons that live within the impacted areas.

Also, the second bill is the LAX Noise Community Accountability Act, and this act will require LAX -- will require LAWA to mail annual noise reports to all hospitals within the airports footprint and within a ten-mile radius of the airport. This, obviously, will include all of the City of Inglewood.

They will also require a detailed description of the extent to which aircraft noise is increased or decreased during the previous year, with the dates and times of plane arrivals and departures that have taken place during prohibitive hours through the previous year, a description of all efforts to reduce airport noise, the extent to which these efforts were successful, and the means and methods used to achieve the noise reduction.

Also, a description of all plans to further reduce airport noise, including noise reduction goals and time tables for the achievement of these goals.

Information about the availability of federal, state and local residential noise mitigation funds, and the application procedures for these funds, will also be required to be sent to residents.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01897-13

Comment:

Again, these are, like I say, a few things we're trying to do to stop this expansion. This is definitely the congresswoman's number one priority right now in the district. She realizes that this expansion, if it goes through, will impact neighborhoods, will impact Inglewood, impact Los Angeles for decades to come, for a century to come.

Response:

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

PC01897-14**Comment:**

And this area already is also overburdened, and we need to look at other areas - Palmdale, Ontario, possibly a facility in El Toro - that will help, you know, take some of the burden off of Inglewood, off of Los Angeles, off of Lennox, off of all of the surrounding communities, and spread some of the burden around to the areas that actually use the airport the most.

Response:

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

PC01898**Hill, Lavonne****Assemblyman Jerome Horton's
Office****6/30/2001****PC01898-1****Comment:**

Good morning, everyone.

Thank you for giving us this opportunity to offer comments about the LAX expansion. My name is Lavonne Hill, and I'm offering comments on behalf of the Honorable Jerome Horton, of the 51st State Assembly District.

Mr. Horton would like for you to know that 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 they can proceed with any expansion effort. If they fail to accurately identify all of the negative impacts and to provide a remedial action plan, the airport may not be allowed to expand. Therefore, you can see the importance of your comments and my comments and suggestions before the deadline for the formal public comment hearing.

Response:

The City of Los Angeles and the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration jointly prepared a Draft EIS/EIR and a Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, in compliance with NEPA and CEQA. These documents described the potential impacts associated with the four build alternatives and the No Action/No Project Alternative, and identified measures that would reduce or eliminate these adverse impacts. The City and FAA jointly held 12 public hearings on the Draft EIS/EIR and twelve public hearings on the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The comment period for both documents exceeded the public comment period required by federal and state laws and regulations.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01898-2

Comment:

For various reasons, Mr. Horton continues to be opposed to the proposed airport master expansion plan, and the current draft environmental impact statement and environmental impact report.

In his opinion, the current EIS/EIR does not satisfy the legal requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act, nor the National Environmental Policy Act, in numerous areas.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01898-3

Comment:

He feels that the airport expansion as proposed will have numerous detrimental environmental impacts on the City of Inglewood and its surrounding neighborhoods. The expansion will cause an increase in auto and air traffic, increased noise pollution, increase and aggravate existing health effects, such as asthma, hearing loss, sleep deprivation, and others, 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 noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding residential property values, Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding quality of life, Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, and Response to Comment AL00017-246 regarding hearing loss. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01898-4

Comment:

We would like for you to know, as an Inglewood city councilman, he authored an initiative to employ legal experts to provide the city with a detailed analysis of the EIR/EIS, and advise the city on how to legally oppose the expansion.

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.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01898-5

Comment:

The lawsuit that was filed against the airport and United Airlines for incrementally trying to expand the airport under the illusion of expanding cargo storage space, although it was not successful, we were successful in legally stalling the construction, and establishing that airlines share liability for negative environmental impacts.

3. Comments and Responses

This established an important precedent, and will prove useful in future dealings with the airport. The courts reaffirmed the need to exhaust all administrative procedures and remedies before suing. Thus the reason we must share our concerns via this formal public comment period, and ask them to respond to these concerns within a reasonable period of time.

Response:

Comment noted. In accordance with the provisions of NEPA and CEQA, FAA and LAWA have prepared written responses to all comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR. These responses are provided herein as part of this Final EIS/EIR.

PC01898-6

Comment:

The airport master plan and Draft EIS/EIR do attempt to address anticipated environmental impacts. However, what is offered is insufficient, and needs to be revised in order to ensure that our neighborhoods stay safe and environmentally sound.

It is quite evident that the draft EIR/EIS fails to satisfy federal policy concerning environmental justice and state law, because it does not consider alternatives and other locations, and it unfairly and disproportionately burdens minority and low-income populations surrounding the airport.

Response:

Issues pertaining to environmental justice were addressed in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01898-7

Comment:

For these other reasons, Mr. Horton would like for you to join and encourage others to work together to present a united front, because we all share a common goal of opposing the proposed expansion, and to this end, strongly believes that working intelligently and collectively will yield positive results.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01899

Murray, Sharon

**Supervisor Yvonne Burke's
Office**

6/30/2001

PC01899-1

Comment:

Good morning, council members. Good morning, panel.

My name is Sharon Murray. I'm here on behalf of County Supervisor Yvonne Braithwaite Burke.

In late January, Supervisor Burke proposed a motion to the Board of Supervisors to urge the board to go on record to oppose all three expansion proposals -and I'll read - for the following reasons:

The LAWA's preferred expansion plan, Plan C, contemplates an increase to 90 million passengers a year. Expansion of any magnitude will affect the quality of life standards for residents living near the airport, as well as for many local businesses and schools. Expansion will increase the environmental air, noise and traffic hazards that are already unmanageable around the airport. Mitigation efforts being proposed cannot effectively address these issues.

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; traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; and impacts to schools in Section 4.27, Schools. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, and 17 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.

PC01899-2

Comment:

Airport officials have conceded that expansion will cause many problems in the surrounding communities, communities which are comprised mostly of minority neighborhoods, which have endured a disproportionate amount of environmental hazards. These hazards have not been addressed from the last expansion two decades ago, despite assurances from LAX officials.

Response:

Environmental justice impacts were addressed in Section 4.4.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, and included presentation of the framework of a proposed benefits program for affected communities.

It should be noted 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, shifts the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive analysis of Alternative D and was circulated for public review and comment.

Although the conclusion of the Draft EIS/EIR was that Alternative C would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region, that conclusion has been superseded by the conclusion of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D is now considered to be the Environmentally Superior alternative and would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region.

PC01899-3

Comment:

Any expansion will displace residents and businesses and traffic congestion. Aircraft noise pollution will increase. While soundproofing of residences and businesses are being recommended as a mitigation effort, this mitigation effort essentially keeps people inside their homes and businesses, and is contrary to all efforts of developing safer, cohesive neighborhoods, which is key to economic development and safer communities.

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, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, and safety in 4.24.3, Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program 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

PC01899-4**Comment:**

We must look at the needs of air travel from a regional perspective. Some airports in the Southern California area have the capacity and local support for expansion. And all of this must be considered and in place before we should move forward on considering expansion of the facilities at LAX.

Response:

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

PC01899-5**Comment:**

This is not to say that Supervisor Burke is against modernization, enhancement or improvement of the existing facilities of LAX or the addition of new facilities. These upgrading efforts, which are not necessarily expansion efforts, should also be considered as alternatives to nonexpansion of LAX.

Therefore, Supervisor Burke moves that Board of Supervisors take a do-not-support position on the LAX expansion plan as written; support a thorough study for modernization, enhancement and improvement of existing facilities at LAX, including terminals that can accommodate the new generation of larger, quieter aircraft; reconfiguration of runways; air traffic control tower safety improvement; relocation of small commuter planes that now take up 30 percent of the air traffic;

Support efforts to enhance traffic flow in and around LAX; encourage public transportation, and alleviate noise pollution and traffic congestion on surface streets, which now affect the residential and business communities; support a cap on the annual number of flights landing and taking off at LAX at the present level of 790,000;

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments AL00033-39 and PC00281-17 regarding the relocation of commuter aircraft to other airports and Response to Comment PC01018-29 regarding the imposition of a cap on the number of flights at LAX and PC01018-50 regarding the ability of LAX to accommodate new large aircraft. 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 (consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP). 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.

PC01899-6**Comment:**

Support the lowering of the decibel threshold, and elimination of abrogation of easements being imposed by LAWA;

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01899-7

Comment:

establish an LAX expansion review committee, comprised of representatives from the CAO, aviation commission, county counsel, regional planning and public works, to advise the board on these issues and provide recommendations.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01899-8

Comment:

We're also encouraging everyone to participate in the 180-day review process.

Response:

Comment noted. The comment period for the Draft EIS/EIR was extended for a total of 295 days.

PC01900

**Dickerson, Esq.,
Charles**

City of Inglewood

6/30/2001

PC01900-1

Comment:

We're delighted that so many of you have come today to hear about these comments that we have prepared in response to the environmental impact statement and environmental impact report which has been submitted by LAX.

At the risk of perhaps being a little bit too simplistic, I'm going to nevertheless take that risk, because lawyers are frequently accused of speaking in legalese or putting items in language that sometimes kind of goes over even our own heads.

So I'm going to try my very hardest to explain some of the concepts and ideas that have been forwarded as a result of this entire project being proposed. If this is too simple for you, please bear with me. If it is not, I hope it will be of some help and assistance to you.

Essentially, I want to describe to you how we have arrived at where we are today, and then tell you exactly where we are today, and then I will be presenting the experts who will provide the information.

How did we get to where we are today?

Approximately eight years ago, as of tomorrow, Richard Riordan became mayor of Los Angeles. When he became mayor of Los Angeles, he did at least two things that have had an extremely significant impact on the residents of the City of Inglewood.

What were those things? They were both related to construction and development. The first was, he determined that it would be in the best interests of the City of Los Angeles to build the Staples Center, and in so doing, it was his intent that the local teams that were playing here in Inglewood - namely, the Lakers, the Kings, the Sparks -- would move from Inglewood to Los Angeles.

In fact, that has happened, and as a result, the City of Inglewood has suffered some detriments, and some of those detriments are primarily related to revenue. We no longer receive some of the tax benefits that we had from having those teams play within our city.

The second thing that he did that had such a significant impact on the City of Inglewood is, he decided that in order to increase economic development in the region of Los Angeles, that the Los Angeles airport should be expanded.

I'll say that again. In order to increase the economic viability, the economic vitality, of the Los Angeles region, he believed that Los Angeles Airport should be expand.

So what did he do? He appointed a number of commissioners to the Los Angeles Airport Commission who took his ideas and created what is now commonly referred to as the Los Angeles Master Plan. That master plan describes, sets forth, presents a means through which Los Angeles World Airport, specifically, LAX airport here, can be expanded.

We talk a lot about the expansion of LAX, and I'd like to talk for just a moment about exactly what that means. Some of you have had the benefit of seeing some of the comments and the summaries that we provided, and some of this information is included there; and we might be duplicative, but I think we better take that risk today.

Expansion means an increase of operations at Los Angeles Airport. Well, what does that mean, an expansion of operations at LAX? It means that the effort will be to make Los Angeles Airport in such a way that it can accommodate additional passengers and additional cargo; obviously, the two elements that come in on airplanes. So the whole idea about expanding LAX airport is to make it so that airport can accommodate more passengers and more cargo.

How would they do that? Well, it's very simple. They are going to have to, in order to accommodate more passengers, build more terminals. In order to accommodate more cargo, they are going to have to build more cargo facilities. And in order to accommodate more passengers and cargo, they need to build new roads and build new passageways through which passengers and cargo can get to and out of Los Angeles Airport.

By building these new terminals and building these new roads, it was the intent of Mayor Riordan of Los Angeles and the Los Angeles Airport Commission to allow for an expansion of Los Angeles Airport.

And that is the first step. They created this 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.

PC01900-2

Comment:

Now, once they created the master plan, the law requires that if in fact they are going to construct new roads or construct new facilities, construct new terminals, they must prepare and circulate two documents. One is called an environmental impact statement, the other is called an environmental impact report.

You will hear a lot of talk about an EIS and an EIR, and that's exactly what they are - EIS, environmental impact statement; EIR, environmental impact report.

Well, what are those? The law says that any time a developer is going to build something -- in essence; I'm summarizing here -- but in essence, any time a developer is going to build something, that developer must take into consideration the impact that the development will have on the environment.

Any time a developer is going to develop something, build something, that developer must submit a statement that describes and explains what environmental impact will occur as a result of that development.

Well, Los Angeles Airport is, in this sense, a developer, because it is determining that it is going to build new roads, build new facilities, build new terminals, and in so doing, it is required -- "it" being Los

3. Comments and Responses

Angeles Airport -- is required to submit an environmental impact statement and environmental impact report, which describe the environmental impacts that will impact upon the various communities around the airport as a result of the development.

Just so you'll know, you will hear sometimes a reference to NEPA and CEQA, and I want to tell you what those are for just a very quick moment so that you'll understand what we're talking about when we talk about the law imposes this requirement.

NEPA is the National Environmental Policy Act, N-E-P-A. That is an act which was enacted by the United States Congress. Under that act, any developer must submit an EIS, or environmental impact statement, before that developer can go forward with the development.

California has its own environmental act. It is called the California Environmental Quality Act. We frequently refer to it as CEQA, California Environmental Quality Act. And under the California Environmental Quality Act, or CEQA, any developer who is going to develop must submit an environmental impact report, E-I-R.

So we have a national act, we have a state act. Under the national act, which is called NEPA, or the National Environmental Policy Act, a developer must submit an EIS, environmental impact statement. Under the state act, the state law, the California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA, a developer must submit an environmental impact report. There's where we get to EIS/EIR.

So to summarize so far, the commission, pursuant to Mayor Riordan's direction, decided, "We're going to develop these additional things out in L.A." The law says that L.A. airport must now, if they are going to do this development, submit this environmental impact report/environmental impact statement.

Los Angeles World Airport in fact prepared an environmental impact report/environmental impact statement, EIR/EIS. And I hope you won't mind us primarily referring to it as the EIR/EIS from this point forward.

That EIR/EIS was submitted on January 18, 2001, this year. That document comprises over 12,000 pages, and was developed, I think, at a cost of approximately \$60 million.

What I mean by that is, when Los Angeles Airport commission decided that they needed to develop these additional facilities, and therefore had to come forward with an environmental impact report or environmental impact statement, they hired experts, and those experts made an analysis and submitted their report.

I'm telling you that the cost to the Los Angeles Airport for developing their master plan and their environmental impact statement and environmental impact report was approximately \$60 million. That's six zero million dollars. And it took them many years to do this.

Mayor Riordan wanted this to be one of the hallmarks of his administration, so he wanted this done prior to his leaving office, and as many of you know, today is in fact his last day in office.

I don't mean to turn this into a political rally.

But in any event, he wanted to have this done prior to his leaving office, so now, in January of this year, his commission submitted the environmental impact statement and environmental impact report.

Now, under the law, the CEQA and NEPA law, interested parties have an opportunity to comment on what is said in the environmental impact statement and environmental impact report. Interested parties can get up and object and say, "You, developer, you LAX, have said that you're going to build this, and you are saying you're going to build this additional facility, you're going to build this additional terminal, you're going to build these additional roads, and you, LAX, are saying that as a result of building these roads and facilities, there are going to be environmental impacts on the communities around Los Angeles."

"However, we, Los Angeles Airport, are going to mitigate those environmental impacts by doing A, B, C, D and E." That's what they put in this 12,000-page document. They said, "We're going to do X, Y and Z, and as a result of doing X, Y and Z, A, B and C is going to happen. But if A, B and C happens, we're

going to do D, E and F to make sure that A, B and C doesn't hurt the people of Inglewood, the people of Lennox, the people in the surrounding communities."

Interested parties such as you, such as the city, such as us, have an opportunity, under both of those laws, NEPA and CEQA, to object, to raise concerns, to raise issues. We're permitted to say, "We do not believe that the impacts that are supposedly mitigated by this environmental impact statement or environmental impact report are sufficient."

In fact, people like you and people like us have an opportunity to say, "You shouldn't be doing this at all. And the reason why you shouldn't be doing this at all is because of the impact that it will have on the environment."

This is the primary way through which individuals such as ourselves have an opportunity to raise objections to a development such as the expansion of LAX. That's why it is so vitally important to the City of Inglewood, to our elected officials, to each of you, that we participate in this process here and now, because this is really the forum through which we have an opportunity to say to L.A., "We don't think this development should go forward."

Now, I want to make it very clear. This is a legal requirement. And when I say "this," I need to be more clear. Our submitting our objections is a legal requirement to any further legal action that the City of Inglewood may contemplate at any time in the future. If we do not submit comments, either orally or in writing, then we will not have any legal standing to challenge this development. So that's why it's so vital and important that we do this.

Response:

Comment noted. In accordance with the provisions of NEPA and CEQA, FAA and LAWA have prepared written responses to all comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. These responses are provided herein as part of this Final EIS/EIR.

PC01900-3

Comment:

I also want to distinguish for you the difference between the legal challenge and the political challenge.

The legal challenge is one that focuses on: Why should this project be stopped as a matter of law? The political challenge says: Why is this not good public policy?

Now, the two are often very closely enmeshed, and in the legislature and congress, those two concepts come together consistently, the creation of law and public policy. But at this point, they are separate and distinct concepts.

What we are doing here today is providing to you the information that we have gathered to be able to say to L.A. and any court that we may ultimately discuss this with, "This development should not go forward as a matter of law."

That is an argument that is totally distinct from any effort that may be promoted by this panel, by you, to say this project should not go forward as a matter of public policy. That is an entirely different effort, one in which we invite your participation as well. But today we're going to be focusing on why we, as the representatives of the City of Inglewood, are saying this project should not go forward as a matter of law.

Now, that's kind of how we got here. That's what this is all about today. We are wanting to explain to you why we have the arguments that we have developed to suggest to L.A., and ultimately to a judge if need be, why this project should not go forward as a matter of law.

In creating our arguments for saying this matter should not -- this development should not go forward as a matter of law, we have had to analyze the environmental impact statement and report which was submitted by Los Angeles Airport, and in so doing, we have hired experts.

3. Comments and Responses

The first experts that we hired was the law firm of Radcliff, Frandsen & Dongell. We hired them based on my recommendation. My recommendation was based on the idea that this is one of the world renowned environmental law firms that specializes in handling environmental matters. Not only are they based here in the Los Angeles area, but they have offices around the world.

You're going to hear today from at least three members of that firm. The first person that you're going to hear from is Jules Radcliff. The name of the firm is Radcliff, Frandsen & Dongell. Mr. Radcliff is the senior partner of that firm.

Mr. Radcliff is going to talk with you in just a few minutes about the four alternatives for the development of the project that LAX has set forth. What does that mean?

Essentially, when L.A. decided that we were going to build out LAX, expand LAX so it could accommodate more passengers and more cargo, and then set forth an environmental impact statement and environmental impact report, in so doing, LAX considered four different alternatives for how the development should go forward.

We commonly refer to those alternatives as Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and what is called the No Action/No Project Alternative. That's Alternative A, B, C, and No Action. In just a moment, Mr. Radcliff is going to speak with you and explain to you what is Alternative A, what is Alternative B, what is Alternative C, and what is the No Action Project -- No Action/No Project alternative.

After he speaks we're going to hear from other experts who have analyzed other elements of the proposed project and how it will environmentally impact us, how it will increase noise in Inglewood, how it will increase traffic in Inglewood, how it will have an impact on air quality in Inglewood, how it will have human health risks attendant to it.

And because I don't want to overburden you with too much -- I almost feel like I have already -- we're going to take this one step at a time. I'll first introduce Mr. Radcliff, and he will give his comments, and then I'll come back and introduce the other experts as they come up.

But starting with Jules Radcliff, I'd like you to know that he's a member of the California and District of Columbia Bars, having graduated from UCLA Law School in 1976. He is also a graduate of California State University at Northridge.

He is a contributing editor to the International Court of Justice opinion briefs, which is an American Bar Association project. He served as executive assistant to Lt. Governor

-- Leo McCarthy, from 1983 to 1984, has been a member of the Los Angeles County Courthouse board of directors since '89. He's served on a variety of charitable and public service organizations. He's a well-known, well-respected, world-renowned lawyer, who is a specialist in this area, and I am pleased and proud that he has consented to accept the responsibility of carrying out Inglewood's response to the environmental impact/ environmental statement report.

So without further ado, I'd like to present to you our lawyer, Mr. Jules Radcliff.

Response:

Comment noted. Responses to comments provided by Mr. Jules Radcliff are provided in responses to comment letter PC01901.

PC01901 Radcliff, Esq., Jules Radcliff, Frandsen & Dongell 6/30/2001

PC01901-1

Comment:

One of the things I want to start with, because Chuck said he was going to keep this simple, mine's going to be a lot simpler than that.

It goes without saying this airport is just an enormous, gigantic, politically powerful presence in this area and this city. Dealing with changes of this proposed magnitude over at that airport is a challenge for anybody. And I'm going to stress something here, because I think it's why most of you are here.

We're going to talk about a lot of technical things so you know what's happening on the legal side, but the starting point is this: Your city council, your mayor, the city administrator, Joe Rouzan, and Chuck Dickerson have, I think, done an extremely skillful and very adroit job at trying to manage that behemoth sitting over here. I think they've gone a good job in managing the relationship.

There is no one person, no one city, no one anywhere, who can dictate, who can simply say, "No, you can't do it." It's a complex task.

Chuck Dickerson mentioned a major piece of this already. It's both legal and it's political. You, unquestionably, have an opportunity to influence the political. And I appreciate the fact that Mr. Dickerson commented on how we got where we are today.

This started off with Dick Riordan, and we just happen to be sitting here as there's a change in administration taking place. There's probably going to be a change over at the LAX board. My guess is there may be a little bit more open and sympathetic ear.

You people have to live with this, as do a lot of others around here. There has to be a balance between the needs of the airport, whatever they may be, and the fact that human beings have to live here. And I think the timing just couldn't be better for this, and I would encourage absolutely everybody, that's either watching this later on cable or sitting here today, to go ahead and take a shot and see if you can make a little bit of a difference.

Jim Hahn, who I've known as long as he's been in public office, has been a person who has always listened, and I suspect he's going to have a very good working relationship with this council and with the people in this city.

What I wanted to do was just sort of tee up the issues, if you will, kind of give some framework to what we're talking about here, and give you some framework so that when you call these people, when you call Jim Hahn's office, when you call whoever, don't let them buffalo you.

Don't let them snow you. It's not all that complicated. The technical stuff, I have trouble following. You don't have to follow it. That's what these guys all get paid to do. That's their job.

But what's happening at the moment is we're coming up on this big showdown. We are there, people. The showdown has arrived. Your council has been looking at this for months; the city, under Riordan, has been gearing up for months, and now the die is being cast.

They are throwing down the gauntlet, and they throw it down in the form of this master plan. And what's going to happen is the city, through the careful management that they have brought to the relationship with this airport, is going to continue to work the political side of it, no question about it.

And they have made the commitment to bring on people who know how to deal with the technical side of this. Make no mistake, there's a showdown here, and one of two things is going to happen, and it's this simple.

When all of the comments, all of the criticisms, all of the responses, all of the reactions to this master plan is received - again, keep in mind, it's a new mayor as well - when all of this comes in, they are either going to throw it out or make big changes in it, in which event they have to come back, and they are going to try to do it in a different form -- that would be good - or they are going to say, "I don't care. We're going to do it anyway."

And if that's the case, as Mayor Dorn said, it goes without saying, that's a lawsuit. That's what we'll be handling. And the whole point to the technical challenge is to cross every "t" and dot every "i," so that when you file the lawsuit, a judge somewhere says, "Hold on. You did it wrong. You gotta go back."

My personal opinion is, on balance, by and large, if you have to file a lawsuit, you've lost, because right now --think about this - you're either right or you're not. And you're going to hear some things explained here today that will tell you that in fact, you're not crazy. You're right. This is nuts, what they are doing.

3. Comments and Responses

The problem that has been encountered so far is a mayor determined to push it through no matter what -- he doesn't live here -- and a staffed board over at LAX doing his bidding - they don't live here -- so they didn't care what anybody said. That's my opinion.

And if we had four more years of that, I think they would say, "We're going to ignore you. We hear you. Nice of you to talk to us, but we're going to do it anyway."

Now, this starts to be more of a political talk than a legal talk, but it's important to know we're not looking at four more years, we're not even looking at four more days, of that mayor, and so what you want to do is hear what your city council, your city administrative officer, your city attorney, and to a certain extent what we have to say.

But listen and take your cue from them, because they are good at this, and this is the time to go for the jugular. You have an opportunity to get this fixed. You have an opportunity to change it.

Now what I'm going to turn to is, I'm going to frame the legal issues and technical issues that they are going to address, and if you guys are like me, there have been times that I have sat in on things like this on an issue I didn't know a lot about, and when I began to hear all the technical stuff, I started to kind of fold my tent a bit. I was a little bit intimidated. I kind of thought, I don't know this stuff too well, and all I need is somebody to answer me back in some sort of technical gibberish, and I won't be able to say anything.

Don't fall for that here. You're going to hear some very practical problems with what these people want to do. And I don't think any of us are crazy. We haven't put our heads in the sand and said, "No, there don't need to be some reasonable accommodations at LAX." That's not it at all.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01901-2

Comment:

What they have laid out over at LAX is nuts, and it needs to get rolled back, it needs to get revisited, it needs to get downsized, and most importantly, it needs to be put in the context of this whole 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. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC01901-3

Comment:

There's a technical legal issue, and this goes directly to something Chuck Dickerson mentioned. It's a legal issue, but it's wrapped all around a very common sense issue. The legal issue says, when they're thinking about doing something like this at LAX, must they take into account the whole region -- Palmdale, Ontario, Long Beach -- or can they just restrict their thinking to this airport? That's a technical legal issue.

But think about the common sense. You're going to hear one of the reasons LAX is saying they have to do this is because they don't have a choice. It's going to grow like crazy no matter what, and they can either expand the infrastructure to accommodate it or not.

That's not necessarily true. If in fact there were no airport at Ontario, no airport at Burbank, no airport at Long Beach, if there were no other airports, then maybe they've got a point. That's a legal issue, but it's a common sense issue.

Response:

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

PC01901-4

Comment:

And if I were to be in your shoes, and I wanted to work with the council people here, and with the mayor and the city attorney and Joe Rouzan, in trying to do something about this, I wouldn't try to latch on to everything.

I would pick two or three common sense issues, and I would look these people in the eye -- I mean the new mayor's administration and the people at LAX -- and I would say, "You tell me that I'm wrong on a common sense level. You tell me that." Because you have the comfort sitting here of knowing that your city has already put together the legal team and the expert team that can deal with the technical arguments. Hit them with the common sense arguments.

Here's what you're looking at. The reason I say it's a showdown, we're working on a time schedule now that is largely a function of law. It's the rules. This can't go on forever, so it's going to come to a head here real quick, and a lot of what me, my firm, the experts are going to be doing is taking care of the practical technical deadlines.

Don't even give it a thought. That will happen. But when the whole thing comes to a head, and then the new mayor, presumably the new airport board and others, have to make a decision, was this a lunatic idea or not? and then they'll go forward.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01901-5

Comment:

When you get into the dialogue, what you're going to hear - and let me now turn to what this master plan says. And I've tried to distill it down so that I can understand it.

It starts with the assumption - and I've already touched on this, and for anybody taking notes, this is one you put a big mark by, because this is the one they can't defend.

It starts with the assumption that LAX is going to grow no matter what. Maybe that's true, maybe it's not. We're debating that. They are saying that over the coming 10, 15 years, the annual passenger traffic at LAX is going to go up by at least 21 million. 21 million people. It's going to go up.

It's going to go from the current 58-, 60-, 65 million, whatever it is per year right now, it's going to go on up by at least 21 million. That's what they are saying. And they are saying the cargo traffic is going to go up by another million to a million and a half tons of cargo per year, with no changes over there. That's what they are saying.

That is not necessarily a correct premise. Think about this. You're part of an extended family. The airports are part of an extended family of airports in different regions. You happen to have the house where everybody has decided they want to stay. You talk to your other relatives and you say, "Come on, you can take some of these kids and some of these cousins into your house over there in the next neighborhood. Don't put it all on me."

That's what's going on over here. These people at LAX are saying, "No, you don't get to do that. You just have to stay focused on your house." That's a huge fundamental legal issue and it's a huge fundamental practical issue, and it's the practical part that you can hammer on.

3. Comments and Responses

But I wanted to start there, because that's where LAX started. And if you take the time to read the executive summary of this master plan, or, God forbid, the whole master plan - it's an unbelievable document - they slip that in. They just slip it in.

The gist of it is, "Here in our master plan we're going to tell you that we're very reasonable people, and we considered four alternatives, and we tried to balance the interests, and we tried to select the alternative that we believe does the least amount of harm to the community, et cetera, while still taking care of the needs of the airport."

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

PC01901-6

Comment:

You guys know, as I know, there are people in Orange County that drive up here and use this airport to go places. Now, there may be very good practical reasons for that, but it strikes me they've got all the power. They can talk to the FAA, or whoever they need to, and try to get airports in Orange County to have better connections. I don't know what it takes. That's their problem, not ours. But that's where they start.

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.

PC01901-7

Comment:

So what I'm underscoring here, you're going to hear most of the technical analysis focused upon the one alternative that LAX says they want to use, and I'm telling you, be careful. That's a legal requirement, but it is a political trap.

Do not fall prey to the notion that these people considered every alternative, because they didn't, but this is the way they have legally teed up the issue for us, so legally, we have to meet them on that ground.

Politically, your hands are not tied that way. Politically, you can start at the beginning, and you can say, "Hold on here. There's an alternative that you all missed, and that is, take all this power" -- what was it, \$60 million they've pumped into this? What would that have bought it in the way of lobbying power in congress if they had tried to put a little of that time and effort into increasing the traffic to other regional airports around here? That's my point. So let's turn to alternatives, not as we define them, but as LAX teed them up for us.

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

PC01901-8

Comment:

They said, as Chuck pointed out, that there were three, four alternatives. The fourth alternative was basically do nothing, no project, no nothing. They rejected that out of hand for everything I just explained.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that neither the City of Los Angeles nor the FAA has made a decision regarding approval of the Master Plan, including the No Action/No Project Alternative. It should also be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01901-9

Comment:

So let's take a few moments to talk about the three alternatives. And I just love this. It's like - the way LAX is doing this, it's a little bit like talking to a child, because the child knows no better, so you say, "I'll give you three choices, and that's it," and the kid doesn't know that's crazy, there's --

So I'm struggling with that issue myself, and that's why I'm dwelling on it. It's a political issue. It's hard for us to attack legally, but you folks can hammer away on it.

But they say there's three major alternatives. Of the three alternatives -- they are labeled A, B and C, easily enough. Of the three alternatives, I'm just going to give you a brief synopsis of them so that you're conversant with what they do.

Two of them involve adding runways, so let's start with what kind of impact these three do-something alternatives have on the community, because two of them, Alternatives A and B, both involve new runways, one on the north side, one on the south side. It's going to have an impact. Alternative C doesn't involve adding a new runway.

It involves extending an existing runway, so there's an increase in a lot of stuff at LAX. In order to accommodate these increased runways and the resulting increase in capacity, all manner of things have to happen in the community and surrounding the community.

All three alternatives involve building a new terminal, putting a peripheral road around LAX, an express highway connecting 405 to LAX, things of that nature. And the three alternatives -- which I'll call the three build alternatives -- the three alternatives collectively, under A and B, the City of Los Angeles will be acquiring 330 businesses -- gone. Under A and B, the City of Los Angeles will be acquiring 57 single-family homes and 27 multiple-family units, most likely apartments -- gone.

3. Comments and Responses

The city says, "That's why we didn't pick A and B. That's why we went with C," because under C -- which only involves extending a runway, not adding a new one -- but under C, the city will still take away 240 businesses - 240 gone.

Most amazingly, under C, you still lose the same number of single-family homes, 57, and you still lose 27 multiple-unit structures. So LAX says, "Well, that's a heck of a lot better for everybody. We're only going to wipe out 100 less businesses, but still 200 plus. Never no mind we still wipe out the same number of living quarters."

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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 require the acquisition of any residences.

PC01901-10

Comment:

At the airport itself, under Alternatives A and B, they both result in increasing the number of gates, new gates. A would increase the new gates by 87, so it would go up to 273 gates. The current number is 186. B would increase the number of gates by 69, to 255 total. Again, there's 186 gates over there right now.

So LAX says, "Well, we're going to try to reduce the impact." So under C --which is the favored alternative for LAX, that's what they want to do. They are going to increase the number of gates by 42, so it would go to 228 gates.

Now, an editorial footnote for a second. What they have done is pose a horrible, and then they have said, "But we're not going to give you the horrible. We're going to give you the awful. The horrible being 87 new gates, but we're just going to add 42." So you're supposed to be thankful and feel a lot better that you're just not going to get it quite as bad as you could have gotten it, because they could have been bad guys and gone with A.

They say that under all three alternatives, the number of flights is going to increase. Now, I don't know about you, I live in a flight path as well, and I don't kind of really care how many gates are at the airport that's driving me nuts. I just know that when I'm sitting outside and a plane goes overhead, I tend to count airplanes.

Under A, they are saying -- and this really starts to become a parade of horrors -- "If you guys don't watch out, we're going to hit you with 485 increased flights." It could be that bad. If we go to Alternative B, same number.

Now, these are not stupid people. They know -- [jet aircraft noise]. Hear it? They know that's what reminds you. That reminds you every time. So they are saying, "It could be 485, but because we want to minimize the impact on you, under C, we're going to increase it by 85."

Now, think about it. How dumb do they think we are? If they had started out saying, "We're going to go to 85, or it could be ten," right, we'd be up in arms, going, "Oh, my" -- you know. So they start out saying, "Could be 485. Lucky you. Under the alternative that we're going to do, no matter what, you're going to get 85 new flights."

They pulled the same stunt with the number of passengers. Under Alternatives A and B, there will be an increase of 40 million passengers per year. Under Alternative C, the one they are going to do, it's 31 million passengers per year increase.

Now, again, the big hit with passengers is how many people are driving around the neighborhood, but that translates less directly than airplanes over your head.

Those are the major differences. I could tell you the cargo numbers increase, you would understand that, but it doesn't have quite the same impact. It's trucks on the street, and all the rest. The numbers aren't as dramatic between A, B and C.

But they are saying, "A, B, C - we have to do one of the three, because we have to build. We don't have a choice. And at a minimum, we have to add a new terminal, a roadway around, an express road," all that kind of stuff, and they are saying, "Be thankful. We could put 480 flights over your head more, but we're just going to do 85."

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated that would 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 or LAX Expressway.

PC01901-11

Comment:

What they are not looking at is the no build/no project alternative, the one they rejected, the one they just kind of ignored.

Response:

Neither FAA nor the City of Los Angeles has selected a preferred alternative, or approved the LAX Master Plan. The No Action/No Project Alternative has not been rejected, nor ignored. A complete analysis of the environmental consequences associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative is provided in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01901-12

Comment:

Now, in transitioning over to these folks, the practical political points of sensitivity -- and again, pay close attention to what your council people say, what your mayor is saying, the city administrative officer, and the city attorney.

They are signaling, directly and indirectly, the political points of vulnerability that you can hammer away at. All I have done is highlight those that relate directly to the presentation you're going to hear, and what I don't want to do is sit down leaving you feeling like what these guys say next are the only arguments you have, because I struggle with what I hear when they start talking.

What matters is, they are making a mockery of the process. They are treating us like children. They are saying, the same way we say to a child, "I could give you three whacks on the butt, or I could give you one." Thank God it's going to be just one.

That's what they're doing here, and they are doing it because they are saying, "We don't have to take into account what happens in the whole region. Huge legal common sense flaw in this plan.

Response:

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

PC01901-13

Comment:

What you're going to hear now is focusing principally upon their Alternative C, as we must do, because that's what LAX has done. And again, I'm just trying to emphasize, don't fall for the trap. Don't take the bait. This is not necessarily take C or die. You don't quite have that problem.

We have the problem, because we have to pick C apart. And it will come as no surprise to you, as you listen to what these folks say -- this goes to the political process -when a mayor makes a decision that he's going to strip all your teams away from you and take them downtown, and to heck with you, there's

3. Comments and Responses

a lot of horsepower behind that; and a lot of people just kind of get caught up in it, and they get away with it.

When he says, "I'm going to take and turn LAX into something vastly bigger than it is," you at least have some legal hurdles he has to go over, and as he goes over those legal hurdles, you get to do something that you don't get to do when he strips your teams away. You get to say, "Let's take a look at all of those legal assumptions you just made."

And so the important point here is, we're not making this up. You're going to hear flaws, and we're not the only people who see them. These flaws actually exist. And it should not come as a surprise that there are flaws, because when somebody with enough horsepower in government wants something, everybody else has a tendency to get in line and say, "Yup, I'll do it."

And guess what. In the product that they produce, they tend to give short shrift to some problems. They tend to take some issues and kind of put them back here, hoping you won't see them, and they tend to take some other issues and say, "Well, you know, let me deal with that."

But then they give you a lot of smoke and mirrors, and our job has been to wade through 12,000 pages and figure out where's the smoke and mirrors, where's the nonsense, where are the things that we know are there.

Any time somebody is absolutely determined to ram something home and run roughshod over you, you can bet they are going to make mistakes. There's going to be flaws. And happily, for purposes of the legal hurdle they have to go over, those flaws are very important. And again, it's what all these guys are all going to be addressing.

So I'll turn it back over to Chuck. But recognize, just because you're hearing these flaws, that's only Alternative C out of three, but the LAX people are ignoring the fourth, which is, they don't have to do this.

But anyway, these guys will give you the flaws in C. They are not making it up. It's pretty bad.

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. This new option - Alternative D - The Enhanced Safety and Security Plan - was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment PC01901-8 regarding the status of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01902

Hattis, Dale

Clark University

6/30/2001

PC01902-1

Comment:

One of my favorite definitions of an expert is "more than 50 miles from home." And in a way, as Mr. Dickerson has said, I'm really not -- this feels quite a bit like coming home, because, you know, I grew up here, and I'm just pleased to try to help in making the analysis that is done for air traffic expansion in the LAX area fair and informative to all the people who are going to be affected by that.

And I think that's really one of the important responsibilities of technical types, is to communicate, to ask the questions that should help a democratic society, the people of a democratic society, to make the choices that will affect their lives.

So what I want to talk to you a little bit about is, at least in theory, about how one should try to structure an analysis to be informative in making choices, and then I'll tell you a little bit about the ways in which I think the current analysis that LAWA has offered falls short of what you should have expected, particularly for a \$60 million enterprise, and what can be relatively readily remedied in further analysis that you can suggest that they do.

Anyhow, the basic idea -- and this is basic common sense that is really not rocket science. If I'm going to make a choice, what I first would like to do is to define the full range of the realistic choices that I have available to meet the perceived needs that I'm building the project for.

Second, I want to fairly and fully assess the results that I might care about that could follow from those different choices over the whole time scale where the differences are going to be created in the world that would result from the alternatives that I've defined.

And finally, I want to make those methods that I use to do the analysis and the results clear and accessible to all of those who are affected.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC01902-2

Comment:

Now, starting with the first, you've already heard quite a bit of discussion about the problems and the way that the current 12,000-page analysis has structured the problem, and one of the big things that I think they really should be encouraged to consider are possible economic actions that would have the effect of shifting the demand from the LAX airport to outlying airports, because it's just common sense.

You know, do you want to place a major polluting facility upwind of the population or downwind of the population? I think, you know, it's pretty clear that there's going to be some benefits to shifting it downwind.

And it's also pretty clear that people who use air services respond to economic incentives. So if I create a \$200 difference between landing at LAX and landing at Ontario, right, there's going to be a fair number of folks who are going to consider that. And if you create such differentials by having increased user charges at LAX, maybe some subsidies for the outlying airports, then I think you're going to have a chance of making that shift, and it seems to me that we ought to examine the consequences of possible choices along those lines.

They would generate -- obviously, if you had some increased user charges, it would generate some additional revenue that could also be used, in fact, to fund other mitigation actions that would sort of lower the existing burden that the community now has.

You would expect to change the rate of increase in demand for air service at LAX. At the very least, if you have to build something, maybe you could build it on a more extended schedule, with better environmentally protected technology, and benefit in that way.

And finally, the other thing that should be noticed is sort of an equity issue that gets to the environmental justice domain, and that is that if you create a system that does not accommodate all of the demands that you project to be happening, well, you're creating essentially a monopoly-type situation.

So those folks who control the access to a limiting resource are going to have the opportunity, and most likely are going to take the opportunity, to realize the economic benefits from control of the restricted access. So essentially, if I control a limiting resource, then I've got a chance to raise the revenue.

So that if the governmental entities don't impose the user charges to control the demand, then it's likely that other economic factors, like airlines, are going to realize that benefit, and so that creates, you know, a situation that it seems to me should be analyzed in a fully sophisticated analysis.

Response:

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.

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

3. Comments and Responses

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.

On a number of occasions since the airlines were deregulated, airport operators have sought to implement more economic-based pricing models with limited and mixed success. The U.S. Department of Transportation rejected Massport's peak period pricing theory because it was based on a faulty cost-allocation methodology. The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey was successful in promulgating a congestion pricing recommendation through the FAA's Notice of Proposed Rule Making procedure in 2000. The NPRM has been set aside for now due to the downturn in activity since mid-2001. The FAA's current Rule on Rates and Charges, under the principle of Prohibition of Unjust Discrimination, would not seem to permit peak period pricing in order to force aircraft operators to use another airport.

The landing fees and terminal rentals at a given airport typically represent between 4 and 6 percent of an airline's cost to operate at that airport. Differential pricing between airports in a region would be a minor factor among the many that an airline would consider when deciding whether to provide service to a given airport.

PC01902-3

Comment:

So let's go on to, necessarily, the issues of framing the options for comparison, which I think can be clearly improved with a recognition of the possibilities of economic measures and measures involving shifting the demand to outlying 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.

PC01902-4

Comment:

There's also a number of serious problems in the way the current document assesses and compares the consequences of the different policy choices.

Firstly, they mainly talk about impacts in two different snapshots in time: 2005, which is sort of during the construction, but actually is not actually at the peak of construction -- they would get bigger impacts had they actually done the analysis as of 2004, which is the actual peak; and 2015, which is after the construction is supposed to be completed.

If you're going to have a picture of the total impacts, you need to understand, what is the total sum of impacts that we expect over the entire period. They could do that. They didn't do that. They should have done that. They can do that in further analysis if you insist.

Response:

The year 2005 was selected as an interim year to compare and evaluate impacts associated with each alternative during the course of project implementation. The year 2004 as being the peak year for construction-related air pollutant emissions for Alternatives A, B, and C was accounted for in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01902-5

Comment:

The second thing -- and this is actually even a bigger issue -- is that the impacts are expressed in terms of "the significance" for the most exposed individual in a particular area for the air pollutants, or the area in some cases that is significantly affected, either by having too much cancer risk or cancer risk

exceeding a particular value, or having too much noncancer risk, given an even more arcane set of units.

It would be much better and much more understandable to everybody if they were to go beyond this artificial definition of significance, and basically tell you, to the degree that we can from our existing information, how many cancers do we expect to be produced under the different options, so that we can see, okay, how many extra serious health problems are happening, how many extra folks do we expect to have asthma attacks because of the particles in the air.

Response:

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

Chemical exposure is likely to result from many common human activities, with a resulting potential for health risk. For example, benzene exposure may occur during the act of fueling a vehicle. Ambient air in even the most rural of areas contains chemicals that pose a health risk. Therefore, some measure is necessary to evaluate whether potential human health impacts are significant. Thresholds of significance are used for this purpose and are more suited to the evaluation presented in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01902-6

Comment:

And the particles in the air are most important for increasing deaths mostly from heart attacks and related conditions. And we have now the capability, from a large number of epidemiological studies in Los Angeles, and in about 89 other cities in the country in the most recent analysis, to say, within some broad ranges, how much extra deaths do we expect from the extra load of particles in the air.

They could do that. Seems to me that's part of being frank with the community about what the total effects of the alternative actions are. And it wouldn't cost 60 million bucks to do that, but it does require a little bit different analysis that takes into account the latest scientific literature that's available in the field and some improvements in their air pollution modeling.

Response:

The content of this comment is essentially the same as comment PC01902-5; please refer to Response to Comment PC01902-5.

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

PC01902-7

Comment:

Actually, air pollution modeling sort of takes information about the amount of particles and other pollutants that are emitted, that are released, and then says, 'Okay, where did they go? How quickly? How much are people exposed to?'

Right now, essentially, what they've done is to take a relatively defined area around the airport and say, "We're going to quantify the impacts here, because we're pretty sure that that's where the most intense impacts are."

But if you really want to assess the total benefits and total costs in health terms for the community of Southern California as a whole, the South Coast Air Quality basin, you need to have a basinwide modeling of the extra impacts, and suffice it to say they didn't do that.

They've calculated basinwide or Southern California-wide changes in economic flows. They can tell you, "Okay, this is our estimate of the extra number of jobs that are going to happen, the extra dollars that are going to be realized by different levels of different sectors of the economy."

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please refer to Response to Comment AL00017-35.

PC01902-8

Comment:

It seems to me that it's fair to assess the health changes, at least those that we know about, in the same population aggregate units, and then to break it down --what does it mean for Inglewood, okay? What does it mean for El Segundo? What does it mean for Los Angeles as a whole? -- so that you can make your judgments about whether the requirements of the environmental justice portions of the Act are reasonably satisfied, or you can in fact bargain for the mix of changes in mitigation measures and other policies that would be fair in approaching the needs of the community as a whole.

That's enough for the technical stuff.

Response:

Please refer to TR-EJ-1 regarding potential air quality and health risk impacts on low-income and minority communities.

Cancer risks and chronic non-cancer hazards were presented graphically in the Draft EIS/EIR as risk or hazard isopleths. These isopleths provided an illustration of how risk and hazard might be distributed in communities around the airport. Additional clarification was provided in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR about risks and hazards for individual communities. Risk and hazard isopleths based on residential exposure were presented on maps that identified community boundaries. Please refer to Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and subsection 4.1.3 of Technical Report S-9a of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for additional details and results of the evaluation.

PC01902-9

Comment:

Finally, I think it's important that they communicate. That the document that's done as a result of this communicate fairly and appropriately.

Oh yeah, let's - we've got a little bit more on the technical stuff, but I'll be quick about this.

It's important in making this kind of broader analysis that the methods and results be clear and accessible to all of those who are affected, so I think it's important that you create a consolidated bottom-line summary of expected outcomes for different parties, including the economic benefits for LAWA and the airlines, and the expected health changes.

So, you know, in important technical issues, they need to show the sensitivity of the results to alternative possibilities. Do you think that anybody can predict air travel population growth over the next 20 years with absolute certainty? No, of course not.

You know, they have to expose the uncertainties, the consequences of major possible states of the world, for the results of their choices. I mean, this is basically fair and honest in trying to do an analysis.

These things have uncertainties. There are ways of trying to estimate what those uncertainties are, and fairly carry the uncertainties through the analysis -- what is the effect of this and that possibility on the overall costs and benefits, health effects, noise effects, what have you, that we expect to result?

I think I've gone into that, and I think at this stage, I'll turn it over to you folks for further discussion. I think we have a number of other presenters. And I'd be happy to amplify on any of these issues in response to any question you folks have.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01903**Freytag, John****None Provided****6/30/2001****PC01903-1****Comment:**

I'll try to take everything to heart that I've heard here so far as far as simplifying the explanation. And I'd also kind of like to reiterate what Mr. Radcliff said. He had some excellent ideas of other things that should be done.

Nonetheless, my assignment was to review the document that was before me. And that is not to say that I don't think there are a lot of other things that should be done, but the focus of my work here has been to look for deficiencies and things that I think are lacking in this document. And they are significant, but that is not the entire story right there.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01903-2**Comment:**

So what we have here in the noise analysis portion of this master plan EIS/EIR is somewhat straightforward. They prepared a noise exposure analysis for two base years, the year 2005, the year 2015, for each of the three scenarios, the no project, and as well, they compared that with what they call the baseline year.

Now, I know a lot of you have a lot of experience in noise, so I'll try to be kind of brief, but for those of you that haven't, there's really three elements that go into what we call noise exposure.

The first of those is, obviously, how loud the individual aircraft are. I think that's pretty obvious.

But secondarily, and equally important, is the volume of aircraft. We obviously have a much worse situation with more aircraft than with fewer aircraft, so that is factored into this noise exposure measure.

And then the third item that goes into this is the distribution of those aircraft, whether they happen during the daytime, the evening or the nighttime. The evening aircraft are penalized by some 35db, while the nighttime are penalized by 10db. And that's the standard that has been established out in California and accepted nationally, and it is the standard that was used to evaluate here.

As I will mention in a moment, I don't believe that's everything that should be said on this subject, but it is a standard. It's correlated with social surveys of percentage of people highly annoyed. And quite frankly, we had only one number. There's no reason you need only one number, but if you had to use one number, probably the CNEL measure is probably the best for average community response.

Response:

The level of total noise is not related directly to the number of operations, but rather to the combination of the number of operations and the level of noise produced by each. For example, 1000 operations by a small single engine propeller aircraft would produce approximately the same noise energy as one operation by a B-727. Also, the penalty associated with operations that occur during the evening (7 p.m.-9:59 p.m.) is 4.77 decibels.

LAWA conducted an analysis of the impacts associated with single event noise. That analysis was provided in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR with supporting data in Appendix S-X and Technical Report S-1. Also please see Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01903-3

Comment:

Coupled with that, we want to look kind of at the history of the noise exposure here at LAX, and it pretty much parallels what's happened across the country. Essentially, over the last 20 years, the individual aircraft have been getting a little bit quieter. Certainly, the old 707s and early 727s are certainly quieter than the planes we have now.

But while all that has happened, we have also gotten tremendously more aircraft. And not surprisingly, the predictions that are set forth in all these scenarios kind of tend to show the same thing --well, we're going to keep getting quieter aircraft, but there are going to be a lot more of them.

The way this is put together, the CNEL equation shows that we have had a historical decline in noise exposure. If you've been watching the noise contours as they are published here, they get gradually ever so smaller. They've been inching back for some 20 years.

Response:

Old 707's and 727's produced noise levels with at least twice as much noise energy as aircraft of similar sizes that are in operation today. The forecasts indicate that on the average day in 2015, Alternatives A and B would provide for the operation of approximately 18 percent more aircraft, while Alternative C and the No Action/No Project Alternative, as well as Alternative D, would provide for a decrease in total operations from Year 2000 levels due to no additional runways and a significant reduction in propeller driven aircraft. For additional information on this topic, please see Topical Response TR-N-6 and Subtopical Response TR-N-3.3. 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.

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included information comparing each of the study alternatives to the Year 2000 noise conditions. The commentor will find that the Year 2000 contours are narrower than the 1996 contours north and south of the airport, but longer and broader than the 1996 contours along the approach paths east of the airport. The estimated population within the 65 CNEL contour actually increases from 49,000 under the environmental baseline to 50,300 under Year 2000 conditions. For additional information on this topic, please see Topical Response TR-N-1 regarding the noise modeling approach, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-1.3, and Topical Response TR-GEN-1 regarding the environmental baseline.

PC01903-4

Comment:

Now, that brings me to the first and really what I consider a key deficiency in this assessment, and that is the use of the 1996 baseline year. Essentially, the noise impact is presented by saying, well, here's what it is, what they call "now." It stays current throughout the entire EIR/EIS, and here's what it will be in the future; and you lay one contour over the other, and you can see the new areas and all this, how much is it going to grow.

Well, why in the year 2001 are we using a 1996 baseline year? I know it takes a while to come up with 12,000 pages, but it doesn't take five years. Now, the reason -- well, I can't say why they did it, but I can tell you the effect. This noise has been going down most dramatically over the last ten years.

Just briefly, in 1990 they passed something called the Airport Noise and Capacity Act, and basically, the FAA said, "We're going to phase out the noisiest airplanes by the year 2000." And there's a lot more to the story than that, as you might imagine.

But basically, that's what they did, and there were phaseouts. And sure enough, we have gotten rid of most of the noisiest airplanes. There's always going to be noisy airplanes, but there are no longer planes flying that are noisier than a certain certified threshold.

So by picking the year 1996 instead of the year 2000, you've got a noisier environment than you have today. So what is being compared here throughout all of these alternatives is a 1996 base year that's noisier than what we have now. So when we compare these two contours, and we count the impacted population in these areas, and the schools and the churches and the number of dwelling units and all that, we're comparing it with the history five years ago and not really what's happening today. I think a more appropriate year certainly would have been something like 2000.

Now, I'm certainly not the only one to discover this. I certainly want to give credit to the South Bay Council of Governments, because when I got around to reading their review of the noise, they came up with exactly the same thing. So that's the first key point.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00033-87.

PC01903-5

Comment:

Second point is certainly worth mentioning. It's not as dramatic. Here we have these flight tracks that are shown on one of these here. That's where all the lines are with the planes in the sky, and that's the basis of how these contours are put up.

Obviously, you take the planes, you know how high they climb and you know how much noise they put out, and then you add up all of this noise energy and you come up with these noise contours. And there's an FAA standard program that was used to do this.

Now, the thing of it is, these planes do not fly on one line in the sky all the time. They have very defined air traffic procedures and all, but they have crosswinds, and this, that and the other, and there's a known leeway in the way these planes disburse as they go out here. And it's all part of air traffic control, and it's all monitored on the radar, and all the information is available, certainly to the airport, in preparing this.

They should have used more flight tracks, disbursed them more. You'll get slightly larger contours by doing that. In other words, for example, if we have a single flight track in the sky, and we have two airplanes on exactly the same flight track, you'll have a smaller contour than if you take each of those planes and you fan them out just a little bit. So that's a fairly important issue, and certainly one that's worth bringing up.

Response:

Not all aircraft operations are identical and aircraft operations may be impacted by a variety of factors. Section 4.1, Noise of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix D, Aircraft Technical Noise Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, completed under FAA Orders 5050.4A and 1050.1D. For more information on track dispersion please see Topical Response TR-N-1 regarding the noise modeling approach, particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-1.4 regarding simplified line drawing flight tracks vs. track dispersion.

PC01903-6

Comment:

The third point I wanted to bring up is that the CNEL, or this community noise equivalent level, is a sole measure or metric used to measure the noise, and it's an absolute requirement that that be done; but it's also left that supplemental noise analyses may also be done, and I think, certainly for a project this size and this magnitude, that that would have been appropriate.

There's really nothing in the CNEL that relates directly to speech interference, the speech interference that you realize at home and that you realize in schools -- the fact that you can't carry on a conversation over the dinner table or watch the TV or talk on the telephone, those types of interferences - do not relate directly to this total noise dose, this integration of noise level and noise volume.

3. Comments and Responses

So I think they did - a time above analysis is mentioned in here. However, they never did anything with it; never did any conclusions, never left us another way to look at the noise.

Response:

To better respond to public requests for more information about single event noise, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR includes two substantive new analyses - one addresses nighttime awakenings and the other discusses the effects of single events on speech interference in schools. Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR includes more than 100 pages of grid point information that provided single event and time-above computations for numerous locations throughout the noise-affected area around the airport. For further information related to this topic, please see Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-2.4. In addition, please see 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, regarding analysis of single-event noise impacts.

PC01903-7

Comment:

Another, I think, very serious impact: We hear an awful lot by the proponents of the airport that it's of some kind of economic benefit. And without going into that, they really, I feel, need to say, "Well, what is the economic detriment?" And that is, on the property values of the residences and business in this community. There's no financial impact of any sort on this.

I think it could reasonably be done. We certainly have historical real estate records on property values here. You can compare similar properties that are highly noise impacted with these that aren't and come up with something like that. Dollars are dollars, and I think that it's only fair to look at both sides of the coin on that issue.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding the effects of LAX on property values.

PC01903-8

Comment:

Finally, they included in the end, almost as an appendix, kind of a laundry list of health-noise impact issues, but then they never conducted any analyses of those. And these are very, very serious. Certainly, sleep interference. There's no way to directly relate the CNEL value to sleep interference. You need to look at the individual noise levels of the aircraft, how loud they are in the homes.

There's other health effects, such as increased stress and all. I think that in the large aggregate of the Inglewood community that there's probably a lot of stress and all, and there's not a word mentioned in the report in the way of assessing that.

We've already talked a little bit about environmental justice issues, like where do these contours go.

And then finally, I think one of the key issues that I would certainly like to have seen in this is the learning effect on children. There's much more literature coming out on this all the time.

When children are interrupted, it isn't just that they've lost what the teacher might have been saying at one point. It's distracted the whole class, and it takes them a while to come back in. It's a complex and a very serious issue. And that's the final issue I think should have been covered in this.

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. Please see also Topical Response TR-EJ-1 regarding health effects and environmental justice.

PC01903-9

Comment:

So those are the comments that I recommend be put in for the critique of the document.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC01903-1 through PC01903-8 above.

PC01904 Vandenburg, Tom Radcliff, Frandsen & Dongell 6/30/2001

PC01904-1

Comment:

I'm going to be presenting the comments that Mr. Calkins had. I'm a lawyer, not an air pollution expert, but I'm going to try to cover what he covered.

And they put up a board. There's five main points for Mr. Calkins' report that I want to talk about. He actually did two reports for us, and they are on the website in the appendices, so you can download those and read those for yourself.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC01904-2

Comment:

The first issue that I want to talk about in regards to his report is environmental justice. Now, I want to just describe what I understand environmental justice to be. There are two parts to that.

Environmental justice is a concept in law, both in federal law and in California law. The first concept is, the concept of the undue burden from a project should not fall on communities that are low income or minority. That's what environmental justice says. It says you should spread the burden, and not have it simply fall on people of low income or minority.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01904-3

Comment:

The second one, the second concept for environmental justice, is that if you're going to inflict burdens on people, you also have to give them benefits, so there has to be a balance.

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

3. Comments and Responses

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.

PC01904-4

Comment:

Now, I want to talk about that in terms of Mr. Calkins, but I also want to direct you to Mr. Dickerson's letter, because after the summary, the first topic that his letter talks about is environmental justice, and he shows in that letter that LAWA has missed on both of those point. So I just want to direct you guys to that.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01904-5

Comment:

But in terms of air pollution, Mr. Calkins looked at that, and what he said was this. He said one area that they did not look at was ozone. Ozone is smog. The document has a passing comment about ozone. It says that ozone might increase.

Now, they are required to analyze every significant effect, okay? Ozone is a very significant effect. Studies have shown that ozone leads to increased cases of asthma and increased cases of respiratory illness, and for them to simply say that ozone might increase, they are just playing - you know, they are glossing over something that's very important.

Response:

Because ozone is a regional pollutant and can only be predicted using regional photochemical models that account for all sources of precursors in the South Coast Air Basin, it was beyond the scope of the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR to address the future attainment of either the 1-hour or 8-hour ozone ambient air quality standards.

PC01904-6

Comment:

The second issue is that the master plan does not conform to other local plans. Now, LAWA can do what they want on their property, but in the overall scheme of things, they are required to fit their plan into a regional plan, and they've got two big problems. The first is called the regional transportation plan.

Now, a lot of people probably know what the regional transportation plan is. You probably were involved in the regional transportation plan. The Southern California Association of Governments gets together and comes up with a plan for the next 25 years for all transportation in Southern California.

Now, that just happened a couple of months ago, and part of that plan is that LAX does not expand. Now, the LAX master plan contemplates huge expansion at LAX. The regional transportation plan says no. So they've got a real problem here. They are supposed to conform their plan to what SCAG is saying, and they haven't done that, so they are going to have a real problem. If they try to defend that in a court of law, they are going to have a real problem with that.

Response:

Local airport owners/operators, such as LAWA, must consider adopted regional plans (including SCAG's RTP) in their decision-making process. They are not required, however, to fit their plan into the regional plan. In response to the direction of Mayor Hahn, LAWA has developed a new alternative for consideration as part of the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D, the Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, is designed to serve aviation activity at LAX consistent with the SCAG 2001 RTP selected aviation scenario. To ensure that the LAX Master Plan Alternative D was fully analyzed to the level of the previous Master Plan alternatives, LAWA prepared a Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. 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 Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding the consistency of Master Plan alternatives with local and regional plans.

PC01904-7

Comment:

They have another plan they have a problem with, too. It's called the air quality maintenance plan. Southern California has an air pollution problem, so Southern California is required by the Clean Air Act to maintain a plan - How are we going to clean up the air? - and the entity that does that is the South Coast Air Quality Management District.

Now, South Coast puts out a new plan every three years, and they are in the middle of putting together a new plan. Now, the problem that LAWA has is, they don't know what's going to be in that plan, and whatever's in that plan, it's very likely that it's not going to include expansion at LAX.

So not only is LAWA going to have a problem with the regional transportation plan from an air pollution perspective, but they are also going to have a problem with the South Coast and what they come up with.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments AF00001-4 and PC02203-92 regarding LAX emissions and conformity with the Clean Air Plan.

PC01904-8

Comment:

The third point: Inadequate analysis of impacts on Inglewood. And again, we're talking specifically about air pollution. CEQA requires analysis of all impacts, including what's called cumulative impacts.

Now, what cumulative impacts are is this: LAX is going to expand, but there's also going to be expansion in economic development and more activity in the area. LAX can't just look at what they are going to do, but they've got to look at what everybody else is going to do as well.

They've got to look at what Inglewood is going to do and what the growth is going to be in Inglewood. They didn't do that at all. They didn't take into account any growth in Inglewood. It's illogical. They are not going to be able to defend this. They need to go back and say, "Okay, this is what we're going to do, but this is what Inglewood's going to do, so the total is going to be here."

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00018-60 regarding cumulative impacts.

PC01904-9

Comment:

Now, interestingly enough, what they did do is that they assumed that all the mitigation measures would be put into place and that all the traffic projects that are going to supposedly reduce traffic would also be put into place. They made assumptions on their own side for their benefit, but they didn't think about other problems that they were going to have.

The problem that they have with this mitigation and with the traffic projects is they don't have any funding. So they are saying, "Yeah, this is all going to happen. We don't know where the money's going to come from, but this is all going to happen." It's another illogical point in LAWA's analysis.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01904-10

Comment:

Next point, health risks of air toxics. There's no comprehensive baseline study. They don't know where they are.

Now, amazingly enough, LAWA just comes out and admits this. This is a quote from the document:

"The health risk assessment did not evaluate impacts of toxic air pollutants associated with current airport operations."

They don't know what the health risks for air pollution is for current airport operation. That's a pretty basic fact. If you're going to figure out what impact your plan is going to have, you've got to know where you are today.

Now, they have started a study on this. They've started a rather large study. It's going to take them at least a year, probably two years, to complete that study, and at that time they will begin to have the ability to analyze and figure out what they are talking about, what impact it's going to have. But until then, they have no way of doing that. It's a major problem.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HRA-1 regarding the baseline used for the human health risk assessment included in Section 4.24.1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Topical Response TR-AQ-2 regarding the LAX Ambient Air Quality and Source Apportionment Study.

PC01904-11

Comment:

The fifth and final point on air pollution: Mitigation measures. The mitigation measures, Mr. Calkins comes straight out, they are insufficient. They don't get the job done.

Now, I want to just give a quick point about Mr. Calkins on this, which is interesting. This is his area of specialty. This is what he did when he was at EPA, was he worked on air mitigation. And when the EPA officials up there in San Francisco found out that Mr. Calkins was looking at this, they called him up and they said, "Would you please come down to us and tell us what you think, because we have to make comments on this, and we don't know what to say." So it will be interesting to see what the EPA says. I think it will sound somewhat familiar.

LAWA makes no commitments on mitigation, okay? In the document they make absolutely no commitments, okay? They make one promise. They promise to discuss it. They say, "Okay, in the future, we'll sit down, we'll talk to the communities, we'll talk to the South Coast, we'll talk to the EPA," but that's all they committed to.

Now, Mr. Calkins is an expert. He's looked at this and said, "That's ludicrous. That's just completely unacceptable. They can't defend this." He's looked at the mitigation measures that are proposed or that are discussed. They are discussed. They are not really proposed, because there's no commitments.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AR00003-63.

PC01904-12

Comment:

LAX identifies 15 of the mitigation measures as priority. Mr. Calkins agrees. He says they are priority, they should be done today. He also looked at the list, and he said there's another 14 that they came up

with that also should be done today. And I won't go into all of them. That's 29 measures. I'm not going to go into all that, because it's all in this report. You guys can get that off the website.

He also went beyond that and proposed some of his own mitigation measures. I want to touch on three of them.

The first one that he suggests is an incentive program to cut down on employee trips to LAX. The analysis is that a lot of the traffic is caused by employees coming in and out, and that's something that LAWA can influence by encouraging the vendors on site to offer incentives to their employees to find other means of transportation other than driving in and out of the airport.

His second idea is this: He wants the FAA to institute what's called an emissions fee on the airlines. Basically, the airlines would pay for every plane that comes in based on the amount of pollution that that plane contributes to the air.

Now, that's going to have two effects. Number one, the airlines are going to have to take a look at that. They are going to have to think about, Maybe we should send some of these planes to Ontario; maybe we should send some of these planes to Orange County, because we don't have to pay this fee, as opposed to sending it to LAX.

The second thing it's going to do is the planes that they do send to LAX are going to be the cleanest ones in their fleet. They've got two planes, one's dirty and one's clean, they are going to send the clean one.

The last point has to do with user fees, which has been touched on. You create an incentive program. You give discounts for using the outlying airports. It's very simple. As Dr. Hattis talked about, it's a very simple idea. You know, put the pollution out where there's less people, and then you'll have less problems and less health effects, And from a CEQA perspective, that's how you reduce and minimize impacts.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01196-12 regarding air quality impacts and further mitigation measures. There are many incentive programs already in place at LAX to encourage employee carpooling and reduce off-site trips. The incentives are outlined in greater detail in LAWA's Rule 2202 Trip Reduction Plan as required by the SCAQMD. LAWA provides on-site eating facilities, preferential carpool parking, on-site childcare facilities, etc. All of these measures are meant to reduce employee trips. The South Coast Air Basin has regional air pollution problems that transcend far beyond the area in and around LAX. Sending "dirtier" planes to Ontario, Burbank or Orange County does nothing to alleviate the regional air pollution problems affecting Southern California. Second, because the environmental impacts would not be alleviated, but merely shifted to another location, this is not considered feasible mitigation. Please refer to Topical Response TR-RC-1 for information regarding the role of the LAX Master Plan in meeting the regional aviation demand.

PC01905

**Dickerson, Esq.,
Charles**

City of Inglewood

6/30/2001

PC01905-1

Comment:

Just to put a cap on the last point that Mr. Vandenburg was making, this whole idea about providing financial incentives to the airlines to send airplanes, particularly high-polluting airplanes, to other areas, it works like this:

Every time I fly -- I'll restate that. Just about every time I fly to Washington, D.C., I fly into the Baltimore-Washington International Airport. There are three airports in Washington -- there's Dulles, there's what's now called the Reagan Airport, and Baltimore-Washington. If I fly into Dulles, generally during the week, a round-trip flight is going to cost me somewhere close to \$1,000. If I fly into Baltimore-Washington, a round trip is basically going to cost me \$500 to \$600.

3. Comments and Responses

So what you do is you encourage the airlines to make it more expensive to fly into Los Angeles, if they are going to be sending more pollutants here, and make it less expensive to fly into, say, Orange County or whatever.

Now, that's going to have another kind of impact on us. Some of us will complain that after all, why should the folks in Orange County supposedly get the break? But the whole idea is to encourage the airlines to send those airplanes into those other areas by offering lower costs for the flight.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-2 regarding the role of deregulation in aviation planning for a discussion of airline response to market demand, deregulation, and airport pricing models and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding subsidies to encourage airlines to serve regional airports.

PC01906 Bures, Matt Radcliff, Frandsen & Dongell 6/30/2001

PC01906-1

Comment:

Again, I'm standing in for Mr. Cook, so hopefully what I will do, as Mr. Vandenburg did, is help you understand some of the technical nature - some of the technical information that is included in the City of Inglewood's presentation to LAWA.

That is, again, on the website, but for those of you who don't know what the website is, let me give that to you, because it's bandied about a bit. www.cityofinglewood.org. That's o-r-g. And I assume you know how to spell City of Inglewood.

The other thing that you might want to do, just for your own edification, is take a look at what is on the web with respect to the master plan, and you can locate that at [www.laxmasterplan](http://www.laxmasterplan.org) -- that's all run together -- .org, and there are a number of options that you can click on, and you can see maps.

For example, the first thing I want to do, is we've talked about a number of traffic aspects and we've talked about a number of modifications that are going to occur. This very blurry picture has been blown up off of the LAX website. Let me just hit a couple of the high points.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC01906-2

Comment:

This is the extension of the LAX Expressway that's designed, at least in theory, to facilitate the flow of traffic to the airport. The 105, along with the Green Line, are supposed to be extended along the southern portion of the airport. This aspect here looks - yeah, this aspect here is what's been called the Airport Ring Road. Supposedly what this does is it facilitates traffic flowing around the airport.

What I would suggest to you is, this isn't a traffic plan that's designed to ease your life or anyone else's life. As you go through and evaluate the plan yourself, as you look at the city's comments, what you will see is, How do we get more cargo into and out of the airport so that LAX can make more money? That's what it is.

Cargo facilities, Ring Road to facilitate trucks going and in and out of the place. That is what it's there to facilitate. What do trucks mean? Trucks mean traffic.

Response:

The Ring Road is designed to primarily facilitate airport passenger and employee traffic, not truck traffic. In fact, though trucks are allowed on the Ring Road, the primary cargo areas accessed by these trucks are located on the east side of the airport, while the Ring Road mostly assists west side traffic. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo traffic.

PC01906-3

Comment:

And to go back to the health aspects, trucks also mean more diesel exhaust, and diesel exhaust, as Dr. Hattis will tell you, is a very nasty, bad thing that you don't want to have.

I don't mean to oversimplify, but hopefully, that gives you a picture of what it is that we're looking at so you understand when everybody says, "When we develop LAWA, actually things are going to be better." They are not.

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-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.

PC01906-4

Comment:

You've heard several mentions to "MAP," M-A-P, which is million air passengers. From my perspective, "MAP" means more automobile pain. And that's -- let me give you an - I like to think of analogies, so let me begin -- before I go through the points that Mr. Cook made, let me give you a couple of analogies.

A number of us here are not exactly slim of girth. If you take a pair of pants that you've had for a while and you try and put them on, and you haven't been exercising and modifying your diet, you can't exactly get them on, and when you cinch the belt, what happens to the belt? It folds over the edges, right?

Well, it's the same concept with LAX. If you take the same size pair of pants, meaning the stuff that's on the ground, and you try and put more body into it, what does it do? It spills over. And where does it spill over? Into Inglewood.

Or if you'd prefer a less personal analogy, what LAWA is arguing is that they've taken the funnel that facilitates transportation into the airport, and they've made the funnel bigger. Well, that makes sense. Sure, you get more traffic into and out of it, and that should ease everybody's lives. But the funnel is bigger, and the flow going into the funnel is now higher.

What you need to do is either keep the flow in the same or reduce it if you want to ease congestion, because a bigger funnel, when you're handling more traffic, simply means you still have more traffic. You just have more of it going through at any given point in time.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01906-5

Comment:

Those are the fundamental points that underlie this. They are in the business of moving cargo. They want to make money. They want to make money on your backs, and they don't care if traffic is falling in your backyard in order to do that.

That's my summation of what it is that Mr. Cook says, but let me hit a couple of his more specific points.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC01906-6

Comment:

First of all, what is a baseline? We've used that expression. Let me try and define it for you. If you're going to decide that a project has an environmental impact, you have to be comparing it to something. Well, what is it you compare with? You compare with a baseline. And you've already heard a very good argument as to why it is that the baselines that are being used are no good from a noise perspective.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-1 regarding baseline issues and Topical Response TR-N-1, Subtopical Response TR-N-1.3, regarding baseline issues pertaining to the noise analysis.

PC01906-7

Comment:

Well, similarly, if you're going to compare what it is that SCAG has done and what it is that LAWA is proposing, you have to at least have the same baseline for traffic, and you don't. Instead, what you have is an environmental baseline of 1996.

You have another baseline that is existing conditions. Oh yeah, plus we have growth. In that context, by contrast with noise, we're (unintelligible) with noise, and if you're comparing with older, noisier aircraft, the current quieter aircraft shows less of an impact.

Well, conversely, if you're comparing with trumped up numbers from a traffic perspective, and you already have high traffic levels, you're artificially showing a reduced impact. The fact is, you're going to have more traffic. You're going to have more traffic coming in. And if you want to compare anyway to decide whether I'm right, Mr. Cook is right or someone else is right, use the same numbers, use the same baseline. They don't do that, and that's a fundamental flaw.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology and results, particularly Subtopical Response TR-ST-2.2 regarding the definition of baseline scenarios and incorporation of local/regional plans and programs.

PC01906-8

Comment:

No analysis of the impact of LAX Expressway upon Inglewood. You'll find that this is a theme that's repeated throughout all of the traffic aspects, and the bottom line is they ignore Inglewood. What is the 405 Expressway from the north going to do to life in your city? They don't discuss that. They don't discuss the effect of the 105 extension on Inglewood. They also don't discuss the extension of the inclusion of the Ring Road.

The bottom line here is not have they done it right. They haven't done it at all. And the argument is probably going to be, "Well, all we have to do is look at the project and the local community"; but the local area only extends to the 405, ignoring again the funnel concept.

If everything's going into the funnel, it's filling up the funnel. If the pants are full, what happens on the other side of the funnel? What happens up here when the pants don't -when you can't fit into the pants? And that's the issue for Inglewood.

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. An analysis of the impacts of the LAX Expressway and its connection to the Ring Road on Inglewood was provided in Appendix K, Supplemental Environmental Evaluation for LAX Expressway and State Route 1 Improvements. In addition, a separate environmental document would be prepared to address the environmental impacts of the LAX Expressway, if it is a part of the selected Master Plan alternative, before construction would begin. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. Note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway.

PC01906-9

Comment:

I'm going to give you some homework at the end of this so that you can visualize a little more what it is I'm talking about. Tom Vandenburg also touched on the master plan, the fact that it does not conform to the regional transportation plan. I'm not going to belabor points that have already been made.

Suffice it to say again, SCAG adopts an RTP every three years. The latest one, although it's not final, it's April 2001 -- but as you're already heard from our other experts, if you have information available, why don't you use it? And they don't. Instead, they take a look at the 1998 regional transportation plan.

The regional transportation plan, again, does not include things like the Ring Road, the 105 extension or the 405 Expressway, so there's no way to compare it.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment AL00017-47. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-47. In addition, the RTP includes an action to mitigate the effects of expanding existing airports and consider the reuse of military air bases so that community impacts are minimized. This action supports the development of ground access improvements at LAX.

PC01906-10

Comment:

So let me go on to the homework portion of this. And this is going to involve the intersections and the traffic flow in your backyard. For those of who you have a Thomas Guide -- and no, I'm not advertising for them, but it does work in their comment -- at pages 702 and 703, that's where Inglewood gets put together. I want you look at the following intersections. And for those of you who also go to the LAWA report, those are the following intersection numbers:

Intersection No. 7, Aviation at Arbor Vitae;

Intersection No. - and if I pronounce it wrong, I'm sorry, I apologize - Intersection No. 8, La Cienega and Arbor Vitae;

Intersection 26, La Cienega and Century;

Intersection 40, La Cienega and Florence;

Intersection 72, La Cienega and Manchester;

Intersection 111, La Cienega and Interstate 405. But that's the southbound ramp, and that's important.

Now, if you circle those intersections on your map, you're going to say, "These are the places that they've studied. They actually took a look at Inglewood." They did not, however, look at northbound exits. You'd think they might want to do that.

3. Comments and Responses

Well, let's have them take a look. You go back and take a look through the report and tell me if they analyzed the northbound Century exit from off the 405. I don't think they did. Take a look and tell me if they examined the northbound exit at Manchester off the 405. I don't think that they did.

They did evaluate traffic flows, and they are proposing widening lanes and things like that on Manchester and Arbor Vitae and Century west of La Brea. But when you take your map, like I did, outline the city, mark the intersections, and then draw pink lines for Manchester and Arbor Vitae and Century. And what you look at is, you'll say, "First of all, there are a couple of other places that they didn't look at that it makes sense to me they would look at."

Honestly, I don't live here, but if I looked at the map and I asked myself how would I want to get to LAX, I know the freeway's going to be crowded, so I'm going to try and cut through somewhere, right? Well, what am I going to do? Maybe I'll exit at Hawthorne and I'll cut up to Century. I don't think Hawthorne and Century was evaluated.

What if I want to go up a little further to Arbor Vitae and La Brea? That's not been evaluated either.

What happens if there's a horse race going on, and we've got the backup over here over at the 405, can you all escape?

When was the last time somebody tried to go west so you could get on the 405? Or do you all go south to the 150 so you don't have to hassle with that?

Think logically about what's going on, and what you will see is the only thing they looked at is the LAX area, the immediate environs. They ignored the fact that once the funnel is full, it's got to spill over somewhere. It's got to back up, and the place it backs up is right into your backyard. They don't address that at all.

Response:

The northbound I-405 off-ramp at Century Boulevard is ramp #18 in the analysis. The northbound I-405 off-ramp at Manchester is ramp #12 in the analysis. Hawthorne Boulevard east of I-405 is studied as link #10 in the analysis. Century Boulevard east of I-405 is link #12 in the analysis. Arbor Vitae Street is link #11. La Brea Avenue is link #24. All of these locations were itemized and impacts identified in Appendix F of Technical Report 3b. These intersections were also addressed in Section 4.3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, as well as other additional intersections. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC01906-11

Comment:

That's your homework. But I want to tie this into something, too. You remember I said that this all ties into cargo, right?

Well, how are you paying for that? And remember something that Mr. Radcliff said. Actually, I think the numbers are worse than what he said.

Alternative A takes away 57 single-family dwelling units, so does B, and so does C. The preferred choice is C, though, right? Well, how many here live in apartment dwellings or live in condos, something like that, where there's more than one family? There's got to be a number of you here.

Well, Alternative A gets rid of 27. Alternative B gets rid of 27. Alternative C gets rid of 89. That's in the master plan Draft EIS/EIR. That's how they are paying for cargo. That's how they are paying for failure to take a look at traffic in your backyard. And what I mean by that is, gee, if we have fewer people in Inglewood, there are fewer cars on the road and less traffic.

Response:

The commentor is incorrect in his statements regarding residential acquisition under Alternatives A, B, and C. All three of the alternatives would result in the acquisition of 57 single-family homes and 27 multi-family dwelling units, for a total of 84 dwelling units under each of these alternatives. It should be noted that Alternative D does not propose any residential acquisition.

PC01907 Adams, Michael None Provided 6/30/2001

PC01907-1

Comment:

"What is being done to expedite the noise testing of those dwellings that are under the flight path that are not on the list? And how does that addition of the \$10 million impact those aforementioned dwellings?"

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the existing Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP), including how eligibility is determined, how soundproofing is prioritized, current noise monitoring, and how approval of the LAX Master Plan would revise the ANMP.

PC01908 Wetring, John None Provided 6/30/2001

PC01908-1

Comment:

My name is John Wetring. I am not (unintelligible), but I'm very much against the expansion of the LAX (unintelligible). I hope you don't come through with this plan, what they plan to do 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.

PC01909 Sly, Aldene None Provided 6/30/2001

PC01909-1

Comment:

My name is Aldene Sly, and I'm a resident of Inglewood for 36 years.

I want to first thank the panel of attorneys that have come and have done such a great job in disseminating the information that you passed on to us today from the EIS/EIR. It was an awesome job, I know, to disseminate this kind of information, to make it understandable to us as laymen, because we would have never been able to do it. I don't care if they had given us five years. So thank you very much for that.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01909-2

Comment:

My main concern is the environmental justice portion, and as a resident and as a minority, it seems that big corporations always seem to take the path of least resistance, which they think, in this case, is Inglewood. We are not the path of least resistance, and we refuse to be dumped on.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01909-3

Comment:

I want to thank Mike Stevens, as well, because he has educated many of us in terms of what LAX is trying to do, and without him we would have been so ignorant, and it's more understandable, what you have told us today. We understand it much better, and you have confirmed a lot of the things that we have been learning through this process.

There was the statement that Mr. Radcliff made about having gone through this process, and then if it had to go to trial or court, that we would have lost anyway. I didn't understand that, and I hope I misunderstood it, but that is -- I think I'm quoting him correctly -- "If you have to go to court, then you've lost already." So if someone would clarify that for me. Tell me if I have misunderstood that statement.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01909-4

Comment:

The health issues are horrendous in Inglewood already. The LAX airport cannot mitigate what is happening to us today.

Response:

Please refer to 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 mitigation strategies.

Overall, implementation of any of the build alternatives is expected to reduce aircraft emissions below the levels expected with the No Action/No Project scenario. 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.

PC01909-5

Comment:

We are getting sick. We have cancer, we have asthma, we have many, many people suffering from lung conditions, and that is just on my street in my block. And we know it's from the atmosphere, from the air pollution, because people who have only lived there a short while, came in healthy, and now they are suffering from these ailments.

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.

PC01910 Miller, Dawn None Provided 6/30/2001

PC01910-1

Comment:

Hello. My name is Dawn Miller. I live in District 2, and I want to thank the panel for putting on - like she said, disseminating the information to us on the EIR, but I have to say that in evaluating the City of Inglewood's response, I'd have to go by what you're doing and not by what you're saying.

And what you're doing is fairly well documented. You're collaborating with LAWA on the Century Boulevard corridor project. You are not involved in fighting the Arbor Vitae Interchange project. So what you're doing is speaking much more loudly than what you're saying.

So I would like you, the City of Inglewood, to stop treating this city as if its LAX's backyard, and I want you to cancel the MOU, and I want you to fight back.

Response:

The LAX Master Plan does not include the Arbor Vitae interchange project. Federal funding has been removed from that proposal project. Alternatives A, B, and C would improve the Century/Sepulveda interchange. Alternative B would also include a tunnel for Century Boulevard to provide a taxiway between new cargo development and the south field. Alternative D would make no changes to Century Boulevard.

PC01911 Scott, Swinton None Provided 6/30/2001

PC01911-1

Comment:

My name is Swinton Scott. I live in District 2.

Good afternoon to everybody up there, and thank you very much for your presentation. It was very well done.

I wanted to speak about how the loose leaf binder that was made up of the response to the EIR/EIS I thought did not go far enough in condemning the EIR/EIS. And in truth, there should have been no need for any of this in the first place if the memorandum of understanding had never been signed by the City of Inglewood or agreed to.

The EIR/EIS report is probably okay if you own a business looking to expand by pushing out the residents. Is LAX to be looked at like it's a neutron bomb, which will get rid of all the people in Inglewood and keep the real estate right where they want it, which is empty and ready for redevelopment and rezoning?

This expansion should never have gotten this far in the first place, let alone with the City of Inglewood signing the MOU with LAX. The EIR/EIS should be thrown out. We don't want to have commerce taking over our lives just to make money on our backs and on our lives, our quality of life has gone down the drain.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01912 Smith, Jesse None Provided 6/30/2001

PC01912-1

Comment:

My name is Jesse Smith.

First, to all the mayor and all the council. I'm not a good speaker, but I've never been to one of the meetings, but I always look at them every Wednesday night.

What I want to say, I live on 109th Street, in the Fourth District, between Yukon and Lemoli, and it's nothing but a freeway there. The cars come through there 60 and 70 miles an hour. And I've been talking to my councilman about. He say, "We're going to look into it."

We got two big trucks come there and park every weekend loaded with trash. You can't get out of your driveway. You go to back out, you nearby get hit by a car, and I don't know why something can't be did about that.

We used to -- several years ago, when we called up the police about this, they'd come out, and these trucks wouldn't park there. But from Yukon and Lemoli, that's all you got there is these big, large trucks. You can't get out of your driveway.

And I have this big tree in front of my yard, where I've spent over \$700 -- I've been in (unintelligible) for the last year. I've spent over \$1,000 for those trees for plumbing, busting my pipes under my house and everything, and I don't know why something can't be did about it.

Response:

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

PC01913 Baker, Doris None Provided 6/30/2001

PC01913-1

Comment:

I'm Doris Baker.

I came to California the first time in 1956. I flew in at the little airport on Airport Way, and it was nothing to what that airport is. And I'm an airport freak. But I live right here, 80th Street, right off of Crenshaw, and they tell me I'm not covered with insulating your house?

Response:

Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included a discussion of LAWA's Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP), including the residential soundproofing program being implemented as part of the ANMP.

PC01913-2

Comment:

When I first came here, (unintelligible) over there by Century, 'cause that's the way I came in all the time, and I could look down, but I can look down here on Florence Avenue when I come in, 'cause I make a trip every year in the airplane. At my age, I don't need to go every year -- I mean every -- twice or three times a year.

But I know about the airplane, and I like it, but I don't like what the airplane does to the community. These kids in school, they don't have trained teachers, and then if she's not trained, and then this noise is there, how do we expect a future in our city?

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.

PC01913-3

Comment:

And I would like to congratulate Judith Dunlap, because she has taken the same position that I have had. And I have been to every meeting I've heard of.

This I got yesterday to tell me about a meeting today. That's not kosher with me. I taught school for 40 years, and you boys and girls that are serving now, I didn't teach you like that. And I taught special ed, and I know special ed kids can do it, you can do it, too.

Let's get the people together and get what the people want and what they say they want, and let's work together. If you don't want to work for the people, move out, and let somebody that wants to work for the people in Inglewood get up here and work for us.

And if we fight together, and get a group like this group is today - I mean, I like what you say. We will have somebody to work for us, and we won't have to worry about this.

Response:

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

PC01914	Springs, Larry	None Provided	6/30/2001
----------------	-----------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01914-1

Comment:

Good afternoon. My name is Larry Springs. I live in the First District, and I want to congratulate the panel on its well-done job on the presentation that you have given the community. There's no way that we could have read 12,000 pages in the EIR/EIS.

When I received this information on the EIR/EIS, I'm sure a lot of people wanted to know what in the heck was an EIR/EIS, and I'm sure you explained it very well.

I want to commend the city council for actually getting the notice out. I received the notice in my water bill, I saw it on the website, and this information was given to us on the first day of the week. However, I think Saturday's a terrible day. A lot of people have things that they need to do.

I'm not criticizing you for doing it on a Saturday, but I think it would have been done better on a weekday. I'm kind of disappointed in the amount of people that we have out here this afternoon, or this morning/this afternoon. I think that we should have had more.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01914-2

Comment:

I think that Los Angeles International should have spent \$60 million on trying to devise a way of diverting some of the aircraft to other 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. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC01914-3

Comment:

I think the City of Inglewood and the city council should work with the people in the community, because they know what our concerns are. It's not like its a secret to them. They are aware of what our concerns are. And one of the concerns was the Arbor Vitae off-ramp, and I don't think the City of Inglewood heard our message in regards to the Arbor Vitae off-ramp, so that's a concern that the city council and the mayor needs to take a look at.

Response:

The proposed Arbor Vitae interchange has had the federal funding withdrawn and is not a part of the LAX Master Plan.

PC01914-4

Comment:

Another concern that the city should look at would be the avigation easement that was signed by a lot of people in the community. Now, the city council was responsible for putting out some of the information on the avigation easement. They should have been opposed to it from the very beginning.

People don't understand how important signing an avigation easement means to them. They are assuming that once they sign this document, then they have air conditioning, soundproofing and things of this nature.

But we don't just live in our homes. We live outside our homes. We do functions outside of our homes as well as inside, so it seems like once we sign a avigation easement, we get this soundproofing and this air conditioning, we're okay, but we're really not.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR; however, see Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.13 regarding avigation easements and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC01914-5

Comment:

What happens in another ten years, when that particular soundproofing and air conditioning is not working anymore? Is the city going to come back and help us, or is Los Angeles International going to come back and help us? Those are things that we should take a look at, and we need the support of not only the city council, but other people in the community.

Response:

Comment noted. The noise impact area which determines residential uses eligible for sound insulation under the ANMP is described in Topical Response TR-LU-3, Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4, and is based on the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL noise contour (ANMP 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, due to the phase out of noisier aircraft, 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. As described in Section 4.2.6 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, under LAWA staff's new preferred Alternative D, the number of noise-sensitive uses exposed to the 65 CNEL would be reduced compared to the 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions. However, as listed in Table S4.2-30 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, 260 dwelling units would be newly exposed to the 65 CNEL outside the ANMP boundary.

As stated under mitigation measure MM-LU-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the ANMP boundary would be expanded to include those units newly exposed to the 65 CNEL contour. Under the current ANMP, residential units that receive sound insulation are considered compatible and are not reassessed. Under LAWA's Soundproofing Installation Agreement, it is the homeowner's responsibility to maintain and not remove any soundproofing materials or equipment. All work performed to provide residential sound insulation is guaranteed by the contractor for one year. In addition, some of the components of residential sound insulation have extended time frames and written warranties from the manufacturer. For example, acoustic windows are under a ten year warrantee and acoustic doors have a five year warrantee; although these basic soundproofing materials typically last well beyond the warrantee period. All components of residential sound insulation (i.e., acoustic windows, acoustic doors, air conditioning, attic insulation, and fireplace damper) should last at least ten years with proper maintenance.

PC01914-6

Comment:

Now, my question to the panel that gave this fantastic presentation is: What do you want us to do as a community? And what is our responsibility? You had indicated that its the law, that we have to work within the law, and you want us as a community to do something, so what is it that you want us to do? Is there something special that we need to do?

Response:

Comment noted. Please refer to Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01915	Schneider, Danny	LAX Community Noise Roundtable	6/30/2001
----------------	-------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------

PC01915-1

Comment:

I'm Danny Schneider, and I represent this area and the entire north and east sides of the airport at the LAX Community Round Table, and applaud all of the people that have come out and are staying here to hear all the comments.

I'd like to acknowledge the panel and your leadership here for helping in the fight. It's extremely important that we continue, because even when we stop this particular expansion, it's not going to stop all expansion.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01915-2

Comment:

One of the things that I would like everyone to do is to send a postcard to new Mayor Hahn to remind him that he has pledged to stop the expansion, and to appoint commissioners who are of the same mindset. And you want to send those to 200 North Main Street, Los Angeles 90012. That's L.A. City Hall.

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.

PC01915-3

Comment:

Now, in terms of problems in areas, I just want to remind everyone that there's still an LAX Expressway project from Caltrans, and if they continue with that project, they are going to wipe out your Centinela Adobe. That's right in my neighborhood.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding potential impacts on the Centinela Adobe. Please note that Alternative D, the LAWA staff preferred alternative, does not include the LAX expressway.

PC01915-4

Comment:

In addition to that, of course, soundproofing you've heard already isn't enough, but I think one of the most important things that we can recognize from this whole issue is the fact that this is one of the few times that you've seen all of the communities working together, and I applaud all of you for doing that. Thank you.

I also would like to announce to everyone that the next Round Table meeting is July 11th, at The Proud Bird, the 5 o'clock noise committee and 7 o'clock general meeting.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts and soundproofing in Section 4.1, Noise. Also, please refer to Topical Response TR-LU-3 for additional discussion regarding noise impacts and soundproofing.

PC01916**Smith, Cecil****None Provided****6/30/2001****PC01916-1****Comment:**

I am Cecil Smith.

To the council, the elected officials and officials of Inglewood, and to this panel of experts:

Among the experts in particular, I have enjoyed what you've said, including the city attorney. You spoke well. Attorneys, they are accustomed to telling us what we want to hear, so we wonder, what have you done wrong?

So congratulations for these experts here. I like a lot that you said. You gave some good reports. You have said this is going to be hard for the Department of Airports to defend. I like that.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01916-2**Comment:**

But there's one other thing here, and that is that MOU that have been signed by a number or majority of our elected officials. That is going to be hard for us to defend. They are going to say, "We don't have to."

There is too many loopholes in that MOU. One councilperson, Councilperson Judy Dunlap, wrote those. I read them. I read the MOU. I agree with each one of them. And the first one of the myths that she wrote threw it out into left field, which to me, this one alone, plus the others, amounts to a hold harmless letter.

The City of Inglewood, whatever you have to do to us, you can expand it. I could be wrong now. What is written and what you're saying is two different things. It's so much that that MOU, what it does not say, that's going to be hard to defend. But you know something? I think we can.

We want to stop this expansion according to environmental impact or justice system. Take it someplace else. El Toro. They have the Marine base. When I was in the Marines, they - I was not in the Marines. I was in the Navy. They flew big planes in and out of there. Open it up. That is the next best step.

But here, this MOU that have been signed, that's going to be hard to defend. The damage is already done.

Response:

The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the City of Inglewood (Inglewood) and Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) provides a framework for the two parties to cooperate in pursuing and implementing certain measures designed to study and mitigate the possible environmental impacts on Inglewood from existing and future operations at LAX. The MOU does not commit Inglewood to any position for or against any of the alternatives being considered for the Master Plan. Moreover, the MOU does not, in any way, alter or influence the environmental review and public input processes required for the Master Plan under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), nor does it affect the decision-making processes of the City of Los Angeles and the Federal Aviation Administration, relative to the Master Plan. The MOU does not bar individual homeowners or the City of Inglewood from taking legal action regarding the City of Los Angeles'

3. Comments and Responses

adoption of a Master Plan for LAX. Please refer to pages 10-11 of Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for further information regarding the MOU between the City of LA and Inglewood. Also see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding the elimination of El Toro as the site for a new international airport in Orange County.

PC01917 Douglas, Roosevelt None Provided 6/30/2001

PC01917-1

Comment:

I'm Roosevelt Douglas, 29 years a resident of Inglewood. I'm in the Third District. All councilmen are my councilmen. My immediate councilman, Third District, is Mr. Jose Fernandez.

I want to say, they have written this \$60 million master plan, and your pretty commission, and in turn, they recruited the labor union, because the union relies on them. That's a long contract, and contracts mean money, and so the union are fighting very hard to get this passed, because money talks in any language.

And the union are very strong. They have lots of members, and they have lots of pull with lobbying their councilman, and so I don't feel that the City of L.A. is going to walk away from \$60 million that they already have put out.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01917-2

Comment:

Also, I'm very alarmed with the pollution. We got so many different things these airplanes can do -- expansion can do to us that's harmful, but the most important one I think has been said already, is the major health concern is the breathing problem.

I have a breathing problem, and it seem like all my family and my block members have. And to have these added, heavy-duty planes, that's what I remember stated here on the board, with the bad planes, that's going to be detrimental.

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.

PC01917-3

Comment:

And I want to state, we Inglewood citizens have not begun to fight. And Mr. Radcliff, I think you -- I think you -- I recommend as you stated here. And I want you to know we are strong supporter of our mayor, city council, city attorney, Mr. Rouzan, our city administrator, and staff, along with the president of No More L.A. Expansion.

He's a very hard worker, but we want him to work along with our elected official, because our elected official are the one have the expertise, along with you all, sir, can get things done for us.

So along with our citizens, I say we're going to work with you. And God bless you all, and God bless Inglewood.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01918 **[unreadable], Mina** **None Provided** **6/30/2001**

PC01918-1

Comment:

My name is Mina (unintelligible). I live in Westchester. We own some property in Inglewood. I'm a realtor, and the concern I have is I think Inglewood should have advertised the EIR/EIS hearings. They were both held on the same day, same time, and no publicity was given to those hearings, and people were not encouraged to submit their comments.

I came here, and I asked somebody from the mayor's office if I could pass out, just as a common courtesy, the public comments form and an envelope addressed to Jim Ritchie, where people can write down their comments and mail them so that we have a lot of negative comments about the expansion, and I was told that I cannot pass out any of these forms.

I'm not sure how many people here are aware that they should write down their comments and mail them or give them out to you, how many people and what kind of comments they need to make.

Response:

We ask that all commentor's provide a public comment card so that we can properly respond to each individual comment. Thank you for your assistance in informing the public and distributing comment cards.

PC01918-2

Comment:

They need to make comments on the regional solution. We need El Toro to be expanded or Palmdale, Ontario.

Response:

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

PC01918-3

Comment:

The traffic mitigation, we need to figure out, or LAX needs to respond to us, how the traffic is going to be mitigated on our 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. A comprehensive traffic mitigation plan was proposed that would be effective in mitigating project-related traffic. The plan was presented in Section 4.3.2.9 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01918-4

Comment:

The noise level, what they are measuring is just average noise level, not one-time noise level, so they do not take into consideration the loud single event noises.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-2, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-2.1, regarding single event noise and CNEL differences and 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 regarding analysis of single-event noise impacts.

PC01918-5

Comment:

The air pollution, because the EIR/EIS predicts that the increased ground and air traffic will result in increased emissions of all five criteria pollutants.

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.

PC01918-6

Comment:

The safety. Safety is a big issue. There may be more accidents.

Response:

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

PC01918-7

Comment:

Cargo demand. LAWA is focusing its expansion to meet projected cargo demand, and that is going to affect the surrounding area for distribution, heavy shipping, warehousing, high trucking and cargo traffic.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00908-9 regarding cargo demand and Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

PC01918-8**Comment:**

So Mr. Mayor, if you have no objections, I would like to pass out these forms and envelopes, which people can take home and write their comments, and make sure that they are submitted before July 25th.

It's a shame that we have only 911, according to Jim Ritchie. People talk and talk and talk, but what are they doing?

Response:

Comment noted. FAA and LAWA encourages public comment.

PC01919**Stevens, Mike****None Provided****6/30/2001****PC01919-1****Comment:**

My name is Mike Stevens. I'm president of the L.A.X. Expansion No!

And in reference to working with our government, we have attempted - we had a meeting with -- as a matter of fact, Congresswoman Maxine Waters went with us to meet with Mayor Roosevelt Dorn and the city manager, and we asked - there were certain things that we asked for. The councilwoman was with us on that. She supported us, and to no avail. The City of Inglewood turned us down flat. Things such as this.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01919-2**Comment:**

If you take a look at all the alternatives over there, there's one thing that stands out and that's "Other Major Improvements." One of them happens to be the Ring Road. Now, as was stated earlier, the Ring Road starts over here at the 405 freeway and Arbor Vitae. It makes its way all the way down to the beach, comes down to Imperial Highway, and comes back east to the 105 freeway; virtually a complete circle, when you include Sepulveda Boulevard here.

One of the things that this city should do that the MOU prevents you from doing presently is bringing forward a lawsuit, because if you take a look right here, Mr. Mayor - and we've shown you this time and time again - you see these little arrows right here? Those represent planes. And that means airport property is coming all the way to the 405 freeway.

Inglewood should have brought forward some type of litigation, and should bring forward litigation now. The problem is not Mr. Radcliff. As a matter of fact, Mr. Vandenburg, I believe your name is, he addressed that issue to a certain point. The point being this, is that you're dictating to them, the way I'm getting it, what they need to do.

Now, the bottom line is this: What do we need to do? We need to send a clear and sound and solid message that we are opposed to the Arbor Vitae Interchange, which is here. We also need to bring forward legal action, whether as a form of an injunction.

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. 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.

PC01919-3

Comment:

This yellow area here represents Manchester Square. This is going to bring the airport all the way to the 405 freeway. This city could take issue with this, could take legal action. You need to turn loose Mr. Radcliff and Mr. Vandenburg and let them do what they do best.

You have grounds for it, because LAX cannot, cannot, spend PFC money except on airport property. That's why they're acquiring Manchester Square. They have to complete that Ring Road. The only area that's left to complete is on Manchester Square property, which is between Airport Boulevard and the 405 freeway.

Now, the funny thing is, as Mr. Vandenburg alluded to, they take for granted that they have already acquired this property. That's where Inglewood has to step in and stop them now.

Now, last month they turned over all streets, all thoroughfares, over to LAX. That helped LAX. Where we're going to stop LAX -without the land, they can't expand. If you look at the plan, this one swatch of land is primarily the addition of land. Everything else is a rearrangement. We have to hit them where it hurts.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01919-2 above.

PC01919-4

Comment:

Now, last we went to SCAG, we were successful at keeping them at 78 million annual passengers - the residents of Inglewood, Westchester, El Segundo - and also have the Arbor Vitae project pulled as far as funding, which is what Mr. Vandenburg referred to.

But this City of Inglewood still supports the Arbor Vitae Interchange. We have to have that project pulled. We have to change our position on it as a city. We have to bring forward litigation in reference to Manchester Square, and the Arbor Vitae Interchange project, in order to be successful as far as stopping not only expansion, but also incremental expansion, because after it's all over, said and done -

- once the EIR has been defeated --

- that incremental expansion will continue.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01919-2 above.

PC01920

Karpio, Cecil

None Provided

6/30/2001

PC01920-1

Comment:

Good afternoon. My name is Cecil Karpio. I'm from District Two, and I have a question that I need answered, please.

3. Comments and Responses

On the 37-page letter from Mr. Dickerson to Mr. Ritchie, on item No. 12, where it has to do with comments by the South Bay Cities COG are incorporated by reference, I spent all night trying to - I'm sorry I'm slow in getting up to speed, but what I need is that reference, the comments by the South Bay Cities COG.

I don't have it in my copy of the comments, but I was hoping I'd be able to review that, and I couldn't find it anywhere on either the South Bay COG's website or the City of Inglewood's website, and that's really important for me to review, especially under considerations of the South Bay Cities COG's -South Bay Cities coastal corridor transportation study, which does uphold and advance Arbor Vitae Interchange, and that Arbor Vitae interchange has been pulled by SCAG.

And I hope to see that the South Bay COG comments as well take into consideration the fact that Arbor Vitae does support LAX expansion. But yes, it is in the South Bay Cities coastal corridor transportation study, which came out January 2001, and which the City of Inglewood is a member.

Response:

Please see the responses to Comment Letter AR00003 which contains comments on the Draft EIS/EIR from the South Bay Cities Council of Governments dated September 20, 2001.

PC01920-2

Comment:

As to the discussion of avigation easements, how does the El Segundo -- I'm sorry I'm not pulled together here. How does the El Segundo findings, where the judge said it is illegal to ask for avigation easements in return for sound insulation, how does that play into this whole thing?

Response:

Comment noted. The nature and application of avigation easements at LAX was described in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also refer to Topical Response TR-LU-3, particularly Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.14, regarding aviation easements.

PC01920-3

Comment:

And as to the memorandum of understanding, I am a little bit confused, or I don't understand. What happens if Inglewood does have to go into litigation? We hope that doesn't happen. It looks like it won't because of the way the EIR/EIS was put together, but what happens if we do have to go to litigation? I really want to hear a comprehensive discussion of the effects of the MOU.

Response:

The comment does not pertain to the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment PC01916-2 regarding the nature and purpose of the MOU.

PC01921	Zimbrano, Diane	None Provided	6/30/2001
----------------	------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01921-1

Comment:

Good afternoon.

To the panel members who joined us today, I want to say thank you. For the limited time - I think we hired you about a month and a half, two months ago- that you had, you've done a fairly extensive study. I only wish our city counsel had chose to hire you much earlier, and you could have done a far more comprehensive study.

THE REPORTER: What's your name?

3. Comments and Responses

My name is Diane Zimbrano. I live in District Four.

Among the comments we heard today was that everything's Mr. Riordan's fault, and I've got to say, he couldn't have done it alone. He needed other votes. Now, some mayors do believe they are God, but I don't know that he's one of them.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01921-2

Comment:

I've got to suggest that as we go through and blame another entity for our not taking action by not suggesting to the residents of this community how to go about responding to the environmental impact report, by not presenting to them the video, the visual applications, the Alternates A, B and C, we, the residents of this community, have not had the opportunity, except for a few members of this community, doing that educational process.

We heard that approximately 57 homes, no matter what alternative, would be eliminated, and that's not very many. But that doesn't take into consideration the people who have already been eliminated. We call them Manchester Square's former residents. That does not include the people who are being kicked out of their homes, not dwelling units, for the benefit of sound mitigation. We should have taken a stand a long time ago.

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. 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. Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition.

PC01921-3

Comment:

Now, one of the people who had submitted a speaker card earlier and had to leave, because she thought she could actually come here and participate, as opposed to the monologues, wanted me to point out that no amount of someone else's economic development is beneficial to those of us who suffer the environmental injustices.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed environmental justice in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, and economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix F and Technical Report 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D and Technical Report S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01921-4

Comment:

You see, over and over again, we hear it's the other guy who hurts us, when, in reality, frequently its lack of information being provided to this community so they can in fact speak on their own.

3. Comments and Responses

I must say, thank you so much to the SCAG members who voted just a couple days ago to request 78 or less MAP. I wish I could say it was our councilperson and our representative was there to push that through. In fact, he was absent.

But then again, that's the story of our lives. And I hope that the people of LAWA pay greater attention to us than I generally believe this city's governmental officials do.

Response:

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

PC01922 Sanders, Pat None Provided 6/30/2001

PC01922-1

Comment:

Good afternoon. My name is Pat Sanders. I'm a resident of the First District.

I want to say first, thank you to the mayor, council people that are present; also a city official, Mr. Rouzan, and our own city attorney, Mr. Dickerson. You've done a very fine job in presenting this.

Also, I want to say thank you to the panel. Your reports and everything, you're really right on target. I'm really glad everybody is on the same page working with this. And I also want to say thank you to Mike Stevens, because I wouldn't have been able to understand half of what you have given us this afternoon if it hadn't been working a year with him, and also attending SCAG meetings and attending MTA meetings.

I want to just say, everybody has kind of hit on points that I do agree with, and I'm not going to reiterate those, but I'm really concerned. The people that are here, we're a small group. We need to carry this information forward and tell everybody, and along with our council, "Mr. Riordan" -- and he's Mr. Riordan now - "don't think that it's going to end there."

This has been a political thing. He's courting Bush, or Bush is courting him, to take over as governor. We're talking about big money. And we have already seen they are, to me - by this report, which is an insult, they are going to ignore Inglewood and what our importance is to this project, just try to roll over us.

I still think that the citizens need to be vigilant. I mean, let's face it. If Bush doesn't know his own second man has one foot on a banana peel and one foot on a skateboard with his heart issue, then he's not going to care about us and our environmental issues.

(Unintelligible) common sense. So I really want to say that the citizens have got to be involved, and really, let's be vigilant, and let's work with this.

This excellent panel, please include more of the citizens here. And we've got to still go out to those SCAG meetings, we've still got to go to MTA meetings, and we have to go to our council meetings and really be supportive of our council. You have to be supportive of us also.

Response:

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

PC01923 Bramera, Francisco None Provided 6/30/2001

PC01923-1

Comment:

Good afternoon. My name is Francisco Bramera, and I live on Kelso Avenue.

3. Comments and Responses

First of all, when one has as a picture of Los Angeles, there are many features concerned. People want to come here because they want to go to Disneyland. And luckily, I'm a small guy, but if I was like Michael Jordan, probably I could touch the airplanes that fly through the ceiling of my house.

But the unfortunate thing is that the capitalists do not understand, what they are doing here is probably a mistake, because when the Japanese come here, they don't want to come and see Inglewood. There is nothing to see here. The only thing that we had has been taken downtown.

So the Japanese don't come here, the foreigners don't come here, and most of the traffic that come here goes to Disneyland, the house of the stars and other places. We care about those people. That is not our business to care. That should be included here.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01923-2

Comment:

We should care about the education of our children that go to Inglewood High. I can hear the airplanes. The kids that come here can hear the airplanes. I and you probably have more responsibility to pay attention to the teachers. They probably don't have as much. We are forcing them to compete with less than proper places. These buildings are not insulated against those airplanes.

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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding how the existing and proposed Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program relate to schools.

PC01923-3

Comment:

And the airplanes are getting bigger and noisier and are using more gas that is lethal to our residents. We are killing people. When I saw this issue, I came, because to me what LAX means is Latins and Africans Being Exterminated. Latins and Africans Being Exterminated. Population of Latins, 46 percent; population of African-American, 46 percent. The rest probably don't count. But some people do care. I saw that they care, too, because their children are being annihilated.

We are killing people in gas chambers, which takes only one minute, two minutes, five minutes. In Inglewood, it takes ten years. From my own experience, I can say that we are allowing these people to kill our people. Their education is suffering. And we are getting worse than some cities in the world.

Bangkok is more polluted than LAX, but we are getting closer to them. Santiago, Chile, is more polluted than Los Angeles. It's hard to believe that there are cities that are more polluted than Los Angeles to some Americans that come from Minnesota that come from Virginia, and then let's talk about the Canadians. Canadians think that we are -

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, environmental justice impacts in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, health and safety impacts in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and impacts to schools in Section 4.27, Schools, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendices D, F and G, S-C, S-E and Technical Reports 4, 14, 17, S-C, and S-E.

PC01924 Slaughter, Velma None Provided 6/30/2001

PC01924-1

Comment:

Good afternoon, everyone. Mayor Dorn, council that's present, Mr. Rouzan, and attorney Dickerson, and our visiting panel, thank you for being with us this morning, and now this afternoon.

My name is Velma Slaughter, and I live in District 1. I've been in District 1 for over 27 years. I have one son, and he was raised in Inglewood, born in Inglewood. He's in the Navy now.

But what I would like to say is that I'm totally opposed of the L.A. expansion, and I feel that L.A. expansion would destroy Inglewood as a city and community, and it will destroy lives.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed 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.

PC01924-2

Comment:

A regional solution is the only answer -- El Toro, Palmdale and other airports. To take their fair share of the responsibility would be great. I feel, Inglewood, we have enough burden on us, with the air, the pollution, the traffic. We just can't take it no more. It's detrimental to our health. Stop victimizing the people of Inglewood.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to 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, traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and human health in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4, and 14a of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, S-4, and S-9a of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01924-3

Comment:

Also, I would like to say, if the mayor and some other people on the panel would have took this position that they have taken I seen, I'm going to say, in the last, say, five months, possibly, give and take, and brought in the top guns, our panel, the attorney, and had them working with us then instead of now, we would not be going through what we're going through.

And I really appreciate, Mayor Dorn, you and the city council, for bringing -- and attorney Dickerson, for bringing in the panel, giving us information, but I -- I'm not claiming to be no attorney, so I don't want nobody going back and saying, "Velma Slaughter said she's an attorney."

But I do understand a lot of things that they were talking about, and one person I have to thank for that dearly that I have been working with for over two years, and that's Mr. Mike Stevens.

3. Comments and Responses

I attend all the meetings -- a lot of SCAG meetings, MTA meetings, Caltrans meetings, Round Table meetings, all kind of meetings. And we went up to Lake Arrowhead Thursday. We had a bus-load of people. We went up there, and we had some good victories.

But the Arbor Vitae off-ramp that they want to make, and the Ring Road going around the airport, and also - because they will tell you that that's not tied into the expansion of LAX. They are lying to you. Yes, it is to move traffic in and out.

So I just want to again thank all of you guys, and especially thank Mike Stevens for all he have done for us, because he's there for us and all these meetings we go to to get educated on what's going on.

Response:

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

PC01925

Moltan, Nancy

LAX Expansion No!

6/30/2001

PC01925-1

Comment:

Hello. My name is Nancy Moltan, and I'm a member of L.A.X. Expansion No! Mike Stevens is the president, and I appreciate Mike so well, because I wouldn't know what I know if it wasn't for Mike, because you, Mayor, sold us out.

And I want everybody here to know the mayor sold us out. And the reason why I know, I was at his meeting when he said he signed the contract. And he did. And I forgot what I was going to say.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01925-2

Comment:

Oh. I want to know why that they can't just build another airport and stop expanding that one. It wasn't made when the blood was made. They can go to the desert and find a place to build an airport, and not bring all this mess in here on us.

Response:

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

PC01926

Gill, Karen

None Provided

6/30/2001

PC01926-1

Comment:

Good afternoon. My name is Karen Gill. I live in District 1.

I'd like to thank the mayor and the council and Mr. Rouzan and Mr. Dickerson for putting together this opportunity for the residents to come and speak. I'd like to commend the panel for the work that they did, and also in presenting it to me so that I can understand the work that you did.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01926-2

Comment:

One of the comments that I noticed that LAWA made was that there's no scientific evidence about the connection between noise and learning. If I read the comments correctly, they say that, and that's not correct. There is scientific evidence, depending on what they zero in on.

Many of those graduate students, we did work with auditory discrimination and the effects on learning, and so I know that they had studies then, and they have to have even more available now.

And there were studies done in 1980 that reported that children attending schools near LAX had more difficulty in solving cognitive problems. There was a study done in 1995, and I'm not sure which airport area they did the study with, but there was a study done that said children chronically exposed to aircraft noise have significant deficits in reading.

And so if they can zero in on auditory discrimination. I'd just like to briefly give a definition. It's the brain's ability to tell the difference between very similar sounds. An impairment in auditory discrimination can interfere with verbal comprehension and the development of functional reading skills.

In addition, a serious weakness in auditory discrimination in the classroom setting can be confused with inattention as the child appears not to have listened closely. So a lot of times, when we are told maybe that our children aren't paying attention, it may be because of the outside noise.

So it's not just insulating the buildings. It's also what goes on when the children play outside, outside of our homes, outside in the schoolyard.

It also means that what happens is, you start to tune out the sounds. So you can realize that when your neighbors come, people come to visit you from outside of this area, and sometimes you're sitting outside, and you don't pay attention to the noise because you've become adjusted to it in some cases, and your friends will count the planes. That's auditory discrimination. What we have started doing is tuning out the noise.

But when that happens at a lower level, the children start tuning out what's happening in the classroom. So even if the teacher stops, which is disruptive, they are still not coming back in when the teacher is ready to resume the conversation again.

So I would like, if there's something that -- I would like the city to push for L.A. to actually show the scientific evidence that's there that shows that there are detrimental effects.

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

3. Comments and Responses

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.

PC01927 Green, Rudolph None Provided 6/30/2001

PC01927-1

Comment:

Yes. My name is Rudolph Green. I live in the 1st District. I'm a member of the mayor's advisory counsel.

I would like to speak on what Dr. Mattis spoke on earlier today about the environmental studies that have not been done, especially in the areas of health. There have been many things in the area of health, such as the survey for the people that live in and under the flight pattern of the LAX, LAWA.

One of the things that the - I've read the executive - most of the executive summary of the EIS/EIR Report, and I found that there's many holes in that report that needs to be addressed, and I'm very pleased that this panel and the city council and Mr. Rouzan has put together this panel to address these issues, and they've done an excellent job, and I applaud you for that.

One of the things that I would like to speak on is if they could do some kind of study for those areas of the people who live directly under the flight path of the airport that would compare them with other cities that are not in this area, such as Torrance, Beverly Hills, any of those outlying cities that don't have the same effects of the fallout and pollution that we that live directly under the flight pattern has.

Response:

Comment noted. Human health impacts are 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.

PC01927-2

Comment:

I also think about what we have is an inalienable right as life, liberty and pursuit of happiness, and all three of those things have been taken from us by LAWA.

They've taken away life as I used to know it. I've lived in the City of Inglewood for 31 years. I've lived on 2nd Avenue in Century Heights, which is directly under the flight path of LAX. They've taken away my liberties -- or they have attempted to take away my liberties to have a real enjoyable life and able to fight them on these issues, but I'm going to continue to fight.

And the pursuit of happiness. Pursuit is always searching for, looking for, hoping to have happiness, and I cannot have the happiness that I think that I'm entitled to, or anyone in this city is entitled to, that they have taken away from us.

Response:

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

PC01927-3

Comment:

And as far as the mayor, people say that the mayor has not fought this issue. I believe he's diligently fought this issue on the expansion. And please don't confuse the MOU and the expansion as being one and the same.

Response:

The comment does not pertain to the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment PC01916-2 regarding the nature and purpose of the MOU.

PC01928**Allen, Raymond****None Provided****6/30/2001****PC01928-1****Comment:**

My name is Raymond Allen. I've been living in Inglewood actually since 1983. You can almost throw a rock and hit my house from here, okay?

What I have to say basically is, you know, my wife and I, we've been complaining for years about the noise. And my wife even, you know, tried to enter into the lottery to get our house insulated or soundproofed, but so far we haven't heard anything, okay? Nothing has happened.

Response:

Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included a discussion of LAWA's Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP), including the residential soundproofing program being implemented as part of the ANMP.

PC01928-2**Comment:**

My address is to the attorneys, okay? What are we waiting for? You know what I mean? I mean it's been years. I don't understand what attorneys do. What do you guys do? Do you guys sue people, or just - we need to just sue people or sue this airport, okay?

What are we waiting for? That's all I want to know is what are we waiting for? And people need to just stand up and stop taking this, okay? That's the reality of it. We just need to stop taking this.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01929**Barardi, Josephine****LAX Expansion No!****6/30/2001****PC01929-1****Comment:**

I'm Josephine Barardi. I've lived in Inglewood since 1958.

A few years ago, I voted Yes to assess myself about \$100 a year for more police protection, and I have a question. Why is it that I, as a member of

L.A.X.E.N!, a faithful taxpayer of Inglewood since 1958, have been deprived of meeting at the police community building near Manchester and Crenshaw? We used to meet there once a month, and all of a sudden we couldn't meet there. L.A.X.E.N! is a democratic grass-roots organization which makes visible all our concerns at the different government organizational meetings. I've been to meetings at the Caltrans, the Metropolitan Transit Authority, Southern California Association of Governments, the Orange County Board of Supervisors, the airport commissioner meeting in Van Nuys, the Southern Regional Air Quality Management District, the Los Angeles City Council meetings, and the City of Inglewood Council meetings, at which the city council walked out.

Now, all of this was because I was informed of L.A.X.E.N! meetings, and I've been faithfully attending them, and I think the effort to close off the police community center there backfired, because other doors have opened to us.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC01929-2

Comment:

I'm interested in the Arbor Vitae Interchange, because I live near Arbor Vitae and La Cienega. That is the key to the Ring Road around the airport, and it will place an unjust burden on me and my neighbors. It will demolish Inglewood homes, and according to a member of the school maintenance department, it will demolish Oak Street school.

Response:

Comment noted. This comment is similar to comment AL00008-8. Please see Response to Comment AL00008-8. See also Topical Responses TR-ST-2 and TR-ST-4 regarding the Arbor Vitae interchange.

PC01929-3

Comment:

I feel that the City of Inglewood made it easy for them to do this. Years ago Inglewood saw that LAX was slowly demolishing Manchester Square by offering 30 percent above market price to homeowners for them to move away so that they could make that area a cargo center and fall in line with the cargo cult that I see.

Response:

Comment noted. As described in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, voluntary acquisition program at Manchester Square is for noise compatibility purposes and is occurring separate from the LAX Master Plan. Please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand.

PC01929-4

Comment:

Right now I enjoy perfect ventilation in my home. When I open the windows, I get a breeze from the west cooling off the house in the afternoon.

Now I'm being offered a chance to lock myself up.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

PC01930

Baker, Elaine

None Provided

6/30/2001

PC01930-1

Comment:

Good afternoon, city council, Mr. Rouzan, Mr. Dickerson, and esteemed panel.

It has been very gratifying to be here and to hear your exchange regarding the issues that we face here in Inglewood.

I'm sorry. My name is Elaine Baker. I'm a resident, City of Inglewood, 2 District 4, approximately 27 years, under the flight path.

I attended a meeting at the South Bay COG where they had a panel such as yourself, and it seems as though we all came up with the same conclusions. It's gratifying to know that and to know where we're going.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01930-2

Comment:

Also, I have attended a SCAG meeting whereas it was noted that Orange County has spent in the sum of \$40 million to fight an airport being placed in their backyard. So in essence, they are saying, "We don't want that nasty airport in our backyard. We want those cheap tickets when we come to Los Angeles. We want to wear out your roads, we want to pollute your air, but we don't want it in our backyard."

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding the El Toro conversion, constraints at John Wayne Airport, and the Ontario Master Plan.

PC01930-3

Comment:

Well, I would like to go on record as saying that Inglewood should not be charged for the disproportionate part of taking the impact on our environment, our children's learning.

We talk in terms of school, and the young lady that was here when she said about the children not learning. Actually, that's true, because the children are not sleeping at night where I live when those planes go across -- the big cargo planes go across and rattle my house at 2 and 3 in the morning and wake me from my sleep.

Also, when my granddaughter comes to visit me, she is awakened from her sleep, so how can this child wake up at 6 o'clock in the morning, at 7 o'clock in the morning, with the planes going over; to the extent that you have to conclude a conversation, tell the person that you're speaking to, "Wait just a moment, as soon as the plane goes over, we can continue our conversation"?

Response:

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

PC01930-4

Comment:

This is what is being imposed upon myself and others that live under the flight path here in Inglewood. So I say to you, I support any and every effort that goes forth to fight further expansion in the airport.

I do realize that the airport was here when I moved here, but I guarantee you, when I moved here, I hardly heard a plane at all. I don't know whether they were flying at a higher altitude or whether they were spacing the trips or whatever. It is nothing to the magnitude that I'm confronted with today.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

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.

PC01931 Roberts, Sandra None Provided 6/30/2001

PC01931-1

Comment:

Good afternoon, members of the city council, city administrator, Mr. Dickerson.

That was a marvelous presentation. You did a great job with the response to the EIR/EIS. Thank you very much. And thank you, panelists, for a very interesting afternoon.

My name is Sandra Roberts. I don't know if I told you or not.

I'm opposed, of course, to LAX's expansion. The EIS/EIR fails to address how to prevent aircraft collisions over and near our city. It also fails to propose how LAX intends to mitigate traffic and aircraft emissions that are so detrimental to our health. Nor the mitigation of noise pollution, which causes psychological and neurological disorders has not been addressed.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures for human health and safety in 4.24, Human Health and Safety, traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 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. The health effects of noise were addressed in Section 4.24.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR with supporting information provided in Technical Report 14b. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety, Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation, and Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects.

PC01931-2

Comment:

These factors negatively impact our community 24 hours a day. LAX must not feel that we are expendable just because we are a low-income minority community. This is tantamount to genocide.

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.

PC01932 Mann, La Verne None Provided 6/30/2001

PC01932-1

Comment:

Good afternoon, Mayor, council members, Mr. Rouzan, panel. It was a fantastic presentation.

I'm here today, hopefully, to put something in that would save the children. I have an example, my granddaughter, who just got graduated from Gallaudet University, which is a university for the hearing impaired. She was born in Inglewood, and she lived quite close to the airport. In taking her to John Tracy Clinic at that time, they mentioned it's possibly the airport, that the airplanes come in.

3. Comments and Responses

Upon hearing that, and not being sure really, couldn't do anything at the time, she did move to San Diego in a nice quiet neighborhood, but at that time the damage was done.

You'd be surprised the children who are in school who you think may be ignoring you, like we thought that she was doing when she was young, but she couldn't hear. She would do fine as long as she could see our lips. We did not realize that she was reading lips at the time, but she had severe hearing loss.

So I'm hoping that this will come about where maybe we can save children. Don't think they are ignoring you. Have them tested. It's very possible that their hearing loss is to the point where they just don't know what's going on unless they actually hear you.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-246 regarding the fact that existing and future noise levels at and around LAX are projected to be well below the OSHA and CalOSHA standards that serve to protect against hearing loss. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00038-11 regarding the impact of high noise levels on children. 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.

PC01932-2

Comment:

Also, I bought my home 35 years ago, and I bought it because of the backyard. It's quite large, which most people on the avenues do have large yards. If I knew that this was going to happen, I would have bought a condo if I had to stay in a house with locked up windows. I mean, you know, give me a break.

Do we actually have to just keep going, or do we have to wait until there's really a catastrophe of all those planes, and then something will be done right away?

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 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-4 regarding outdoor noise levels and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC01933

Pray, Ralph

None Provided

6/30/2001

PC01933-1

Comment:

My name is Ralph Pray, and I'm a resident of Inglewood for 38 years, and a retired FAA employee, and I would look to speak to the issue of safety as it relates to LAX current air traffic and ground operations and exposure to terrorist attacks.

I'll repeat that. Safety as it relates to LAX's current air traffic, ground operations and exposure to terrorist attacks.

Fact No. 1: Today, LAX is high on the top ten most dangerous airports for ground incursions. That's a fact. It's also a fact that the FAA does not know how to correct the problem of rising ground incursions.

It's also a fact that LAX was the target for the terrorist that was arrested recently in Seattle. This international terrorist, his destination was Los Angeles. He carried incendiaries and bombs with him. If he hadn't been arrested in Seattle, he would have had LAX as his target.

Fact 4: Plans A, B and C all result in an increase in air traffic and ground traffic.

3. Comments and Responses

Fact 5: This will cause LAX to have more exposure to ground accidents and to terrorist attacks.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety and Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security issues. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00033-233.

PC01933-2

Comment:

Legally and politically, the only safe course of action is a regional approach. Under the LAX plans, we perish. With a divided regional plan, we live.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to 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.

PC01934

Brown, Milton

None Provided

6/30/2001

PC01934-1

Comment:

Milton Brown, District 3.

My major claim to fame to being here in terms of noise mitigation -- as I like joke, but in reality -- I'm the last Inglewood citizen that lives the furthest west, and each plane that flies over north runway, I'm about 200 feet underneath.

So nobody in this room is more impacted by noise than me. I am familiar and each and every runway pattern, how far out the heavies must go to land. When Northwest makes a left, I know it all, and I stand surviving it.

Now, in this room I almost feel like the battle of the Israelis and Palestinians in trying to get a peace treaty. Everybody here is right. There is, unfortunately, nobody wrong. But what appears to be missing is, for a city that basically can only earn, regrettably, 25 percent of what it takes to support us, we seem to be tremendously indifferent to the economic impact of having 75 to 80 million people of the world coming within two miles of our area.

Of course, the regions want a piece of that. They are out there with nothing. We've lost FedEx. They've moved out there. We should be agreeing that there is faults, but we should also be trying to mitigate those faults with the pluses.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01934-2

Comment:

There must be pluses in this new growing global economy. For one, why can we not see if we can't have everything going over the ocean?

With computerized technology, the idea of a physical pilot actually landing is about as arcane as Snoopy flying a (unintelligible) plane. The so-called prevailing wind theory that pilots prefer to only land coming into the wind can be easily handled today by lengthening the runway, and simply having the computer take over the plane somewhere in the ocean, and bring him in as gently as he needs to be

brought in. This way we get the activity of a global expansion, and we also no longer have to deny anybody using their backyard.

Response:

Comment noted. Computerized technology has been applied to a wide range of sophisticated applications; however, the use of computerized technology does not overcome basic aerodynamic principles.

The need to land and takeoff into the wind is more than a pilot preference. Basic principles of flight, such as how an aircraft wing generates lift cannot be wholly overcome by the application of technology. Wind direction and speed are key factors in aircraft operations because wind flow across the wing is required to produce sufficient lift to support flight. Each aircraft is designed and certified to safety standards that dictate how much crosswind or tailwind component can exist and ensure a safe landing or takeoff. This wind component will vary depending on gross weight of the aircraft, temperature, and many other variables. This is particularly true at the lower speeds required for landings.

Landings performed with tailwinds require higher airspeeds and longer runway lengths. The more pronounced the tailwind, the higher the approach speed requiring longer runway lengths to accomplish a safe landing. When sufficiently high enough, an approach speed would preclude the aircraft from landing without forceful intervention by the pilot. Touchdown at such speeds would likely cause tire failure as the aircraft tires could not tolerate the heat generated by the friction created between the tire and the runway surface. The latest computerized technology would not be capable of controlling the wind direction and speed.

An additional consideration for an all-over-water operation is the instrumentation available to provide approach guidance during low ceiling and visibility conditions. The Instrument Landing System (ILS) for Runways 6 and 7 are Category I. They do not support instrument approach and landing to the lowest possible landing minima. Today, during the night hours when aircraft approaching LAX are landing over the water, this operation is suspended when ceilings on the west end of the airport are 400 feet above ground level (AGL) and the airport reverts to landings to the west. In order to achieve lower landing minima from the west the ILS and approach lighting systems would require a significant upgrade. The siting and installation criteria of an ILS is very critical relevant to terrain and other objects that may cause a deflection of the electronic signal. It is quite possible the sand dunes west of the airport could adversely impact the operation of the ILS signal precluding lower landing minima. An upgrade approach lighting system may have to be extended into the environmentally sensitive area (the El Segundo Sand Dunes and the El Segundo Blue Butterfly Habitat Restoration Area) as well.

Weather and approach aids aside, the criteria for conducting simultaneous opposite direction operations required the operation be conducted in Visual Meteorological Conditions (VMC). VMC conditions occur when the ceiling is at least 1,000 feet AGL and the visibility is at least three statute miles. The conduct of simultaneous opposite direction operations also requires a runway centerline separation of 1,400 feet during daylight hours and 2,800 feet during nighttime hours based on the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) operating procedures and standards.

The proposed Alternative C runway centerline separation of 800 feet for both the north and south runway complexes would not meet the requirements to conduct such operations. Thus, to employ this type of operation would require using one runway complex for arrivals and one for departures. This is essentially the operation conducted today during the over-ocean operation between midnight and 6:30 a.m. Today this operation is manageable because of the reduced number of operations conducted during the late-night hours. To apply these procedures on a continual basis would have a deleterious effect on overall airport capacity, essentially reducing airport capacity by approximately 50 percent, and perhaps up to 70 percent when the weather is less than VMC.

The late-night over-ocean operation at LAX has been used safely for over thirty years. The operational procedures dictate all arriving aircraft land on the north runway complex (Runway 6L) and all departing aircraft utilize the south complex (Runway 25R). Application of these procedures during peak traffic periods would result in extensive taxi distances and airport surface congestion. It would also concentrate aircraft on departure routes reducing airspace capacity and resulting in extensive departure delays. It would also raise environmental questions from communities north and south of the airport as 100 percent of the noisier departure operations would be concentrated on the south complex, while quieter landing operations would occur on the north runway complex.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01934-3

Comment:

So all I ask is, we attempt to find some kind of compromise. It should not be us versus them. Yes, the airport probably took us for granted. People like Mike Stevens, Judy, and other members of the council did their job in making that not happen, but we don't want to drive them away.

I'm not sure if these are the people to create the solution. We need solutions too, not just stopping. So let's open our minds to trying to -yes, we should want to be partners with that airport, respected partners. Because why? We need the money. We spent \$260 million, and we can only earn seven.

And the man said, "Well, people are coming here to go to Disneyland. Well, why can't we create a place where people come here and come to us? So we have a lot to do, but let's try to look for balance in our argument.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01935

Corey, Elizabeth

None Provided

6/30/2001

PC01935-1

Comment:

Elizabeth Corey, and I'm from District 1.

I'm going to quote something from the Draft Environmental Impact Report, Proposed Amendments to the Merged Inglewood Redevelopment Project. That's dated April 10th, 2001. This has to do with Lockheed and the added area that's proposed. On page 2-9, the following comments are made:

"With the expansion of LAX, this area has become unsuitable for residential use, since it is located in an expanded pathway. ..since it's expected that eventually the area will be developed with freight forwarding or other airport-related uses that now dominate the north Inglewood Industrial Park area."

That's just what was stated in that draft environmental impact report under that area.

My comment or question: Assuming the City of Inglewood knew that LAX was doing incremental expansion, why didn't the city take aggressive action against the airport years ago to change the course of events?

Why are they saying that acquiring land and more land that is required is a likelihood or the possibility the airport or LAX will expand?

We're seeing land acquisition right here in Inglewood. And what was just stated, for airport use, seems to me that the city is saying one thing and doing something else. Doesn't make sense here.

Response:

The City of Los Angeles, as lead agency for the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR, cannot speak for the City of Inglewood. Acquisition, and the associated impacts, of each of the Master Plan alternatives were addressed in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01935-2

Comment:

But the Arbor Vitae Interchange. This is the book from last year, Caltrans. Why didn't the City of Inglewood take a stand against the Arbor Vitae Interchange last year at the public hearing that Caltrans

held in July in Community Room A? This book was given to all our elected officials, but I believe only one elected official was at that meeting.

To Mr. Vandenburg, Mr. Freytag and Mr. Bures: Thank you for bringing to light everything that Mike Stevens has been saying for the past two to three years regarding --

-- incremental expansion, regarding Arbor Vitae Interchange, 405, and what the city has not been doing.

We did meet, but they chose not to work with us. I have attended many of the meetings that previous speakers have mentioned, and it's just too bad that our elected officials waited this long to have this meeting -

- 23 days before we have to turn in the written report.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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 has had the federal funding withdrawn and is not a part of the LAX Master Plan.

PC01936 Meloutas, Barbara None Provided 6/30/2001

PC01936-1

Comment:

Hello. My name is Barbara Meloutas. I'm a resident of Westchester.

Unfortunately, I was out of the country when they had the FORAMA meeting, so I came here to get some more information, and it seems like the lawyers have done a good job.

I'd like to ask a question. If there has to be a report before there's expansion, isn't incremental expansion also illegal, if that's the law? So should that be included in your remarks or in your case, whatever you're going to do?

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00018-19 regarding LAWA's assessment of the project's impacts in conjunction with past, present, and probable future projects in the area.

PC01936-2

Comment:

Secondly, I do think that economic solutions are the only way to go, because money talks, so why don't we charge the cars from Orange County and outlying areas that come into our area? Why don't we charge them a fee for using our airport?

Response:

LAX is a public facility and is supported by grants from the FAA. It is illegal to charge different fees to users of the same facility and thus discriminate among users.

PC01936-3

Comment:

The City of L.A. has to take charge of the these kinds of fees, as one of the lawyers mentioned about charging fees to airplanes which are dirtier than planes that are cleaner.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles is prohibited from imposing differential landing fees for aircraft based on their emissions levels.

PC01936-4

Comment:

I'm also concerned about the number of responses Mr. Ritchie said he got. He said he only got 911. I feel like, can we trust the wolf? I don't know.

Who is looking at these things? Who is counting the responses beside LAWA? Thank you for what you offered us today, and I'm going to continue to work with Mike Stevens.

Response:

Copies of all written and oral comments provided on the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR are included in the Final EIS/EIR. In accordance with the provisions of NEPA and CEQA, FAA and LAWA have prepared written responses to all comments received. These responses are provided herein as part of this Final EIS/EIR.

PC01937

**Autry, Yvonne
Michelle**

None Provided

6/30/2001

PC01937-1

Comment:

My name is Yvonne Michelle Autry. I've been a resident of District No. 4 for about 25 of my 34 years, and I'd like to thank the panel for addressing a lot of the issues that had been raised and the concerns of the community in the last one or two years, again reiterating or just restating a lot of what Michael Stevens and a lot of us have been saying for a few years. I thank you for finally documenting and presenting a study. Hopefully, you'll continue to listen to us.

Just to drive this matter home, as I live here, and I was educated in this community for the majority of my education, high school, elementary school, again, because of the bombardment - it's like being shell-shocked, okay? I can't think of another word. And it's gotten worse. The children suffer, the seniors suffer, everyone does. And I know that, you know, some of the traffic can be diverted to other airports, okay?

Just, again, to make this very clear, symptoms of fibromyalgia, not just problems with sleeping, but also serious chronic migraines, headaches, birth defects, again, neurological damage, damage to the immune system, which could cause an increase in the advent of AIDS or other diseases, okay, just because of the continuous bombardment, and again, with the pollution of the air and the water okay? It's very, very serious.

But you see, with this environmental genocide, a lot of these symptoms go untreated, and it just looks like as if we're just kind of an apathetic, lazy, slow, retarded, dysfunctional people that become homeless, unemployed, and just kind of, you know, the undesirable, people that just don't want to work. Many of us cannot get up. As one of the residents said, her child can't sleep.

Okay. Again, problems like asthma, symptoms of asthma and bronchitis, problems with heart palpitations, respiratory illness and infection, because, you know, without oxygen, the body can't heal itself. We can't live without oxygen too long. At least you can't live a healthy life with a high standard of living like a human being, okay?

Brain damage, not just for the children, but people my age and seniors as well, from lack of oxygen. Symptoms of attention deficit syndrome, forgetfulness, symptoms of Alzheimers due to the lack of oxygen. Brain damage, cellular deterioration symptoms, in which case people are treated with medication, when all they need is clean air and sound insulation and clean water.

Hyperactivity, hypertension --

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 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 and Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding land use and noise mitigation.

PC01938 Bures, Matt Radcliff, Frandsen & Dongell 6/30/2001

PC01938-1

Comment:

The most important thing that I want to respond to is a comment that actually I believe is a misunderstanding about what Mr. Radcliff said when he said, if you file a lawsuit, you've lost already.

You have to remember that in a context. As we've been listening here today, we've heard a number of different opinions, some saying, "No way, no how, no expansion," and others saying, "Well, wait a second. If we do that, what happens to the business?"

Mr. Radcliff's point was simply, when you get to the point of filing a lawsuit in a given context -- and this is not to say whether you should or should not, okay? That's not what I'm speaking to.

When you get to the point that you are filing a lawsuit, you have to have already loaded your gun, pulled it, pointed it, cocked the trigger, and you're pulling the trigger. There's nothing more after that. Then it's in the judge's hands or the jury's hands.

What he was speaking to is, if you get to the point that you are filing a lawsuit, you have lost already, you have lost in the court of negotiation, you have lost in the court of community involvement. That's what he was speaking to. Not that you have a loser lawsuit, simply you have lost in those avenues of opportunity. That's what he was speaking to.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01939 Dickerson, Esq., City of Inglewood 6/30/2001
Charles

PC01939-1

Comment:

A couple of other real quick points.

Mr. Springs asked, what is it that we would like to have the community do? One of my last duties for today is to give you the address to which we are asking that if any of you have any written responses further that you would like to send to LAX, I'd like to give that to you. And this really goes to Mr. Springs's question about what we'd have the community do.

If you'd like to write, write. At this point that's the only thing that is really left open to us, until such time as LAX takes the comments that they shall receive, not only from us, but from other communities, and evaluate.

3. Comments and Responses

The address is as follows: Los Angeles World Airports, LAX Master Plan Office, Post Office Box 92216, Los Angeles, California 90009-2216.

As an alternative, so I don't have to spend time reading this again, all of you I think have in your packets a copy of a letter that goes under my signature to Jim Ritchie at Los Angeles Airport, and you may use that same address if you wish to send comments to Los Angeles Airport relative to the matters today. So please, what is the community to do? Write. And I encourage you to do so.

Response:

Comment noted. In accordance with the provisions of NEPA and CEQA, FAA and LAWA have prepared written responses to all comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. These responses are provided herein as part of this Final EIS/EIR.

PC01939-2

Comment:

With respect to the question about the South Bay Council of Governments' comments and our adopting them by reference, my understanding - and I might need some help here, fellas - is that they have not yet been finalized.

Is that correct?

But when they are finalized, they will become a part of our response by our having referred to them. I do not know whether the Council of Governments is going to be putting their comments on the website as we have. We will do everything that we can to get copies of them, and make them available through the clerks office, or whatever, but I want to respond to that.

And I think that's just about all that we can say today.

Response:

Comment noted. The South Bay Council of Governments' comments on the Draft EIS/EIR (AR00003), referred to by the commentor, were incorporated by reference into the City of Inglewood's comment letter on the Draft EIS/EIR (AL00017). Responses to the South Bay Council of Governments' comments are provided in response to comment letter AR00003.

PC01939-3

Comment:

With respect to the question about what are we waiting for to sue, I regret to have to tell you that there are certain procedural requirements that we must comply with prior to our having -- in the law we call --

There's a concept in the law called ripeness, r-i-p-e-n-e-s-s, and a lawsuit is considered to be ripe after all of the preliminaries to the lawsuit have been exhausted. In many instances, as this, we call this the exhaustion of administrative remedies. Once all those remedies are exhausted and you still do not have the relief that you want, then your lawsuit is ripe, and you can file it at that point.

Unfortunately, I understand -- I have not lived in Inglewood. I do not live in Inglewood. I haven't lived here, and haven't had the privilege of being your city attorney, until two and a half years ago, and have become very well aware of the issues and concerns that this community has since that time.

And I'm going to tell you that while I understand that you have had all these concerns, as it relates to the EIS/EIR, which is all that we're here to talk about today, we're not even yet at a point of ripeness for the filing of the lawsuit.

But I can assure you, if that time arises, I am certain that the - I know that the council will be advised, and the council at that time will make a determination as to whether further legal action should indeed be taken. The best thing that I can encourage you to do at this time is what I said a moment or two ago, to please do write.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01939-4

Comment:

As a final comment, I do want to take this one opportunity to say to you that I have been your city attorney for the last two and a half years, and I have never had an opportunity like this to say before that it is a privilege to serve in that capacity.

Undertaking this particular project has been a mammoth, mammoth job. We're not done with it yet, and we do appreciate all comments that you've brought to us today, and we will certainly take them into consideration and incorporate as much of them as we can.

We are trying to make certain that all of your written comments that have been submitted today will also be sent with the response that the City of Inglewood will send to LAX.

So I want to express to you my thanks to you for having come and participated today, for actually, and frankly, your words of encouragement, as we are doing the utmost best that we can to try to present to LAX, and whatever other legal authorities we need to -we are trying to present them in the best way that we can so that your interests are best protected.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01940

Dunlap, Judy

City of Inglewood

6/30/2001

PC01940-1

Comment:

First, I'd like to state regarding -- make a statement regarding my lower classman, Dr. Dale Hattis. We both attended Morningside High School at the same time. I graduated in 1962, he graduated in 1964.

I would like to say, at that time the Inglewood Unified School District ranked in the top 10 percent of educational institutions in the State of California. The State of California ranked number one in the nation. We have a long way to go. There were lot less planes flying over Inglewood in the early '60s.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01940-2

Comment:

I would like to also state that the one hearing that we were allowed from the FAA and LAWA, that was the public hearing held at the casino, which was the official opportunity for residents of this city to give comments. The FAA and LAWA has advertised, as you know, as having offered three public hearings. Indeed, I want the record to reflect they had one public hearing in three places. It's far different.

Response:

Thank you for your comments. The three location hearing was one of many to solicit public input. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 for a listing of all public hearings. Also, please visit the web site, www.laxmasterplan.org.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01940-3

Comment:

With regard to the comments from the public on the MOU, there are many differences of opinion here, up on this stage, as well as in the audience. I agree with those in the audience that believe the MOU has everything to do with expansion, and I believe that you had a right to comment to that.

And Congresswoman Maxine Waters actually encouraged this body, the Inglewood City Council, to not accept that MOU, because it was laying the groundwork for LAX expansion; and her attempts to block that were ignored by our city council. Inglewood City Council passed it anyway.

Response:

The comment does not pertain to the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment PC01916-2 regarding the nature and purpose of the MOU.

PC01940-4

Comment:

I would like to comment with regard to environmental justice. I don't think LAWA, Los Angeles World Airport, even knows anything about environmental justice. If they did, they would have compensated us over the years for the impact they have on us now.

The current sound insulation program going on in the City of Inglewood is for damage now. It has nothing to do with the expansion.

Plus, I believe that the fact that our homes are valued from \$150,000 to, say, \$250,000, when they should be \$300,000 to \$600,000.

Environmental justice means that they will begin to compensate our current property owners for their loss of value over these years. Then they can begin to talk about another day.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Sections 4.4.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a discussion of environmental justice. Also, please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

PC01940-5

Comment:

They also need to come into our city and look over our health problems. Not only our children, but our seniors, people who have lived here for 30 years that are suffering, developing asthma in their 70s, because they live under the flight path. They need to start paying our medical bills today, not tomorrow.

Response:

Comment noted. Human health impacts are 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.

PC01940-6

Comment:

And I'd like to end with a question to the panel that has to do with our submission, which is what this meeting is about, our comments.

We have the 37-page summary at the beginning, and then our booklet that we're submitting is divided with a number of appendices, one of them being, of course, the SCAG comments. Now, what is it that we need to know that makes us believe that the LAWA is going to comment on everything?

What requires them to comment to a section which has been, say, one of your studies, if your study is actually directed to us, if one reads it, as opposed to just the 37 pages? Meaning, what is it that we need to know that would make us believe that they are actually going to respond to all of the issues brought up and all of the appendices?

As well as the fact that even though we're submitting to SCAG, what is it that we are presenting that's saying these are also our questions in addition to our questions?

I want to make sure that everything is clearly covered and responded to. So if that could be answered, I would really appreciate it.

Response:

In this Final EIS/EIR, FAA and LAWA have provided responses to the comments included in the City of Inglewood's 37-page letter dated July 10, 2001, as well as to individual comments contained within the separate studies undertaken on behalf of the City by technical consultants, and included in the City's submission as Attachments 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. The City's submission also included an attachment containing transcripts of their June 30, 2001 Discussion and Comments on the LAX Draft Master Plan and EIS/EIR Report, of which this comment is a part. Responses to these comments are provided in PC01901 through PC01941. The other letters and Public Comment forms provided with the City's transmission were treated as individual public comment letters; responses to these letters are also provided in this Final EIS/EIR.

PC01941	Dorn, Roosevelt	City of Inglewood	6/30/2001
----------------	------------------------	--------------------------	------------------

PC01941-1

Comment:

First of all, I want to thank the panel. I think you've done an outstanding job today. I think that you have thoroughly and completely informed those that are here, and I think that those that see this on Channel 35 will be very impressed with your answers and with our objections to the EIR/EIS report.

Someone raised the issue as to why didn't we do this earlier. We didn't do it earlier because the report was not ready earlier. This meeting would have meant nothing until the report was ready, until the experts were ready to make their decisions.

Now, someone said, "Well, why wasn't it done a long time ago?" It wasn't done a long time ago, because the EIR and the EIS was not submitted to us until January. That's the reason. You can't act on something until you received it.

We received it in January, and we went out and we hired experts to go over it, and you see the results of studying 12,000 pages in that short period of time. And it is a short period of time, and the only reason we got that much time is by lobbying the city council, L.A. City Council, or lobbying the Board of Supervisors and everyone else to have them extend it for the six months rather than 30 days, which is all they had to do by law, but we were able to get them to extend it, the comment time, for six months. So that's the approach that we have used.

Response:

Comment noted. The comment period for the Draft EIS/EIR was extended for a total of 295 days.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01941-2

Comment:

As far as the lawsuit in regard to the ring around the interchange: Now, first of all, Mr. Kirkley is the one who made the motion to pull the money for that, so why anyone would say that the City of Inglewood is for that interchange is beyond me. I don't understand that, when our city councilman is the one that made the motion for the money to be pulled from it.

That's a fact. The city council, we do not and have not supported that circle around the airport. Yes, I firmly believe it has everything to do with an expansion. That's the reason we don't support 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. 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.

PC01941-3

Comment:

The other issue is, clearly, we are continuing to call upon the mayor of Los Angeles, the mayor elect -- I guess, as of today or early tomorrow, he will be the mayor -- Jimmy Hahn. We will continue to call upon him.

I had an opportunity to meet with him. I spoke with him at the National Mayors Conference in Detroit. He was there. He again assured me that he opposed the expansion, and that he certainly will continue to work with Congresswoman Waters. He knows she's opposed to it. He knows that I oppose it. I told him we are both on the same page.

Therefore, with that, we believe that with Jimmy Hahn opposing it, hopefully he will appoint commissioners that will oppose the expansion. If that occurs, we believe that that will kill it from the word go. That's what we're hoping for.

If it doesn't, we will take the next step when the lawsuit becomes ripe. You heard the city attorney explain to you, when the lawsuit becomes ripe, if that becomes necessary, we'll file a lawsuit.

We thank all of you for coming. Tell your neighbors to watch this so that they will better understand what the issues are. And with that, God bless you, and have a great afternoon.

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.

PC01942 Alan Arbaugh, Tracy None Provided

7/3/2001

PC01942-1

Comment:

I am writing this letter to address some of my concerns regarding the proposed LAWA expansion. As a 26 year resident of the city of Inglewood and a retired senior citizen, I have noticed fallout and pollutants associated with the Los Angeles airport that I had not really been aware of, or paid particular attention to during my working years since I did not work in the area.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 for information regarding deposition and soot. 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.

PC01942-2

Comment:

Lately I have noticed an increase in problems with my breathing. I am also starting to cough for no apparent reasons. These are problems that I have never had before.

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.

PC01942-3

Comment:

I am constantly being awakened by the airplane noise that we are forced to endure day and night.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01879-5.

PC01942-4

Comment:

Carrying on a conversation in the outdoors is almost an impossibility.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC01942-5

Comment:

We have very strange coatings on our flowers, shrubbery, and trees. I just recently stopped planting a vegetable garden because of the strange spots that appear on my tomatoes and leafy vegetables. The fallout on our vehicles is terrible. We are being forced to wipe our vehicles almost daily, have them washed weekly and have them detailed (polished) about 4 times per year. These are big investment items and even more so when you are a retired senior citizen.

Response:

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

PC01942-6

Comment:

The fallout and pollutants from the aircraft traffic is just the tip of the iceberg. The increased street traffic has a tremendous negative impact on the city. One can easily smell the pollutants in the air.

3. Comments and Responses

During the summer months, it is impossible for one to remain inside with the windows closed, which means that we must endure these pollutants inside our homes also.

Response:

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

PC01942-7

Comment:

The presently designed noise contours are a real joke. Our home is less than 75 feet outside of the noise contour and yet plane after plane flies directly over our residence.

Response:

The commentor resides along the extended centerline approach to the north runway complex, just outside the 65 CNEL contour. For information regarding the 65 CNEL threshold see Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences, particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-2.2. 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.

PC01942-8

Comment:

The environmental studies have not been in any way comprehensive, or the people responsible for them would know that they are meaningless.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01943

Hollier, Geraldine

76th Street Block Club

7/20/2001

PC01943-1

Comment:

My neighbors (THE INGLEWOOD/LOS ANGELES 76TH STREET BLOCKCLUB), my family and everyone I have spoken to in the City of Inglewood is against this LAX Expansion Plan. We understand that more people are taking to the air for transportation. This is why we feel other alternatives must be pursued in solving this ongoing air transportation issue.

Response:

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

PC01943-2

Comment:

These are but a few of our long list of concerns:

Noise Pollution-We are already subjected to the air traffic noise generated by the planes in it's pre-expansion state, we can only imagine what it will be like in the post expansion state.

Air Pollution -We are extremely sensitive on this issue. We do not feel that we are being told the truth about the current negative impact on the environment these planes are causing on all whoare in it's flight path today. This issue will not resolved by soundproofing-this is a silent killer and "Right To A Healthy Life Issue". We shiver at the thought of what it will be if the airport is allowed to expand at LAX.

Increased Traffic Congestion In Inglewood and Neighboring Cities
Negatively Impacting Our Property Values

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, 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.

PC01943-3

Comment:

We are confident that common sense and sound judgement will prevail and you will heed our issues and concerns regarding this urgent matter. The welfare of the citizens of Inglewood and those who work or visit our city must always have priority in deciding what business dealings will be supported or rejected.

Response:

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

PC01944

Spires, Karl

None Provided

7/24/2001

PC01944-1

Comment:

As a resident and homeowner in the city of Inglewood, I do not support the LAX expansion. It will lower our property value, increase noise and air pollution as well as other things.

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-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01945 Ferguson, Leon None Provided 7/2/2001

PC01945-1

Comment:

This letter is my reply to the dEIS/EIR on the expansion plan for the Los Angeles airport. (Note there is no capital on airport as it does not rate or deserve one.)

I am in full agreement with any and all written and oral oppositions to the Master Plan, the EIS and the EIR. As block captain for 128 homes (approximately 520 adults and children) in Inglewood. I can speak for my neighbors also, who, to a man/woman, also oppose any expansion plans and the EIS/EIR as it is written.

We are forever seeking relief for the planes that fly over our neighborhood now - so to imagine more low-flying jets on a daily basis is uncomprehendable. The EIS/EIR fails to address, as it is impossible, the human toll attributable to years of aircraft flying over ones abode.

I will not go into great details about the EIS/EIR reports as the Comments Draft from the City of Inglewood as well as Assemblyman Horton's written comments on the EIS/EIR are quite comprehensive and say it very well - the EIS/EIR as proposed is seriously flawed both legally and environmentally. The only solution that will satisfy those living under the flight path is to scrap any expansion plans that impact our neighborhoods and take a regional approach to expansion so as to spread the devastation around.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, 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-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC01946 Koella, Frederic None Provided 8/14/2001

PC01946-1

Comment:

And what about noise and pollution!!!

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.

PC01946-2

The remainder of this comment letter is identical to form letter PFF; please refer to the responses to form letter PFF.

PC01947 La Rouche, Mark None Provided 7/10/2001

PC01947-1

Comment:

Please send a response that this was received.

Response:

In accordance with the provisions of NEPA and CEQA, written responses to all comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR are provided herein as part of this Final EIS/EIR. The Final EIS/EIR has been made available for public review at FAA and LAWA and through distribution to public libraries throughout the area, and is available electronically at www.laxmasterplan.org. Responses to individual comments included in this comment letter are provided below.

PC01947-2

Comment:

The master plan calls for moving the north runway, and extending it east. This now puts my home closer to the flight path if not under it. Also hangers will be built just south of my home thus there will be constant noise from taxing planes. There is no mention in the plan or EIR about the noise impact and how to mitigate this. The noise impact is already considerable for landing and take offs from within the home and while standing outside. Am I to wear ear plugs and special communication gear that allows me to speak to the person standing next to me?

Response:

Comment noted. Section 4.1, Noise (subsections 4.1.6 and 4.1.8), and Section 4.2, Land Use (subsections 4.2.6 and 4.2.8), of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS presented an analysis of noise impacts and provides mitigation measures to reduce these impacts on noise-sensitive uses. Noise from aircraft taxiing on the airfield is usually less than and masked by the noise from aircraft operating on the runway, because taxiing uses less power than takeoffs or landings. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential sound insulation program and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels. Refer to Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current mitigation measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. Also please see Topical Responses TR-LU-5 and TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation.

PC01947-3

Comment:

The noise will become more constant as the frequency of arriving flight increases. The FAA has already said they will increase.

Response:

For information regarding increased noise levels see Topical Response TR-N-6, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.2 regarding the relationship between traffic levels and noise levels.

PC01947-4

Comment:

The Draft Master plan & EIR do not explain how lost park space will be replaced and when. Neilson field is a prime example. It is not explained who will pay for this?

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01014-3 regarding expansion of Carl E. Nielson Youth Park.

PC01947-5

Comment:

Also LA City code require a specific acreage per 1000 residents which is not currently met. How will this be achieved with so much airport expansion? In the Westchester area.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00264-2 regarding expansion of parks and recreation areas. While there would be a limited increase in demand for park and recreational facilities, parks and recreation areas would be expanded by approximately 11 acres under Alternatives A, B and C, and by at least six acres under Alternative D. As discussed in Section 4.26.3, Parks and Recreation (subsection 4.26.3.6), of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, implementation of the LAX Master Plan would have largely beneficial effects on park and recreational facilities within and around LAX, particularly in the Westchester area.

PC01947-6

Comment:

With moving the runway north, this increases the noise and pollution levels at Westchester park. No mention of measure to mitigate the problems. What will be done?

Move Westchester park? Enclose it in a sound proof dome?

Also a result of the above problems people may choose other parks which are already overcrowded.

Response:

Based on the analysis provided in Sections 4.2.6 and 4.8.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Westchester Park Recreation Center would not be significantly impacted by aircraft noise under any of the Master Plan alternatives. Activity level at Westchester Park is not expected to decrease or shift to other parks as a result of development of the LAX Master Plan. Although Westchester Park would be newly exposed to the 65 CNEL under Alternatives B and C compared to 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions, for park use, this increase is not considered to be significant. Under Alternative D, LAWA Staff's preferred alternative, Westchester Park would not be newly exposed to the 65 CNEL. However, it is acknowledged in Section 4.9 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, that an increase in outdoor noise levels between the 65 and 75 CNEL could affect outdoor speech and the quality of certain outdoor activities. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

See Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding increase in pollution levels as a result of development of the Master Plan alternatives.

PC01947-7

Comment:

Given that the flight path is closer to my my home and that there will be more planes taxing closer to my home because of the cargo facilities proposed south of my home. Plus the proposed capacity is and will be 100+ MAP. There will obviously be more plane flights per day, week & year. Thus, How will the increased pollution levels affect local residents health? The pollution is very toxic and causes cancer, respiratory problems. The future use of the airport proposes the Doubling of person & cargo traffic which will double the amount of pollution.

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.

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-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

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. 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.

PC01947-8

Comment:

Also a result of the above problems people may choose other parks which are already overcrowded.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00264-2 regarding expansion of parks and recreation areas. As discussed in Section 4.26.3, Parks and Recreation (subsection 4.26.3.6), of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, implementation of the LAX Master Plan would have largely beneficial effects on park and recreational facilities within and around LAX, particularly in the Westchester area.

PC01947-9

Comment:

I do not believe the sampling of pollution levels in the EIR are accurate in terms of number of times per day samples are made, location of samples, times per year and especially sampling in good (stale air) versus condition that favor lower pollution measurements.

Response:

Monitoring data were obtained using methods recommended and approved by U.S. EPA. Data were appropriately quality-assured and are therefore acceptable for use in regulatory applications. The gaseous pollutants are monitored and reported hourly at the Hawthorne and on-site monitoring stations. The peak values from these stations are used to represent ambient air quality for existing conditions. See Response to Comment AR00003-48 regarding location and airport impact at monitoring stations.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01947-10

Comment:

Given all the expansion plans for moving the runway, and extending it east plus the construction of all the cargo facilities south of my home, plus the construction of the expressway several hundred feet from my home it is expected that my neighborhood will become less desirable to live in. It could be compared to the Westchester square area and those areas east of the airport that are under the flight path. How will my propertee values be affected? Is it possible that I will lose money because values drop below the purchase price? If property values increase will my property value increase the same amount (or level) as other beach areas between the Palisades & P.V.? If not nothing states how I am to recoup these differences. You now see the "cost" of the changes is not just the dollar value of the expansion work.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding the effects of LAX on property values.

PC01947-11

Comment:

The EIR states that 240K people are affected by the airport expansion. I believe this number to be incorrect. First the EIR does not state very well how this number is determined. The factor should include a 3 to 5 mile distance extending from the proposed final perimeter. These residences and Business and impacted the most by noise, pollution and land value loss. This number is definitely large than what the airport reports. The FAA even says this number is 80K.

Response:

Comment noted. The number of people potentially affected by the LAX Master Plan varies by issue. The basis for establishment of the various study areas for the issues addressed in the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR were described in each of the Chapter 4 sections of the documents under the heading "General Approach and Methodology." Also see Subtopical Response TR-N-2.3, regarding evaluation of impacts beyond the 65 CNEL noise contour, and Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding effects on 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.

PC01947-12

Comment:

These numbers only take into account people affected immediately near LAX. What about those people under the flight paths that feed into the final approach paths? And those people under or near the takeoff paths? The people are also affected by noise & pollution, it has to go somewhere. By increasing the number of flights more pollution & noise will be forced upon them. You may think it is negligible but the constant bombardment of noise does eventually affect one's hearing. The same goes for the unregulated pollution from the jet engines. This constant bombardment will have an affect on one's health. The human body at some point will give up.

Response:

Comment noted. Regarding cumulative noise metrics and the fact that the CNEL takes into consideration several variables associated with noise energy and timing see Subtopical Response TR-N-2.1, regarding impacts under flight tracks beyond the 65 CNEL contour see Subtopical Response TR-N-2.3, regarding increases in aircraft flights translating to increased noise see Subtopical Response TR-N-6.2. Effects associated with Air Quality and on Human Health Risk were addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting documentation provided in Appendices G and SE and Technical Reports 14 and S-9.

PC01947-13

Comment:

As usual the Government takes what it needs for the supposed better good. Unfortunately the better good of Westchester is not being considered. You are removing one third of the business district with no clear plan as to how to replace it. Thus leaving Westchester residence to explore outside its community for its needs.

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 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 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.

PC01947-14

Comment:

Outside in a world of congested streets and freeway, which are expected to become more congested because of population growth, the Playa Vista project and the lack of a speedy mass transit system. Why not just buy all of Westchester since the remaining parts will be the only place for future expansion, or you can then buy the Playa Vista project and we can swap land. I get a larger piece of land and a new house and you get more of Westchester to expand into.

Response:

Comment noted. No residential acquisition is proposed under Alternative D. Please refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding the potential effects of the Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester.

PC01947-15

Comment:

The EIR does not provide proper models for describing traffic flow from outlying regions into LAX. Since LAX will handle 90% of passenger and cargo traffic how do the vehicles reach and return from LAX from such areas as S.F.V., San Bernardino, Orange & San Diego Counties. The freeways and side streets in and around LAX are already bulging as the seams and movement is at a snail's pace. Outlying regions are in the same boat, if not now they soon will be with the expected population increase throughout So. California.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

As described in Draft EIS/EIR Chapter 1 (page 1-14), LAX carries 74 percent of regional airport passengers and 78 percent of regional air cargo demand. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns for more information.

PC01947-16

Comment:

This poses a problem not addressed by the EIR. Since traffic congestion problems either existing or new will reach from LAX through the outer region how will expansion mitigate these congestion problems. The problems are not only due to increased vehicle traffic of people entering and departing LAX. But what about the population explosion that will clog all the freeway arteries local to LAX and those in outlying region. Is LAX going to pay trillions of dollars to widen the 405, 5, 101, 10 etc for these freeways entire length?

A region approach make much more sense since thus helping to reduce vehicle traffic along major arteries by keeping traffic localized in a smaller region. One thing I've heard is that cargo arriving in LA is sent daily to Las Vegas. If this cargo arrived in Ontario it would reduce traffic at LAX, reduce air & noise pollution because of the shorter driving distance.

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Sections 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, and 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding existing regional traffic. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring activity to outlying airports.

PC01947-17

Comment:

No where in the EIR does it provide for proper estimates for added vehicle pollution caused by the increased number of passenger vehicles and trucks to and from LAX. If there are another 10 MAP this usually means 20M trips. From outlying regions this can produce a considerable amount of noise & air pollution. In and around LAX there will be one thick cloud of pollutants - not appropriately clean air. Will the airport provide me with a pollution filtration system for my home? For walking around Westchester? Will LAX pay for my increased health cost due to current and increased sinus and respirator problems?

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality impacts, including emissions from on-road sources, 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. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed surface transportation impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise.

PC01947-18

Comment:

What not take the money and build an airport out in the desert and a rail system to reach it from all major So. Calif. Regions.

Response:

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

PC01947-19**Comment:**

Is LAX just too greedy for that additional CARGO traffic?

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01948 Jacquet, Joyce None Provided 8/15/2001

PC01948-1**Comment:**

I would like a Monitor for noise. Why not update for 2001 survivor.

Response:

The commentor is a resident of Los Angeles and is located between noise monitor IN4 (439 98th Street) and noise monitor IN6 (9601-6th Avenue). LAWA monitors noise to comply with State of California regulations. These regulations require that noise be monitored within the 65 dB CNEL area. The monitoring locations were approved by the State of California as adequate for compliance with these regulations. The 25 installed noise monitors, together with LAWA's monitoring of flight operations and use of available computer noise models, gives LAWA an accurate description of the 65 CNEL area, as required by State regulations. The State and Los Angeles County (to whom LAWA submits noise monitoring reports for review) apparently agree. Due to the cost of installing noise monitors (over \$10,000 apiece plus maintenance), it is not economically feasible to have a noise monitor within a few blocks of everyone's home. LAWA's current system is adequate for describing long-term noise impacts throughout the community. In addition to LAWA's professional opinions, they must also rely on the judgment of the State and County that the noise monitoring system is adequate.

It would be extremely expensive to install a permanent noise monitor every few blocks. It is important to keep the noise monitors in fixed locations (as opposed to moving these around) for two reasons. First, fixed locations are necessary in order to accurately determine the size of the annual noise impact area, per State regulations. Second, only by fixing the noise monitor locations can LAWA analyze trends; that is, is it getting noisier at particular locations over the long term. The use of "temporary" or "portable" locations is of limited use to LAWA, since LAWA has nothing to compare these measurements to, and LAWA has little way of knowing whether the days they do monitor at a particular location are typical, noisier, or quieter unless the noise is monitored almost every day. The noise contours for the Year 2000 were presented in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01949 Roberts, Sonda None Provided 8/15/2001

PC01949-1**Comment:**

My name is Sonda Roberts I've lived in Inglewood at the above address for 29 years with my mother and daughter. When we moved to Inglewood the air was clean, the street traffic was minimal, air traffic compared to today was almost nonexistent, basically the quality of life was good.

After moving to Inglewood I worked on Century and Airport Blvd and then on Sepuiveda and Centinela. Thinking I was lucky to work so close to home.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01949-2

Comment:

My mother has had lung cancer, has emphysema, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, and asthma. She lives on medical oxygen. My daughter has asthma and I was diagnosed with asthma ten years ago, rather late in my adult life. We have no predisposition for these diseases, none of my other family members have lung or respiratory diseases and we didn't have them either before moving to Inglewood .

Time spent out of doors is difficult because if I'm out for more than fifteen minutes my breathing becomes labored without a face mask. I always enjoyed the out of doors and gardening in my yard. Even the plants, nature's natural filters, are overwhelmed by pollutant film. I haven't had a vegetable garden for some time the because of this film. I know my pets are adversely affected too, I've had two dogs die of cancer. I have to endeavor to keep the yard and everything rinsed off for all our sakes.

As I've said my mother has oxygen (in her house). Thankfully my daughter nor I are oxygen dependant but we do have air filters in every room going, all the time. Without the filters the black adhering dust film would be much 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, Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC01949-3

Comment:

On clear nights it use to be fun to watch the occasional aircraft approaching LAX from the Eastern horizon. Now there is no horizon, just plan after plan one immediately behind the other as far as I can see. I don't look anymore, it causes me emotional discomfort because I become anxious about when will the accident happen?.

Response:

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

PC01949-4

Comment:

There is nothing in any version of your Master Plan how you intend to mitigate pollution caused by fuel emmissions, particulates and

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01196-12 regarding air quality impacts and further mitigation measures. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollution.

PC01949-5**Comment:**

The safety factor is critical because the landing and takeoffs are occurring at a volume the cannot insure that any incursion that results in an accident has a high probability of occurring over a populated area.

Response:

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

PC01950 Contreras, Maria None Provided 8/15/2001

PC01950-1**Comment:**

Yo Quisiera que Alguno de ustedes viniera hacer un AnaLis del polvo grasa porque yo enotado que Los carro en La manana Los Limpia uno y sueLtas prieto como polov y tambien enotado que Los ArboLes frutaLe se hacen Los Limone y Las naranjas prietas y Las hojas por por afuera como grasa

I would like one of you to come make an analysis of the dust and grease because I have noticed that the cars in the morning, we clean them and they release dirt like dust. And, also I have noticed that the fruit trees, the lemons and oranges become black as well as the leaves from the outside like grease.

Response:

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

PC01951 Contreras, Jose None Provided 8/15/2001

PC01951-1**Comment:**

Nosotros no estamos de Acuerdo con La Ampliacion del airopuerto porque ya con esto es Demasiado Ruido y si se Amplea sera doble el Ruido y en Verdad nos afecta tanto como a Los humanos como a Los AnimaLes y A Los harboles frutaLe se Asen prietos como grasa por favor ya basfa nuestra saLud esta de por medio ya nosotros ya Bamos de saLida aganLo por La jubentud o La nines deL futuro que no Tengan el mismo problema que nosotros que estamos pasando esuchenos.

We do not agree with the expansion of the airport because with this it would be too much noise and if it is expanded, the noise will be doubled and in reality it affects not only the humans as well as the animals and the fruit trees that become black with something like grease. It is enough please, our health is on the line, we are already on our way out, but at least you should do it for our youth and children of the future that they do not have the same problems we are currently facing.

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-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01952 Kogut, M.D., Stanley None Provided

8/1/2001

PC01952-1

Comment:

I am a long term resident of Marina del Rey, which as you may know, is taxed but not fully (and is selectively) represented. (Only "the influential" are seriously heeded). In recent years, neighboring Lincoln Bd has had a spate of commercial and residential properties. The consequent congestion of people and vehicles is noticeable and rising. Jefferson Blvd. to the S.E. of Mar. d. Rey. is the next place to be destroyed by developers (and those who are employed by them).

Meantime, a jewel (i.e. The Marina) is only to be a memory of what it formerly was.

In 1981, there was no Ritz Carlton in the Marina; but now a quarter of a mile South of it there are proposals for hotels, residences and businesses to be fit into a space 1/10 the size of what is appropriate-and for what?-not for the good quality of life of permanent residents.

Response:

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

PC01952-2

Comment:

But I digress: this is a letter opposed to airport expansion - which will so pollute the Marina with diesel and noise that it will become just as unliveable as the homes (now excavated) that were to the West of the Airport originally. People could not live there for health and mental reasons.

But now, Supervisor Knoke steps up (we call him the "silent man"-because he pays heed only to the influential miniscule few) and has the hubris to fight against LAX airport expansion-why? its Palos Verdes, of course where some very influential people live in expensive homes with expensive clout.

I have tried to reach that Supervisors office for years, but who am I? just a voting citizen who knows beauty when he sees it (as did Teddy Roosevelt) and wants his share of peace to enjoy it.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed water quality in Section 4.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, coastal resources in Section 4.14, Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers, 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 6 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-4, and S-5 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. 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.

PC01952-3

Comment:

Expanding LAX will lead to increasing vehicular congestion in and around the airport within a radius of 20 - 25 miles minimally. Lincoln Blvd eventually will need a tunnel or elevated road. An elevated road over Lincoln or a tunnel beneath will have a jammed egress and ingress. Lincoln will be non-functional as will be neighboring freeways.

Response:

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

PC01952-4**Comment:**

The FACT is: LAX CANNOT and will not be able to contain all of the air traffic, all of the time! Now and 10 years from now-

Why? Space!!! (or lack of same)

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding airspace capacity and see Response to Comment PC00260-1 regarding physical and activity constraints.

PC01952-5**Comment:**

Los Angeles, like N.Y., needs another major airport.

Where? - Now brains have to go to work and figure it out. - The first thing I think of is replacement of slums and compensatory relocation, ideally. So think about it, you engineers, and architects!-with the permission of elected officialdom

Response:

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

PC01952-6**Comment:**

It requires good moral and ethical judgment-a fair profit with fair play. Do your jobs! and do them right please. California can stay beautiful-it is the duty of officialdom to keep it that way!

Response:

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

PC01953**Waters, Maxine****U.S. House of Representatives****6/9/2001****PC01953-1****Comment:**

Congresswoman Maxine Waters Calls Los Angeles World Airports' Environmental Impact Statement and Report a "Flawed" Document

3. Comments and Responses

For Immediate Release
June 9, 2001

Contact: Walter Cole
(323) 757-8900

(Los Angeles, CA) Today, at LAX Expansion Public Hearing held at the Pavilion at Hollywood Park in Inglewood, Congresswoman Maxine Waters (CA-35) released the following statement:

"Today the citizens of Inglewood, Westchester and other communities surrounding Los Angeles International Airport will make their collective voices heard. They will state loud and clear to the officials of Los Angeles World Airports that the Environmental Impact Statement and Report, the EIS/EIR, is a terribly flawed document.

"LAWA has put forward several alternatives that are so horrible in their impacts that they can only help make their preferred alternative, Alternative C, look wonderful by comparison. But Alternative C is not an answer to all the woes that the neighborhoods surrounding LAX face. It is nothing but a nightmare for the future.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01953-2

Comment:

"LAX is already an environmental monster. It is the single greatest producer of toxic air pollutants and smog inducing particulate matter in the Los Angeles Basin. If this expansion plan is approved the situation will only get far 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 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.

PC01953-3

Comment:

Nitrous oxide emissions from LAX will increase by over 1,500 tons annually by 2015.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-7 regarding NOX emissions.

PC01953-4

Comment:

An additional 7,000 people will be exposed to noise from jet aircraft of 65 CNEL or above.

Response:

The comment states the number of people that would be newly exposed to the 65 CNEL noise level under Alternative C compared to the 1996 baseline, as presented in Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.6.1.4) and Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6) of the Draft EIS/EIR. Note that under LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative, Alternative D, the population newly exposed to 65 CNEL noise levels is estimated to be 5,100 which is less than identified for Alternative C, as indicated on Table S4.1-30 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. 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 impacts that would occur under the Master Plan alternatives.

PC01953-5

Comment:

To handle the increased amount of cargo that will enter LAX will require 156 18-wheelers a day. These large diesel trucks will add to the pollution in our air and clog the streets of our neighborhoods.

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. 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.

PC01953-6

Comment:

"The EIS/EIR states again and again that there are "significant and unavoidable" negative impacts from noise and air pollution and increased automobile traffic but gives no workable solutions to mitigate those impacts. LAWA claims that these mitigation programs will be developed in time after the project is finally approved. This is a completely unacceptable approach. How can residents fully analyze a project that will have such an overwhelming impact on them when they are not given the full details?

Response:

Extensive lists of recommended mitigation measures were provided in Section 4.1, Air Quality, Section 4.6, Air Quality, and Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for significant impacts related to air quality, noise, and traffic, respectively. The environmental analyses within those documents concluded that even with implementation of those mitigation measures, certain impacts related to those environmental disciplines could not be reduced to a level less than significant. As such, they are deemed to be significant and unavoidable; however, extensive mitigation programs for those issues would nevertheless be implemented, as determined during project approval.

PC01953-7

Comment:

"LAWA officials rejected the need to utilize the wealth of regional airport facilities in Southern California. This is especially troubling given that LAWA has at its disposal multiple facilities that are, or can be, equipped to handle the expected future increases in air travel demand. Nearly one-hundred cities have joined a coalition urging the use of current airports at Palmdale and Ontario. LAWA must realize that they cannot ignore the wishes of these cities and their citizens.

"Already governmental agencies such as the Southern California Association of Governments, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, and a bi-partisan coalition of Southern California's Congressional representatives, myself included, have spoken in support to a regional approach. Most operations at these facilities will have none of the impact on residents, schools, churches and business that are experienced by those living underneath the flight path 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

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. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC01953-8

Comment:

"Most disturbing of all is the lack of any environmental justice plan. The majority of those who are affected by LAX expansion are African American and Latino. These communities already face a lack of access to healthcare and prevention. They also already face high rates of asthma and other respiratory ailments. To ask these residents to expose themselves to even higher health risks is unacceptable and immoral.

Response:

The analysis in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed these issues. Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR indicated that the Environmental Justice Task Force was formed to initially focus on working with the affected communities to develop the LAWA Environmental Justice Program. The Task Force was also charged with the goal of helping to ensure that the Master Plan for LAX is carried out equitably, protects human health and environment, and promotes economic vitality for all the people of the Los Angeles Region. Mitigation measures addressing the environmental issues of concern were included in Chapter 5, Environmental Action Plan, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 for a description of the Environmental Justice Program and Benefits.

Subsection (Mitigation Measures) of Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided information on air quality mitigation measures. Specifically, mitigation measure MM-AQ-1, Implement Revised Air Quality Mitigation Programs (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), included a wide array of actions to reduce airport-related air quality impacts. Most of the components of this mitigation measure focus on actions that would be taken at LAX to address impacts both in and around the airport, with additional actions providing benefits that will accrue more broadly to the South Coast Air Basin.

Finally, please also see Response to Comment AL00017-190.

PC01953-9

Comment:

"LAWA has put together a 12,000-page document that is hefty but full of holes. They offer us no answers. Their science does not add up. LAWA's presentation tell residents how wonderful this new expansion will make life but residents are not being informed of the true potential environmental horrors of this expansion. LAWA must go back to the drawing table and come up with a plan and environmental report that answers these questions. They must then present a document to the residents of Inglewood and Westchester, Lennox, El Segundo and other affected cities, that is truthful.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01954 Stewart, Jeff None Provided 6/9/2001

PC01954-1

Comment:

The proposed expansion of LAX will generate far more than 89 to 98 MAP the airport claims. The current airport serves 67 MAP, and it was projected in 1978 to handle 40 MAP in its current configuration.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00008-12 for a discussion on growth beyond the identified capacity for Alternative C. Also, please note that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

PC01954-2

Comment:

Flawed Baseline Analysis

The Draft EIR/EIS uses three distinct baselines for analyzing the impacts of the proposed expansion. Each is employed selectively to minimize the environmental impact at issue.

Response:

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

PC01954-3

Comment:

For example, the section discussing noise uses as its baseline year, the year prior to the introduction of Stage III noise standards for commercial aircraft. The effect is to attempt to mitigate for a noisier baseline.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00033-87. Also, please see Topical Response TR-N-1, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-1.3 regarding use of the year 1996 baseline noise levels from which to measure benefit increases associate with proposed alternatives.

PC01954-4

Comment:

Traffic

The impacts of additional LAX traffic on the I-405 are insufficiently analyzed in the Draft EIR/EIS.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC01954-5

Comment:

Also, the following roadways are not analyzed:

Athens
Baldwin Hills
Del Aire
Lennox
Ladera Heights
El Camino Village
Marina Del Rey

Response:

The commentor's list appears to be city names, not roadways. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the study areas and intersections.

PC01954-6

Comment:

Finally, the majority of the off-airport traffic analysis focuses on areas north of the airport. This is insufficient. The issues definitely extend to areas south of LAX, especially the Sepulveda/El Segundo and Sepulveda/Rosecrans, intersections.

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 Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the study areas and intersections.

PC01954-7

Comment:

Air Quality

LAX is the single largest generator of NOx emissions in L.A. County. The proposed expansion could triple the existing total. The EIR/EIS contemplates mitigating only 30% of the new NOx emissions. Finally, NOx and SO2 emissions for each proposal will reach a level of significant impact.

Response:

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

PC01954-8

Comment:

The resulting air quality will affect respiratory systems among 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.

PC01955 Ross, William Law Offices of William D. Ross 6/20/2001

PC01955-1

Comment:

This letter submitted on behalf of the county of Los Angeles and the County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors (collectively "County") requests that the United States Department of Transportation-Federal Aviation Administration ("FAA") and the City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles World Airports ("LAWA") schedule and conduct additional public hearings regarding environmental studies addressing proposed master plan improvements at Los Angeles International Airport ("LAX") so that the public participation requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Pub. Res. Code § 21000 et seq., "CEQA") and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. § 431 et seq., "NEPA") are fulfilled.

Response:

Comments noted. Further hearings have been conducted on the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 for a listing of all public hearings. Also, please visit the web site, www.laxmasterplan.org.

PC01955-2

Comment:

Further, the County submits that additional public review is required because the EIS/EIR has failed to make public the findings contained in a document entitled "Airport Capacity Benchmark Report 2001" prepared by the FAA (the "Benchmark Report"). The Benchmark Report Executive Summary indicates the FAA has developed capacity benchmarks for 31 of the nation's busiest airports, including LAX, to understand the relationship between airline demand and airport runway capacity in order to solve ongoing problems of congestion and delay. The study predicts that in ten (10) years LAX along with eight (8) other airports will experience significant passenger delays and reduced quality of service. The FAA has conceived a 10-year air traffic control modernization plan that will squeeze 30% more traffic into the commercial aviation system. This FAA report was released to the public on June 5, 2001, just four (4) days before public hearings were conducted regarding the Project on June 9, 2001, but more than four (4) months after the joint Draft EIS/EIR was made available for public review and comment on February 2, 2001. Because the Benchmark Report constitutes significant new information which was not set forth in the Draft EIS/EIR, the public has been deprived of the opportunity to comment on this important document, thus necessitating revision and recirculation of the Draft EIS/EIR. Because this new information is not set forth in the Draft EIS/EIR, the environmental analysis has not addressed potentially significant adverse environmental effects, including cumulative impacts of the implementation of the Benchmark Report modernization plan at LAX and other heavily trafficked airports. Accordingly, the Benchmark Report must be added to the Draft EIS/EIR, and thereafter revision and recirculation of the Draft EIS/EIR is required.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00036-30 regarding the FAA Benchmark Study.

PC01955-3

Comment:

Based on the above and the analysis presented below, the County Board of Supervisors demand that further hearings be set and the public comment period on the EIS/EIR be extended so that individuals located in the Los Angeles region impacted by the project will have an opportunity to provide oral comments. The Board further demands that the Benchmark Report be added to the Draft EIS/EIR and that the Draft EIS/EIR be revised and recirculated so that adverse impacts, including cumulative impacts of the implementation of the Benchmark Report Modernization Plan at LAX and other congested Airports can be analyzed and addressed. The County Board of Supervisors demands a

3. Comments and Responses

response from the City on or before Wednesday, June 27, 2001. Should the county's concerns be ignored, County intends to pursue all available remedies, both legal and equitable.

Response:

Comment noted. Nine public hearings were conducted throughout the Los Angeles area to present information and solicit public input regarding the various alternatives of the Draft Master Plan and the associated environmental analysis presented in the Draft EIS/EIR. This level of public outreach is well above and beyond the requirements of NEPA and CEQA. Additionally, the 295-day public review period provided for the Draft EIS/EIR is well beyond the requirements of NEPA and CEQA. For a list of public hearings, please see Topical Response TR-PO-1. With regards to the "Benchmark Report", referenced in the comment, indicating that substantial growth at major airports is anticipated to occur over the next 10 years and that passengers will experience delays and reduced quality of service, that basic conclusion is consistent with the objective of the master plan at LAX-to anticipate and provide for anticipated growth in aviation demand in a comprehensive manner. (See Chapter 2 of the Draft EIS/EIR regarding the purpose and need of the project.) The environmental impacts associated with Alternatives A, B, and C, and the No Action/No Project Alternatives that would occur in light of such anticipated growth were addressed in 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. The environmental impacts associated with Alternative D were addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR

PC01955-4

Comment:

NEPA AND CEQA MANDATE THAT THE FAA AND LAWA MUST HOLD ADDITIONAL PUBLIC HEARINGS AND CONTINUE THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD, IF NECESSARY, TO FURTHER PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

In the face of strong opposition, LAWA and the FAA scheduled a single public hearing which was conducted concurrently at three (3) separate locations on Saturday, June 9, 2001 at the same time of day. The time allotted to people wishing to provide oral comments at that hearing was limited to a maximum of three (3) minutes per person. This constituted the only scheduled opportunity of which we are aware for any individual to provide oral testimony regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIS/EIR in analyzing the environmental impacts of this significant project proposal.

As you are aware, public participation is a critical part of both the California and Federal environmental review processes. Although the County recognizes that written comments may also be submitted with regard to the Draft EIS/EIR on or before the end of the public comment period on July 25, 2001, the law requires that public hearings be conducted in a fair and reasonable manner. In our opinion, given the size and scope of the Draft EIS/EIR, and the magnitude and intensity of the proposed LAX expansion (attempting to accomplish on 3,500 acres at LAX what required 35,000 acres in the Denver area), limiting the public hearing to a single weekend day at three (3) separate locations located within several miles of each other and at the same time of day was neither fair nor reasonable. This constricted public hearing schedule ignored people with unavoidable calendar conflicts who were thus forever prevented from participating in the public hearing process by providing oral testimony. Based on the foregoing, the County strenuously objected to the timing and location of the prior public hearings and demanded that additional public hearings be scheduled in more diverse locations prior to the close of the public comment period on July 25, 2001 and that the public comment period be extended, if necessary, to ensure that a diligent effort to involve the public in the entire Los Angeles region in implementing NEPA and CEQA is achieved and public participation requirements and procedures are fulfilled. The bases for holding additional public hearings are as follows:

First, 49 U.S.C. § 47106(c)(1)(A)(i), which governs public hearing requirements for applications under 49 U.S.C.S. § 47101 et. seq. for airport development projects involving the location of an airport or runway or a major runway extension, mandates that public hearings be conducted. These statutory requirements have been ignored. The statute provides that the Secretary may approve such applications,

(A) only if the sponsor certifies to the Secretary that - -

(i) an opportunity for a public hearing was given to consider the economic, social, and environmental effects of the location and the location's consistency with the objectives of any planning that the community has carried out . . .

The FAA's obligations in this regard are elucidated in the procedural rules governing public hearings. The FAA is mandated to establish "a reasonable date, time, and place for the hearing". Due regard shall be given to the convenience of the parties with respect to the place of the hearing." 14 CFR § 13.55 (emphasis added). This section is applicable to the statute governing the public hearings at issue.

Nevertheless, as a consequence of the truncated scoping process and public hearing format, the "opportunity for a public hearing" has not occurred. This project, as described in the EIS/EIR, has a regional impact on the greater Los Angeles area for a variety of reasons including, without limitation, that other airports in the Los Angeles County region will take up existing and anticipated aviation demand that the proposed project will not handle. Based solely on the locations of the draft EIS/EIR for public review, the impact of the project is anticipated to encompass, among other places, the San Fernando Valley, Ontario, Lancaster, East Los Angeles and Costa Mesa in addition to the so-called greater Los Angeles area. Yet the only public hearings that were scheduled were three simultaneous hearings on Saturday, June 9, 2001 from 12:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. at three specified locations -- West Los Angeles (immediately adjacent to the airport), Inglewood, and Manhattan Beach -- all within several miles of each other and the Los Angeles International Airport. Moreover, the scoping process did not include a single agency within San Bernardino, Orange, Riverside and Ventura Counties yet the EIS/EIR identifies the importance of LAX in the region as a whole. Under the established hearing schedule, if individuals had a personal conflict with the limited Saturday only hearing schedule, they were precluded from personally participating in the hearing process by providing live comment. Individuals in the Los Angeles region impacted by the project were foreclosed from the opportunity to comment during truncated public forums considering the economic, social and environmental effects of the location of the airport's improvements and the location's consistency with the objectives of planning efforts being carried out in the excluded counties. Cf. *Ecology Center, Inc. v. United States Forest Service*, 192 F.3d 922, 926 (1999). This circumscribed public hearing schedule could not and did not fulfill the public participation the FAA and LAWA are obligated to provide.

Second, the FAA and LAWA have ignored the required level of "public involvement" mandated by NEPA. Specifically, the Council on Environmental Quality has provided that agencies shall, inter alia "(a) make diligent efforts to involve the public in preparing and implementing their NEPA procedures," "(c) hold or sponsor public hearings or public meetings whenever appropriate or in accordance with statutory requirements applicable to the agency" and "(d) solicit appropriate information from the public." See 40 Code of Federal Regulations ("C.F.R.") § 1506.6.1 Given the complex NEPA issues concerning this project, which imposes a regional impact on the greater Los Angeles area, a diligent effort required by NEPA regulations should have required more than three simultaneous hearings on Saturday, June 9, 2001 all within several miles of each other near LAX. The NEPA scoping process also did not include a single agency within San Bernardino, Orange, Riverside and Ventura Counties despite the fact the EIS/EIR identifies the importance of LAX in the region as a whole. Similar to the EIS/EIR scoping process, the public hearing format turns deaf ears to the public impacted in these ignored counties in violation of NEPA and CEQA. The public hearing format further undercuts the "public involvement" sought by NEPA and the required diligent efforts to involve the public in implementing NEPA procedures. See 40 C.F.R. § 1506.6. Especially given the size and complexity of the EIS/EIR and the County's request for additional hearings to ensure the broadest possible participation in the process, the limited public hearings fail to comply with NEPA and CEQA.

In conclusion, the scheduled public hearings that occurred were insufficient to fulfill the FAA's obligations under either 49 U.S.C. Section 47106(c)(1)(A)(i) or NEPA and CEQA. Accordingly, County respectfully requests your support by demanding, on behalf of the City of Los Angeles, that the FAA and LAWA schedule additional public hearings in all affected jurisdictions in the Los Angeles region at varying times prior to the close of the public comment period (or following an extended comment period, as necessary) so that all interested individuals and jurisdictions can be heard.

3. Comments and Responses

1 See CEQA § 15202 (public hearing on environmental impact of project should usually be held when lead agency determines it would facilitate purposes and goals of CEQA). See also *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors*, 52 Cal.3d 553, 564 (1990) (CEQA process protects . . . informed self - government.") See also 14 C.F.R. § 13.55 ("The Hearing Officer shall set a reasonable date, time, and place for the hearing, and shall give the parties adequate notice thereof and of the nature of the hearing. Due regard shall be given to the convenience of the parties with respect to the place of the hearing.") [emphasis added].

Response:

Comments noted. The FAA and LAWA are committed to providing opportunity for public comment. Therefore in addition to the three location hearing, several other hearings have been conducted to further this priority. Further hearings were conducted on both the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review. Additional information can be viewed at the web site, www.laxmasterplan.org.

PC01955-5

Comment:

THE DRAFT EIS/EIR MUST BE REVISED AND RECIRCULATED TO CONSIDER NEW INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE BENCHMARK REPORT

On or about June 5, 2001, the FAA in its Benchmark Report outlined a 10-year air traffic control modernization plan to squeeze thirty percent (30%) more traffic into the commercial aviation system while easing delays and increasing safety by giving pilots better information on weather problems and the location of other aircraft. Under a series of FAA planned programs the control of planes in the air and on the ground will gradually shift toward satellite-based systems. The FAA plans to re-equip ground-based systems with digital radar and better software and controller displays. It also is counting on weather research that may someday give pilots and controllers up to six (6) hours notice to help them plan routes around bad weather even before it develops. The plan is even bigger than the Advanced Automation System, which apparently wasted \$2 billion dollars and sullied the FAA's reputation before it was cancelled in 1994. The FAA estimates that it will spend at least \$11.5 billion by 2010 on new facilities and equipment to enhance capacity. See www.faa.gov (Washington Post Online article entitled "FAA To Outline 10-year Plan to Modernize Agency Seeks To Ease Delays, Boost Air Traffic By 30%"). The FAA believes the plan is necessary following years of poorly executed FAA upgrade programs and a virtual ban on the building of new runways and airports, which resulted in long delays and cancellations beginning in the summer of 1999. Because the Benchmark Report constitutes new information addressing potentially adverse environmental effects of the project that was not contained in the EIS/EIR, the FAA and LAWA are obligated to add this significant new information to the Draft EIS/EIR and thereafter issue new notice and recirculate the revised Draft EIS/EIR for additional comment and consultation. Applicable statutory provisions, i.e. CEQA section 21092.1 and CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5, and case law indicate that revision and recirculation of the EIS/EIR is required.

If, subsequent to the commencement of public review and interagency consultation but prior to final EIR certification, the lead agency adds "significant new information" to an EIR, the agency must issue new notice and must "recirculate" the revised EIR, or portions thereof, for additional commentary and consultation. CEQA § 21092.1; CEQA Guidelines § 15088.5; *Laurel Heights Improvement Ass'n of San Francisco, Inc. v. Regents of the University of California*, 6 Cal.4th 1112 (1993) ("Laurel Heights II"). The revised environmental document must be subjected to the same "critical evaluation that occurs in the draft stage," so that the public is not denied "an opportunity to test, assess, and evaluate the data and make an informed judgment as to the validity of the conclusions to be drawn therefrom." *Sutter Sensible Planning, Inc. v. Board of Supervisors*, 122 Cal.App.3d 813, 822 (1981). Recirculation of an EIR requires notice pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15087, and consultation pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15086. CEQA Guidelines § 15088.5(d). thus, in issuing a recirculated EIR for public review, the lead agency must publish a new "notice of availability," and must consult with, at a minimum, all responsible agencies, trustee agencies, "[a]ny other state, federal, and local agencies which have jurisdiction by law with respect to the project or which exercise authority over resources which may be affected by the project," and "[a]ny city or county which borders on a city or county within

which the project is located." CEQA Guidelines § 15086(a). The FAA and LAWA can satisfy their obligations to recirculate the EIR by reissuing only the revised part or parts of the EIR, rather than a whole new document. "If the revision is limited to a few chapters or portions of the EIR, the lead agency need only recirculate the chapters or portions that have been modified." CEQA Guidelines § 15088.5(c).

The California Supreme Court in *Laurel Heights II*, formulated the following legal test for determining when "recirculation" is required:

[W]e conclude that the addition of new information to an EIR is not "significant" unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project's proponents have declined to implement. . . [R]ecirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR "merely clarifies or amplifies . . . or makes insignificant modifications in . . . an adequate EIR."

Laurel Heights II, supra, 6 Cal.4th at 1129 (emphasis in original)

The *Laurel Heights II* Court then provided four examples of how the above-stated principle should be applied and practiced:

"Recirculation is required, for example, when the new information added to an EIR discloses:

- (1) a new substantial environmental impact resulting from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented;
- (2) a substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.
- (3) a feasible project alternative or mitigation measure that clearly would lessen the environmental impacts of the project, but which the project's proponents decline to adopt;
- (4) that the draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that the public comment on the draft was in effect meaningless."

Laurel Heights II, supra, 6 Cal.4th at 1130; (emphasis added, citations omitted); CEQA Guidelines § 15088.5(a).

Recirculation is required here because the information contained in the Benchmark Report, which FAA and LAWA are obligated to include in the Draft EIS/EIR was neither addressed nor analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR. As a consequence of this new information concerning the project, new substantial adverse environmental impacts necessarily will result from the broadening of the scope of project objectives as affected by the FAA's implementation of the Benchmark Report that has not been previously addressed nor analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR nor made subject to public review and comment. Recirculation of the Draft EIS/EIR, therefore, is required. See CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5(a)(1); *Laurel Heights II*, supra, 6 Cal.4th at 1129; see also *Sierra Club v. Gilroy City Council*, 222 Cal.App.3d 30 (199) (new information demonstrated draft EIR had not addressed potentially substantial adverse environmental effects, thus requiring revision and recirculation).

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00036-30 regarding the FAA Benchmark Study.

PC01955-6

Comment:

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, the County requests the City's assistance in furthering the public participation requirements of CEQA and NEPA by demanding that the FAA and LAWA conduct additional public hearings on the project so that persons potentially affected by the project in the greater Los Angeles region can voice their concerns. In addition, the City must demand that the project applicants

3. Comments and Responses

incorporate the Benchmark Report in the Draft EIS/EIR, which must then be revised and recirculated to reflect the new information contained in that report.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01955-3 and Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the extensive public participation opportunities provided by LAWA and the FAA for the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00036-30 regarding the FAA Benchmark Report and the fact that it does not affect the Draft EIS/EIR analysis.

PC01956

Gaines, John

City of El Segundo

6/9/2001

PC01956-1

Comment:

Good afternoon, I am John Gaines, City Council Member of the City of El Segundo

The City of El Segundo, like many communities represented here today will submit detailed and expansive comments to the EIR. I will highlight just a few of our objections to the proposed expansion.

The report has not considered a reasonable range of alternatives to the expansion of LAX.

Response:

The comment letter submitted by the City of El Segundo is identified as Comment Letter AL00033. 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.

PC01956-2

Comment:

The number of alternatives analyzed is unusually limited.

Response:

Comment noted. 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.

PC01956-3

Comment:

This report never seriously considers appropriate use of available airports in the 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. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC01956-4

Comment:

This report does not consider alternatives that would result in impacts less severe than the preferred Alternative C.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment PC01094-4; please see Response to Comment PC01094-4.

PC01956-5**Comment:**

No regional analysis of air quality impact is provided

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.

PC01956-6**Comment:**

There are no noise mitigation measures in the report

Response:

Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding noise mitigation.

PC01956-7**Comment:**

The report concludes that increased traffic and activity levels will result in significant increased toxic air emissions in all expansion scenarios. However, the report fails to describe how the huge increase in toxic emissions will be adequately mitigated.

Response:

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 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.

PC01956-8**Comment:**

Throughout this report, baselines have been inconsistent and inappropriate,

Response:

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

PC01956-9**Comment:**

selected alternatives have not met CEQA and/or NEPA mitigation requirements, and the depth of analysis has not been sufficient to support the adoption of the proposed Master Plan.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01956-10

Comment:

The project's stated objectives have not been met through the preferred alternative and the biases of the proponents of LAX expansion are blatantly evident.

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. A Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provides 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 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.

PC01956-11

Comment:

One of the fundamental requirements of this process is for the lead agency to pursue alternatives that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant effects of the proposed project. This requirement has not been met in this report.

The city of El Segundo expects you to issue an entirely new EIS/EIR that properly and effectively explores viable alternatives and identifies appropriate mitigation measures to lessen environmental impacts.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01956-10 above. Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01956-12

Comment:

Before yielding the podium to my colleagues, let me express my outrage with LAWA, the FAA and the City of Los Angeles for the underhanded, adversarial and counterproductive manner in which these hearings are being conducted. It's little wonder that the citizens of our communities, like citizens across this land, harbor such deep distrust for and dislike of the bureaucracies, like you, that hide behind and distort governmental process in order to accomplish self serving objectives.

Response:

The FAA and LAWA have conducted several hearings on both the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 for a listing of all public hearings. Also, please visit the web site, www.laxmasterplan.org.

PC01956-13

Comment:

Battalions of PR consultants costing the taxpayers 10's of millions of dollars, personal attacks on local officials, bureaucratic obfuscation and legal shennigans will not make this expansion acceptable to us.

Rest Assured, El Segundo and over 100 Southern California cities and agencies covering 5 counties that have joined us in fighting this expansion will use all the administrative, legal and political means at our disposal to ensure the proposed expansion described in this miserable plan never takes 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.

PC01957 Lazzaretto, Dominic A. C. Lazzaretto & Associates 6/9/2001

PC01957-1

Comment:

Personal Comments on the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR for
Public Hearings on June 9, 2001

Good Afternoon. My name is Dominic Lazzaretto and I am here to represent the LA County Board of Supervisors. After careful review of the draft EIS/EIR, we have concluded that the errors, omissions, and inaccurate assumptions in the document are so pervasive that its validity is wholly compromised. As a result, the only appropriate action is to substantially revise and recirculate the document. We base these conclusions on the following factors:

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC01957-2 through PC01957-11 for responses to the specific concerns presented by the commentor.

PC01957-2

Comment:

Considering only 3 alternatives for a project of such magnitude is unusually limited.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding the range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01957-3

Comment:

The preferred alternative contains the most significant impacts yet meets the least number of objectives set forth in the EIS/EIR.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00022-3 regarding the number and severity of impacts associated with Alternative C compared to Alternatives A and B and Response to Comment AL00022-43 regarding Alternative C's fulfillment of the project objectives.

PC01957-4

Comment:

The document repeatedly acknowledges that LAX is part of a regional system but the scoping outreach did not include a single agency within San Bernardino, Orange, Riverside, or Ventura County and none of the alternatives considered any form of a regional solution.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00007-1 regarding the scoping undertaken for the LAX 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. 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. Please also see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC01957-5

Comment:

The baselines that were used were inconsistent and outdated, which significantly reduces the impacts of the project.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments AL00022-12, AL00022-55, and Topical Response TR-GEN-1 regarding baseline issues.

PC01957-6

Comment:

The project horizon year is 2015, yet the project cannot be completed before that date. This also skews the potential impacts of the project.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR provided a program level of analysis for each of the alternatives considered for LAX Master Plan, based on general assumptions of the timing and phasing of individual improvements. As individual projects under the Master Plan would advance toward implementation, they would be examined in light of the environmental analysis presented in the Final EIS/EIR for the Master Plan. Variations or modifications to the proposed phasing plan may occur during the overall course of Master Plan implementation; however, to the extent such changes do not substantially alter the conclusions of the Final EIS/EIR, the impacts would have been addressed. Recognizing that approval of the Master Plan did not occur in 2002, as assumed in the construction phasing schedule used in the Draft EIS/EIR, a shorter construction period would be required to complete the Master Plan improvements. A reduced construction period would not necessarily change the means and methods of construction assumed in the Draft EIS/EIR, but would increase the intensity of construction activity. The most notable environmental disciplines affected by construction activities are air quality, noise, and traffic. Construction-related impacts pertaining to all three of these issue areas were identified in the Draft EIS/EIR as being significant and unavoidable. A reduction in (compression of) the overall construction period for the three build alternatives addressed in the Draft EIS/EIR would increase the severity of those construction-related impacts, which have already been disclosed as being significant and unavoidable.

It should be noted that the nature and extent of improvement projects proposed under Alternative D, which was added subsequent to the publication and review of the Draft EIS/EIR, are substantially less than those of Alternative A, B, and C. Alternative D does not include several of the major projects, such as the LAX Expressway, the ring road, the west terminal, and additional cargo facilities associated with the other build alternatives, and, therefore, could be completed within a much smaller overall construction program. The construction schedule for Alternative D, as addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, assumes the start of construction in fall 2004 and completion by 2015.

PC01957-7

Comment:

Air quality is shown to be a significant impact both before and after mitigation. Therefore, the mitigation measures do not appear to be sufficient.

Response:

Please note that minimizing a project's significant impacts to insignificance is not required in order to obtain project approval. Mitigation will be employed to reduce emissions to the extent technologically feasible; however, all pollutants may not be mitigated to a level below all significance criteria.

Please also see Response to Comment PC01196-12 regarding the revised mitigation program and its inclusion in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01957-8

Comment:

The population that is shown within the 65 CNEL noise contour is half of what LAWA reported in the same period (4th quarter 1996). This undermines the validity of the document and misrepresents the impacts of the project.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PHP00003-8; please refer to Response to Comment PHP00003-8.

PC01957-9

Comment:

There are no noise mitigation measures in the document even though noise was determined to have significant impacts. This goes against CEQA requirements.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Responses TR-LU-5 and TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation. Mitigation measures were prepared in compliance with CEQA requirements, as described on page 4-8 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Aircraft noise mitigation was described in Section 4.2.8 of the Draft EIS/EIR beginning on page 4-216. Mitigation measures for road traffic, construction equipment, and automated people mover noise were provided in Section 4.1.8 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR beginning on page 4-78. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR also provided mitigation measures for aircraft noise in Sections 4.1.8 and 4.2.8.

PC01957-10

Comment:

The Environmental Justice discussion simply fails to meet NEPA requirements. As written, valid review is not possible.

Response:

The specifics of the comment are not clear, however, the analyses contained in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice and Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provide comprehensive information pursuant to NEPA and CEQA requirements, consistent with Executive Order 12898 and DOT Order 5610.2. 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.

PC01957-11

Comment:

Finally, the EIS/EIR somehow concluded that short distance flights would go to outlying airports but there is no commitment to ensure it happens. The document either needs to explore the impacts of

3. Comments and Responses

these flights staying at LAX or needs to include an alternative that properly identifies a plan for a regional solution.

Response:

More detailed information regarding the nature and mix of flights anticipated for future conditions is provided within the Draft Master Plan. It should be noted 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, 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 is that Alternative C would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region, that conclusion 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.

PC01957-12

Comment:

We would like to submit our preliminary comments and findings into the record of this hearing and will submit our final comments prior to the July 25th deadline. Thank you.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC01957-2 through PC01957-11 above.

PC01958

Kirkley, Larry

City of Inglewood

6/9/2001

PC01958-1

Comment:

INTRODUCTION: I am Inglewood Council Member Lawrence A. Kirkley speaking for the South Bay Cities Council of Governments, which is a joint powers authority of the 15 South Bay cities plus the Harbor Gateway/San Pedro area of the City of Los Angeles. While we will be providing more detailed written comments, I would like to highlight some critical issues.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC01958-2

Comment:

I. CAPACITY

A. LAX will accommodate more daily operations than what is projected in the Master Plan.

1. The Draft projects approximately 2000 daily operations per day. LAX already accommodates over 2000 operations per day and has done so since 1998.

2. The true environmental impacts such as noise, emissions, and surface traffic are concealed by understating how many operations will occur at LAX should the Project go forth.

3. The Draft violates both the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) because it doesn't disclose to the decision makers and the public the Project's reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts, and the Project isn't analyzed in its entirety.

Response:

Detailed discussions of the number of operations associated with the Master Plan alternatives were provided in 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. The number of daily operations at LAX was summarized in Table 3-2 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Table S3-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Response to Comment AR00003-7 regarding the validity of the assumptions pertaining to the airside analysis and Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding projected versus actual capacity levels at LAX.

PC01958-3

Comment:

II. IMPROPER BASELINE

A. Every environmental analysis must establish a baseline to provide a benchmark of existing conditions against which the environmental impacts of a project may be measured.

B. LAWA uses three different baselines to conceal the true impacts of the Project.

Response:

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

PC01958-4

Comment:

1. Environmental Baseline (1996): the purported conditions in existence before implementation of the Project.

Used in Noise Impacts: By comparing the Project's noise impacts to the noise impacts experienced in 1996, the Draft includes in its analysis all of the noisy Stage II aircraft that were phased out in 1999. By including the noisy aircraft in the analysis, the Draft gives the impression that the Project will not have much of a noise impact. The opposite is true.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00033-87. Also, please see Topical Response TR-N-1, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-1.3 regarding use of the year 1996 baseline noise levels from which to measure benefit increases associate with proposed alternatives.

PC01958-5

Comment:

2. No Project baseline for 2005 (and 2015) which includes natural growth on the airport resulting from implementation of the already approved airport projects that purportedly would have occurred even if the Project is not implemented.

Used in Air Quality: This baseline assumes growth in airport operations and attendant aircraft emissions. Therefore, the use of the No Project baseline for air quality purposes creates an artificially high level of emissions in each year against which the air quality impacts of the project are measured.

Response:

Operational and construction-related emissions were compared against the 1996 environmental baseline for purposes of determining significance under CEQA. Off-airport traffic emissions were compared against an adjusted environmental baseline. Please See Topical Response TR-GEN-1 regarding the environmental baseline and the adjusted environmental baseline.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01958-6

Comment:

3. Adjusted Environmental Baseline for 2005 and 2015 which include the off-airport land use activities and regional circulation improvements in place, but without any improvement to airport facilities.

Used in Surface Traffic: The Draft uses Adjusted Environmental Baseline, which minimizes the potential direct impact from the Project because it assumes that off-airport traffic volumes will grow even without the Project, thereby reducing the proportional effect of the added airport traffic from the Project.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2, in particular Subtopical Response TR-ST-2.2, regarding the definition of baseline scenarios and incorporation of local/regional plans and programs.

PC01958-7

Comment:

III. NOISE IMPACTS

A. The Draft does not analyze nor disclose any cumulative noise impacts that the Project will have on the South Bay communities.

1. The Draft narrowly focuses on aircraft noise impacts created by aircraft approaching LAX from the east, and from start-of-takeoff roll. (No noise impact analysis on runway sideline noise or deployment of reverse thrust in areas immediately to the south of the airport.)

2. The Draft fails to analyze noise impacts south of Inglewood and El Segundo.

Response:

For a discussion of the noise effects of the Master Plan alternatives on the South Bay communities and modifications to traffic routings in that area not included as part of the Master Plan, please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1. Evaluations do address runway sideline noise or reverse thrust effects on areas immediately south of the airport.

PC01958-8

Comment:

B. The Draft only focuses on the 65 db CNEL significant noise area and does not address any other noise impacts in areas of concern to South Bay communities. While neighborhoods further south of El Segundo may not technically be under the 65-db CNEL significant noise impact areas, we consider the noise impact of a single, heavily loaded 747 over our communities as important. At a minimum, there should be a supplementary single-even noise analysis for communities south of the airport.

Response:

This information was located in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report. For more information on single event levels please see Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences and in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-2.2 and Subtopical Response TR-N-2.3. 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. Single event noise was extensively analyzed for nighttime awakenings and classroom disruption in sections 4.1, Noise and 4.2, Land Use of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report and Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report. Additionally, please Response to Comment PC02605-29 regarding single event levels.

PC01958-9

Comment:

C. The airport improvements will lead to an increase in air traffic which will inevitably lead to increases in over flight noise created by aircraft departing LAX. Air Traffic Controllers separate aircraft departing from LAX. On departure, much of the aircraft will have to be routed close to the shoreline or over the South Bay communities to accommodate for the increase in operations and to reduce delay. This will increase over flight noise.

Response:

Alternatives A and B would result in significantly increased numbers of overflights. Neither Alternative C nor Alternative D project substantial growth in activity from the future no action condition. Much of the growth anticipated by Alternatives A and B is through the expansion of the peak hours of operations - that is, the airport would operate at peak capacity for longer periods of time during the day. If either of these alternatives are selected for development, the number of departure flights would increase and departure routes over the ocean may be adjusted further to accommodate greater traffic levels. South Bay departures are addressed in Topical Response TR-N-3 in particular Subtopical Responses TR-N-3.1 and TR-N-3.3 and Topical Response TR-N-6, regarding noise increase and in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.2.

PC01958-10

Comment:

IV. SURFACE TRAFFIC

A. The Draft barely considers traffic in the South Bay communities. Out of the 61 evaluated intersections, and an additional 15 intersections selected for focused analysis, only nine of these 76 intersections were south of the I-105.

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Sections 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, and 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please refer to the Topical Response TR-ST-2 for a discussion of the study area and identification of facilities analyzed.

PC01958-11

Comment:

B. The Draft claims that people driving to LAX from the south use the freeway more than surface streets. This is not true for three reasons:

1. Airport traffic south of LAX represents a significant component of traffic on local streets. For instance, the volume to capacity ratio analysis proves that the airport contribution of traffic during the PM peak at Sepulveda Boulevard south of El Segundo constitutes a significant impact.

2. Interviews at freeway intersections indicate a large percentage of airport trips. More than 30% of the trips at northbound I-405 ramps at El Segundo were LAX related.

3. The Draft is internally inconsistent because, while claiming that there is more freeway traffic than surface traffic south of the airport, it also states that dispersing LAX onto many arterial and freeway routes minimizes the surface traffic impact on any given route. Which is it: Dispersion into surface streets? Or, circulation in the freeways? If it is circulation, shouldn't there be freeway improvements south of the airport such as those contemplated to the north?

3. Comments and Responses

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 comment regarding the statement that traffic south of LAX tends to use I-405 takes this sentence out of context and misinterprets the statement. The referenced sentence is part of a larger discussion of existing traffic conditions, and observing that traffic currently diverts off of I-405 onto arterial streets. Later in the same discussion, on page 4-289, there is a paragraph regarding South Bay arterial streets which states that airport-bound motorists on these arterial streets are primarily South Bay residents. When put in its proper context, the referenced statement is fully consistent with the observations being made regarding the use of I-405 in accessing LAX. Also, there is airport traffic on surface streets to the south (per comment #1), but it is much less than on I-405. Further, traffic using the El Segundo Boulevard ramps is regional traffic using I-405 (per comment #2), which supports that claim that regional traffic tends to use I-405 rather than surface streets. As a result, there is no inconsistency (as claimed in comment #3).

PC01958-12

Comment:

C. There is no reason why the proponents of the Project shouldn't consider the surface traffic effects south of Rosecrans Blvd.

Response:

Reasons for definition of the study area, including Tiers I, II and III, are summarized in Topical Response TR-ST-2. Tier I intersections and Tier II links go as far south as Rosecrans Boulevard, while one freeway section is on I-405 south of Rosecrans Boulevard. The CMP analysis in Section 6 of Technical Report 3b includes regional transportation facilities south of Rosecrans, following procedures established by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority. These procedures include an assessment of all regional transportation facilities in Los Angeles County, including Pacific Coast Highway, Artesia Boulevard, Hawthorn Boulevard, and Western Avenue in the South Bay area. As described in Section 6.2 of Technical Report 3b, an assessment of these facilities was made, and based on the CMP procedures, a CMP impact analysis was performed for Sepulveda Boulevard between Rosecrans Boulevard and Artesia Boulevard and Artesia Boulevard between Pacific Coast Highway and Crenshaw Boulevard. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology and results.

PC01958-13

Comment:

D. The Draft's entire off-airport surface traffic assessment relies on the assumption that there will be a substantial reduction in the number of trips generated from the North side Project.

1. The Draft does not state what specific discretionary actions are needed to modify the allowable land uses on the North side and Continental City properties? Since the traffic reduction is critical to the projected Master Plan generation, the details associated with these properties need to be firmly established.

2. The Draft does not state how compliance will be assured? There is a lack of commitment to ensure that the traffic reduction represented by the changes in allowable land use will occur.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR are program level environmental documents intended to analyze the impacts of a Master Plan. It is acknowledged that further documentation may be required to address certain environmental issues in a more specific manner, as necessary and appropriate. Compliance assurance would be defined specifically in the permit applications for this project.

PC01958-14**Comment:**

E. Using a 2015 horizon year presents a misleading picture of the impacts to surface traffic. 2025 should be used since the airport improvements clearly permit growth in passengers and resulting traffic beyond 2015.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SAL00016-5 regarding the use of 2015 as the planning horizon year.

PC01958-15**Comment:**

F. The Draft's mitigation monitoring plan is inadequate.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment AR00003-24. Please see Response to Comment AR00003-24.

PC01958-16**Comment:**

V. AIR QUALITY

A. The Draft recognizes the existence of specific inmitigable air quality impacts but proposes to delay a complete analysis of these impacts until the Final EIS/EIR, which makes it impossible for the public to fully analyze the Project's air quality impacts.

Response:

The significance of air quality impacts after mitigation was discussed in Section 4.6.9 in both the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding increased air pollution.

PC01958-17**Comment:**

B. The Draft erroneously assumes that amount of aircraft activity will be virtually identical whether or not the Project is implemented.

1. The draft claims that aircraft activity under a No-Project scenario will be 98% of the activity if the Project had gone through. This simply is not true and violates sound economic theory. If you build it, they will come, and aircraft activity cannot and will not remain the same whether the Project goes forth or not.

2. Expansion of the runways, creation of new access roads, changes in aircraft traffic flow, and alterations in the market will all lead to an increase in capacity which, in turn, will lead to an increase in demand and, thus, the number of passengers and aircraft that use the airport.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding projected versus actual capacity levels at LAX and legal limits on the ability to control activity levels at airports. Activity at airports is determined largely in response to market conditions and demands, and how airlines choose to serve those demands. As described in TR-GEN-3, each of the alternatives being considered for the Master Plan would respond to that market demand differently, based on LAX operating within different levels of constraints. Based on existing constraints at LAX, the activity level of LAX in 2015 is anticipated to be approximately 78.7

3. Comments and Responses

million annual passengers, which is approximately 80 percent of the activity level that would otherwise occur under Alternatives A and B, which have far fewer constraints, and approximately 88 percent of that associated with Alternative C. Alternative D, added subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, is designed with certain constraints that would provide for activity levels in 2015 comparable to those of the No Action/No Project Alternative, but offering a far superior quality of service to passengers and visitors at LAX.

PC01958-18

Comment:

VI. AIRSPACE

A. The Draft treats aircraft over flying the South Bay communities as if the aircraft immediately enter a black hole or drop off the runway after take-off.

Response:

All noise evaluations considered the effects of aircraft departing to the west and the anticipated location of those aircraft after implementation of the No Action and build alternatives. Because the noise of South Bay overflights is substantially below the level of significance, additional evaluation is not warranted. Flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay are addressed in Topical Response TR-N-3, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1.

PC01958-19

Comment:

B. Not only does the Draft ignore important airspace issues, but also when it does supply data, it uses inaccurate, outdated sources and consultant opinion.

1. The Draft uses only one airline to compute performance for all airlines operating at LAX. In reality, the flight track will vary which each aircraft.

2. The Draft assumes that the demand on the airport will be consistent; that all the routes will be the same, and that speeds will all be comparable. The assumptions are invalid and non-representative of the activities at LAX.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AR00003-10 regarding the use of performance data in the Master Plan,
Response to Comment AR00003-14 regarding aircraft speed assumptions, and
Response to Comment AL00051-60 regarding the airspace and flight path analysis.

PC01958-20

Comment:

C. The Draft ignores air traffic efficiencies that could be brought about through better use of the airspace and that might obviate need for the Project.

LAWA used outdated data from 1994. There have been several changes to the air traffic system since 1994 that, if used in the calculations, would have had profound effects on the results. For instance, since 1994, the FAA has implemented dual (Civet) Arrival Procedures, which have resulted in average timesavings of 4.4 minutes per aircraft. This data was not considered in the Draft's analysis on delays.

Response:

The content of this comment is similar to Comment AR00003-17. Please see Response to Comment AR00003-17 regarding analysis of air traffic efficiencies.

PC01958-21**Comment:**

D. The Draft depicts additional new routes over areas not previously impacted.

Certain Draft maps show that when LAX is operating in its normal west flow, turboprop aircraft begin their turn before the shoreline. This is contrary to the stated airport policy and would potentially bring them over South Bay communities.

Response:

The commentor is correct that some aircraft begin their turns prior to reaching the coastline. The stated policy by LAWA is that "unless directed otherwise by ATC, pilots of all aircraft departing toward the west shall, in accordance with Subsection 4, maintain runway heading until past the shoreline before commencing any turns." Consequently, the flight track maps take into consideration the deviations from the policy that reflect ATC decisions to divert smaller aircraft from the runway heading to provide better separation between large and small aircraft. The maps referenced by the commentor are maps of existing flight tracks. All alternatives identified in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provide for departures to cross the shoreline before initiating their turns. For additional information about the impacts of noise over areas south of the airport, please see Topical Response TR-N-3, in particular Subtopical Responses TR-N-3.1 and TR-N-3.2, regarding early turns over areas north and south of LAX. For additional information or noise abatement procedures enforcement, please see Topical Response TR-N-7, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-7.1.

PC01959**Paz, Cynthia****None Provided****8/20/2001****PC01959-1****Comment:**

This letter is in regards to the master plan to expand LAX airport.

As a resident of Playa del Rey, I am firmly opposed to LAX expansion. The noise & pollution are getting worse with each passing year.

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.

PC01959-2**Comment:**

The flights out of LAX get later & later & the frequency has gotten out of control - one after another, often planes taking off in the two runways (north) at the same time, compounding the noise.

Response:

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 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 information on noise impacts on nighttime awakenings and mitigation proposed for such impacts.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01959-3

Comment:

There is no reason why Palmdale & Ontario airports cannot take up the slack. Why can't cargo air freight go out of 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.

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. Please see Response to Comment PC00599-54 for more information about cargo activity.

PC01960	Jagger, Bruce & Betty	None Provided	8/18/2001
----------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01960-1

Comment:

We are not in favor of anymore LAX expansion - Updating for current capacity in both passengers & freight is OK.

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.

PC01961	Rose, Harry	None Provided	8/16/2001
----------------	--------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01961-1

Comment:

I HAVE BEEN TOLD BY AIRPORT OFFICIALS ON NUMEROUS OCCASIONS THAT UNLESS THERE IS A MASTER PLAN PUT INTO PLACE THAT ALLOWS LAX EXPANSION, THERE CAN BE NO MONEY AVAILABLE TO MITIGATE THE DEVASTATION ALREADY WROUGHT ON SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES.

I ASKED WHY AND WAS TOLD THAT THEY NEEDED TO HAVE A MASTER PLAN IN PLACE TO PERFORM THE MITIGATION.

I THEN ASKED 'IF A MASTER PLAN WAS PUT INTO PLACE THAT CONSTRAINED LAX TO ITS EXISTING FOOTPRINT AND 78 MAP, WOULD MONEY BE AVAILABLE FOR MITIGATION? THE ANSWER WAS NO.

3. Comments and Responses

HOW CAN THIS BE? THE DAMAGE TO OUR COMMUNITIES HAS BEEN DONE AND IT WAS DONE BY LAX.

Response:

At the time the Draft EIS/EIR was circulated, there were three build alternatives (Alternatives A, B, and C) and a No Action/No Project Alternative being considered for the LAX Master Plan. Under those scenarios, only the No Action/No Project Alternative would maintain the existing layout of the airport and would have 78 MAP at 2015. Under NEPA and CEQA, it does not provide mitigation for the No Action/No Project Alternative. Subsequent to the 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. Unlike the No Action/No Project Alternative, however, implementation of Alternative D would include mitigation measures.

PC01962 Mann, Len None Provided 8/17/2001

PC01962-1

Comment:

I HAVE NEVER SEEN DECISION MAKERS CONSIDER THE NORTH END OF THE VALLEY FOR PALMDALE AIRPORT USE! ! ! IF I HAD A CHOICE TO GO TO PALMDALE OR INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, I WOULD GO TO PALMDALE. IT TAKES ME ABOUT 50 MINUTES TO GET THERE. IF YOU HAD \$1 A DAY PARKING AND FLIGHTS TO A LOT OF PLACES, THE CHOICE WOULD BE A NO BRAINER. YOU HAVE THE NORTH END OF THE VALLEY, SANTA CLARITA, NEWHALL ETC. WOULD ALL CHOOSE PALMDALE BECAUSE OF THE TREMENDOUS HASSLE OF INTERNATIONAL AND GRIDLOCK. THIS AREA PROBABLY INCLUDES 2 MILLION PEOPLE OR MORE.

Response:

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

PC01963 Evans, Herbert None Provided 8/13/2001

PC01963-1

Comment:

There are several good reasons why LAX should not increase the quantity of flights,passenger traffic auto traffic or geographical boundaries.These detriments to safety,health and environment should and could be overcome by changing all inter-continental and cargo flights to Palmdale. This would:

- (a) eliminate all four engine planes from crowded LAX.
- (b) inter-continental passengers would not suffer the pain of getting tangled up in the crowds who are changing planes or satellites for connecting flights. Many of the out-of- town passengers would stay at a new Palmdale hotel complex, either before an early morning departure or after an evening arrival.
- (c) Developers would love the opportunity to create a desirable experience for travelers who have to make or have made a many hours flight.
- (d) all incoming cargo is not destined for the most western part of L.A. County.Palmdale would make a destination or transfer or distribution center to many parts of So. Calif.

Response:

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

PC01963-2

Comment:

'Everyone' knows that someday the Palmdale area is going to have a fast method of getting to the San Fernando valley with routes to Orange and San Bernardino counties. Let's start it now!

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC01963-3

Comment:

The feeder planes to supply Inter-contintal flights would use Palmdale in stead of LAX. That would ease air and ground plane traffic at LAX, a safty plus.

Response:

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

PC01964 Calley, Joe & Ora None Provided 7/17/2001

PC01964-1

Comment:

1. We don't need anymore traffic.- conjection. cargo etc.
2. People can use any airports, other than LAX
3. Don't need the added fumes etc as it's causing lots of people with c.o.p.d. & breathing problems (I know!)
4. So many older people will lose their homes and have to move - very sad, all for "progress"

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and health and safety impacts in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G, and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4, 5 and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2, S-3, S-4 and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic, Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, and Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition.

PC01965 Garrett, Mark None Provided 7/21/2001

PC01965-1

Comment:

Please be advised that I am adamantly opposed to any further territorial expansion of the LAX facility. The residents of Westchester and Playa del Rey have already forfeited enough of their land to the airport in previous expansions.

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.

PC01966 Lansberry, Margaret None Provided

PC01966-1

Comment:

What can I say that has not been said all ready and I agree with all of it.

The expansion will take half our town, add noise, pollution and traffic.

We live here because of the weather and the friendly neighborhood and I have no wish to move any where else.

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, 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.

PC01967 Rouseyrol, Andre & None Provided 8/14/2001
Barbara

PC01967-1

Comment:

We as residents of Westchester for the past 36 years are opposed to the expansion planned for LAX for the following reasons:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below. 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.

PC01967-2

Comment:

1) SAFETY from overcrowding of the air corridors.

Response:

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

PC01967-3

Comment:

2) TRAFFIC is a nightmare for the residents now in trying to get to business; our area cannot handle any more cars .There are no mitigation measurers for handling the traffic on either the surface streets or the freeways.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC01967-4

Comment:

3) CARGO demands should be handled from other areas, i.e. Ontario, Palmdale and El Toro Develop these airports to take the pressure off LAX.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00599-54 for more information about cargo activity.

PC01967-5

Comment:

4) LOSS of the Central Business District on Sepulveda Blvd and homes. LAX continues to take homes from the area. We want our Westchester to stay as it 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 described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsections 4.2.6.2 through 4.2.6.4), acquisition within the Westchester Business District would be about 16 acres or 31 percent of the District under Alternative A, about 11 acres or 21 percent under Alternative B, or approximately 13 acres or 26 percent of the District under Alternative C. Under Alternatives A, B, and C, relocation opportunities would be available for some uses nearby within Westchester Southside. Also, many of the uses being acquired are airport related and a number of the community related uses that would be acquired (a bank, an office supply store, a bar and beauty shop) would still remain available through similar businesses that are located in close proximity within the Westchester Business District.

Regarding residential acquisition, please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1, and note that Master Plan Commitment RBR-1 ensures that LAWA will implement a relocation plan for affected properties in compliance with the Uniform Relocation Act, state and local regulations, and FAA Advisory Circular 150/5100-17.

Also, as 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 or residential acquisition. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC01967-6

Comment:

5) NOISE and AIR POLLUTION keeps increasing which destroys the family life. The residue in our bird-baths in the yard are proof of the increase in air pollution over the past years.

Response:

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

EIS/EIR. Please also see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PC01967-7

Comment:

Domestic airlines have been seen dumping fuel over Westchester.

Response:

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

PC01967-8

Comment:

LAX is already one of the regions single largest source of Nox emission.

Response:

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

PC01967-9

Comment:

At the present time there are so many large developments in the immediate area of LAX and not enough allowance for the increase of cars and people to handle these developments.

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00018-19 regarding the evaluation of cumulative impacts in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC01967-10

Comment:

This Plan is only a short-term quick fix approach and should not be allowed to go forward for all of the above reasons. The development of the City of Los Angeles owned airports in Ontario and Palmdale should be where the expansion is done. Please leave LAX as is and go elsewhere..The Master Plan is not the answer.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

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.

PC01968 Lachman, Mary None Provided 8/13/2001

PC01968-1

Comment:

I am opposed to the LAX expansion for the following reasons:

1. It will increase noise levels above the 65db CNEL.
2. It will increase traffic.
3. It will increase pollution levels.
4. It will destroy parts of 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; 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.

PC01968-2

Comment:

I support a regional approach to expansion using Palmdale and Ontario.

Response:

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

PC01969 Myers, Marillyn None Provided 7/22/2001

PC01969-1

Comment:

My husband and I are against the LAX Expansion proposition.

Response:

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

PC01970	Russell, Tom	None Provided	8/12/2001
----------------	---------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01970-1**Comment:**

I once met an ex airline pilot who was being forced out of his Westchester home south of 88th St. (around 1974). He had wanted to retire here. He said our climate was better than the French Riviera.

Even longer ago I was delivering take out food. A young woman answered the door revealing (now I have your attention!) a hovel of greasy motorcycle parts. Her husband used their living room to re-build his Harley.

Refreshing ocean breezes are capable of more than lifting vehicles of rapid transport. They also raise the human spirit. Please Jim, build your next Harley someplace 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-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

PC01971	Bauske, Irene	None Provided	8/15/2001
----------------	----------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01971-1**Comment:**

It's time to concentrate on a regional plan to accommodate future airport use in the Southern California area. For all international flights and many national ones, people and cargo must leave from LAX. This one little southwest corner of the county shoulders all the evils of an airport too small for all this use. Other airport facilities in the region (Palmdale, Ontario, Van Nuys, El Toro & unused military bases in the Inland Empire) should be developed to take their fair share of the burden. Let's try to ease that traffic on the 405, Sepulveda and Lincoln Blvds. Let's ease the awful plane noise on Century Blvd. that occurs every few minutes. Let's ease the scary statistics of "near-misses" at LAX by diverting the volume--not just for one or two years, but permanently with a real regional solution. How about all cargo at Palmdale--the stuff has to be trucked anyway.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC01972 Booth, Worth None Provided 8/16/2001

PC01972-1

Comment:

I REALLY NEVER EXPECTED TO BE WRITING A REALLY INTENSE CRITICISM OF ANY REASONABLE EXPANSION OF FACILITIES FOR HUMAN EXPANSION SUCH AS THE CURRENT EXPANSION OF LAX.

I RELUCTANTLY CONCEDED THE LAST EXPANSION OF LAX WAS NECESSARY AND NOT BADLY DONE EXCEPT UNFINISHED WITHOUT AT LEAST ONE RAIL LINE DELIVERING DIRECTLY INTO THE TERMINAL. FUNNELING SO MUCH TRAFFIC FROM 405, 105, AND SOUTHERN BAY AREAS SEEMED LIKE A PURE STOP-GAP UNTIL THE OLYMPICS WERE OVER. THE FINAL STRAW WAS TERMINATING THE 105 ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF THE TUNNEL.

IN ANY CASE, EVERY EXPANSION MUST BOW TO SOME CONSTRAINTS. ANT HILLS, TERMITE MOUNDS, WOLF PACKS, NATURAL SEAPORTS ETC. CAN NOT EXPAND BEYOND REASONABLE LIMITS. IN MY OPINION, LAX IS ALREADY ABOVE THAT LIMIT.

THE GROUND ACCESS TO LAX IS VERY CRITICALLY REDUCED TO ONLY 3 SIDES BECAUSE OF THE OCEAN ON THE WEST.

THE ENTIRE NEIGHBORING COMMUNITY ON THE WEST COAST IS A NICE MIX OF BUSINESSES, BEDROOM COMMUNITIES AND BEACH ACTIVITIES.

I STRONGLY FEEL IT HAS SUFFERED MORE THAN ENOUGH IMPACT FROM THE AIRPORT. FINISH PUBLIC TRANSPORT ABOVE OR BELOW GROUND AND THEN QUIT. THAT WOULD GIVE THE SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES A MUCH NEEDED RESPITE. THEN QUIT.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC01972-2

Comment:

IT REQUIRES ABOUT 3RD GRADE VISION TO SEE THAT ORANGE COUNTY NEEDS ITS OWN POTENTIALLY MAJOR AIRPORT AT EL TORO. WE HAVE HAD ENOUGH FROM THAT HUGE AREA.

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.

PC01972-3

Comment:

STOP THIS FOOLISHNESS AT LAX AND START BRINGING PALMDALE UP TO SPEED AS ANOTHER REGIONAL

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.

PC01972-4**Comment:**

BUT WHY DELUDE OURSELVES INTO BELIEVING THAT WE NEED TO PROVIDE ANY MEANS TO SCHEDULE THEM IN/OUT OF LAX? NEXT SOMEONE MIGHT SUGGEST TRYING TO GET BUSINESS AWAY FROM SAN DIEGO TO "GLORIFY" OUR TEEMING LOCAL COMMUNITIES. I FEEL SOME VERY SELFISH COMMERCIAL ENTREPRENEURS JUST CAN'T STAND BACK AND REALIZE THE TIME HAS COME FOR THEM TO SPECULATE ELSEWHERE IN THE AREAS JUST DESCRIBED

Response:

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

PC01972-5**Comment:**

LIKE THE ANTS, THE TERMITES, AND THE WOLF PACKS---THERE IS A LIMIT TO MOST ALL THINGS AND I DO HOPE THOSE WILLING TO SHATTER OUR COASTAL COMMUNITY FOR THEIR FINANCIAL GAIN WILL BE DRIVEN INTO LESS CROWDED COMMUNITIES.

THANK YOU FOR LISTENING (ANY ONE THAT READ 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-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC01973**Forman, Sandra****None Provided****8/17/2001****PC01973-1****Comment:**

I am opposed to the proposed expansion of LAX for the following reasons:

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC01973-2

Comment:

1. As a lifelong resident of this area, I have observed the increasing congestion and pollution caused by the growth of the airport. At an off time I can get to LAX in 30 to 40 minutes. At a popular flying time I can figure at least 1 1/2 hours to get to the airport and at least 30 minutes to go around the circle. It is dangerous and infuriating.

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. 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.

PC01973-3

Comment:

2. The location of LAX seems to me to be a major accident waiting to happen. The kind of traffic that goes in and out of the airport belongs far away from a highly populated area. It is this way in almost every other major airport that I have experienced both in the U.S. and in Europe and Australia.

Response:

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

PC01973-4

Comment:

Please do not allow increased traffic at this 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. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC01974

Farrow, Willie

None Provided

8/8/2001

PC01974-1

Comment:

I would like to state my objection to any further expansion of the Los Angeles International Airport 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.

PC01974-2

Comment:

1. I moved into Carlton Square in Inglewood, in June, 1988. At the time of my purchase of the property (purchased in February, 1988), I was not aware that my home sat directly under one of your flight paths, (it is my understanding that my house on runway number one). It is my further understanding that runway one had been under construction for approximately two years, and was opened ten or fifteen days after I moved into my house, and believe me, I have suffered hell since that time. Had I known, believe me I would not have purchased this house under any circumstances.

Response:

Comment noted. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the aircraft noise mitigation program.

PC01974-3

Comment:

2. The hazards that I am faced with daily are:

A. Oil in my swimming pool,

Response:

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

PC01974-4

Comment:

B. Noise daily from six am in the morning until two am at night (I was told by one of the persons who monitor incoming flights that 1900 plans pass over my house daily,

Response:

The commentor's residence is located east of the north complex . Of all alternatives, Alternative B forecasts the maximum number of operations in the year 2015 to be 2540 daily operations. Of those 2540, approximately 39 percent of the arrivals (or 495 daily operations) are forecasted to pass over the commentor's area while landing on the north runways from the east. 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.

PC01974-5

Comment:

C. I am currently suffering with a "sleep disorder". The only way I get a good nights sleep is to leave town for a few days, and believe me this can be very expensive.

D. I have been on sleeping pills for the past few years, now they are not working,

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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01974-6

Comment:

E. I love gardening, and would love to feel convertible in my swimming pool, but between the oil in the pool and the noise, it is impossible.

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-1 regarding air pollutant deposition, and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC01974-7

Comment:

F. I love entertaining my friends and family in the back yard, but the noise prevents us from enjoying such a simple pleasure.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC01974-8

Comment:

Your next reasonable question would be, "move"?

Unfortunately, I house is not marketable, due to the fact that I must disclose to a potential buyer that "this house" is located under a flight path, something that was not disclosed to me when I purchase it. I do not believe anyone in their right mind would consider paying \$250,000 for a house they could not enjoy, therefore; I am stuck.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding the effects of LAX on property values.

PC01974-9

Comment:

I am sixty one years of age, my options are very limited. This house was purchased by me a single woman, because it contains many of the amenities I felt I needed in my declining years, i.e., it offers twenty four hours security, exterior maintenance and upkeep, five minutes from my office, and neighbors with whom I have some common interest with, however; the noise and pollution is taking toll on my health.

An expansion of this airport will only add to my present condition.

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-1 regarding impacts to the quality of life.

PC01974-10**Comment:**

Instead of expanding LAX, why not use other airports, Ontario, Burbank, Orange County to spread the misery around, or consider purchasing all homes in the area, especially those homes that are not marketable for a just and reasonable price, for me that would be perfect.

Why make life more miserable for those of us who have already suffered enough.

Response:

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

PC01975 No Author Identified, None Provided**7/1/2001****PC01975-1****Comment:**

LAX face-lift or beautification project started in summer of 2000 and before the Democratic National Convention. The face-lift or beautification still goes on (June 2001). \$12 million was spent which included 15 pylons and 3 40ft. tall letters spelling LAX.

Since last 6-8 months, no week is passed without news about LAX. The news about \$12 billion expansion master plan or LAX safety or LAX congestion.

\$82 million budgeted for developing and promoting LAX's expansion plan against which 60 million already spent. \$65 million spent on LAX master plan, which contains 12000 pages and took 5 years in making. \$12 million spent for legal, consulting, public relations, etc. \$315 million spent for sound proofing in buildings around LAX area. \$70,000 plus spent on ads announcing the hearings in newspapers about \$12 billion expansion plan.

\$485,000 study, conducted by NASA as part of a continuing effort to curtail near miss (crashes) at LAX. \$5 million spent since 1999 to install more lighting and signs on taxiways and runways and distributed posters showing problem spots to pilots.

LAX was built to accommodate 40 million annual passengers (map). 67.6 million passengers traveled in 2000 and in 2001 it will be more. Studies project that aviation demand at LAX will reach 92-98 M.A.P. by 2015.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01975-2**Comment:**

Against above facts and figures, one should ponder how much spent on upgrading computer systems which operates and controls entrance and exit of parking lots. The computer system is 20 years old and totally worn out resulting in frequent breakdown. Exit booths are in depleted condition. Due to frequent faulty performance of the computer system, lanes are closed, customers' problems arise and employees have to face their rude behavior. No proper communication from exit area to office. As LAX operates over capacity, employees are over burdened and customers are frustrated when they do not

3. Comments and Responses

get space and cannot make fast airport exit. Planes jam taxiways and runways. Cars jam ways to terminals and parking lots.

Is there any plan for immediate implementation to remedy above ills or the customers/employees will have to wait till 2015 when so called Master Plan will be completed or the present entrance/exit system of cars will be replaced by more automation by 2015 to cope 92-98 MAP. Hoping to hear about this thru news media or in the public hearings which will take place from 9-11-01 thru 9-20-01.

One can get details of computer problems from Cubic who handle maintenance and can know how many working hours are lost in each shift due to lane closures for computer problems.

Response:

Each of the build alternatives being considered for the Master Plan include substantial improvements to existing airport facilities, including on-airport roads and parking facilities. Chapter 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR provided a description of the improvements associated with Alternatives A, B, and C, as well as a phasing concept for each. As indicated therein, improvements to, or addition of, parking facilities is anticipated to begin in the sixth year of project construction. Similar information was provided in Chapter 3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR relative to Alternative D.

PC01975-3

Comment:

LAX SHUTTLE: Posters and flyers reading "Join Our Space Program" inducing to park in Lots B and C is meaningless. It is easy to get NASA Shuttle then LAX Shuttles. Passengers not interested in 2 hours free parking as 99% of passengers park in Lot B and C for long term. Daily in busy hours and in busy days, passengers have to wait considerable time for shuttle and then shuttle crawls thru traffic jams to reach terminals. In Lot B only 2 exits, additional exit lane not added to cope more traffic. Passengers Parking in Lot B will reach terminal 7 in one hour in rush hours due to waiting for the shuttle and traffic jam in Century Boulevard and inside the airport.

Response:

Comment noted. Each of the build alternatives being considered for the Master Plan include improvements to, or replacement of, existing parking facilities, with the intent of improving public and employee parking at LAX. Parking impacts were addressed in Section 4.3.1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC01975-4

Comment:

The present situation in LAX is so much congested due to summer traveling season which started from June and will remain same till Labor Day. Opponents of LAX Expansion must have observed the situation to discuss in the coming public hearings.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01976 Hysaw, Guillermo 100 Black Men of Los Angeles, 1/18/2001
Inc.

PC01976-1

Comment:

100 Black Men Has a long tradition of advocacy for the African American community in a variety of forums. It is in that spirit that we would like to convey our support of the Los Angeles International Airport Recommended Master Plan. The LAX Recommended Master Plan will bring much needed

economic opportunities, renewed hope, to the local community, bringing benefits rarely seen in lower income neighborhoods.

All of us are thrilled to see the radical change that will come about when new jobs and small business opportunities from the airport are made available to cities like Inglewood, Lennox, Hawthorne, and South Central Los Angeles. Southern California will continue to be a model to the rest of the country due in part to solid corporate citizens such as LAWA.

Thank you for your willingness to include members of the African American community throughout the planning process. 100 Black Men is certain that in the coming months, LAWA's commitment to involving all those directly impacted by the expansion, will be of immense benefit to everyone.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01977 Yamasawa, Benson United Litigation Resources 7/6/2001

PC01977-1

Comment:

As the General Manager of a litigation support company in downtown Los Angeles, I am expressing my support for the Los Angeles Airport Master Plan. Los Angeles International Airport is a world class facility and needs to continually maintain and develop itself to better serve the people of Los Angeles.

Striving to maintain its World-Class status requires a commitment to update all aspects of the facility and meet the growing need of all air travelers that come to Southern California. I believe that the Los Angeles Master Plan is a great opportunity to improve our Los Angeles International Airport.

I am please to be a supporter of the Los Angeles Airport Master Plan and look forward to seeing the success that it will bring to Los Angeles.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01978 McGlover, Stephen The Black Business Association 6/18/2001

PC01978-1

Comment:

It is easy to see that the LAX Recommended Master Plan will benefit our local communities in a variety of ways, whether it is through job opportunities, business opportunities or simply the positive economic impact it can have on local communities. That is why I would like to communicate the Black Business Association's support of the LAX Recommended Master Plan.

We are extremely excited to see the ways that the Master Plan will benefit local minority communities like Inglewood, Lennox and South Central Los Angeles. Many organizations talk about their commitment to benefiting the local community, but LAWA's Recommended Master Plan can make those benefits a reality.

The Black Business Association (BBA) supports the LAX Recommended Master Plan and is looking forward to working with LAWA to improve the economic climate in communities adjacent to the airport.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01979 Collins, Frank Bricklayers & Allied 1/16/2001
Craftworkers, Local No. 4

PC01979-1

Comment:

I am writing on behalf of Bricklayers Union Local No. 4 CA and the 1500 members of our Union, to inform you of our support for the modernization of Los Angeles International Airport. With the Master Plan for the airport being issued, it is time to have public review and approval of the plan so that modernization can begin.

We believe that the Master Plan's implementation is vital to the economic viability of the region over the next two decades and if we, as a community, do not move forward as soon as possible the negative impacts will be tremendous. With the Los Angeles International Airport providing \$60 billion in economic output in Los Angeles and the region directly related to over 400,000 jobs, 50,000 at the airport itself, the potential for new growth is tremendous. However, if the citizens of Los Angeles wait too long, other regional airports, outside of California, will undermine our ability to provide jobs and economic viability in the future.

The Master Plan has provided a model for handling the coming increase in passenger needs and the tremendous need that our tech, medical manufacturing, medical service and financial service businesses have for air cargo transport. With the expected air cargo tonnage to reach 2.6 million tons by 2015, Los Angeles must have the capacity to handle the air craft that will import and export the cargo.

As you know, the Construction Craft Unions in this area and the Los Angeles/Orange Counties Building & Construction Trades have supported economic growth in Los Angeles by supporting construction projects that we believed were beneficial for all the citizens of the City. In reviewing the Master Plan we believe that the construction and modernization of Los Angeles International Airport under this plan will have a overriding benefit for all the people in Southern California and is vital to their interests.

We look forward to working with you and the elected officials of Los Angeles to see that the Master Plan has the support it deserves. We want to participate in the effort to have the plan approved, so please let us know what we can do to assist.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01980 Louie, Ron Chinatown Merchants 7/12/2001
Association

PC01980-1

Comment:

On behalf of the Los Angeles Chinatown Merchants Association, we support the Master Plan of Los Angeles International Airport.

We believe the new plan will bring more economic opportunities to the entire Southern California area.

With the continuing population and economic growth here in Southern California, the advancement of LAX is the necessary progression.

We recommend the approval of the LAX Master Plan.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01981 Ackerman, Bruce Economic Alliance of the San Fernando Valley 1/18/2001

PC01981-1

Comment:

The Economic Alliance of the San Fernando Valley is the economic development corporation for this region. As such, we are vitally concerned about the ability of our region to compete in a global economy.

The LAX Recommended Master Plan encourages the comprehensive use of airport facilities throughout the Los Angeles basin. It also increases the capacity of LAX to meet growing demands for air travel and air cargo, thus improving our capacity in the Valley to meet the future needs of our businesses and residents.

The Economic Alliance fully supports the LAX Recommended Master Plan. We look forward to a continued strong relationship with LAWA to improve the economic climate in this region.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01982 Hopkins, James International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers 1/15/2001

PC01982-1

Comment:

The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 11 strongly supports the Los Angeles International Airport Recommended Master Plan. The rebuilding of the airport will bring tremendous economic benefits to our region. It is clear that the airport is a major source of jobs and economic activity. But in order to compete for business in the Asian Pacific Rim, we need to upgrade and modernize this major asset.

Our members will be working under a project labor agreement, which means that their wages and benefits will be based on a union standard. When our members go to work, our communities thrive. Our 7000 members live all over this region and invest their time and money in their communities. If the Master Plan is adopted by the Los Angeles City Council, our cities will benefit, our economy will grow and the flying public will be better off. We need an airport we can all be proud of. Moving forward on LAX modernization will take us a step closer to that goal.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01983 Choy, Edwin Globotours 6/21/2001

PC01983-1

Comment:

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

3. Comments and Responses

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

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

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01984	Hlodan, Robert & Gloria	None Provided	6/28/2001
----------------	------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC01984-1

Comment:

As residents of Los Angeles, we would like to express our support for the Los Angeles Airport Master Plan. Los Angeles is a World Class City and the Los Angeles Airport is a World Class Airport. It needs to maintain that profile to continue to provide the kind of service and facilities necessary to serve the people of Los Angeles and the world.

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

We look forward to being supporters and benefactors of this enterprise. The LAX Master Plan will create a facility we can be proud of.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01985	Waggoner, William	International Union of Operating Engineers	1/12/2001
----------------	--------------------------	---	------------------

PC01985-1

Comment:

Here at the start of the new century, the Modernization of LAX is among the most important projects to enhance the prosperity of everyone in Southern California.

This is why this project will have the complete support of the International Union of Operating Engineers, Local 12, with a Project Labor Agreement (PLA).

A PLA will assure good wages and benefits for some 86,000 construction workers. In turn, this will also spur widespread regional economic growth.

LAX will generate some \$60 billion in direct economic output, which will affect some 408,000 jobs from the airport region-wide.

Over the next 20 years, passenger demand will double while regional cargo demand will triple. Annual cargo transport will reach some 2.6 million tons and substantially increase trade with Asia.

But even as this real demand is increasing, the regional re-development will allow the LAX share of regional demand to decrease.

3. Comments and Responses

The plan will permit 89 million annual passengers by 2015, but this will be 9 million less than the projected demand.

With certain knowledge that the combined benefits will accrue to the economic prosperity of every resident of and visitor to Southern California, I remain,

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01986 Argue, John None Provided 1/17/2001

PC01986-1

Comment:

I support the improvement of LAX. It is vitally important for the improvement of quality of life in Southern California, and particularly in the vicinity of LAX.

This is important to me as a businessman, as a passenger, and as a landowner in Playa del Rey.

Thanks for your consideration of my views.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01987 Rascon, Sergio Laborer's International Union of North America 1/18/2001

PC01987-1

Comment:

I'm writing on behalf of the members of Laborers' Local 300 to express our support for the Los Angeles International Airport Master plan. The modernization effort benefits the whole Los Angeles region by upgrading airport facilities and allowing LAX to remain the areas' critical engine of economic productivity.

Our members and their families benefit through good union jobs, like this project, that enable them to have a decent standard of living with benefits and a secure retirement while living and working in the area. Several thousand of our members are from this community and the money they earn returns and is invested in the businesses and organizations where they live. We want to be on record as strongly supporting the Master Plan and all its' efforts to improve the quality of life in the region that are integral to the Plan.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01988 Lau, Susie Ficare 6/29/2001

PC01988-1

Comment:

My sisters and I have a company called Ficare, maker of fashion accessories. Ficare sells at major department stores in the United States and 14 countries.

3. Comments and Responses

We are constantly traveling and we use LAX as our main travel gateway to South America, Asia and Europe. Whether we are checking our production line, meeting with current or prospective buyers, attending fashion shows, or just plain vacations, our main mode of transportation is the airplane. We rely 100% on the airport and the airlines to take us back and forth comfortably and safely.

Also, Boeing and Airbus have already announced their construction of mega airplanes. Besides its size, it will reduce the time of travel. This is marvelous!!

Therefore, I am writing to express my support for the Los Angeles Airport Master Plan. Its facilities improvement will provide the safety and comfort that we all need.

I am pleased to be a supporter of the LAX Master Plan.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01989 Leong, Henry Quon Yick Noodle Co., Inc. 7/9/2001

PC01989-1

Comment:

As a Los Angeles Chinatown resident and a Los Angeles business owner, I am in favor of further expansion of the Los Angeles International Airport. Ever since being a participant of the Airport's groundbreaking ceremonies until this past weekend's return trip from Hong Kong, I have marveled at the work in progress over the last 4 decades. I have witnessed the development and continued growth of the Airport and have always known it to be conveniently located and user friendly.

I have flown into many airports, foreign and domestic, and in order for Los Angeles to keep at par with so many modern new airports; LAX needs to be further modernized and expanded. So much money and resources have been expended and invested over the years that we cannot stop now. The growth and vitality of Los Angeles businesses depend on the expansion of the Airport and its services.

I am looking forward to a bigger and better Airport, which we can support and be proud of.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01990 Mah, Collin None Provided 6/8/2001

PC01990-1

Comment:

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

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

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01991 Mitchell, Grant Painters & Allied Trades 1/18/2001

PC01991-1

Comment:

Painters & Allied Trades District Council 36 strongly endorses the Recommended Master Plan for the modernization of Los Angeles International Airport.

As you know the Master Plan for LAX, being announced today by Mayor Riordan, would provide better service for the flying public by improving access to the airport, as well as relieving congestion within it. Cargo capacity will be increased, customs facilities modernized and terminal congestion eased while adding no additional runways. Implementation of the Plan will produce thousands of construction jobs in the short term and thousands of full time jobs into the future.

LAX' share of regional demand for air service is dropping. Nevertheless, demand in real numbers will inevitably continue to rise.

For better service, economic growth and good jobs for working men and women, we urge you to support the Recommended Master Plan for LAX.

Response:

Comment noted.

**PC01992 Montoya, Raul Operative Plasterers, Cement
Masons' & Shop Hands'
International Association 1/13/2001**

PC01992-1

Comment:

I am writing on behalf of Plasterers' Union Local 200 and the 900 plus members of our Union, to inform you of our support for the modernization of Los Angeles International Airport. With the Master Plan for the airport being issued, it is time to have public review and approval of the plan so the modernization can begin.

We believe that the master Plan's implementation is vital to the economic viability of the region over the next two decades and if we, as a community, do not move forward as soon as possible the negative impacts will be tremendous. With the Los Angeles International Airport providing \$60 billion in economic output in Los Angeles and the region and directly related to over 4000,000 jobs, 50,000 at the airport itself, the potential for new growth is tremendous. However, if the citizens of Los Angeles wait too long, other regional airports, outside of California, will undermine our ability to provide jobs and economic viability in the future.

The Master Plan has provided a model for handling the coming increase in passenger needs and the tremendous need that our high tech, medical manufacturing, medical service and financial service businesses have for air cargo transport. With the expected air cargo tonnage to reach 2.8 million tons by 2015 Los Angeles must have the capacity to handle the aircraft that will import and export the cargo.

As you know, the Construction Craft Unions in this area and the Los Angeles/Orange Counties Building & Construction Trades have supported economic growth in Los Angeles by supporting construction projects that we believed were beneficial for all citizens of the City. In reviewing the Master Plan we believe that the construction and modernization of Los Angeles International Airport under this plan will have an overriding benefit for all the people in southern California and is vital to their interests.

3. Comments and Responses

We look forward to working with you and the elected officials of Los Angeles to see that the Master Plans has the support it deserves. We want to participate in the efforts to have the plan approved. Please let us know what we can do to assist.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01993 Sham, Stephen Plaza Printing 6/11/2001

PC01993-1

Comment:

As a business owner and am an active member of Alhambra Chamber of Commerce, I am writing to express my support for the Los Angeles Airport Master Plan. It needs to continue the improvement of the Los Angeles International Airport and provide the facilities necessary to serve the people of Los Angeles.

Striving for excellence in improving our Los Angeles International Airport, to do this requires the commitment to update all aspects of this facility and an effort to meet the growing need for air transportation in Southern California. I believe the LAX Master Plan is a great opportunity to improve our Los Angeles International Airport.

I am pleased to be a supporter of the LAX master plan. I look forward to seeing your success to create a facility I can be proud of.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01994 McCarron, Mike Southern California - Nevada 1/18/2001
Regional Council of Carpenters

PC01994-1

Comment:

I am writing to express the support of the Southern California Nevada Regional Council of Carpenters for the recommended LAX Master Plan improvements.

The operations of LAX are a vital component of our local and regional economy and as such we need to take the necessary and prudent steps to insure that the facilities are adequate to meet the demands placed upon it.

The Recommended Master Plan carefully balances the need for improved capacity and operational efficiency with mitigation of LAX's impact on the adjacent community. The department's decision to enter into a Project Labor Agreement insures that the work will be done in a safe and timely manner, while affording maximum job training and placement opportunities to the community.

We encourage the Department to move ahead with all due speed to implement this necessary improvement to one of our local infrastructure's most important components. With more than 86,000 construction jobs, and another 932,000 regionally related jobs at stake it is time to move forward.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01995 Stolper, Sid Southern California Pipe Trades 1/18/2001

PC01995-1

Comment:

I am writing on behalf of the fourteen thousand members of the Southern California Pipe Trades. This letter is to ask for your support for the LAX master plan. The new plan would create eighty six thousand construction jobs, and add considerable growth in regional economy. Trade with Asia will increase, passenger demand will double over the next twenty years, and regional cargo demand will triple.

Modernizing LAX means more jobs, more economic growth and better service. Improving LAX means improvements for the flying public and jobs for working men and women. Create a better LAX and Create 932,000 jobs in the region.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01996 Small, William Sprinkler Fitters U.A. Local 709 1/15/2000

PC01996-1

Comment:

I am writing on behalf of Sprinkler Fitters Local 709 and the 865 members of our Union, to inform you of our support for the modernization of Los Angeles International Airport. With the Master Plan for the airport being issued, it is time to have public review and approval of the plan so that modernization can begin.

We believe that the Master Plan's implementation is vital to the economic viability of the region over the next two decades and if we, as a community, do not move forward as soon as possible the negative impacts will be tremendous. With the Los Angeles International Airport providing \$60 billion in economic out put in Los Angeles and the region and directly related to over 400,000 jobs, 50,000 at the airport itself, the potential for new growth is tremendous. However, if the citizens of Los Angeles wait too long, other regional airports, outside of California, will undermine our ability to provide jobs and economic viability in the future.

The Master Plan has provided a model for handling the coming increase in passenger needs and the tremendous needs that our high tech, medical manufacturing, medical service and financial service businesses have for air cargo transport. With the expected air cargo tonnage to reach 2.6 million tons by 2015 Los Angeles must have the capacity to handle the aircraft that will import and export the cargo.

As you know, the Construction Craft Unions in this area and the Los Angeles /Orange Counties Building & Construction Trades have supported economic growth in Los Angeles by supporting construction projects that we believed were beneficial for all the citizens of the City. In reviewing the Master Plan we believe that the construction and modernization of Los Angeles International Airport under this plan will have an overriding benefit for all the people in Southern California and is vital to their interests.

We look forward to working with you and the elected officials of Los Angeles to see that the Master Plans has the support it deserves. We want to participate in the effort to have the plan approved, so please let us know what we can do to assist.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC01997 Tang, Walter Superior Scientific, Inc. 6/19/2001

PC01997-1

Comment:

As an owner of a medical equipment business that engage in frequent travel through LAX, I wholeheartedly welcome the proposed LAX Master Plan.

Although the present management of LAX has done a respectable job of providing Los Angeles a viable means of access to air travel, the rapid growth of population and economy of Southern California have really stretched the limits of LAX's facilities. The peak traveling periods are quite nightmarish. With the advent of even larger jumbo jets, the international terminals are woefully inadequate.

I applaud your effort to this cause and look forward to a world-class airport that will make Los Angeles the most desirable gateway to the US.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01998 No Author Identified, Teamsters Local 986 1/18/2001

PC01998-1

Comment:

I am writing on behalf of Teamsters Union Local 986 and the 12,300 members of our Union, to inform you of our support for the modernization of Los Angeles International Airport. With the Master Plan for the airport being issued, it is time to have public review and approval of the plan so that modernization can begin.

We believe that the Master Plan's implementation is vital to the economic viability of the region over the next two decades and if we, as a community, do not move forward as soon as possible, the negative impacts will be tremendous. With the Los Angeles International Airport providing \$60 billion in economic output in Los Angeles and the region and directly related to over 4000,000 jobs, 50,000 at the airport itself, the potential for new growth is tremendous. However, if the citizens of Los Angeles wait too long, other regional airports, outside of California, will undermine our ability to provide jobs and economic viability in the future.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC01999 Bond, Willis Teamsters Local 986 1/18/2001

PC01999-1

Comment:

As Director of the Construction Division of Teamsters Local 986, one of the largest Teamsters Local Unions in the Los Angeles area, I cannot stress more to you how important it is to generate improvements to the Los Angeles International Airport.

The modernization of the LAX will result in thousands of much needed jobs, not to mention the growth in regional economy. Project Labor Agreements secure good wages and benefits for industry crafts. And once the modernization is completed, cargo, trade, and passenger demand will no doubt increase over the next twenty years.

3. Comments and Responses

Therefore, it is very much desired that the modernization of the LAX go forth keeping the interest of working men and women in mind.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02000	Hale, Gene	The Greater Los Angeles African-American Chamber of Commerce	1/18/2001
----------------	-------------------	---	------------------

PC02000-1

Comment:

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

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

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

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02001	Bui, Patrick	Vietnamese-American Chamber of Commerce in Orange County	6/25/2001
----------------	---------------------	---	------------------

PC02001-1

Comment:

On behalf of the Vietnamese-American Chamber of Commerce (V.A.C.C.O.C.), I would like to offer our support of the Los Angeles International Airport Recommended Master Plan. The LAX Master Plan will bring great economic opportunities to the communities around the airport such as Inglewood, central Los Angeles, North Long Beach and ultimately benefiting the entire Southern California region, including our Orange county area.

There is no doubt that the most exciting benefit for our communities will be the creation of hundreds of new jobs and small business opportunities.

We appreciate Los Angeles World Airports' willingness to work closely with the Vietnamese-American communities through our chamber. We fully agree with the contents of your LAX Master Plan, as to goals and objectives. When the plan is finally complete and implemented, I am confident that LAX will be an airport all of us can be proud of.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02002 Hwan Pyon, Chang Eun Sung USA International

PC02002-1

Comment:

WHEREAS, the Los Angeles Basin's economic health is dependent upon its transportation infrastructure and air transportation is a major component of that infrastructure;

WHEREAS, Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) is the region's leading airport and the West Coast's international gateway;

WHEREAS, LAX is a vital link for trade, tourism, cargo and business travel;

WHEREAS, air passenger demand in Southern California will double over the next 20 years to more than 157 million annual passengers;

WHEREAS, air cargo demand will more than triple to nearly 9 million tons annually by 2020;

WHEREAS, even with maximum expansion and utilization of other airport facilities and sites in Southern California, passenger and cargo volumes at LAX will continue to grow significantly;

WHEREAS, the last major renovation of LAX was completed in 1984 and, without modernization to handle projected passenger and cargo volumes, the airport faces future gridlock and severe inconvenience for passengers, businesses and neighbors;

WHEREAS, without the extensive traffic mitigation measures that are included in the Master Plan, freeway and surface street conditions around LAX will become intolerable;

WHEREAS, failure to modernize LAX could mean a loss to the Los Angeles basin of more than 200,000 jobs and billions of dollars annually in future economic activity;

WHEREAS, after extensive research and planning, a comprehensive Recommended Master Plan has been developed by Los Angeles World Airports' staff and consultants;

WHEREAS, the Recommended LAX Master Plan addresses major surface transportation concerns, as well as accommodating air passenger and cargo needs;

WHEREAS, this recommended plan is based on sound principles and careful reasoning;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Chang H. Pyon expresses strong support for the Recommended Master Plan and urges the Los Angeles Board of Airport Commissioners, the Los Angeles City Council and the next Mayor of the City of Los Angeles to move forward with timely approval of this plan.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02003 Salot, Martha None Provided

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02002; please refer to the response to comment letter PC02002.

PC02004 No Author Identified, United Association of 1/16/2001
Journeyman & Apprentices of
the Plumbing & Piping Industry

PC02004-1

Comment:

I am writing on behalf of the Plumbers and Fitters Local 761 and the 1,100 members of our Union, to inform you of our support for the modernization of Los Angeles International Airport. With the Master Plan for the airport being issued, it is time to have public review and approval of the plan so that modernization can begin.

We believe that the Master Plan's implementation is vital to the economic viability of the region over the next two decades and if we, as a community, do not move forward as soon as possible the negative impacts will be tremendous. With the Los Angeles International Airport providing \$60 billion in economic out put in Los Angeles and the region and directly related to over 400,000 jobs, 50,000 at the airport itself, the potential for new growth is tremendous. However, if the citizens of Los Angeles wait too long, other regional airports, outside of California, will undermine our ability to provide jobs and economic viability in the future.

The Master Plan has provided a model for handling the coming increase in passenger needs and the tremendous need that our high tech, medical manufacturing, medical service and financial service businesses have for air cargo transport. With the expected air cargo tonnage to reach 2.6 million tons by 2015 Los Angeles must have the capacity to handle the air craft that will import and export the cargo.

As you know, the Construction Craft Unions in this area and the Los Angeles/Orange Counties Building & Construction Trades have supported economic growth in Los Angeles by supporting construction projects that we believed were beneficial for all the citizens of the City. In reviewing the Master Plan we believe that the construction and modernization of Los Angeles International Airport under this plan will have an overriding benefit for all the people in Southern California and is vital to their interests.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02005 Supawong, Jennie US Pacific Financial Services, 6/19/2001
Inc.

PC02005-1

Comment:

Safety and convenience are the key issues that concern air travelers the most. Therefore, the LAX Master Plan is very much needed to renovate and update our Los Angeles International Airport.

As one of Southern California's growing number of immigrants, I certainly support this project to modernize the Los Angeles World Airport. LAX needs to increase its capacity for both passengers and cargo in order to match the region's population and economic growth. Population and economic expansion leads to the necessity of larger and better ports.

I congratulate you in your efforts to support the needs of Southern California's future air transportation. I am happy to assist Los Angeles World Airport in the modernizing of the LAX.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02006 Maguire, Cathy VICA 1/18/2001

PC02006-1

Comment:

The Valley Industry and Commerce Association, a business advocacy organization representing over 300 companies employing approximately 300,000 people, wholeheartedly supports LAWA's efforts to provide the transportation infrastructure necessary for the region to attain and enjoy its full economic potential.

At two major business events held recently in the Valley, Jack Kyser, the highly respected Chief Economist of the Economic Development Corporation of Los Angeles, advised "...that continued enjoyment of the wealth of the Pacific Area by Southern California was dependent upon a vital transportation infrastructure such as that embodied in Los Angeles International Airport..." Those sentiments were recently echoed by the California Department of Transportation in their "Statement of Issues for 2001."

VICA urges you to vigorously press for a Master Plan for LAX that will deliver no less than the full economic potential of that all important gateway to regional, national and world commerce.

Thank you, your colleagues on the Commission and the LAWA Staff for their efforts to deliver a Master Plan that will allow fulfillment of that goal.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02007 Salter, Marc None Provided 8/7/2001

PC02007-1

Comment:

NO LAX Expansion!

Go 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.

PC02008 Neumen, Dave None Provided 8/20/2001

PC02008-1

Comment:

I BELIEVE THAT LA SHOULD USE REGIONAL AIRPORTS SUCH AS PALMDALE & ONTARIO. MONEY SHOULD BE SPENT ON THE PALMDALE AIRPORT.

Response:

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

approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC02008-2

Comment:

AN INCREASE IN AIR TRAFFIC AT LA WOULD INCREASE THE LOCAL TRAFFIC IN WESTCHESTER & INCREASE THE SMOG IN THE AREA. WESTCHESTER PROPERTY SHOULD NOT BE USED TO EXPAND THE AIRPORT, THIS WOULD HURT THE CITY OF WESTCHESTER

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

PC02009

**Palkovic, Lawrence
A. & Diane C.**

None Provided

8/22/2001

PC02009-1

Comment:

As the region grows, it's obvious that the growth and development of such currently owned sites as Palmdale and Ontario, as well as El Toro to international carrier status will happen. But if these sites will achieve their potential - then why push further growth at LAX - which is so clearly limited by area and traffic flow? Any further growth at LAX would involve huge dislocations at existing neighborhoods. By taking homes, jobs, and schools it would needlessly destroy real peoples' lives - where expansion at any of these out lying sites, with much more acreage, would not.

Response:

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

PC02009-2

Comment:

LAX is already overtaxed, with more accidents just waiting to happen.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC02009-3

Comment:

And development of outlying sites like Palmdale (which could serve Bakersfield) and Ontario (for Riverside + San Bernardino) would serve both the travel and job needs of these places far better than development of LAX ever could.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02009-1.

PC02010 Powers, Eileen None Provided 8/27/2001

PC02010-1

Comment:

We - who live close to the airport are experiencing the possibility of a disaster. It is our hope that you will consider the safety of all concerned.

Response:

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

PC02011 Cotton, Mary Lou None Provided 8/26/2001

PC02011-1

Comment:

What the expanding LA metropolitan area needs is more regional airports.

Response:

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

PC02011-2

Comment:

Palmdale - Lancaster is the only logical site - it already exists and could serve the entire northern portion of LA County & the LA Basin, plus Kern County.

LAX should not be expanded until after Palmdale Airport is built.

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.

PC02012 Fähringel, Sheila None Provided 7/14/2001

PC02012-1

Comment:

OWNER/REALTOR SPECIALIZING IN MY ALREADY LOUD NEIGHBORHOOD TRANSPORT PLANES TO EL TORO!!

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. 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.

PC02012-2

The remainder of this comment letter is identical to form letter PFG; please refer to the responses to form letter PFG.

PC02013 Kasper, Mara None Provided 6/9/2001

PC02013-1

Comment:

Our traffic along Pershing and Culver Blvd. is an absolute mess! How can you add to this morning congestion? I live west of Pershing and now the Mon. Bch group is starting to get A.M. smart & short cut from Vista del Mar into our area & then over to Pershing!!

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00043. 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.

PC02013-2

Comment:

How are you going to deal w/ the air & noise pollution? Property values?

No to expansion.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

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.

PC02014 Waller, Carole None Provided 6/9/2001

PC02014-1

Comment:

I strongly oppose any plan to expand L.A.X. I am a local resident of Playa del Rey. My condominium building is adjacent to the airport property. We already have noise, & air pollution, and congested traffic to contend with from LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; 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.

PC02014-2

Comment:

This proposed plan, which creates a loop using Imperial Hwy, Pershing Dr and Westchester Parkway, which reduce my access to my home by 50%. There is already considerable traffic on weekday mornings, which bottle-necks on Culver Blvd to the North.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01454-1 regarding the proposed access plan design. Also, whenever access to a residential area would be affected by the plan, alternate access locations would be provided and in many instances enhanced, to maintain adequate access. See also Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential impacts on the community of Westchester and Response to Comment PC01086-4 regarding the future Pershing Drive to the west.

PC02014-3

Comment:

You are proposing changes which will seriously, negatively impact the quality-of-life in Westchester, Playa del Rey and surrounding neighborhoods

Response:

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

PC02014-4

Comment:

We will not tolerate any more intrusion into our homes & daily lives. We will hold the in-coming Mayor, James Hahn, to oppose this and all projects to expand LAX. We need a Regional Plan to accomodate 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.

PC02015 Sondheim, Gloria None Provided

PC02015-1

Comment:

In view of the negative conclusions by LA county chief administrative officer why are you still pushing this ancient 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.

PC02016 Rosow, Ursula None Provided 6/9/2001

PC02016-1

Comment:

OH - THE SMELL! THE POLLUTION! THE CROWDED TRAFFIC! THE WILDLIFE! THE CAUGHING CHILDREN! DO WE HAVE TO FIGHT THE CORPORATE GREED EVERY INCH OF THE WAY? IS DEMOCRACY (THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE) STILL VALUED? DO THE POWERS THAT BE HAVE ANY CONCIENCE AT ALL? DO OUR VOICES SOUND SO OUTRAGEOUS THAT THEY SHOULD BE IGNORED? THINK OF THE BASIC INTERESTS OF ALL AND CURB YOUR GREED. YOU HAVE ALREADY DEMAGED THE BALOONA WETLANDS. HOW MUCH MORE DO YOU WONT TO SQUEEZE OUT OF 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. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, wildlife impacts in Section 4.10, Biotic Communities, and Section 4.11, Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna, health and safety impacts in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and wetlands impacts in Section 4.12, Wetlands. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G, Appendix J, and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4, 7, and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E, Appendix S-H, and Technical Reports S-2, S-4, and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding odors. 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.

PC02017 Steeg, Kristina None Provided 6/9/2001

PC02017-1

Comment:

I am adamantly opposed to the expansion of the airport as detailed in the Master Plan. The resulting noise, pollution and traffic that will be borne by the surrounding communities is clearly beyond tolerable levels.

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,

3. Comments and Responses

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.

PC02017-2

Comment:

The need for expansion could be met by other regional airports. Virtually all major American cities have at least two large airports. Los Angeles should be the same. To do otherwise places a crushing burden on the thriving, tax-paying communities surrounding 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.

PC02018

Johnson, Paula

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC02018-1

Comment:

To expand LAX would likely make my home of 41 years (Westchester) a fire sale on my 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. Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding residential property values.

PC02018-2

Comment:

The families who have made this town our schools, churches, neighborhoods will be forced to leave - you have no idea how much noise we endure all of the noise and congestion. It is almost a bully tactic to push the towns of Westchester, Playa, El Segundo etc. to bow to the whims of the fat cats who just want to make \$\$\$. This is our HOMES -

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and impacts to schools in Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use, and Section 4.27, Schools. 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 and S-2 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-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation. 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.

PC02018-3**Comment:**

Go to Ontario or others plans - we will not stand for anything less.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to 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.

PC02019**Johnson, Dan****None Provided****6/9/2001****PC02019-1****Comment:**

I am strongly opposed to implementing the LAX master plan, as described, due to the huge negative impact it would have on my community. Westchester would change dramatically as a result of the expansion, and many of the exceptional citizens I know would leave 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-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC02019-2**Comment:**

As a 41 year resident of the South Bay and LAX area's, I ask that alternate plans be developed for consideration before making ANY decision on 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.

PC02020**Weisberg, Katherine****None Provided****6/9/2001****PC02020-1****Comment:**

Over the past years the air pollution has increased so much that the outside Maintenance has become a constant battle with Black soot stains. how can we have anymore.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC02020-2

Comment:

What is the health consequence on our children wellbeing? My son (12 year) has Asthma?!?! What about the thousand of children doing PE & sports in the local schools? Some days are so bad that teachers stop strenuous excersises! - Is that a healthy environment?

Response:

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

PC02020-3

Comment:

Traffic has become unbarable and specially the constant danger due to accidents between Rushing Shuttles & Taxis at our neighborhood intersections - we are at Risk every day!

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.

PC02020-4

Comment:

How can the existing problems be addressed before adding new ones?-

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding the mitigation of impacts associated with current activities at LAX.

PC02021

Margolin, Mary

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC02021-1

Comment:

No LAX Expansion Period! Save our Wonderful Neighborhood. Please put the extra air traffic in Ontario, Palmdale, el Toro, or John Wayne. NO LAX EXPANSION!! PLEASE!
NO LAX EXPRESSWAY!
NO AIRPORT BLVD EXIT!
NO ARBOR VITAE EXIT!
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. 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.

PC02022 Les, Mary Lou None Provided

PC02022-1

Comment:

It takes me long enough to drive to work, less than 5 miles. I do not want more traffic, which would also create more smog. Greed does many evil thing such as a "lie" about the future health & welfare of Westchester residents in respect to the proposed LAX plan.

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. 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 impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC02022-2

Comment:

It does not take a genius to know that this plan will create adverse impact in all the residents in Westchester. Reasons I do not want the proposed plan.

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

PC02022-3

Comment:

A. Would like to request a honest measure (single event) of noise levels.

Response:

Single event noise levels were disclosed in a series of tables in Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR. Those tables provided maximum daily noise levels at several hundred locations throughout the area and the amount of time on an average day that each location would be exposed to noise above 65, 75, 85 and 95 decibels. Please see Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-2.4. 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 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. According to the

3. Comments and Responses

most current research on the subject, single event metrics have limited use in determining long-term noise impacts.

PC02023 **Kanvec, Clare** **None Provided** **6/9/2001**

PC02023-1

Comment:

- 1- NO MORE TRAFFIC
- 2- NO MORE NOISE
- 3- DO NOT DESTROY WEST. AGAIN

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.

PC02023-2

Comment:

- 4- MEASURE SINGLE EVENT NOISE

Response:

Section 4.1, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR included information regarding single event noise. Additional information regarding the significance of single event noise was provided in Section 4.1, Noise, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02023-3

Comment:

- 5- NO MORE NEW FREEWAY ON OR OFF RAMPS

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 note that Alternative D, the LAWA staff preferred alternative, does not include the LAX Expressway or ring road.

PC02023-4

Comment:

- 6- NO MORE POLLUTION IN OUR COUNTY. MOVE IT TO ORANGE COUNTY, WE DID OUR PART

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to 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. 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.

PC02023-5**Comment:**

7- AIRPORT ALREADY POLLUTES OUR LIVES/HOMES/SCHOOLS.

Response:

Comment noted. Existing environmental conditions at, and around, LAX were described throughout Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, as are the environmental effects of each alternative currently being considered for the Master Plan.

PC02024**Koga, Cosdi****None Provided****6/9/2001****PC02024-1****Comment:**

Villaraigosa had the right idea. "Share the burden" and build new airports 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.

PC02024-2**Comment:**

LAX is smack in the middle of residential neighborhoods. Increasing the passenger load at LAX will INCREASE POLLUTION & CLOG UP the 405 worse than it already is. All the fancy poster boards about the various plans are baloney. More planes mean more pollution, more cars mean worse traffic.

Response:

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

PC02024-3**Comment:**

Our kids already have 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02024-4

Comment:

At night the polluted air sometimes smells so bad we choose not to take a walk and close all our windows.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00045 - 4 regarding the topic of odor.

PC02024-5

Comment:

Thick black dust collects on our cars & garden furniture. If I wanted to live someplace smelly & crowded I'd move back to New York.

Response:

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

PC02024-6

Comment:

Our politicians should stop victimizing us and choose quality of life over corporate greed.

Response:

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

PC02025 Spaulding, Raymond None Provided 6/9/2001

PC02025-1

Comment:

ON JAN. 1, 2000, NO NEW STAGE II AIRCRAFT WAS TO BE ALLOWED AIRPORT USAGE. JUST GRANDFATHERED JETS/AIRLINES, 727, UNITED, DELTA, ETC. AS THEY GET PHASED OUT. NOW THERE IS A NEW AIRLINE - "HARPOON," FLYING A STAGE II AIRCRAFT INTO & OUT OF THE AIRPORT. IT'S A SHORTENED VERSION OF A DC-9. SOMEONE IS BREAKING THEIR OWN RULES - AND CREATING MORE INSTEAD OF LESS NOISE AT THE AIRPORT!

Response:

Some of the aircraft that the commentor may be referring to include the Stage 3 hush-kitted DC-9's and 737-200's where the hush-kitting has been completed internally and cannot be distinguished externally. Nevertheless, all aircraft that weigh more than 75,000 pounds that operate at LAX have been retrofitted to meet the latest, most stringent noise level requirements currently adopted by the Federal government. A small percentage of the aircraft weighing less than 75,000 pounds continue to operate legally under earlier noise level guidelines. Please see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures and enforcement, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-7.6.

PC02026 Bholat, M. None Provided 6/9/2001

PC02026-1

Comment:

1 INCREASED AND CONCENTRATED AIR AND WATER POLLUTIONS.

2 INCREASED AIR TRAFFIC WOULD RESULT IN THOUSAND MORE VEHICLES ADDED TO ALREADY GRIDLOCKED STREETS AND FREEWAYS.

3 EXPANDED ARTERIAL HIGHWAY PROJECTS WOULD CUT THROUGHOUT NEIGHBORHOODS.

4 CONCERN ABOUT AIR TRAFFIC SAFETY DUE TO OVERCROWDED SKIES.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, water quality impacts in Section 4.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, safety impacts in Section 4.24.3, Safety, traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and community disruption impacts in Section 4.4.4, Community Disruption and Alteration of Surface Transportation Patterns. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4, 6, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2, S-4, and S-5 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PC02026-2

Comment:

5 BAD FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, INCLUDING OUR ALREADY THREATENED COASTAL WETLANDS.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed wetlands impacts in Section 4.12, Wetlands, and coastal zone impacts in Section 4.14, Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting information provided in Appendix J2 of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02026-3

Comment:

6 BAD FOR COMMUNITIES & NEIGHBORHOODS

7 BAD FOR LOS ANGELES

Response:

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

PC02026-4

Comment:

8 SHOULD BE EXTENTION OF OTHER AIRPORT SUCH AS JHON WAYE, ONTORIO, AND OTHERS FOR INTERNATION FLIGHT SERVICES.

Response:

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

PC02027	Smith, Daniel & Kathy Bristow	None Provided	6/9/2001
----------------	--	----------------------	-----------------

PC02027-1

Comment:

Please do not expand LAX. We believe LAWA should work together with the regional commercial airports that LAWA does not own to create a comprehensive regional solution to the passenger and cargo growth needs of the area.

We live in the Westchester area near LAX and believe the airport should not be expanded and a regional solution should be implemented. Our area lives under the great burden of environmental impacts of LAX, including noise, pollution, traffic, and the danger of a possible air traffic disaster. As Los Angeles expands, it is only fair that other areas of the community shoulder their share of the burden.

Additionally, given the enormous geographic area of Los Angeles and the distribution of population and travel destinations throughout the area, it is only logical and fair to travelers that interational travel capabilities be distributed throughout the region. Why must international visitors to Disneyland fly first to LAX? Since population growth is expected in the Inland Empire and North LA County, why not serve those areas with international airports?

We understand that it would be easier from an operational perspective for LAWA, the FAA and the airlines and cargo carriers to expand LAX. We also understand that the economy of this area needs expanded air traffic capacity. However, we believe LAWA, the FAA and the city government should work harder to find creative regional solutions to our growth needs without unfairly burdening the community surrounding 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. 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.

PC02027-2

Comment:

The environmental burdens our community experiences will only increase with an expanded LAX. These include:

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.

PC02027-3**Comment:**

1) Noise: With current traffic levels it is impossible to enjoy the normal use of the outside areas of a home in our neighborhood (backyard, etc.)

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.

PC02027-4**Comment:**

2) Traffic: There are already thousands of trips in and out of LAX on Sepulveda Blvd. And the 405. These roads can be improved under your plan, but the volume of traffic and pollution of that traffic will increase dramatically with an expansion of LAX.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. See also Topical Response TR-ST-2, regarding the congestion management program, and TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts

PC02027-5**Comment:**

3) Pollution: The pollution surrounding LAX is severe and well documented. It is unfair to subject our community to more pollution.

Response:

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

PC02027-6**Comment:**

We encourage LAWA, the FAA and the airlines to avoid the the solution that is more expedient for you (an expansion of LAX) and to work harder to implement a regional solution which more equitably distributes the environmental burdens of increased air traffic throughout the region. Please expand airport capacity in other areas where population is growing dramatically and don't place all the burden unfairly on the communities surrounding 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.

PC02028 Jacobson, Brent None Provided 6/9/2001

PC02028-1

Comment:

I just spent my life savings to move into a cute little neighborhood in Westchester. I moved in around November and I got to experience what happens when you (LAX) reverse traffic due to bad weather. Don't get me wrong, I bought the house knowing you (LAX) was there, I just don't want to see it get any worse. I puzzles me how so many other airports like Tokyo have placed their main airports outside of town. How does your plan think more airport can e shoved into an already congested area. The airport is already running at a capacity above what the area can comfortably handle.

Response:

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

PC02029 Harrington, Margaret None Provided 6/9/2001

PC02029-1

Comment:

The air traffic needs of the LA region need a much more inclusive regional solution.

Response:

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

PC02029-2

Comment:

The surface transportation system from LAX to the rest of the region, especially the streets & freeways in the immediate area, cannot accommodate the anticipated expansion, even with the mitigations proposed.

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

3. Comments and Responses

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.

PC02029-3

Comment:

In addition, the over-crowding of the air space around LAX is a substantial concern.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00656-2 regarding the airspace capacity for the Master Plan alternatives. Also, please note that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

PC02030

Kasabian, Janet

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC02030-1

Comment:

Taxpayer dollars should be spent to establish outlying airports (ie Palmdale, Ontario) - Traffic mitigation would not be an issue -

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding 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. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC02031

Doherty, Mary

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC02031-1

Comment:

We cannot tolerate any more expansion in this area - ENUF!

Use 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02032 Bray, Sandra None Provided 6/9/2001

PC02032-1

Comment:

1. THE EIR DOES NOT SERIOUSLY CONSIDER A TRULY REGIONAL AIRPORT 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.

PC02032-2

Comment:

2. THE EXPANSION PLANS WILL MORE THAN DOUBLE CARGO ACTIVITY, THUS MORE TRUCK TRAFFIC AND DIESEL EMISSIONS FOR US 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.

PC02032-3

Comment:

3. EVERY MORNING I HAVE A FILM OF OIL ON MY PATIO FURNITURE, CAR AND OBVIOUSLY MY ROOF. THIS WILL INCREASE WITH EXPANSION

Response:

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

PC02032-4

Comment:

4. IRRVERSABLE DAMAGE WILL BE DONE TO HOMES, COMMUNITIES AND OUR BUSINESS DISTRICT AGAIN AS HAS BEEN DONE REPEATEDLY IN LAX-WESTCHESTER-PLAYA DEL REY HISTORY.

Response:

Comment noted. 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 the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA's Staff new 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 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 LAX Northside proposed under Alternative D, include 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 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 described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6.5), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, in contrast to the other build alternatives, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new Preferred Alternative), does not include any acquisition within the Westchester Business District. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential impacts on the community of Westchester.

PC02032-5

Comment:

IT IS TIME TO STOP AND BUILD UP AND UTILIZE OTHER AIRPORTS!
ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02032-1 above.

PC02033

Nathan, Barbara

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC02033-1

Comment:

Seriously flawed study has been done on these documents. There are other airports that can handle the proposed expansion of LAX and I strongly request that another study be created extending airport use to 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.

PC02033-2

Comment:

The concentration of personal property, and existing traffic in the Westchester area makes LAX development impossible. Air quality will deteriorate farther with expansion.

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 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.

PC02033-3

Comment:

Safety continues to be a problem in this neighborhood and expansion of the airport increases the problem of safety.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed aviation safety in Section 4.24.3, Safety, law enforcement in Section 4.26.2, Law Enforcement, and traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1.

PC02033-4

Comment:

There are other locations for air traffic & business and while jobs will be created with airport expansion those same jobs will be created by developing other airports NOT LAX. Wide open spaces are available in Palmdale & at El Toro & at Ontario. Expand there NOT at LAX!!

Response:

Please refer to Response to Comment PC02033-1. 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.

PC02034	Syta, Tom	None Provided	6/9/2001
----------------	------------------	----------------------	-----------------

PC02034-1

Comment:

What happens to Nielson Park (Nielsen Field) under Alternative C?

Is there a replacement location for AYSO Soccer, Softball, etc.?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01014-3 regarding expansion of Carl E. Nielson Youth Park.

PC02035	Wexler, Jeffrey	None Provided	6/9/2001
----------------	------------------------	----------------------	-----------------

PC02035-1

Comment:

It is essential that airports other than LAX -- including Palmdale, Ontario, the proposed El Toro airport, Burbank, and Long Beach -- expand their passenger flight capabilities. It is unfair to require Westchester -- which has already been devastated by past airport expansion -- to bear the brunt of 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.

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.

PC02035-2**Comment:**

Further expansion at LAX must be accomplished with minimal disruption to local businesses and residences.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02035-3**Comment:**

Traffic should be mitigated through the Green Line expansion and rapid transit, rather than through freeway and road construction that will destroy existing homes and businesses.

Response:

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

PC02036**Gauthier, Don****None Provided****6/9/2001****PC02036-1****Comment:**

To the F.A.A.:

Why not limit the number and frequency of flights?

Response:

Comment noted. It is each airline's decision to schedule and operate flights with their choice of aircraft. The decisions airlines make as to where and when to operate and their aircraft are largely based on the markets they serve, passenger and cargo demands, and profitability. In other words, airlines typically fly where and when passengers want to fly to remain fiscally viable.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02037 Junod, Mary None Provided 8/20/2001

PC02037-1

Comment:

We have been residents of Westchester since 1947. We chose the area because of the weather, the suburban atmosphere and a wonderful place to raise a family. LAX was a small airport east of Sepulveda. The air was clear; traffic no problem.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02037-2

Comment:

How things have changed! Why do we have to bear all the problems of growth? Why can't Orange County take care of its own with ready made El Toro or John Wayne expansion?

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.

PC02037-3

Comment:

Why can't Palmdale handle the cargo?

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.

PC02037-4

Comment:

Ontario would welcome more business.

Response:

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

PC02037-5

Comment:

There are plenty of solutions - why are you insisting on expanding LAX and causing so many serious problems in our area. What are you getting out of it?

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed environmental impacts both adverse and beneficial in Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures.

PC02037-6**Comment:**

I look forward to receiving your answers to these questions.

Response:

In accordance with the provisions of NEPA and CEQA, written responses to all comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR are provided herein as part of this Final EIS/EIR. The Final EIS/EIR has been made available for public review at FAA and LAWA and through distribution to public libraries throughout the area, and is available electronically at www.laxmasterplan.org. Responses to individual comments included in this comment letter are provided above.

PC02038**Coleman, Cecileo****None Provided****8/15/2001****PC02038-1****Comment:**

My concerns are the aircraft noise mitigation program boundaries based on 1992 65CNEL contour. Where I live is out side of that boundary, we hear a small sonic boom type noise & movement of the houses each time the aircrafts are heading toward our house. There is a school across the street which is effected by this sound.

Response:

This is not a comment on the Draft EIS/EIR. However, please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels, Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding how to file noise complaints and how approval of the LAX Master Plan would revise the ANMP, Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding vibration effects, and Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding new analyses contained in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR to address single event noise impacts that result in classroom disruption.

PC02038-2**Comment:**

We are concerned about the effects these noises have on the insects, birds and animals in this area. There also seems to be a larger infestation of termites in this area.

Response:

Section 4.10, Biotic Communities, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR discussed potential indirect impacts to sensitive biotic communities and sensitive faunal species from noise levels. Termite infestation is associated with construction of wooden structures, especially houses. None of the build Alternatives described in the Draft EIS/EIR include construction or maintenance of wooden structures of substantial size. Furthermore, termites have not been observed within the State-designated sensitive habitat at LAX. The Los Angeles/El Segundo Dunes does not contain any large wooden structures that could potentially attract termites. Discussion of termite infestation, therefore, is not relevant to the LAX Master Plan.

PC02038-3**Comment:**

Concerned citizens left out of the noise mitigation program

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The noise impact area which determines residential uses eligible for sound insulation under the ANMP 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, Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4, regarding how eligibility for soundproofing is determined and Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.14 for a description of how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

PC02039 Hyra, Joan None Provided 8/29/2001

PC02039-1

Comment:

For decades our family has had to live with the noise, pollution, and traffic caused by LAX in its present state. If it expands, we will have to deal with the negative health effects of even more noise, pollution, and traffic. Southern California needs another international 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 human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PC02040 King, Andrea None Provided 8/23/2001

PC02040-1

Comment:

According to the sample data presentation tables in section 2.2.2, quantification of the noise impact amount of people affected, in the document, "Guidelines for Noise Impact Analysis", I find the conclusions alarming.

The total population from these three tables, 6, 7, & 8, is 1475 (6 = 501, 7 = 362, 8 = 612). On these tables, the reference is 83 people will suffer some hearing loss from the increased noise level. In addition, it states that only 111 people will complain about the change in noise level. These numbers 83 (lost hearing) and 111 (complaints) seem low. If 5% of the affected population suffers hearing loss, then complaints will be greater than 7% (111). More people will be impacted by the victims of hearing loss, and thereby, the number of complaints will rise. Instead of 7% of the population complaining, you will see a complaint rate closer to 13%.

How can the City of Los Angeles impliment a master plan for LAX expansion, when it knows 5% of the affected population will suffer hearing loss? How can that be acceptable?

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC02041 King, Andrea None Provided 8/23/2001

PC02041-1

Comment:

When I requested the document, "Guidelines for Noise Impact Analysis", I was unable to view the section 2.1.3., (Determining the Population affected by the Noise of the proposed project) as page 30 and 31 were missing. Page 29 was printed with page 32 on the backside.

As a resident of Westchester, noise is a major concern. According to the master plan, the north runway extension will be parallel to my house.

The information you are providing the public is incomplete.

Response:

The document "Guidelines For Noise Impact Analysis" is not a component of the Draft EIS/EIR. With respect to the remainder of the comment, please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review.

PC02042 King, Robert None Provided 8/24/2001

PC02042-1

Comment:

Why the Increase in Asthma?

The world resources institute has shown that "we have good reason to be suspicious of the contemporary role of air pollutants. . . in the cause or increase in Asthma. I have recently been diagnosed w/asthma and I believe that increased air traffic would further endanger my health. The dumping of fuel (Benzine?) by aircraft has done substantial damage to the roof of one of my cars and I can only imagine what it has done to my lungs.

Response:

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

PC02043 Junod, George None Provided 8/20/2001

PC02043-1

Comment:

After living in the Westchester area for over 50 years and watching the airport transform a quiet, pleasant area into a noisy, polluted air and traffic congestion mess, I say stop any further taking of homes and adding noise and other problems to our area and neighboring communities.

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, residential and business relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in 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-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. As discussed in TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester business district. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

PC02043-2

Comment:

Besides all the reasons, and good, ones, you have heard for altering the strategy, there is one more I would like to add. Why is it that butterflies, fowl and other forms of life can have hundreds of acres of land and sand dunes set aside (and in some cases restored) but we humans just keep getting pushed around. Noise pollution bothers us too; as does dirty air, traffic congestion, and other related conditions.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC02043-3

Comment:

Its time elected officials pay attention to the wishes of the people. We also know who puts non elected people on boards, so we know who to blame. Let some other areas that have airport expansion possibilities share the load.

Response:

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

PC02044

Putt, Ward

None Provided

8/29/2001

PC02044-1

Comment:

I have been a resident of Westchester since 1963, and during that time I have seen my home at 9122 Croyden condemned and bought by the Airport. Initially, no jumbo jets were to be allowed to use LAX, a restriction soon circumvented by LAX. Over the 38 years I've lived in Westchester there has been a constant attrition to the properties and the peacefulness of the area.

Response:

Comment noted. Please also see Topical Responses TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, and TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

PC02044-2**Comment:**

One can not use Century, or Sepulveda at certain times of the day because of LAX congestion. If one must use the airport for a flight, it is usually impossible to find parking. The perimeter driveways at the airport are virtually at a standstill for much of the day.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02044-3**Comment:**

The businesses along Sepulveda have suffered. Many stores are vacant in large part because the airport previous expansion had nearly halved the population of Westchester and Playa del Rey, by taking many houses and dwelling units.

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.

PC02044-4**Comment:**

The increased noise, air pollution, and traffic resulting from further LAX expansion will cause ever decreasing home prices and will force many to move from the area.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding the effects of LAX on property values.

PC02044-5**Comment:**

While there is major effort to preserve the local wetlands and the habitat for the El Segundo blue butterfly, no such concern is felt for the endangered species, residents of Westchester, Playa del Rey and Marina del Rey.

Response:

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

PC02044-6**Comment:**

The expansion of LAX should be limited to improving access and parking at the existing facility.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02045 Habib, Magi None Provided 8/22/2001

PC02045-1

Comment:

I DO NOT support the 'Master 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.

PC02045-2

Comment:

I do however support other effective alternatives like:

- Developing a major airport at Palmdale, LA County, to provide full service for Cargo and passenger traffic. This will support travel needs for all residents of SFV, Santa Clarita, Newhall and the Antelope Valley. We all know that Los Angeles owns 17,500 Acres in Antelope Valley (5 times of LAX).

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale for a discussion of multi-airport markets, airline economics and passenger choice.

PC02045-3

Comment:

- Supporting transportation projects such as high-speed rail lines and widening of freeways, which should improve access between and around regional airports.

Response:

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

PC02045-4

Comment:

- Expanding and developing Ontario Airport.

Response:

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

PC02045-5

Comment:

This is the correct way to go, we should plan for 2010 and beyond and not a short-term fix.

Response:

Comment noted. However, the LAX Master Plan extends to the year 2015.

PC02046 Habib, Hazem None Provided 8/22/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02045; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC02045.

PC02047 Krause, Gaile None Provided 8/27/2001

PC02047-1

Comment:

Best option for residents in our area is to take cargo areas to expand in.

Any part of plan requiring removal of homes is bad for the community.

Noise level is high already - if the airport is closer, it will be worse.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, land use impacts in Section 4.2, Land Use, and relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1 and 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1 and S-3 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-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition.

PC02048 Cox, Julie None Provided 8/1/2001

PC02048-1

Comment:

The "benefits" of LAX expansion seem to be mainly economic, affecting area businesses and jobs, especially during the buildout period of expansion. Yet, our local Chamber of Commerce opposes expansion because "expansion threatens the entire local business community as well as the residents who are a significant part of the customer base that supports local businesses." (Galanter Newaletter, 7-23-01)

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socioeconomics, and relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses. 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. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC02048-2

Comment:

The "risks" of LAX expansion seem to be mainly to the health of Westchester residents and their families, and to those living in the adjacent and surrounding communities.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. 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-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding impacts to human health. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC02048-3

Comment:

These risks arise from daily violations of the federal Clean Air and Clean Water Act and Their Amendments. This strongly suggests that the degradation of air and water quality cannot be mitigated. It's important to remember that today's air pollution will be tomorrow's (or the next day's, etc.) water pollution.

Response:

The commentor's mention of a connection between air pollution and water pollution is an oversimplification of an extremely complex and long-term process. The water bodies of the Earth serve both as sources and sinks of contaminants in the global cycle of carbon, nitrogen, sulfur, and other elements. For example, while oxides of nitrogen may be transported from the atmosphere to the surface of a water body via chemical transformation to nitrates followed by wet or dry deposition, or simply be absorbed at the air-water interface as nitrogen dioxide, these same compounds can also be released into the atmosphere from the water body at a later time. The atmospheric and hydrologic dynamics of these complex cycles are beyond the scope of this forum.

PC02048-4

Comment:

Nor can the anticipated increases in surface and air traffic and their degradative impacts be mitigated.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, 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 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-2, S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC02048-5

Comment:

In spite of this, we are being assured by the advocates of LAX expansion that the increases in annual passenger loads and overall traffic will result in decreases in adverse impacts on health.

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.

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-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

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. 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.

PC02048-6

Comment:

The "improvements" claimed by proponents of LAX expansion have little to do with the "safety" of expanded LAX operations. (Galanter Newsletter)

Response:

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

PC02048-7

Comment:

In addition to worsened air and water quality, our health will also be negatively affected by the increased stress induced by rising noise levels. This kind of stress has been shown to damage immune system responses in animals and humans.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise.

PC02048-8

Comment:

I don't think these negative impacts on our health are worth the unsupported claims of rising economic and business impacts.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix F and Technical Reports 5 and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D and Technical Report S-3 and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02048-9

Comment:

I would appreciate your answers and responses to my implied questions and concerns.

Response:

Responses to individual comments included in this comment letter are provided above.

PC02049 Jenkins, Lillian None Provided 8/23/2001

PC02049-1

Comment:

I must express my thoughts about the airport plans to expand its current capacity both in space and passengers.

I am not telling you anything you don't know about the effect this will have on the surrounding neighborhoods but I must implore you to think about the future.

As Los Angeles starts to reinvent itself, tearing down old one story buildings and replacing them with 5 and 6 stories, as we are starting to see along the Lincoln corridor and in Marina Del Rey. Our population is also going to soar rendering the airport, even with new expansions, obsolete and inadequate within a short time.

It is time for you and your committee to be strong. You have an awesome responsibility and an awesome decision. It is time to tell the airlines no more added schedules at LAX. We must tell those in government, who are in charge, that LAX can not accommodate anymore new airlines.

It is time to look to Palmdale as our regional airport.

If not now, when?

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to 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.

PC02050 Downing, Patricia None Provided 8/24/2001

PC02050-1

Comment:

I oppose the LAX Master Plan because it proposes LAX expansion but fails to include a plan for regional airports.

It is time to abandon the LAX Master Plan and take a regional approach to airport planning.

My detailed comments are attached.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to 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. Please see Responses to Comments PC02050-1 through PC02050-10 below.

PC02050-2

Comment:

I oppose the LAX Master Plan because it proposes LAX expansion but fails to include a plan for regional airports, especially Ontario and Palmdale airports.

The plan does not manage long term growth and the proposed ring road and expressway will require acquisition of over 140 homes and 200 businesses in Westchester. People near LAX already bear a disproportionate share of the traffic, noise and pollution. What happens when this is not enough? Demands will continue. LAX is landlocked and is only 3500 acres. We can't just keep eating away at the surrounding 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. Alternative D does not include the ring road or LAX Expressway. 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-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; 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.

PC02050-3

Comment:

We need to go where the property already exists - Palmdale and Ontario. Los Angeles already owns 18,000 acres in Palmdale - five times more land than 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. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC02050-4

Comment:

Palmdale Airport which is bigger than Dallas/Fort Worth will soon launch a marketing campaign to attract airline flights and passengers. And to those that say it is so far out - so what? Denver Intl is "out there" and remember many airports that are now in the midst of communities were once "out there".

3. Comments and Responses

Palmdale should assume a larger share of the region's growing air traffic. Palmdale Airport already has runways and terminals and could begin passenger and cargo service today. It can support 26 flights per day right now. It will provide a more convenient airport for travelers from the San Fernando Valley and northern parts of LA county. Plus the people of Palmdale want this new airport!

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.

PC02050-5

Comment:

The lack of high speed access has been a hurdle in the past. Now the State plans to build a high speed rail which would provide a direct link between Palmdale and downtown LA. Support this transportation project. With efficient rail service into Palmdale there would be good connectivity and Palmdale can serve the growing population in North LA County through new agreements with airlines and assistance of FAA.

Response:

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

PC02050-6

Comment:

Service can be increased at Ontario. It already has Metrolink service to Union station and is an ideal partner for LAX. Ontario Airport hosts about 7 MAP, has 2 runways with an option of adding a 3rd. It could handle over 20 MAP if legislation would override its AQMD restriction of 12M. Ontario, a region of rapidly growing population, wants expanded airport traffic and is more convenient to many areas of Orange County.

Response:

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

PC02050-7

Comment:

Getting airlines to use these airports is another matter. Airlines say demand is not high enough to profitably increase service to Ontario or to begin at Palmdale. Only FAA has the clout to bring the airlines to the bargaining table and encourage them to use other airlines. The FAA needs to make it worthwhile for the airlines to make it work. One way might be to repeal the 59% increase in landing fees at Ontario.

Response:

The FAA is not responsible for setting passenger ticket prices or airline airport fees. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-2 for a discussion of the airline response to market demand, deregulation, and airport pricing models.

PC02050-8

Comment:

LAX is operating at 68 MAP. The last expansion was only supposed to handle 40 MAP and then they would go to Palmdale.

The projection is that passenger demand will grow about 53% to 98M by 2015. LAWA projects 146 MAP in the region by 2015 and SCAG predicts 157M by 2020. If the 2000 census figures were used the increase would be much higher. Thus the \$12 billion expansion would be inadequate before completed. We've already spent \$60 Million. Let's cut our losses and abandon all proposals. The census also shows population density increasing in outlying areas. Therefore those airports must play a larger role in absorbing growing demand.

Response:

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

PC02050-9

Comment:

In addition, they want to expand to 4.2 mil tons of air cargo to meet future demand which means more trucks, more flights and heavier, louder aircraft. Both passenger and cargo traffic must be distributed throughout the region. As long as we still have international flights to the LA area, businesses won't lose business to other cities but without a regional plan we risk losing our place as the west coast international leader.

The LAX master plan is a short term, quick fix approach which fails to provide the long term planning our region needs. We need to replace it with something workable. Southern California must adopt a future-proof plan. We need to commit to a regional solution to meet demand for passenger and cargo services. The area would be best served by having 3 to 4 major airports, each capable of handling 20-40 MAP with capacity for future expansion. We have more than enough airports to form a regional system. We need to adopt a regional plan that fairly shares the benefits and burdens of air transportation across our region.

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 PC00599-54 for more information about cargo activity.

PC02050-10

Comment:

The bottom line is no action at LAX period! Enough is enough! The time has come to cut our losses at LAX and abandon the master plan. The time to go for a regional approach to airport planning is 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02051 Wiltz, Pamela None Provided 8/2/2001

PC02051-1

Comment:

I visited the LAWA website recently and would like to address the problem of noise in the Westchester area.

When I moved here 7 years ago, yes...I knew there was an airport here. But I sat out in front of the home I was to purchase and listened for airport noise. At all times of the day and night for several weeks I did this.

I can tell you that there has been a substantial increase in noise levels during the last several years. My windows rattle and rumble. I have to stop my phone conversations.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. However, please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. Noise impacts on the community of Westchester are discussed in Topical Response TR-LU-2. Regarding increase in noise levels at the commentor's property (located at 8000 Naylor Avenue), to qualify for soundproofing, properties must be exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels. As shown on Figure S1 in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, and Figure S4.2-2 in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, this property is located outside the 1992 fourth quarter, 1996 baseline, and Year 2000 65 CNEL contour. Also relative to single event noise levels that result in nighttime awakening (as established by the 94 dBA SEL noise contour), under the 1996 baseline, this property is located within the 94 dBA SEL contour and under Year 2000 conditions this property is outside the 94 dBA SEL, as shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

See also Topical Responses TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration, TR-LU-3 regarding residential sound insulation under the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP), TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels, and TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC02051-2

Comment:

I've been awakened in the middle of the night. My children sometimes can't get to sleep due to high noise levels.

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.

PC02051-3

Comment:

I don't want to live in a soundproofed "box" trapped in my house without being able to open the windows and doors. And I shouldn't have to.

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.

PC02051-4**Comment:**

The LAWA website indicates that there is a noise hotline which responds quickly to complaints. I can tell you that's just NOT true. There is no longer a person manning the line...it's a recording that takes a message and there is no response to our complaints.

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 and addressed by LAWA Noise Management staff, then the responses (broken down by date, time and block address) are sent to the requesting community members. LAWA has recently installed a PASSUR system to assist the community in tracking aircraft operations. By going to the LAWA website www.lawa.org and entering the Noise Management section, community members can specifically identify LAX operations that cross their community. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding additional information regarding filing noise complaints and LAWA's handling of noise complaints.

PC02051-5**Comment:**

I was told years ago that noisier aircraft were being phased out, but residents around the airport have not noticed a decrease in noise, but rather an increase as more cargo comes in and out of LAX.

Response:

Large aircraft that do not meet the FAA's most stringent noise level limits were phased out of the fleet effective December 31, 1999. Large aircraft are allowed to make more noise than smaller aircraft, and the large aircraft operating at LAX have been flying there for many years. These large aircraft were initially constructed to meet the current noise level limitations. Please see Topical Response TR-N-7, particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-7.6, regarding ANCA phase-out of Stage 2 aircraft and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PC02051-6**Comment:**

I enjoy living near an airport. In fact, it's pretty exciting seeing planes take off and land. But enough is enough. This area will be unbearable if expansion plans go forward. To double the amount of air traffic that this airport was intended to handle is foolhardy. This is a flawed plan that will not be a solution to the problem.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC02052 Toedter, Seth None Provided 8/10/2001

PC02052-1

Comment:

I'm confused. My truck couldn't pass California emission standards and it cost me a substantial amount of a paycheck to fix the problem. But I understand that the airport - Los Angeles - is a primary polluter of toxins, but that they don't answer to anyone. So....I can't pollute, but the airport can?

Response:

Comment noted. Aircraft engines are required to meet USEPA emission standards. Ground support equipment at the airport required to meet USEPA and CARB emission standards for off-road mobile sources. Stationary sources at the airport (power plants, maintenance facilities, etc) are required to comply with SCAQMD regulations.

PC02052-2

Comment:

If there is any question about whether the airplanes actually pollute, you are invited to take a look at the soot and "black stuff" all over my patio, truck, plants. I never saw this stuff when I lived in other parts of Los Angeles.

Response:

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

PC02052-3

Comment:

How can the airport continue to say that there is (and will be) little impact to the surrounding area if air traffic increases? There is already and impact and it would be nice to have some answers.

Response:

Comment noted. Environmental impacts of each Alternative are addressed throughout Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Consequences and Mitigation Measures, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with the supporting documentation provided in the related appendices and technical reports. 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.

PC02053 Howell, S. None Provided 8/1/2001

PC02053-1

Comment:

Traffic, traffic everywhere. That's what comes to mind when people think of Los Angeles. Is that really what we're projecting to the rest of the country? Impassable freeways and unbreathable air?

All of us are concerned about the impact of an expansion at Los Angeles International Airport. As goes the 405 freeway, so goes our city.

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

3. Comments and Responses

Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC02053-2

Comment:

I recently drove from Brentwood on the Westside to visit a friend in Orange County. On a Friday. Need I say more? My question to you is, where will you put all the additional cars that the proposed expansion will generate? Although I have followed this issue through it's meager coverage in the local media, I've not under-stood what the traffic plan would include. Is there a traffic plan? At one point, I was told by an official in Mayor Riordan's office that they planned to use the carpool lane of the 405 for all airport traffic. Surely you jest !!

Response:

The traffic plan was summarized in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Chapter 3, Alternatives, and in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. See also Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology and results.

PC02053-3

Comment:

And speaking of Orange County. My friend whom I visited does a lot of international travel. She would much prefer to NOT make the long commute to LA to take a flight.

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.

PC02053-4

Comment:

For a city that is so longing to be a leader why have you chosen such a backward step? This additional traffic certainly seems like a plan for disaster instead of progress.

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-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PC02054

Lipp, Susan

None Provided

7/21/2001

PC02054-1

Comment:

I have to say that you folks have done an amazing job keeping all of this secret from the citizens of Los Angeles. Although I live in the valley, I do have friends who live in the airport area.

Response:

The project team has provided extensive media, newsletter and neighborhood outreach. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review. Also, please visit the web site, www.laxmasterplan.org.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02054-2

Comment:

Traffic on the 405 south of the 10 frwy. Is always horrendous. There is no way to guage how long a trip to LAX will take on any given day. How is it that the expansion of the airport will benefit all of us???

The impact on traffic alone will be an added burden to a city that is verging on gridlocks and has not addressed it's traffic issues. The 405 is a major artery running through the entire west side of our city. I can't help wondering what magical plan you people have for mitigating the enormous burden to an already burdened system.

We (the public) have not heard anything about how you plan to address this traffic issue that affects ALL of the city.

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.

PC02054-3

Comment:

It appears that your "build it and they will come" attitude is prevailing. Does Los Angeles really need to expand LAX??? NO ! Just as other major cities have, we need other options, a regional plan, a sharing of the burden with all those folks who are currently happy to fly in and out of LA.

Response:

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

PC02054-4

Comment:

This plan looks like a band-aid for a boo-boo that's too big to fix.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02055 Meister, Cynthia None Provided 8/21/2001

PC02055-1

Comment:

Since I drive all over LA as part of my job, I feel qualified to comment on the impact an airport "modernization" will have. Freeway traffic here in LA (as well as surface streets) is a constant source of stress. I own a business and I'm not following the logic as to how the airport is good for my business. Quite the opposite is true. I lose money every time I sit in traffic or try to judge how long it will take to pick up a client at the airport.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, health in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 2, 3, 5, and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2, S-3, and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02055-2

Comment:

As the daughter of a pilot, I'm well aware that this airport is not a safe place, but expanding the current facility is not the answer either. This will only be a temporary "fix" to a problem that all of the area needs to solve - not just those of us who live near the 405 freeway.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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 impacts in Section 4.24.3, Safety, with supporting data in Technical Reports 14 and S-9b. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC02056 Devitis, Joanne None Provided 8/20/2001

PC02056-1

Comment:

My husband and I are very concerned about the increased noise from the airport that we've noticed since we moved here 4 years ago.

Response:

The noise levels at Grid Point K08, located near the commentor's residence, were computed for the environmental baseline (1996) and for Year 2000. They indicate that the CNEL at the site declined 1 decibel between 1996 and 2000, and the average amount of time above 65 decibels from aircraft declined from 12 minutes per day to less than one minute. 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 Appendices D and S-C. Also, please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increases.

PC02056-2

Comment:

It's hard to enjoy our pool and backyard barbecues with planes disrupting the quiet of a Sunday afternoon.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC02056-3

Comment:

What a great neighborhood this is and how sad that you think Westchester is insignificant enough to "sacrifice" for greed and profit.

We had no idea that there were plans underway to enlarge the airport when we moved here. We knew there was an airport here & that was O.K., but the plan you propose looks frightening in it's scope.

We urge you to find alternate solutions to expansion of an airport that is already impacting us with excessive 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. 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-4 regarding noise mitigation. 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.

PC02057 Sherman, Lila None Provided 8/20/2001

PC02057-1

Comment:

It's time for the airport commission to realize that one airport cannot cover the entire L.A. & surrounding areas. There needs to be sharing of other airports. At the rate they are thinking Westchester, Inglewood, El Segundo & where else we don't know will be done away with eventually - L.A. owns Ontario & Palmdale, its time for some decent thinking not greed. It is easy to not care when you live some place else - If any of them lived in Westchester or areas surrounding the airport, I'm sure it would be looked at differently.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to 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.

PC02058 Wilson, Craig None Provided 8/25/2001

PC02058-1

Comment:

I oppose any expansion of LAX and/or the freeways & on-ramps near LAX because we already have enough traffic - smog - jet fuel dumped on our neighborhoods - (Inglewood - Westchester - Playa Del Rey - El Segundo, et al. Our children must live & breathe & play in these conditions.

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 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping.

PC02058-2

Comment:

Orange County (El Toro) & other areas should shoulder their share of the burden of air traffic.

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. 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.

PC02059 No Author Identified, None Provided

PC02059-1

Comment:

For next workshops, you need to have names on your name tags instead of just "STAFF" to personalize/humanize your staff.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02060 No Author Identified, None Provided

PC02060-1

Comment:

This meeting should have been better attended by the Inglewood Community. The majority of us got the information about this by word of mouth.

Please do a better job of getting the information out to the community.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review.

PC02061 Adams, Michael Kelso Townhomes Association

PC02061-1

Comment:

My name is Michael Adams President of Kelso Townhomes located at 124 W. Kelso St., Inglewood, CA 90301. Phone is 310-419-0045. Our complex has not been included on the list for noise mitigation because it was constructed after the date where all new construction was to be built with noise reduction features. Because of the forementioned our complex is not being tested for noise mitigation.

3. Comments and Responses

However, we homeowners know that an injustice is being place upon us. We would like for testing to occur at our dwelling for the possible inclusion on that list.

Response:

It appears that Kelso Townhomes were constructed in conformance with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations (California Construction Code) which requires that multiple-family housing built after 1975 in areas of high noise levels (i.e., greater than 65 CNEL) include sound insulation to reduce interior noise levels to 45 CNEL. Also, according to information provided by the City of Inglewood Residential Sound Insulation Program, the property referenced by the commentor is located outside the City of Inglewood's ANMP boundary. However, should the property be determined not to conform to Title 24 standards it could become eligible for soundproofing with implementation of the LAX Master Plan, as it is shown to be significantly impacted under all of the Master Plan alternatives. See Topical Response TR-LU-3 for further description of revisions to the ANMP that would occur with implementation of the LAX Master Plan.

PC02062 Khoury, Elizabeth None Provided

PC02062-1

Comment:

This meeting (workshop) was not well publicized. Why didn't a member from staff appear at an Ing. City Council meeting to let the public know about this workshop meeting? I understand there will be another workshop June 16, 2001. Why not come to our City Council meetings? Inglewood City Council Meetings - every Tuesday at 1:30 p.m.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC00178-2 for a description of how the meetings were advertised.

PC02063 No Author Identified, None Provided

PC02063-1

Comment:

The same document at all 7 tables does not cover the "enviornmental" concept nor "justice."

Response:

LAWA received a substantial number of recommendations for mitigation measures and other benefits relating to environmental justice concerns from the environmental justice workshops, comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR, and more recent community outreach. A consolidated list of recommendations was compiled and was instrumental in defining the benefit and mitigation proposals presented in Section 4.4.3.7, Environmental Justice Program, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

LAWA has an existing Environmental Justice Program that builds on existing policies and programs in order to mitigate various potential significant impacts that the LAX Master Plan build alternatives may otherwise have. A portion of environmental justice-related mitigation measures included in the Environmental Justice Program are detailed in Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.8), Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.8), Section 4.4.2, Relocation (subsection 4.4.2.8), and Section 4.6, Air Quality (subsection 4.6.8), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The same sections also discussed non-economic benefits to the surrounding community, including landscape improvements to impacted communities; implementation of aviation-related curriculum at local high schools; establishing an aviation academy on airport grounds for high school or college students; and a 10-acre nature center for public education.

Please refer to Topical Response TR-EJ-2 for additional information regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits.

PC02064 Khoury, Elizabeth None Provided

PC02064-1

Comment:

Why didn't staff have an hour meeting with the public first before the workshops. This way anyone who had a comment/comments could express their opinion so everyone could hear and know what is really going on.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC00178-2 and PC00178-3 regarding advertisement of and the manner in which the workshops were conducted. Please also see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process.

PC02065 No Author Identified, None Provided

PC02065-1

Comment:

We do not need to accomodate LAWA by building an interchange on and of Arbrer Vita. We need the Historcal Society to be at peace where it is. The Historical building is History of Inglewood.

Response:

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

PC02065-2

Comment:

What about envioromental justice?

Response:

The analyses contained in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, and Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provide comprehensive information on environmental justice pursuant to NEPA and CEQA requirements.

PC02066 No Author Identified, None Provided

PC02066-1

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

PC02067 Khoury, Elizabeth None Provided

PC02067-1

Comment:

Noise:

With the increase in electricity rates how will the local residents benefit from the air conditioning system that is being provided by LAWA.?

Response:

Comment noted. While it is acknowledged that use of the air conditioning system will increase the customer's utility bill, air conditioning will also increase the value of the home. Residential sound insulation provided under the ANMP uses acoustically-rated doors and windows. The installation of these doors and windows 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 for a description of the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

PC02067-2

Comment:

How will LAWA mitigate outside noise?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels. As stated in TR-LU-4, even after the incorporation of the mitigation measures proposed under the LAX Master Plan, significant noise impacts would remain where aircraft noise levels of 75 CNEL or greater affect residential areas such as backyards, patios, or balconies, as well as other outdoor community areas where noise would interfere with speech and other activities, and where classroom activities take place outdoors. Although increases in outdoor noise levels within the 65 to 75 CNEL contours would occur under the build alternatives, these increases would not exceed thresholds of significance. However, it is acknowledged that such increases may be perceptible and could affect outdoor speech and the quality of certain outdoor activities. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-5 and Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation measures presented in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for more information regarding noise-related mitigation.

PC02067-3

Comment:

What will LAWA do with our schools? How will they be able to mitigate outside noise?

Response:

Please refer to Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding school mitigation.

PC02067-4

Comment:

Our children are unable to learn with this noise pollution. More children are being tested for Special Education than ever before.

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.

PC02068 No Author Identified, None Provided

PC02068-1

Comment:

LAWA has an overflow of passengers more the present airport can handle. If you notice there is a delay taking off when landing a delay. There is no doubt you do need Regional expansion.

We need the upgrade El Toro to the size of LAWA it is over due.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC02069 Khoury, Elizabeth None Provided

PC02069-1

Comment:

Jobs: Inglewood residents and other residents in other cities have had many opportunities to apply for jobs at LAX. Why not spread the wealth around and build other airports/or expand other airports in other counties and give the jobs to other residents in those 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.

3. Comments and Responses

This page intentionally left blank.