

PC02403 **Cox, Ph.D., P.E.,** **None Provided** **7/26/2001**
Donald

PC02403-1

Comment:

I have reviewed a portion of the ERI related to the LAX expansion, and followed media reports related to LAX expansion and development/expansion of regional airports in the Southern California area (i.e. El Toro, Palmdale, Long Beach, Ontario, etc). There is no doubt that handling additional air traffic in the Southern California area with a plan than relies on regional airports is best for the people of Southern California, and is the only long-term solution. Expansion of LAX is not a solution, will decrease the quality of life for the people of Southern California, and only benefit the major airlines and other companies that want a centralized system of air travel.

Response:

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. 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.

PC02403-2

Comment:

Expansion of LAX will exasperate the horrific traffic congestion that already exists (from Santa Clarita to north San Diego County) along the 405 Freeway and those that feed it. It's not just the air travelers or cargo handling companies trying to reach LAX that will suffer from this increase in freeway traffic; all people that use and/or live near the freeway system will suffer.

Response:

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

PC02403-3

Comment:

It makes no sense at all to have people (or cargo) traveling all the way to LAX from Santa Clarita, north San Diego County or areas east of L.A. County, when there is the option of developing airports in El Toro and Palmdale or expanding the existing regional airports to handle this traffic. Wasted time, fuel consumption and pollution would all be less with a regional plan that decreases the travel distance required for people (or cargo) to get to a plane.

3. Comments and Responses

It makes no sense at all to decrease the quality of life for a large number of people around LAX (resulting from increased traffic, noise, pollution, etc.) when development or expansion of regional airports will affect many less people.

It makes no sense at all to close or relocate businesses and households that already exist around LAX, and at the same time, allow developers to build houses on vacant land surrounding an existing airport (El Toro) or in an area where the people want an airport (Palmdale.)

All politicians and government officials must view the increase in air traffic as a regional issue, involving all of Southern California. More importantly, they must do what is best for the people of Southern California, not what best serves the interests of the major airlines and other entities promoting expansion of LAX and restriction of regional airports. Development and/or expansion of regional airports will best serve all the people of Southern California and is the only viable long-term solution to increased air traffic.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC02403-1 above.

PC02403-4

Comment:

Mayor Hahn, City Counsel, County Supervisors, etc., should be using their positions to 1) encourage politicians (and others in power) in the surrounding areas (i.e. Irvine Co. and other developers) that regional airports are the solution and, 2) do all they can to make sure the Master Plan for LAX is not implemented.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County transportation demand.

PC02404 Sochar, Karen None Provided 8/24/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02244; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC02244.

PC02405 Sauer, Paul None Provided 9/23/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02327; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC02327.

PC02407 O'Rourke, Patricia None Provided 8/24/2001

PC02407-1

Comment:

I am writing to let you know of my opposition for the expansion of Los Angeles airport.

I have been a resident of Playa Del Rey for 20 years, and love it. I am a mother of a 18 month old son and want him to grow up and love it as I do.

Response:

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

PC02407-2

Comment:

In my opinion the expansion of LAX will add too much additional pollution, dirt and jet fuel burn off that already is in our air and we already breath too much of.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increases.

PC02407-3

Comment:

Daily I must clean his patio toys of this film from the jets.

Response:

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

PC02407-4

Comment:

What is this doing to our lungs, let alone a young childs?!

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.

PC02407-5

Comment:

The increased traffic is going to add to even more air problems and the congestion of our streets.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01881-100 regarding improved air quality with increased airport activity.

PC02407-6

Comment:

I vote for you every election and you have done well by the community. Please stand with my neighbors and myself and do not let this happen to our great town.

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.

PC02408

Rezzo, Jean

None Provided

9/24/2001

PC02408-1

Comment:

I am opposed to the expansion of LAX:

Response:

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

PC02408-2

Comment:

(1) Pollution is extremely unhealthy at existing levels. My two sons & I have been finding respiratory problems, including bronchitis & pneumonias, to be very difficult to get into remission. There are known carcinogens in the airplanes exhaust emissions and are not regulated ever as closely as smog controls for autos. This disastrous & unhealthy situation will only increase with this expansion.

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.

PC02408-3

Comment:

(2) The events of Sept. 11th, 2001 have in a tragic and devastating way woken us up to the lack of security surrounding LAX. This war against the terrorists will cont. for many years. The last thing this area needs is expanding LAX, which is in such a highly populated area. For this reason I will fight against any expansion efforts even more. The traffic and security issues are now my main focus and I would like to be notified soon that LAX and LAWA has decided permanently against any expansion plans.

Response:

Please see Response to Comments AL00051-93, PC01881-31, and PC02131-5.

PC02409

Doeh, Giyora

West L.A. Realty, Inc.

9/21/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01387; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01387.

PC02410 Lindstrom, Dean None Provided 9/21/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02167; please refer to the response to comment letter PC02167.

PC02411 No Author Identified, None Provided

PC02411-1

Comment:

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

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC00908-2; please refer to Response to Comment PC00908-2.

PC02411-2

Comment:

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

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic. Alternative D, which was addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, would not increase cargo handling facilities at LAX. As indicated in Table S3-2 (page 3-23) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, cargo operations are projected to increase to about 3,120,000 tons/year at LAX by 2015 under the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative D. The traffic impacts of this level of cargo activity were described in Section 4.3.2.6.1 (beginning on page 4-293) of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02411-3

Comment:

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

Response:

This comment is similar to comment PC00908-4. Please see Response to Comment PC00908-4.

PC02411-4

Comment:

Expansion would add numerous cars to our surface streets and freeways.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC02411-5

Comment:

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

Response:

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

PC02411-6

Comment:

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

Response:

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

PC02411-7

Comment:

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

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program. To achieve the full benefits of this program, windows need to be closed. See also Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels.

PC02411-8

Comment:

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

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC00908-9; please refer to Response to Comment PC00908-9 regarding cargo demand.

PC02411-9

Comment:

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

Response:

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

PC02411-10**Comment:**

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

Response:

This comment is essentially the same as comment PC00908-11. Please see Response to Comment PC00908-11.

PC02411-11**Comment:**

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

Response:

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

PC02411-12**Comment:**

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

Response:

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.

PC02411-13**Comment:**

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

Response:

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

PC02411-14**Comment:**

The State of California has plans to build high-speed rail that would provide a direct link between

3. Comments and Responses

PC02415-2

Comment:

You know the people around El Toro don't want to tolerate the airport fallout troubles we experience with LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC02416 Hyra, Joan None Provided 9/10/2001

PC02416-1

Comment:

The communities surrounding LAX have had to live with traffic, noise, and pollution for too many years. Another international airport is needed in Southern California; NO to 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. 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-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC02417 Pouliot, Stephen None Provided 8/28/2001

PC02417-1

Comment:

As a twenty-year residence of Venice, California, I have watched the growth and gentrification of the westside with interest, and lately with profound concern. I cannot believe how it's possible that the proposed growth of Marina Del Rey and Playa Vista can be accommodated by the singular access of Lincoln Boulevard.

Poll any resident, and they will tell you that getting to the airport at peak traffic times takes three times as long as it use to-and the above projects will only acerbate the chaos.

Response:

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

PC02417-2

Comment:

Improve LAX, modernize it, utilize new technology, but do not expand the facility.

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.

PC02417-3

Comment:

Neighboring communities must step up to the plate, and in their maturity share the burden -and pride in providing new facilities for the expanding era of flight.

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.

PC02418 Jones, Ray & Janice None Provided

PC02418-1

Comment:

Please do not expand LAX, it is already a traffic nightmare.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02418-2

Comment:

We fly at least 20 times a year and would love to fly out of Palmdale.

Response:

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

PC02419 Neumen, Dave None Provided 8/21/2001

PC02419-1

Comment:

The use of regional airports such as Palmdale & Ontario is the only feasible way of handling the projected increase in air traffic without a permanent damage to the City of Westchester.

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.

3. Comments and Responses

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

PC02419-2

Comment:

An increase in air traffic at LAX would also increase the surface traffic resulting in more smog and traffic delays 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. Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the pollutant emissions from airport traffic.

PC02421

Ernststoff, Michael & Donna

None Provided

7/23/2001

PC02421-1

Comment:

As I read Appendix D, Section 3.3, Figure 9, of the LAX expansion EIR, departure route D6RW will pass essentially directly over my home under all of the alternatives being considered. Furthermore, I project the elevation of the aircraft when they are passing over my home to be only a few thousand feet.

My computation of aircraft elevation is as follows. Departure track D6RW passes over my house at about 20,000 feet (~4 miles from the end of the runway). Assuming a ground speed for the aircraft of 275 mph (-400 ft/sec), and a climb rate of 2000 ft/min. The aircraft will pass over my house about 60 seconds (one minute) after take off at an altitude of approximately 2000 feet.

Are my computations correct?

Response:

Aircraft assigned this route are non-turbojet aircraft which do not climb at the rates assumed by the commentor. The incidence of eastbound departures from LAX is extremely small, averaging 4 to 5 daily by 2015. These aircraft do not climb at the rates nor attain the speeds assumed by the commentor. At the commentor's location, the propeller aircraft would be at an estimated altitude of approximately 3,000 feet above sea level. Also please refer to response to PC02362-2.

PC02421-2

Comment:

Under what conditions will departure track D6RW be used?

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Departure track D6RW will be used when weather conditions require or during nighttime operations. The incidence of eastbound departures from LAX is extremely small, however, the referenced departure occurs 0.2 percent of the time. These aircraft if destined for Burbank or Van Nuys airports are assigned a final altitude of 4,000 feet, thus would be no higher than that. Aircraft continuing westbound for Santa Barbara and beyond continue their climb to an altitude of 8,000 feet.

PC02421-3

Comment:

Under what conditions will approach tracks A6L7, A4R0 A4R1, A4R8. a4L0, A4L1, and A4L8 be used. All appear to pass directly over my house at low altitude.

Response:

Turbo-jet aircraft arriving from the Pacific Northwest and Asia are routed over the Santa Monica VOR. These aircraft cross a point 10 miles west of Santa Monica at altitude of 10,000 feet and then descend to cross Santa Monica at or above 7,000 before proceeding eastbound. The aircraft that use this procedure fly in the vicinity of the commentor's' residence. Refer to Section 3, Future Aircraft Operating Conditions of Appendix D, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C1, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a more detailed description of runway percentage usage.

PC02421-4

Comment:

Although I'm not necessarily opposed to all aspects of airport expansion, I am opposed to one that places my home under a low-flying flight path.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternatives C and D do not include the construction of additional runways, but they do include relocation of the runways to accommodate a new parallel taxiway to reduce runway incursions. The easterly landing thresholds of each of the four runways will not be located closer to the communities to the east of the airport.

PC02422

Topal, Jack

None Provided

7/20/2001

PC02422-1

Comment:

I am opposed to the airport expansion because of increased traffic that will create problems in our small neighborhood, of Playa Del Rey. Adding a terminal on Pershing will cause traffic grid-lock at Westchester Blvd & Pershing: At present during AM & PM traffic Pershing at Culver, which is one lane in North & So. directions (on a curve) is grid lock adding a terminal will make this situation much worse.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment AL00018-30. Please see Response to Comment AL00018-30 and Response to Comment PC01467-1. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PC02422-2

Comment:

As well as the airplane noise: We cant sleep in the summer because of the AM & PM flights overhead.

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

PC02423 Shumaker, Deborah None Provided 7/22/2001

PC02423-1

Comment:

I would like to commend you, Transportation Secretary, Norman Mineta for your foresight in forming a task force to create an alternate plan to the currently proposed Master Plan to expand LAX. The current plan does nothing to resolve a regional airport solution to a national transportation issue.

LAX was not designed to be the only major airport in the region. Some of the regionally elected officials forget that all roads do not lead to LAX. Los Angeles is the 'Urban Sprawl' capital of the world and has only one major airport. Other major cities in this country have recognized that their cities need more than one airport to handle passenger and commerce traffic. Now is the time for Los Angeles to realize that we too need more than one major airport.

Please continue your efforts for a regional airport solution to a national transportation issue.

Response:

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

PC02424 Powell, Steve None Provided 7/22/2001

PC02424-1

Comment:

An article in today's paper prompted me to write to you. While I am not strongly opposed to any expansion at LAX, I am curious as to why the federal government is not developing policy that would make use of former air force bases more enticing.

Response:

Comment noted. The role of the FAA is to ensure the safe and efficient use of navigable air space in the United States. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02424-2

Comment:

I live in Big Bear Lake, California. To travel to Los Angeles International requires travel time of approximately 2 hours if it is not during rush hours. Ontario Airport is not much better.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02424-3

Comment:

As an alternative we have the former Norton AFB (San Bernardino) and George AFB (Victorville) that are largely unused. By providing incentives for airlines to begin service at these unused airports, expansion at LAX would be unnecessary and many people who live east of Los Angeles would have greatly improved access to airports.

As the FAA is fond of saying, the problem is the lack of runways. Why not take advantage of two airports with runways waiting to be used?

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA do not control development or operations at Norton AFB (San Bernardino) and George AFB (Victorville).

PC02425

**Adelmann, Bill &
Nancy**

None Provided

6/20/2001

PC02425-1

Comment:

Please don't consider enlarging LAX. This will adversely impact those of us who live and work anywhere near it. Congestion and noise pollution and other pollution is already nearly unbearable.

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

PC02425-2

Comment:

The traffic that comes to L.A.X. from Orange County is considerable. Another airport is needed there. Work on El Toro (or Ontario). L.A.X. is big enough!

Response:

Comment noted. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC02426 Poyourow, Joanne None Provided 7/18/2001

PC02426-1

Comment:

It certainly appears like your staff and administration are well schooled in cover-up, distorting the time and location of occurrence so that noise complaints can all be brushed off, explained away, and registered on the record as "consistent with normal operations".

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Subtopical Response TR-N-2.1, regarding CNEL characterization of noise events.

PC02427 Stapleton, Faith None Provided 7/17/2001

PC02427-1

Comment:

Noise due to aircraft flying Northeast from LAX continues to adversely impact the quality of my life and well being. There is no way to sleep without interruption from jet as well as commuter type planes. The periods most intolerable are from ten pm to 2am and then from 5:45am to 9:30am.

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.

PC02427-2

Comment:

Obviously I am OPPOSED to LAX expansion for these personal reasons as well as crowded skies, additional freeway traffic, and worst of all the excessive pollution which jets generate.

Response:

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

PC02428 Scharzmann, Karen None Provided 7/14/2001

PC02428-1

Comment:

WE DO NOT WANT LAX TO EXPAND, FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

- too much noise, in an already noisy area
- too much pollution, in an already polluted area
- too much air traffic, in skies where near-misses are already too common

3. Comments and Responses

- unsafe and unmanageable traffic conditions, in an already overcrowded area---not even including Playa Vista!
- not enough thought given to using Palmdale and/or Ontario and/or El Toro as venues

WE HAVE SUFFERED ENOUGH BY LIVING NEAR IN THE POLLUTION AND NOISE OF LAX AND ENVIRONS. LET US ENJOY THE ENVIRONMENT THE WAY IT IS, AND ASK OTHERS TO SACRIFICE SOME OF THEIR PEACE, QUIET, CLEAN AIR, STREET TRAFFIC, AND SANITY!!

Response:

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

PC02429

Ruppert, June

None Provided

7/15/2001

PC02429-1

Comment:

The recent meeting at the Fuyama Hotel was very productive, and all behaved very well. Obviously the audience was 99% against expansion.

Response:

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

PC02429-2

Comment:

Considering the spread of Los Angeles, I would hope that comparable study time would be devoted to effective use of other airports in the region,. i.e.

A) Non-passenger service out of Palmdale

B) Valley and San Gabriel area traffic via another airport

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. Please also see Response to Comment PC00599-54 for more information about cargo activity.

PC02430 Galanter, Ruth City of Los Angeles 7/13/2001

PC02430-1

Comment:

I am forwarding comments provided by my constituents in response to the Environmental Impact Report and Statement prepared for the proposed LAX Master Plan. The comments are in the form of a court reporter's report, as transcribed from comments by my constituents at my last Town Hall meeting. Please ensure that the enclosed comments become part of the official public record on this project.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see responses to comments to testimony contained in PC03587 through PC03616.

PC02431 Kendrick, Li None Provided 7/11/2001

PC02431-1

Comment:

I am opposed of the LAX expansion. More congestion, more pollution, more traffic who needs this? Certainly not the Westside!!

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.

PC02432 Richter, Fern None Provided 7/7/2001

PC02432-1

Comment:

I object to the LAX Expansion. The reasons being

- (1) Safety of the passengers
- (2) Traffic
- (3) Pollution (my house so filthy from the airplanes)
- (4) Our community being destroyed by removing homes and businesses.
- (5) Destroying the most ideal place to live weatherwise, community cohesivness. I've lived in Westchester for 55 years!

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, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, and land use impact in Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and 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-AQ-1 regarding air pollution 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

PC02433 Green, Ed None Provided 6/1/2001

PC02433-1

Comment:

I quote an article in Jun. 8th, 2001 Daily Breeze, "a solution that meets the needs of one city, is NO solution at all!"

The above quoted article was authored by Jane Harman and Don Knabe and should be read by all interested parties.

Response:

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

PC02434 Rothman, Mili None Provided 7/24/2001

PC02434-1

Comment:

As an educator and as a resident of Playa del Rey, I wholeheartedly oppose the expansion of facilities and the reconfiguration of runways at LAX.

My reasons are consistent with those outlined in the Resolution to LA City Mayoral Candidates Passed by Democratic and Republican Central Committees March 2001 (attached).

I will diligently work towards a 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 Response to Comment PC02434-2 below and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety and reconfiguration of runways.

PC02434-2

Comment:

LAX already exceeds the previously specified maximum utilization of passenger and freight activity. I support a truly regional solution of NO EXPANSION of facilities and no reconfiguration of runways at LAX.

There is no viable expansion of LAX that would meet projected aviation capacity requirements for Southern California. Funding for airport facility expansion shall be disbursed throughout the regional airport network to the areas of fastest growth in preference to diverting the limited resources to another LAX multi-billion dollar expansion. Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) in Technical Appendix G of the current draft Regional Transportation Plan acknowledges that two to four billion dollars will be saved by expanding Ontario Airport facilities in preference to LAX.

I oppose LAX expansion because it would:

- Increase air safety risks with more planes operating in close quarters.
- Dramatically worsen traffic congestion on I-405, I-105 and local arterials from thousands of passenger cars, vans, and cargo-carrying trucks.
- Result in greater air pollution, damaging local residents' health.
- Create more airport noise; impacting a larger population, causing stress, illness, and reduction of children's learning ability and degradation of property values.

3. Comments and Responses

- Aggravate environmental justice issues. A disproportionate share of low income and minority populations are subjected to increased health and safety impacts and/or displaced from their homes.
- Destroy local homes, schools, libraries, parks, and businesses to provide room for more airport support facilities.
- Divert attention and funds from the expansion of other airport facilities where future population growth is located.

I will push for changes in the FAA charter to require a limit in the number of flights landing at LAX and to cap the passenger and freight traffic to the present levels.

As Mayor, I will push for more realistic federal definitions used to identify and control air and ground traffic, noise and other adverse environmental impacts.

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.

PC02437 Santos, Alma None Provided 7/27/2001

PC02437-1

Comment:

I am requesting that the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA), and Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) terminate the expansion of LAX. I oppose the LAX expansion alternatives A, B, and C.

Response:

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

PC02437-2

Comment:

Also, I am requesting that the "No Action/ No Project Alternative" for LAX Master Plan not be approved. The "No Action/ No Project Alternative" is a fraud because it includes the increase of passengers from 40 million to 78 million. LAX was intended to handle 40 million passengers.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding the 40 MAP activity level.

PC02437-3

Comment:

I am requesting that the "Ring Road", "Arbor Vitae Interchange", and the "Airport Boulevard Connector Road" which are development plans for the LAX expansion be terminated.

Response:

Comment noted. The Arbor Vitae interchange project is not a part LAX Master Plan and federal funding has been withdrawn from that proposed project. Alternative D, the Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, does not include the ring road or LAX Expressway proposed for Alternatives A, B, and C.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02437-4

Comment:

The development of the "Ring Road", "Arbor Vitae Interchange", and the "Airport Boulevard Connector Road" will not solve nor adequately mitigate any of the issues that the LAX draft EIS/EIR proposes.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed surface transportation impacts in Section 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, and in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation. 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 to consider only full interchanges, not partial ones. Please also see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the Arbor Vitae interchange. Note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or the Ring Road.

PC02437-5

Comment:

The development of the "Ring Road", "Arbor Vitae Interchange", and the "Airport Boulevard Connector Road" will destroy the residential communities of Westport Heights, Westchester, and Inglewood.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC02168-4; please refer to Response to Comment PC02168-4.

PC02437-6

Comment:

I am requesting that a "Regional Solution" be developed for airline passengers and airline cargo. Centralizing all the passengers and cargo from Los Angeles County, Orange County and San Bernardino County and San Diego County into LAX is ludicrous. Centralization of all the passengers and cargo into LAX is not feasible. The LAX draft EIS/EIR does mitigate nor address the issues adequately. Now is the time that each region should develop and accept responsibility for airplane passengers and airplane cargo.

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.

PC02437-7

Comment:

My requests are based upon the Los Angeles International Airport Master Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) / Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The LAX draft EIS/EIR does not adequately address nor mitigate the following issues:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments PC02437-8 through PC02437-17 below.

PC02437-8

Comment:

1. The EIR does not adequately address nor mitigate traffic congestion. Traffic congestion on the 405 Fwy, 105 Fwy, 10 Fwy and the 101 Fwy have not and can not be mitigated. The freeways have become parking lots due to the excess LAX passengers and the cargo. For example, the EIR states that traffic congestion on the 405 Fwy exists between 7 a.m. to 9 a.m. and 3:30 p.m. to 7 p.m. These statements are false. The traffic congestion on the 405 Fwy exists from 6:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. and from 2:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. The 405 Fwy is bumper to bumper with traffic congestion all day long due to the excess 28 million passengers and the 1.4 million tons of cargo that exceed the capacity that LAX was built to handle back in 1966.

Response:

The I-405, I-105, I-10, and I-101 freeways accommodate much more traffic than just airport trips. In fact, the percent of airport traffic on these freeways is generally less than 20 percent, even adjacent to the airport. This percentage quickly diminishes farther from the airport. Section 4.3.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included a discussion of the Congestion Management Program, which is where analysis of freeways beyond the immediate study area is located. 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.

PC02437-9

Comment:

LAX was built to handle 40 million passengers and 1 million tons of cargo per year. Currently, 68 million passengers and 2.4 million tons of cargo pass through LAX per year. All the freeways are becoming parking lots for LAX traffic.

There is no way that Los Angeles can adequately address or mitigate 98 million passengers and 4.2 million tons of cargo by 2015 via the expansion of LAX.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand and Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic. Please refer to Response to Comment PC02168-8 for a discussion of LAX's ability to accommodate 98 million annual passengers and 4.2 million tons of cargo. 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.

PC02437-10

Comment:

2. The EIR does not adequately address nor mitigate health issues. The EIR does not adequately address nor mitigate the air pollution from the passenger airplanes, the cargo airplanes and the freeway traffic due to LAX.

Response:

Human health impacts were addressed in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in

3. Comments and Responses

Technical Report 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PC02437-11

Comment:

The EIR does not address nor mitigate the increase in cancer and respiratory ailments due to jet fuel and automobile and truck exhaust.

Anyone that lives within 10 miles of the LAX airport has potential legal causes of action to sue for cancer and respiratory 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, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, Topical Response TR-HRA-4 regarding human health mitigation strategies, Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC02437-12

Comment:

3. The EIR does not adequately address nor mitigate the noise pollution due to the passenger and cargo airplanes and the freeway traffic due to LAX. The EIR limited the study of noise levels to 65 db. The EIR is inadequate. The noise levels exceed the 65db levels in all of the surrounding communities: Westchester, Inglewood, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, and Playa del Rey.

Today the noise level exceeds 65 db twenty fours a day due to LAX excess passengers and cargo. Eight years ago the noise level dropped below 65 db after 8 p.m. to 6 a.m. due to LAX. LAX has failed to address noise pollution.

Response:

Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-1 regarding the noise modeling approach and Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences.

PC02437-13

Comment:

4. The EIR does not adequately address nor mitigate LAX safety of air space. The recently released FAA report indicates that LAX is the worst airport in the United States regarding near miss collisions. LAX has experienced 33 near miss collisions in the last four years. The limited airspace is dangerous. Common sense tells you that increasing the concentration of airplanes flying in and out of LAX will open the doors to civil actions against the FAA, LAWA and SCAG due the breach of their fiduciary duty to protect the passengers and the people who live in the vicinity of LAX. Expansion of LAX will only increase the liability, damages and deaths due to the concentration and centralization of airplane passengers and cargo in such limited air space.

Response:

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

PC02437-14

Comment:

5. The EIR did not address the issue of risk from earthquakes at LAX. If LAWA, the FAA and SCAG proceed with the expansion of LAX to centralize and concentrate the passengers and cargo from all of Los Angeles County, Orange County, San Bernardino County and San Diego County, what will happen if there is a Northridge size earthquake at LAX? The LAX Master Plan for Expansion puts "all our eggs in one basket" for the entire Southern California region. This is ludicrous. This is a breach of your fiduciary duty. The "Regional Solution" to airport expansion is the only solution to diversify the risk from catastrophic disasters. Southern California's entire economy would be destroyed when LAX is hit by a "Northridge" size earthquake.

Response:

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

PC02437-15

Comment:

6. The EIR did not address, incorporate nor mitigate the traffic congestion, noise, health, and safety issues that are the result of the development of the Howard Hughes project, Playa Vista project, Ballona Creek project and the Marina del Rey project(s). These four (4) developments are going to have a massive impact on the entire Westside of Los Angeles and the South Bay Areas. The LAX Master Plan for expansion and the EIS/EIR have failed to address the impact of these four developments on LAX. Again, this is ludicrous.

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. Mitigation is proposed for all significant project-specific and cumulative impacts.

PC02437-16

Comment:

7. The LAX Master Plan for expansion does not address the fact that two (2) billion dollars will be wasted to demolish Westchester and Inglewood prior to the expansion of LAX. LAWA owns LAX, Palmdale and Ontario airports. Since the land in Palmdale and Ontario was purchase a long time ago why waste billions of dollars?

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC02437-17

Comment:

8. Orange County (El Toro airport, etc), San Diego County and the inland empires should be held responsible to provide airport facilities for passengers and cargo that are destined for that region.

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-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.

PC02437-18

Comment:

I hope James Hahn, Mayor of Los Angeles, will fulfill his promise to stop the expansion of LAX.

Response:

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

PC02437-19

Comment:

The FAA, LAWA and SCAG has a fiduciary duty to address all these concerns. Try the regional airport approach. Stop the LAX expansion plan.

Response:

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

PC02438

**Weinheimer,
Stephen**

None Provided

7/20/2001

PC02438-1

Comment:

I am a resident of Hermosa Beach. As it stands today, my drive along Highland to Vista Del Mar to Culver Blvd. is already congested enough. Expansion of LAX would make this worse.

Response:

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

PC02438-2

Comment:

We should encourage the use of other airports - Burbank, John Wayne etc. Traffic is bad enough in the South Bay and alternative airports should be utilized.

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.

The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. The 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.

PC02439

Russell, Steve

None Provided

7/1/2001

PC02439-1

Comment:

I favor Alternative A Plan.

I still call for:

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02439-2

Comment:

1. High speed commuter rail from dwtn LA to Ontario Intl & Palmdale Airports.

Response:

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

PC02439-3

Comment:

2. expand Palmdale Reg Airport

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC02439-4

Comment:

3. expand San Berardino (Norton AFB) Airport more.

Response:

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.

PC02439-5

Comment:

4. improve Fox Field for Gen Aviation use & Emergency use.

Response:

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.

PC02439-6

Comment:

5. High speed railink to Pt Mugu Area to use airport there.

Response:

The U.S. Navy has decided not to make Point Mugu available for civil aviation. None of the planned high-speed rail systems are linked to the existing Ventura County public airports and those airports are small, serving only commuter flights, with no plans for significant growth. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand. Also, Point Mugu Naval Air Station is not available for public use.

PC02439-7

Comment:

6. More parking at LAX for "Long Flights, International Use" from Century Blvd, 405 N/S Offramps, Manhattan Beach area. OR develop systems where one transfers from Car to Jitney shuttletube/bus/pod all over LAX Proper.

Response:

An expanded FlyAway service would be part of the alternatives, which would provide the type of service the commentor requests. Further, adequate parking would be provided in the most convenient locations possible.

PC02439-8

Comment:

By developing Palmdale Reg Airport, we in LA Cty get these benefits:

- Direct Hi speed RR link from dwtn LA, Glendale, Ventura from expanded Metrolink line
- More jobs
- CUT LAX AIR TRAFFIC by 2/3rds volume.
- expand Industrial base in No Desert area.
- Hwy connection to I15 to Las Vegas made.

- Hi Speed RR to Las Vegas?
- R&D Industrial park complex estd
- Heliport Service for LA Basin from Chino to Oxnard to Long Beach to El Toro Base alone. Needed
- widen I14 to Palmdale alone.

Response:

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

PC02439-9

Comment:

If Burbank Airport closed Today, economic chaos would reign from Fed Ex packages, missed airlines, long drive to Palmdale. High Speed RR is the ONLY Key.

Response:

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

PC02439-10

Comment:

The FAA can help also in these venues other:

- "AutoPilot Program:" install totally automated / anti virus flight computers into Gen Av planes, Bizjets to pilots can fly ala '747 style' with Total Safety.

- Modernize Air Traffic Control

- ALL TRANSPAC ROUTE PLANES carry 4 pilots, 2 on, 2 off. NO more dozing pilots killing lives enroute.

- "User friendly" Heliports, VTOL HeliPods developed.

Yes, fund Moller Industries vehicle alone.

Back to Autopilot, one can in effect "Fly IFR without IFR Rating rule" and can Land said equipped Plane anyplace.

Autopilot problems:

1. System crash
2. power outages ground
3. terrorism

Otherwise, very doable.

Under Autopilot controlled Plane, I could fly from LA to Vegas easily and "all I control is Taxing to runways, initial Takeoff, then taxiing after Landing."

Autopilot combines: GPS, flight controls, Navigation.

<AutoPilot is FBW: Fly By Wire mode.>

- Helicopter controls improvements: under this plan, the FAA/ NASA, US Army, Air Force, Navy, Hawaiian tourism copter Co. Sikorsky, Bell would develop Copter Flight Controls so one steers copter by copter joystick & does Lift by collective

3. Comments and Responses

- 1) BUT no rudder pedals or
 - 2) combine Collective & center joystick OR
 - 3) use F16 style sidestick control pods on seat.
- (Media model: 1960s Flying Sub from TV show Voyage to the Bottom of the Sea.)

Then more can fly ANY COPTER & take less time to train.

Sample test copters: ex Marine 1, Huey, SK 67, HH53, Hueycobra, Gazelle Aerospatile, Puma.

AutoPilot / Copter Controls Benefits:

1. Use avionics.
2. CUT pilot training time to fly craft. 1/2, more
- <3. ANYONE CAN THEN FLY!>
4. Ground support User friendly
5. Tests demo at Air shows held
6. Use offshelf systems, software.
7. Installable in estd airframes.

Win Win for all.

If Gen Av etc is crying for "More pilots," all one need do is Make Flying Inviting and Give Incentives to fly.

Controls, terminology & costs deter would be pilots!

Me, Im Autistic and have a Math problem, thus I alone would need a (Digital readout Instruments) vs Dial analog for even VFR. Major issue.

Below some FAA Study Ideas, voter opinion:

1. "Autistic Pilots since 1950 Census? Yes survey said pilots.
2. Autisim in the Skies: Pilots, Flight Crews.
3. Autisim & Flight Controls from Gen Av to Military."

For tech aid, sources contact:

ASLA, 1612 W Olive Av, Burbank CA 91504.

ASLA & FAA can combine on this Major Study alone.

Response:

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

PC02439-11

Comment:

PS:

FLYWAY RAILWAY PLAN:

Under this plan, a interlinked commutter RR would link:

LAX

John Wayne

Burbank

Ontario

ex Norton AFB
Palmdale
Fox Field (if enlarged)
Hawthorne Gen Airport
Palm Springs
Into 1 Mega transit system.

One can connect via Inter airport Travel Pod, enter Hi speed RR Train or Pods to: Ontario from Fox Field & board Cargo jet to Nairobi quickly.

Whole System would be co/op under: "MTA, OCTD, Metrolink, SBTD/TA" for its track portion?
System would need Uniform Communications, Servicing, Hiring, Work rules, Frequencies alone.
Railway would use 'unused' older LA Cty freeway sections or 'rights of way' near said sections.
By 2020, Palmdale should be King vs LAX.

Response:

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

PC02440 Williams, Randall Honeywell Engines & Systems 9/29/2000

PC02440-1

Comment:

As requested in your letter to Jim Rhoden dated August 31, 2000 Honeywell has reviewed the publicly available APU emissions data, and provided comments on the accuracy of the data. The specific questions raised in your letter have been answered, and an updated list showing aircraft and APU combinations has been provided. Information provided in this letter, including the updated duty cycle average APU emission indices and fuel burn rates provided herein can be publicly distributed.

The publicly available APU emissions data evaluated is Table 9: Modal Emission Rates - Auxiliary Power Units, from the 1995 FAA technical report entitled, Technical Data to Support FAA's Advisory Circular on Reducing Emissions from Commercial Aviation. This report was prepared for the EPA in cooperation with the FAA, by Energy and Environmental Analysis, Inc. This table is included as Attachment 1 to this letter. The same APU emissions information was previously provided to Honeywell as a table entitled, United Airlines APU Emissions Database in a Fax from Bryan Manning of EPA on July 25, 2000. The United Airlines APU Emissions Database is included as Attachment 2. The publicly available APU emissions data will be referred to herein as the United APU Emissions Database to simplify the discussion.

Summary

The United APU Emissions Database appears to be based on APU manufacturer emissions and fuel burn data, but used lengthy APU duty cycles based on United Airlines 1991 operation in one Southern California airport. Since the duty cycles include a significant amount of time at low load conditions, the unburned hydrocarbon and carbon monoxide emissions indices are significantly higher than what Honeywell considers representative for typical APU operations.

APU operation has changed significantly since 1991 due to the increased availability of conditioned air and electrical power at airport gates, and as airlines have reduced APU operation to minimize fuel and maintenance costs. APU operating times shown in the United APU Emissions Database are significantly higher than current airline practice. Honeywell recommends that the Air Transport Association (ATA) estimates on APU operating times presented at the June 21, 2000 EPA/FAA Options Working Group meeting in Washington, DC be used for future calculations. These ATA estimates were based on a limited, informal survey concerning APU usage that some ATA members participated in to facilitate the stakeholder study on airport emissions being conducted in the Options Working Group.

Use of the United APU Emissions Database duty cycle fuel burn and emission indices along with the ATA estimated APU duty cycles to calculate the APU contribution to airport emissions would result in reasonably accurate predictions in NOx emissions, but a significant over-prediction in HC and CO emissions. Subsequent calculations for airport emission reductions from reduced APU usage would similarly be reasonably accurate for NOx, but would over-predict reductions for both HC and CO

3. Comments and Responses

emissions. To improve the accuracy of the calculations, Honeywell has updated the emission indices and/or fuel burn rates in the United APU Emission Database for selected APUs.

Use of the updated APU Emissions Database, along with the ATA estimates on APU operating times will provide an accurate assessment of the APU contribution to airport pollution. As previous studies have shown, the small engine size, high efficiency, low fuel burn, and low emission levels makes the APU an extremely low contributor to airport or metropolitan pollution levels

Honeywell considers detailed APU exhaust emissions and fuel burn rates proprietary information, but does not consider fleet or airport averages calculated from this data to be proprietary. Honeywell will continue to provide detailed APU exhaust emissions information, with appropriate proprietary notices, to airlines and airport operators generating emission inventories. Information provided in this letter, including the updated duty cycle average APU emission indices and fuel burn rates provided herein can be publicly distributed.

Detailed Analysis of United APU Emissions Database

On initial examination, the APU fuel flows and emission indices in the United APU Emissions Database were similar to, but did not match the current Honeywell values for any particular APU load condition. In particular the unburned hydrocarbon (HC) and carbon monoxide (CO) emissions indices (lb/1000 lb. fuel) were high compared to values for a typical APU high power operating condition, and the APU operating times (hours/cycle) seemed excessive. This was the basis for the statement in the letter from Honeywell to Will Dodds of GE (a member of the PAT) in May of this year that "the tables provided contain inaccurate information, . . . including the APU modal emission rates"

On closer examination, the United Airlines data appeared to be calculated for an unknown APU duty cycle based on their 1991 operation in a congested Southern California airport. This assumption was based on the note in the upper left-hand corner of the United APU Emissions Database identifying the airport as LAX and the year as 1991. Note that APU emissions factors and fuel burn at any particular load condition are not dependent on duty cycle, but duty cycle average emission rates and fuel burn (i.e. like the United APU Emissions Database) are dependent on the assumed APU operating modes and percent time in each mode.

The APU duty cycle affects the duty cycle average emission indices in the following manner. Most APUs run at constant speed over the entire load range, with only the combustor fuel-air ratio changing significantly with load. Exhaust NO_x emissions therefore are relatively constant, with only a moderate increase with increasing load. In contrast HC and CO exhaust emissions, which are products of incomplete combustion, are significant only at the no-load or lower load conditions. HC and CO emissions are very low and relatively constant at all the mid- to higher load conditions. Duty cycle average NO_x emissions would then be relatively insensitive to the particular duty cycle selected, however duty cycle average HC and CO emissions could vary significantly depending on the percent time assumed at the lower load conditions. Duty cycles which include a significant percentage of time at low load conditions (like the United Airlines 1991 LAX duty cycle) would have high duty cycle average HC and CO emission indices.

In order to better understand how the United Airlines duty cycle average emissions data were calculated, an attempt was made to duplicate the 1991 United Airlines duty cycle for LAX. Current Honeywell values for APU fuel burn and emission indices were used, with the total APU operating time set to match the listed hours/cycle value from the United APU Emissions Database. In order to simplify the calculations, only the three most common APU load conditions were considered: environmental control system (ECS), main engine start (MES), and a low-load condition which is representative of both no-load and generator-only load conditions. Time for MES was set at 1-minute per main engine, which is typical for most aircraft. The time at ECS and low-load conditions were then varied to best match the listed CO emission levels. Duty cycle average emissions and fuel burn data from the Honeywell calculations and the United APU Emissions Database were then compared. Note that HC emission levels could also have been used to define the time at low load conditions, since there is normally a direct correlation between the HC and CO emission levels.

For both the ECS and MES conditions, the APU was assumed to be running at maximum load supplying both bleed air and electrical power to the aircraft. During ECS operation the bleed air is used to heat or cool the aircraft to maintain a comfortable cabin temperature. During MES the bleed air is diverted through an air turbine starter which provides the power to start the aircraft main engines. The electrical power from the generator can be used for any of the aircraft electrical systems (i.e. lights,

computers, galley, etc.). A more complete description of APU operating modes is provided in Attachment 3.

This initial analysis showed that the United APU Emissions Database duty cycle average emissions indices could be duplicated fairly accurately if significant APU operation at low load conditions were included. The time at low load conditions ranged from 15 to 25 minutes for the narrow-body aircraft (35 to 45 percent of the total operating time), and up to 60 minutes for the wide-body aircraft (30 to 35 percent of the total operating time). Details of this initial analysis are shown in Table 1. below.

Table 1. Error between United APU Emissions Database and Honeywell Simulation

Parameter	Narrow-Body Aircraft	Wide-Body Aircraft
Fuel burn	±7% (1)	±15% (2)
HC emissions	±12%	±13%
CO emissions	0% (3)	0% (3)(4)
NOx emissions	±5%	±1% (5)

Error = 100 (United Parameter - Honeywell Parameter)/(Honeywell Parameter)

Notes:

- (1) except for A320 which was 40% too high
- (2) except for the DC-10 which was 35% too high
- (3) used to match duty cycle
- (4) except for the B777 which was 85% too low
- (5) except for the B777 which was 20% too high

The three main conclusions from this detailed analysis of the United APU Emissions Database were:

1. For the most part, correct APU emissions indices and fuel burn rates were used to generate the duty cycle average data
2. The percent operating time at low load conditions was very high
3. The APU operating times per cycle (hours/cycle) were very high

APU Operating Times

As stated above, the APU operating times per cycle (hours/cycle) provided in the United Airlines APU Emissions Database were very high. These values are not believed to represent current airline operation. The APU operating times shown in the United table varied from approximately one hour for the narrow body aircraft to almost three hours for some wide-body aircraft. These operating times were based on the very congested LAX airport, which would not be typical of other airports across the U.S. In addition, since the 1991 time frame most airlines have significantly reduced APU operation to minimize fuel and maintenance costs, and the availability of conditioned air and electrical power at airport gates has increased. It is recommended that the information on APU operating times provided by the ATA (presented by Don McLeay of Air Canada) in a presentation entitled Auxiliary Power Unit (APU) at the June 21, 2000 EPA/FAA Options Working Group meeting in Washington, DC be used for future calculations. Honeywell estimations on APU operating times and times in mode were presented at the same working group meeting, and were very similar to the values presented by ATA. A comparison of the United Airlines and ATA estimates on APU operating times is provided in Table 2 below.

Table 2. Comparison of APU Operating Times from United Airlines and ATA

Aircraft Type	APU Operating Times, hours/cycle		
	United Airlines APU Emissions Database	ATA With Gate Power	ATA No Gate Power
Narrow-body	0.82 to 1.39 (1)	0.23 to 0.26	0.67
Wide-Body	1.74 to 2.86 (2)	0.23 to 0.26	1.0 to 1.5

Notes:

- (1) includes B727, B737, A320, B737
- (2) includes DC-10, B747, B767, B77

Note that the APU emission indices have not changed since the 1991 time frame, only the APU operating times. Product improvements to the older APUs have not resulted in any significant changes to the exhaust emissions indices.

3. Comments and Responses

An analysis was then conducted to determine how APU emissions calculated using the current ATA estimated APU operating times would compare to emissions calculated using the operating times from the United APU Emissions Database. For this analysis the comparisons were made on a pound of fuel or pound of pollutant per cycle (or airport turn) basis to include the effect of operating time. The APU emission indices from the United APU Emissions Database were used for all calculations.

Results of this second analysis showed that use of APU operating times from the United APU Emissions Database instead of the more current ATA estimates results in a significant over prediction of both APU fuel consumption and exhaust emissions. The APU fuel consumption and exhaust emissions would be over predicted from 15 to 100 percent using the ATA cycle without gate power (the closest direct comparison), and from approximately 225 to 1040 percent (up to an order of magnitude difference) using the ATA cycle with gate power. Detailed results are shown in Table 3 below. Note that the error between the two calculations is the same for both fuel consumption and exhaust pollutants, since the only variable is the total APU operating time.

Table 3. Comparison of Error in Fuel Consumption and Emissions Using United APU Operating Times Instead of ATA Estimated Operating Times

Aircraft	APU	ATA with Gate Power	ATA without Gate Power
B737-300/500	85-129CK	300%	49%
B737-200	85-129	300%	49%
B727	85-98CK	226%	22%
B757	331-200ER	456%	108%
B767	331-200ER	682%	96%
DC-10	700-4B	595%	74%
B747-100/200	600-4	1043%	91%
A320	36-300	226%	22%
B777	331-500	595%	16%

Value = fuel consumption or exhaust emissions

Error = 100 (Value with United Time - Value with ATA Time)/(Value with ATA time)

APU Duty Cycle

A third, more detailed analysis was then conducted to determine how APU emissions calculated using the most current publicly available information (i.e. using the fuel burn rates and emission indices from the United APU Emissions Database) would compare to emissions calculated from detailed Honeywell emissions indices. The ATA estimated APU operating times were used for all calculations. For this analysis the comparisons were made on a pound of fuel or pollutant per cycle (or airport turn) basis to include the effects of the duty cycle average APU emissions indices and fuel burn rates, and the APU operating times.

For the Honeywell duty cycle, the APU was assumed to be running either in ECS, MES, or a low power mode. The time in MES was assumed to be 1-minute per main engine, the time in a low power condition was assumed to be fifteen percent of the total operating time (typical percentage based on Honeywell field information), with the balance of the time at the maximum ECS condition. APU emissions/cycle were then calculated using the ATA estimated APU operating times assuming gate power either was or was not available. Note that many APUs do not actually run maximum ECS the entire time at the gate, but automatically reduce to minimum ECS (a lower load condition) as the cabin cools down. Use of only the maximum ECS condition in the calculations is conservative, and would tend to over predict fuel burn and all emission levels for these APUs by 5 to 10 percent.

The conclusions from this analysis were that reasonably accurate fuel consumption and NOx exhaust emissions could be calculated using the most current publicly available data (duty cycle average APU emission indices from the United APU Emissions Database, and ATA estimated APU operating times). However, the HC and CO emissions would be significantly over predicted. In general, the variability of the data was much better for the narrow-body aircraft than for the wide-body aircraft. The major difference between the United and the Honeywell duty cycles is the much higher percentage of operating time at low load conditions for the United duty cycle. Details of this analysis are provided in Tables 4 and 5 below.

Table 4. Error Between United APU Emissions Database and Honeywell Duty Cycle per Airport Turn (With Gate Power)

Parameter	Narrow-Body Aircraft	Wide-Body Aircraft
-----------	----------------------	--------------------

3. Comments and Responses

Fuel burn	-10 to +20%	-30 to +15%
HC emissions	+15 to +25% (1)	-50 to +25%
CO emissions	+20 to +30%	-100 to +30%
NOx emissions	-15 to +25%	-30 to +20%

Error = 100 (United Parameter - Honeywell Parameter)/(Honeywell Parameter)

Note: (1) except for A320 which was 65% too high

Table 5. Error between United APU Emissions Database and Honeywell Duty Cycle per Airport Turn (Without Gate Power)

Parameter	Narrow-Body Aircraft	Wide-Body Aircraft
Fuel burn	±10% (1)	-30 to +15%
HC emissions	+15 to +15% (2)	-50 to +20%
CO emissions	+15 to +35%	-100 to +35%
NOx emissions	±10% (1)	+25%

Error = 100 (United Parameter - Honeywell Parameter)/(Honeywell Parameter)

Notes:

(1) except for A320 which was 30% too high

(2) except for A320 which was 65% too high

Due to the variability seen in Tables 4 and 5 above, Honeywell updated the duty cycle average parameters in the United APU Emissions Database that were felt to be significantly in error or outdated. The updated values are shown in Table 6 below.

Table 6. Updated Duty Aircraft AP Cycle Average APU Emissions and Fuel Burn

Aircraft	APU	Fuel Burn lb/hr	HC EI lb/1000 lb fuel	CO EI lb/1000 lb fuel	NOx EI lb/100 lb fuel
B737-300/50	85-129CK	235	1.03	17.99	4.75
B737-200	85-129	235	1.03	17.99	4.75
B727	85-98CK	235	1.03	17.99	4.75
B757	331-200ER	268	0.43	4.13	9.51
B767	331-200ER	268	0.43	4.13	9.51
DC-10	700-4B	463	0.37	3.73	8.23
B747-100/200	600-4	767	0.28	8.65	5.33
A320	36-300	221	0.15	2.05	10.1
B777	331-500	536	0.20	1.89	11.41

Note: Bold items changed from United APU Emissions Database

A final comparison was then made between the APU fuel consumption and emissions for a complete cycle (airport turn) using the revised United APU Emissions Database and the Honeywell detailed emissions indices. Results of this analysis are shown in Tables 7 for airports with and without gate power.

Table 7. Error Between Revised United APU Emissions Database and Honeywell Duty Cycle per Airport Turn (With and Without Gate Power)

Parameter	Narrow-Body Aircraft	Wide-Body Aircraft
Fuel burn	0 to -10%	±10%
HC emissions	-5 to +30%	-5 to +15%
CO emissions	0 to +30%	-5 to 35%
NOx emissions	0 to -15%	-15 to +5%

Ata estimated APU operating times used for all calculations

Error = 100 (United Parameter - Honeywell Parameter)/(Honeywell Parameter)

As shown above the errors when using the revised United APU Emissions Database are minimal, and primarily due to the different assumptions on the percentage of time at low load condition. Use of the revised United APU Emissions Database and the ATA estimated APU operating times should result in a reasonably accurate evaluation of the contribution of APU emissions to airport pollution.

APU and Aircraft Combinations

Two tables showing APU and aircraft combinations were provided to Honeywell for review. The first table, also provided in your August 21, 2000 letter to Honeywell is "Table 8. APUs and Commercial Aircraft Models" from the 1995 FAA technical report entitled, Technical Data to Support FAA's Advisory

3. Comments and Responses

Circular on Reducing Emissions from Commercial Aviation. This table provides an accurate summary of which major APU family is used on different aircraft. The second table, provided as an electronic spreadsheet from one of the ATAsub-contractors (Hagler-Bailey), appeared to be derived from the first table but had numerous errors. An update of the second table is provided as Attachment 4. This table includes the actual APU model installed in each aircraft, along with a recommendation on the APU to use for emissions calculations. Table 8 below summarizes the fuel burn rates and emission indices for the APUs listed that were not already included in the revised United APU Emissions Database.

Table 8. Additional Duty Cycle Average APU Emissions and Fuel Burn

APU	Fuel Burn lb/hr	HC EI lb/1000 lb fuel	CO EI lb/1000 lb fuel	NOx EI lb/100 lb fuel
30-54	69	4.31	36.3	3.57
36-4A	134	0.36	13.47	5.10
36-100	146	0.57	31.1	5.33
36-150[]	149	0.61	6.45	5.10
36-150[RR]	183	0.49	7.26	5.29
131-9	255	0.37	4.88	6.64
331-350	453	0.23	1.86	9.90

APU Useful Life

Two definitions of APU useful life were provided in the EPA letter, along with a request for Honeywell to provide comments on these definitions. From the additional comments provided, it appears the APU useful life definition will be used to evaluate the timing and cost of implementing potential emissions control measures.

One definition of APU useful life provided, was the time between engine overhauls or major rebuilds. The second definition provided was the useful life of a fleet of engines is as follows: if the useful life of a fleet of equipment is 10 years, the last piece of equipment in the fleet is taken out of service at 20 years.

The useful life of Honeywell APUs, with suitable repair and replacement of parts, is equal to the lifetime of the aircraft. Typically this would be on the order of 30 years or 50,000 flight cycles. Most new APUs are designed for on-condition maintenance with no scheduled repairs or maintenance actions.

Hopefully, the information and analysis provided above answer your specific questions concerning APU operation and exhaust emissions, and clarify Honeywell's previous concerns with the publicly available APU emissions data. Honeywell appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on your procedure to calculate APU emissions at airports. Use of the updated APU emissions indices and fuel burn rates along with the ATA estimated APU operating times, with a representative mix of operation with and without gate power, should provide a reasonable assessment of the contribution of APUs to airport pollution levels. Information provided in this letter, including the updated duty cycle average APU emission indices and fuel burn rates provided herein can be publicly distributed.

Please feel free to contact either Joe Zelina or myself to clarify any additional issues on this subject, or for any additional assistance needed for your aviation emissions study or the Voluntary Measures to Reduce Airport Related Emissions program.

Attachment 1. APU Emissions Data from 1995 FAA technical report entitled, Technical Data to Support FAA's Advisory Circular on Reducing Emissions from Commercial Aviation (Page 1 of 2)

TABLE 9: MODAL EMISSION RATES - AUXILIARY POWER UNITS

Please see original document for table.

Attachment 1. APU Emissions Data from 1995 FAA technical report entitled, Technical Data to Support FAA's Advisory Circular on Reducing Emissions from Commercial Aviation (Page 2 of 2)

TABLE 9: MODAL EMISSION RATES - AUXILIARY POWER UNITS

(Continued)

Please see original document for table.

Attachment 2. United Airlines APU Emissions Database

Please see original document for table.

Attachment 3. APU Operation and Load Conditions

APU Operation

The APU is traditionally operated to provide a power source for the aircraft air-conditioning units and electrical systems during gate and taxi operations on the ground. The APU is also used to provide a power source for main engine starting. The APU can also be used in-flight as an alternate power source in the event of a main engine system failure.

The small engine size, high efficiency, low fuel burn, and low emission levels makes the APU an extremely low contributor to airport or metropolitan pollution levels.

Terminology for APU Load Conditions:

No Load - same as Idle - no shaft or bleed load extracted - may be at 100% engine speed or reduced speed depending on the particular APU model (most APUs run at constant speed over the entire load range)

Generator Load- shaft (electric) load only, no bleed air extraction - the generator is mounted to the APU gearbox - a part power condition on the ground - for emissions testing, the generator is usually either set at a representative aircraft maximum load condition, or set to the maximum generator load limit.

ECS - environmental control system - APU bleed air is supplied to the aircraft air conditioning packs, which supply conditioned air to the cabin - for emissions testing the bleed load condition is set for typical aircraft gate operation (depending on the aircraft type and size) -normally includes some shaft (electric) load.

Max ECS - maximum environmental control system - APU bleed air is supplied to the aircraft air conditioning packs - the bleed load is set for the maximum aircraft load condition - normally includes some shaft (electric) load.

MES - main engine start - APU bleed air is supplied to the main engine air turbine starter -bleed load is usually set to a specified corrected flow condition representative of typical aircraft operation - normally includes some shaft (electric) load.

Attachment 4. Updated APU and Aircraft Combinations (Page 1 of 2)
Please see original document for table.

Attachment 4. Updated APU and Aircraft Combinations (Page 2 of 2)
Please see original document for table.

Response:

This letter was attached to the comment letter from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (AF00001). Please see Response to Comment AF00001-20 regarding the Honeywell information.

PC02441 Garbanati, James None Provided

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02179; please refer to the response to comment letter PC02179.

PC02442 Cully, Mark None Provided 9/20/2001

PC02442-1

Comment:

Absolutely no LAX 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.

PC02442-2

Comment:

Playa del Rey is pounded by aircraft noise at all hours, day and night.

Response:

Comment noted. For more information on noise impacts on Playa del Rey, see Response to Comment PC00499-1.

PC02442-3

Comment:

To add aircraft flights is unthinkable. To "realign" the north runway to be even closer to Playa del Rey is idiotic. (stupid!)

Response:

Comment noted. For information regarding future noise increases, please see Topical Response TR-N-6. Alternatives A, B and C propose the development of a runway north of the current north runway alignment. Alternative D would not move runways northward. For more information on noise impacts on Playa del Rey, see Response to Comment PC00499-1.

PC02442-4

Comment:

Enough damage has already been done to too many communities. How about a little intelligent planning for the future? Go back to square one.

Think Palmdale - not greed and profit at all cost to us!

Security (?) and safety first.
Remember???

Response:

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

PC02443

**Cully, Douglas &
Katharyn**

None Provided

9/19/2001

PC02443-1

Comment:

No LAX EXPANSION! EVER! SECURITY! (?) SAFETY! (?)

I vehemently oppose LAX expansion, especially "realigning" the north runway even closer to Playa del Rey.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security issues and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC02443-2

Comment:

There is no concern for the noise levels in our community by the airlines, FAA, or LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. 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. Also, please see Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 regarding existing and future noise levels.

PC02443-3

Comment:

Our "buffer zone" was eliminated by creating new definitions of "early turns," etc. 95 DB (the real noise level with which we live) is commonplace.

Response:

Comment noted. The commentor referred to the phrase buffer zone, which is not used within the noise section of the Draft EIS/EIR. For information on early turns please see Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2 regarding early turns over areas north and south of LAX.

PC02443-4

Comment:

Playa del Rey bears a huge amount of of aircraft noise both night and day.

Response:

Comment noted. For more information on noise impacts on Playa del Rey, see Response to Comment PC00499-1.

PC02443-5

Comment:

Not a single complaint of mine has been answered in the five years I have voiced complaints (after all, the Air Transport Association rules all!) Arrogance!

Response:

Comment noted. LAWA's noise complaint database shows that from 1998 to present, Mr. & Mrs. Cully reported 70 noise complaints. One noise complaint was filed on 9/7/02 and was responded to on April 2, 2003. Their previous complaint was 2/6/01. No response was requested so they were not sent a letter. During 2000 there were 4 noise complaints (2/7, 2/12, 4/26 and 5/15). These and previous complaints were investigated by Noise Management and sent to ANCRO for follow up or response. It is currently the policy to respond to all complainants who request a response by sending them a copy of

3. Comments and Responses

the monthly report of LAWA's investigations. Due to staffing issues, LAWA staff is currently 3 months behind in responses. Also, please see Topical Response TR-LU-3, regarding information on filing noise complaints and LAWA's handling of noise complaints.

With regard to the comment's parenthetical statement regarding the Air Transport Association (ATA), the ATA is a trade organization for the principal U.S. airlines. In that capacity it has played a major role in U.S. aviation since its founding, including the creation of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the creation of the air traffic control system, and airline deregulation. The purpose of the ATA is to support and assist its members by promoting the air transport industry and the safety, cost effectiveness, and technological advancement of its operations; advocating common industry positions before state and local governments; conducting designated industry-wide programs; and assuring governmental and public understanding of all aspects of air transport. ATA members are required to comply with LAWA's and the FAA's rules and regulations and it has no bearing on LAWA's response to noise complaints process.

PC02443-6

Comment:

Our beautiful ocean view property value has been depressed by aircraft noise.

Response:

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

PC02443-7

Comment:

We have lived here forty eight years. LAX invaded our space increasingly over the years.

Who cares? Oh yes, we must bail those greedy folks out so they can further ruin our neighborhood!

Response:

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

PC02444

**Handelman, Murray
& Maxine**

None Provided

9/19/2001

PC02444-1

Comment:

We are totally against the Master Plan. We do not want any plan that limits expansion only to LAX.

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.

PC02444-2

Comment:

Noise: We have lived in Playa del Rey for (40) forty years. For the past month and a half we are hearing plane noise day and night - cargo planes, loud, after 12:00 midnight.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02178-02.

PC02444-3**Comment:**

The planes are flying over Playa del Rey.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02178-3.

PC02444-4**Comment:**

We do not want this noise impact to increase by moving the North runway another 500 feet closer to Playa del Rey.

Response:

Comment noted. Please refer to Response to Comment PC02176-3 regarding the relocation of Runway 24R/6L.

PC02444-5**Comment:**

According to Dr. Joyce Brothers, "Excessive noise has an effect on gastrointestinal function. It can cause blood pressure to rise, severe headaches, and some people become very nervous."

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise.

PC02444-6**Comment:**

Noise is such a great disturbance in our homes - as are the fumes, air pollution, and traffic congestion.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding fumes.

PC02444-7**Comment:**

Ring roads, tunnels, taking of more homes, ruining neighborhoods and business areas cannot be tolerated.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed land use impacts in Section 4.2, Land Use, traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 5, S-1, and S-2. It should be noted that Alternative D, added subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, does not include the LAX Expressway or the ring

3. Comments and Responses

road, does not require extension of the Sepulveda Boulevard tunnel, does not propose the acquisition of homes, and requires substantially less acquisition of businesses than the other build alternatives.

PC02444-8

Comment:

We must have a regional plan to handle the aviation needs over the coming years. Improve Ontario and Palmdale airports. Develop new airports to better serve other communities. This would more fairly share the burdens and benefits of aviation across Southern California.

Response:

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

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.

PC02444-9

Comment:

Stop these expensive and misguided plans for expanding LAX. We don't need more noise, pollution, and unbearable traffic to Playa del Rey, Westchester, El Segundo, and Inglewood.

The answer is a regional plan!

Response:

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

PC02445

Myers, Dorothy

None Provided

9/8/2001

PC02445-1

Comment:

Many people in Palmdale and the Antelope Valley do not want airport expansion here.

We live (our family) about 4 miles away from the airport. We came here years ago for the peace & quiet.

No expanded airport, please!

Response:

Comment noted.

**PC02446 Helling, Edward A. & None Provided
Sara L.**

7/21/2001

PC02446-1

Comment:

The Master Plan is a short term fix. Other options should be considered - such as Palmdale or Ontario - and El Toro in Orange County. It is not fair that LA County should bear all the traffic burden.

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. 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.

PC02446-2

Comment:

Playa Vista development also places a burden on Westchester congestion and traffic. We do not need further expansion & traffic.

Response:

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

PC02446-3

Comment:

Please explore other solutions. 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02447 Topper, Elizabeth None Provided 7/20/2001

PC02447-1

Comment:

Don't expand LAX!!! There already is too much automobile traffic on freeways and streets on the Westside. If executed, the 405 Fwy will become a parking lot. This will impact all Californians and even tourism. Tourists won't want to put up with traffic, esp. since we don't have good mass transit, and they won't come.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02447-2

Comment:

Don't mess up our city for future generations just to satisfy your ego!

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02448 Ter Veen, Janet None Provided 7/18/2001

PC02448-1

Comment:

I urge you to support the expansion of airports other than LAX. Westchester, Inglewood, Playa Del Rey and El Segundo already bear the brunt of the pollution, traffic & noise of LAX. These will only get worse if LAX is expanded.

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

PC02449 Bray, Everett None Provided 7/16/2001

PC02449-1

Comment:

EIR/EIS prediction that increased ground and air traffic will result in increased emissions of all five "criteria pollutants" is unacceptable!

- (1) NOx emissions to increase by 31% per year = UNACCEPTABLE
- (2) SO2 emissions to increase by 55% per year = UNACCEPTABLE
- (3) Construction to add 1,302% increase in smog = UNACCEPTABLE

3. Comments and Responses

Response:
Comment noted.

PC02449-2

Comment:
The entire plan is outrageous to foist on our community for the second time in 25 years especially when we have a choice about where to grow our airports Ontario, Palmdale etc.

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

PC02450 Kotoff, Bettie None Provided 7/16/2001

PC02450-1

Comment:
The attached paper says it all.

[NO ATTACHMENT WAS RECEIVED WITH THIS SUBMISSION]

Response:
Comment noted. No attachment was received with this comment letter.

PC02450-2

Comment:
All those in favor of the expansion should travel up & down Sepulveda Blvd. at peak hours & tell us how we could handle more traffic.

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

PC02451 Jacobs, Edythe Del Rey Manor Homeowners Association 7/15/2001

PC02451-1

Comment:
I've lived in this area for 25 years and hope to be able to continue living here. However, between the airport's plan to expand and the builder's taking over some of our precious wetlands, life becomes less peaceful in this area.

I've invested money to live here and will do what I can to keep it the kind of community I love

Please do your part -

3. Comments and Responses

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.

PC02451-2

Comment:

*P.S. Our intersection at Falmouth & Westchester Pkwy must be kept open.

Response:

Comment noted. Under Alternatives A, B, and C, the Falmouth connection to Westchester Parkway would be too close to the west terminal interchange with the ring road to be safely maintained. The intersection would be replaced with an improved intersection at Pershing/Westchester Parkway. Alternately, Falmouth traffic could use Manchester Boulevard to Lincoln Boulevard with access to the ring road. Alternative D would not affect the Falmouth/Westchester Parkway intersection.

PC02452 Hyra, Joan None Provided 7/11/2001

PC02452-1

Comment:

For many years members of my family have suffered from various respiratory problems. We never even suspected LAX was making those conditions worse. Recently at neighborhood meetings I've heard about the pollutants planes put into our air. Plus we get even more pollution from vehicle traffic going to and from the airport. Our health is being affected negatively because of LAX-caused pollution. No to LAX expansion!

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.

PC02453 Burns, Bruce None Provided 7/12/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00824; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC00824.

PC02455 Triplett, Janice Lear None Provided 6/18/2001

PC02455-1

Comment:

I'm writing this note for my 85 year old parents. They built their home in 1950 and have lived on Airport Blvd. for over 50 years. Now, their quiet neighborhood is in danger of becoming an expressway that would connect the traffic from the 405 freeway to Westchester Parkway to LAX. PLEASE STOP this expansion project as it would cause many negative effects on this community in the form of diesel soot, noise, and air pollution as well as destroying quiet neighborhoods and the quality of life people have worked hard for.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts to quality of life, Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping. It should be noted that Alternative D added subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, does not include the LAX Expressway or the Ring Road.

PC02455-2

Comment:

PLEASE WORK TOWARDS alternatives that would reduce the traffic and provide access to regional airports. Thank you.

Response:

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

PC02455-3

Comment:

We are neighbors to the Lear family and have lived here over 30 years, and an expressway would make it unliveable.

Response:

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

PC02455-4

Comment:

There are regional airports that could easily be expanded with no harm to anyone, such as Palmdale, lots of land. Ontario, and El toro. There are several vacant air force bases available.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

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.

PC02455-5

Comment:

How long would expansion of LAX last? 20 years or less then they would want more of Westchester, which has given enough, several thousand homes already.

Response:

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

PC02455-6

Comment:

We have enough traffic, noise, and pollution, the population is building out, so use airports in other areas, and not funnel passengers and cargo into LAX.

Response:

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

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.

PC02455-7

Comment:

Please save Westchester:

Response:

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

PC02456 Rotolo, Pat & Lenore None Provided

7/21/2001

PC02456-1

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.

PC02456-2

Comment:

Now in the new millenium they want to take more homes and businesses, which includes one half of Westchester business district.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC01751-2; please refer to Response to Comment PC01751-2-2.

PC02456-3

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.

PC02456-4

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.

PC02456-5

Comment:

Pollution will be unhealthy for everyone living in the area and cause cancer not only to the elderly but to the young families which live in the area, El Segundo, Westchester, Playa del Rey, Inglewood etc. There is an abundance of families with young children in these areas.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

This comment is essentially the same as PC01751-5; please see Response to Comment PC01751-5.

PC02456-6

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.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02456-7

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. just to hear it. My daughter lives in El Segundo and the noise is unbearable.

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.

PC02456-8

Comment:

Even with soundproofing, which means we have to keep our doors and windows closed, and turn on the fan for air, which raises the price of our electric bill and we will still breathe in the pollution and breath in more if we go out shopping or work in our gardens.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00088-2.

PC02456-9

Comment:

What are you doing to us?

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02456-10

Comment:

(P.S.) I'm joining my daughters & son and if our grandchildren (their children) 5 of them, have too many respiratory infections or (God forbid) cancer we'll fight like Erin Brockovich and sue LAX out of business & I'm sure other residents

Response:

This comment is essentially the same as comment PC01751-11. Please see Response to Comment PC01751-11.

PC02457 Walsh, Suzanne None Provided 7/23/2001

PC02457-1

Comment:

The surrounding LAX area simply cannot handle a major expansion. The major boulevards are already over-crowded. We are concerned about the increase in noise and air pollution.

Response:

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

PC02457-2

Comment:

The best solution is increased utilization of Palmdale and Ontario airports. Any LAX expansion is only a band-aid to a long term problem of increased need for additional flights.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC02458 Russell, Stephen None Provided 7/1/2001

PC02458-1

Comment:

This voter feels the FAA should alter its regulations to allow citizens to fly Decommissioned/Inactive USAF/USN/USMC combat planes/ copters or those/ due for inaction:

F14, F15, FA18, Hueycobra, Huey, AV8B, A7, A6, A4, F100, F4, F5 T38, T37, T34, T45, T1, S 67, HH53 etc.

(The planned F22 will replace the F15 / F16 craft, while the Joint Strike Fighter: JSF will replace: F14, AV8A, FA18 for the Navy alone.)

(My history role model is the Barnstorming pilots from post WW1 flying JN 4 Jenny biplanes from the then USAC. Same idea for today.)

In Russia, one can ride in a Mig 25 to near space, why not the same here over Nevada, Arizona, NY State, Maine, KS, HI, WA using US jets: F106, F101, F100, F4, F5, TF16, F15.

Said planes can fly from Gen Av Airports IE Fox Field CA.

Benefits:

- Ejection seats removed from planes or made Non usable.
- 'Fly by wire' used
- Operate from small medium fields IE Fox Field CA
- Flown by ex vet pilots anyway

3. Comments and Responses

-"Living History"
- doable.

Hope this helps, route this to those who can effect within FAA.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02458-2

Comment:

PS:

LAX Improvements:

1. extend runway E/W over said beach into surf sea zone, 1000, 2000 plus ft.
leave said beach area unusable due to runway.

Response:

The commentor's suggestion to extend runway over into the El Segundo Sand Dunes and the El Segundo Blue Butterfly Habitat Restoration Area was evaluated as one of the alternatives in the Master Plan and removed from further consideration to protect the environs. Please see Response to Comment PC00998-1 for a detailed explanation on how the decision was made not to consider alternatives that extend runway into Pacific Ocean. .

PC02458-3

Comment:

2. More parking N/S of LAX Proper with Tramway access to LAX-see Las Vegas Macarren Airport tram system.
3. Underground mini subway to connect Remote parking centers?
4. Peplemovers with 80 person pods to link to Terminals.

Response:

Alternative D includes some of the suggestions made by the Commentor. For example, Alternative D proposes construction of an Automated People Mover (APM) System that would connect the Central Terminal Area (CTA) with proposed airport parking facilities at a Ground Transportation Center and an Intermodal Transportation Center. The APM would be designed to adequately accommodate the anticipated number of passengers.

An expanded FlyAway system is proposed in all the Master Plan alternatives. FlyAways are facilities at which airport passengers and employees can park nearer to their places of origin and travel to LAX via an airport-operated shuttle bus. Under Alternative D, the FlyAway shuttles are the only passenger vehicles that would be allowed to access the CTA. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5, and in particular Subtopical Response TR-ST-5.5 for additional information regarding potential FlyAway sites.

PC02458-4

Comment:

5. expand US Customs Center Area.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02458-5

Comment:

6. Satellite Heliports to deter traffic air.

Response:

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

PC02458-6

Comment:

7. More taxiways or remap said taxiways.

Response:

Comment noted. Each of the Master Plan build alternatives would include additional taxiways and modifications made to existing taxiways to remedy the airfield deficiencies which would lead to more airfield congestion by imposing slower taxi speeds. For a detailed discussion of proposed taxiway construction and modifications for each of the Master Plan alternatives, please see Response to Comment PC00563-4.

PC02458-7

Comment:

8. Metrolink Train Terminus sited.
9. Greyhound Bus terminus near LAX!

Response:

A connection to the MTA Green Line would be an integral part of each alternative. Also, buses would be allowed access to terminal curbs in the same manner as exists today. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

PC02458-8

Comment:

10. wind turbines near runways to use winds from sea to power LAX & 10,000 homes, business in area alone, wind turbines housed in shielded domes with inlets for winds & exhaust.

Face seaside, fixed or semi rotate to track wind flow.

Response:

Open spaces near runways at LAX are clear zones, which must be kept free of construction or other structures for safety purposes, or are a part of the El Segundo Blue Butterfly preserve. Wind turbines would constitute a safety hazard and could affect endangered species.

PC02458-9

Comment:

On another Airport issue, I'd like to see Sacramento Intl Sac CA use 2 jetways to unload Jets from Southwest Airlines.

(No, I don't feel FAA should dictate here but unloading time is slow at Sacramento Intl due to 1 jetway per plane.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02459 Younglove, Charles None Provided 9/18/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02168; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC02168.

PC02460 Snell, Kathy None Provided 9/13/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02131; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC02131.

PC02461 Chiella, Karen None Provided 7/21/2001

PC02461-1

Comment:

Pease support a regional solution to airport needs & do not allow 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.

PC02461-2

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.

PC02461-3

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.

PC02461-4

Comment:

(Note - the 405 is already a parking lot - we don't need added LAX 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 surface transportation analysis methodology.

PC02461-5

Comment:

(2) Palmdale & Ontario should be developed to handle cargo - Palmdale wants a bigger airport - give them one!

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. Please see Response to Comment PC00599-54 for more information about cargo activity.

PC02461-6

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:

Comment noted. Impacts associated with Westchester Southside were addressed relative to land use effects in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6) of the Draft EIS/EIR. As described in subsection 4.2.6, 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 to restrict building heights, setbacks, and landscape buffers in order to ensure compatibility with adjacent residential uses. See also Topical Response TR-LU-2 for additional discussion of LAX Northside/Westchester Southside project in relation to the community of Westchester.

PC02462

Keppel, John

None Provided

8/7/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02123; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC02123.

PC02463

**Cook, Richard B. &
Rena D.**

None Provided

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01250; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01250.

PC02464

Ingham, Mary

None Provided

8/1/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01862; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01862.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02465 Berghammer, Arich West Hollywood Chamber of Commerce 7/24/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01861; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01861.

PC02466 Frelinger, Amy Nelson None Provided 7/24/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01786; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01786.

PC02467 Bobak, Juliet None Provided

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01566; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01566.

PC02468 Wankino, Wayne None Provided 7/23/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01643; please refer to the response to comment letter PC01643.

PC02469 Wittenberg, Andrea None Provided 7/23/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01789; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01789.

PC02470 Bobak, Esq., Martin None Provided 7/20/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01563; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01563.

PC02471 Sasa, Kayoko None Provided

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01570; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01570.

PC02472 Andreadis, Irene None Provided 7/20/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01487; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01487.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02473 Santos-DeCure, Cynthia None Provided 7/20/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01544; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01544.

PC02474 Wood, Linda None Provided 7/19/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01678; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01678.

PC02475 Batton, Judy None Provided 7/12/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00934; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC00934.

PC02476 Farmas, Misha None Provided 7/8/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01223; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01223.

PC02477 Griffith, Ronald None Provided 7/8/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01223; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01223.

PC02478 Quiring, Kathie None Provided 7/5/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00596; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00596.

PC02479 Kennedy, Robert & Diana None Provided 7/3/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00591; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC00591.

PC02481 Ford, Betty None Provided 7/1/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01737; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01737.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02482 Jones, Donald L. & Lynn None Provided

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00214; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC00214.

PC02483 Halpine, Susana None Provided 7/30/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01833; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01833.

PC02484 Holabird, Rhoda None Provided 7/27/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01793; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01793.

PC02485 Howell, S. None Provided 8/1/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02053; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC02053.

PC02486 Deritis, Joanne None Provided 8/20/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02056; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC02056.

PC02487 Forman, Sandra None Provided 8/17/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01973; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01973.

PC02488 Lipp, Susan None Provided 7/21/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02054; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC02054.

PC02489 Carlson, Carol None Provided 7/14/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01078; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01078.

PC02491 Sheehan, Jeanine None Provided 9/21/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02191; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC02191.

PC02492 Anderson, David J. & Carol Butler None Provided 9/21/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02186; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC02186.

PC02493 Bulpitt, Ken None Provided 9/21/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02224; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC02224.

PC02494 Dubois, Karen None Provided 9/20/2001

PC02494-1

Comment:

To all those concerned, this is in response to the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) draft-environmental impact statement and environmental impact report (draft-EIS/EIR).

Let me also state that I live adjacent to the north runway of LAX. To all those people who do not want it in their back-yard, well it is in my back-yard and I do oppose the master plan so that it is not in my side and my front yard as well. It is also over my head. The FAA does nothing to curve the airspace above Playa Del Rey for early turns that are supposed to go over to the ocean.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC02494-2

Comment:

When I purchased my condo here, the Office of Ruth Galanter showed me plans to put in a new golf course and a park where Westchester Parkway now is. Now I might have a runway. Well, no trust here when people tell you something.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester and Response to Comment PC00264-2 regarding expansion of parks and recreation areas.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02494-3

Comment:

It is absurd to bring the entire Los Angeles region into the already jam-packed LAX area. Is expansion in the best interest of the communities surrounding LAX? Is it in the best interests of those who must travel for long periods, lengthy hours on the San Diego Freeway? Is it in the best interest to increase air traffic, increase passengers, to where there are already record numbers of near misses? The answer is the same, no, no, no.

Any LAX extension would waste billions of dollars and would be only a short-term fix and affect more than 150,000 adults and children who live nearby to an increase in noise, traffic, and air pollution.

And for what? So that people in Orange County do not have to have it in their back-yard? So that the limited number of businessmen can profit? The answer to those two questions are yes, yes.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No 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-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. 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.

PC02494-4

Comment:

Now down to a major issue that will affect me most of all. I oppose the new entrance from Pershing Drive. I oppose using the Westchester Parkway as a ring road. We do not need more roadways. You could use existing roadways. Additional new terminals could be located at the east end of the airport, accessible from Aviation Blvd.. And guess what, you do not have to condemn existing homes and businesses. A new people mover can connect the new terminal to new concourses and all other terminals. Remote drop off points and baggage checkin makes more sense that to concentrate everything at LAX. We currently have a ring road, much smaller that the one proposed, but it already is a large source of smog, noise and congestion. The proposed ring road would simply be a larger source of more and more smog, noise and congestion.

And what will it do for the people of Playa Del Rey, or even Marina Del Rey? We will all have to go east onto the San Diego freeway to go south.

Response:

This suggested concept of remote drop off points and baggage check-in is very similar to the new Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, Alternative D, which was analyzed in detail in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, the proposed Alternative D would not have a Ring Road or a passenger entrance from Pershing Drive. 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.

PC02494-5

Comment:

Get real, there will always have to be people who live near an airport. I am doing my turn, now let the people from other areas do theirs. Trying to crowd tens of millions of people and huge volumes of cargo where they do not fit is not in the best interest of anyone. LAX is surrounded by heavy populated areas with 12 schools.

Response:

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

PC02494-6

Comment:

With 25% of LAX passengers coming from neighboring counties, now is the time to remove some of the burden from an already overburdened LAX. You need to cap the annual passengers and make our present airport safer and find a regional solution.

Response:

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

PC02494-7

Comment:

Additional runways, entrances or a ring road is not the answer. The only thing I agree with is to make public transportation to the airport easier. Do not give our small community more smog, traffic and noise.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please note that Alternative D would not include a ring road. Alternatives C and D do not include the construction of additional runways, but do include lengthening and relocation of runways to accommodate a new parallel taxiway to reduce runway incursions and improve airfield operations. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02495 Broussinos, Peter None Provided

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02243; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC02243.

PC02496 Sochar, Karen None Provided 9/24/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02244; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC02244.

PC02497 Seyfarth, Gordon None Provided 9/22/2001

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

PC02498 Cassman, Alan None Provided 9/10/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02218; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC02218.

PC02499 Schiltz, Brian None Provided 10/1/2001

PC02499-1

Comment:

Our small town is suffering because of convenience. Divert usage to JFK, Ontario, Burbank. We are 1 city with more airports than all the others. Take advantage of that.

Response:

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

PC02500 Mashburn, Lucille None Provided 10/1/2001

PC02500-1

Comment:

Without a doubt the Master Plan for LAX needs a total rework, with passenger safety and security being priority number one. The large decrease in air traffic will continue, unless people can be guaranteed that that they will be safe from terrorist actions, or from the danger of being shot down by our military forces. Denying passengers penknives, manicure implements, tweezers, and hair spray just won't get the job done. Police, bomb-sniffing dogs, National Guardsmen, can handle ground problems. Air Marshalls are a good idea, but could one Air Marshall have subdued four or five terrorists?

The threat of terrorism needs to be kept off the planes, and out of the airport. One suggestion would be to rebuild the interior parking structures into customs-like facilities. No one gets on the plane without a background check, or previous background clearance. Anyone smelling of alcohol, or appearing impaired by any substance, must undergo testing: either breathalyzer, or urine screening. (These testing methods are non-invasive.) Anyone under the influence is a potential danger to other passengers, and possibly to the aircraft.

Response:

Please see Response to Comments PC02284-17, PC01881-31, and PC02131-5.

PC02500-2

Comment:

Passenger drop-off, pick-up, and parking should be off-site, with shuttles, or people-movers for interior transportation. In addition clean, high-speed efficient transportation is needed, rather than building more freeways, or widening the existing routes. Bullet trains to Orange County, San Diego, Ontario Airport, Palmdale, San Fernando Valley, San Francisco, Seattle, and Las Vegas, would greatly supplement airport operations.

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. Please also see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand and Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

PC02500-3

Comment:

The expansion of LAX would increase security problems exponentially. More vehicular traffic, more passengers, more cargo, would demand more security expense. The logical solution is to make existing facilities more efficient, and more secure. Streamline operations with safety first, and the public will fly again. From a personal point of view, I have flown to Anchorage, Dallas, Little Rock, Newark, JFK, La Guardia, and McCarran, feeling safer in the air than on our crowded freeways. Now I would think about taking three hours waiting for a 30-40 minute flight to Las Vegas, a 2 1/2 hour flight to Dallas, or boarding a fuel-loaded 767 for the East Coast. I'm SCARED!!!

Response:

Security issues were addressed in all alternatives but are the focus of Alternative D.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02502 Faris, Gracie Bobbie None Provided 9/21/2001
Elnora

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02184; please refer to the response to comment letter PC02184.

PC02503 Rasmussen, Laurie None Provided 10/5/2001

PC02503-1

Comment:

By this time, I hope that everyone can agree that we need more regional airports, rather than concentrating traffic at LAX. Various issues such as security, congestion, pollution, revenues and capacity etc., are better resolved when distributing the burdens as well as responsibilities to the local communities and the citizens they serve.

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.

PC02504 Mashburn, Lucille None Provided 10/6/2001

PC02504-1

Comment:

- 1) Use the bomb-sniffing dogs in the terminals to check passengers waiting to check baggage through. Eliminate curbside check-in. Sky-Caps could work inside the terminals to facilitate check-in, after the dogs have checked the baggage. It is still easy for a terrorist to check through explosive-laden luggage, and not even get on the plane.
- 2) Electrify the cockpit door by the pilot pushing a button, giving enough of a jolt to back off anyone trying to force an entry. This method is used in taxi-cab seats in Italy, to discourage thieves, muggers, and obstreperous passengers.
- 3) Allow pilots to depressurize the cabin. Oxygen masks would drop for seated passengers, allowing the pilot to make a maneuver to put the terrorists off balance.
- 4) Install glue cartridges beneath the center aisle carpeting, to be dispensed in the event of hijacking. Stick their feet to the floor to gain temporary advantage.
- 5) Modify all silverware so that knives will cut food, but not people. Serve soft foods or finger foods only, especially on domestic flights. Menus can be modified for international flights, so that sharp knives are unnecessary.

3. Comments and Responses

6) Make it very plain, that if the aircraft is taken over, it will be shot down.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comments PC02284-17, PC01881-31, and PC02131-5.

PC02505 Kitayama, John None Provided 9/24/2001

PC02505-1

Comment:

My comment on the LAX Master Plan is a repeated theme but I wanted to put my name in as a concerned individual. Other airports in the region must share in the passenger and cargo load. The emphasis should be on improving the other airports so that airline companies and cargo companies will want to do business at those 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.

PC02505-2

Comment:

The latest census had the eastern parts of Southern California as the fastest growing areas in terms of population growth. It seems logical to increase capacity nearer to those areas.

Response:

An update of the master plan for Ontario is currently underway. The Ontario master plan will recommend the needed improvements to address the projected demand. The local community supports the airport's growth, and Ontario has the potential to capture a much larger share of total regional demand. Space is available for terminal development between and adjacent to the existing terminals. ONT's air service has grown over the past 15 years as development in the region has expanded into the eastern end of the Los Angeles region, known as the Inland Empire, and air travel demand in the area has correspondingly increased. Development of Ontario will only meet part of the regional demand. Please also see Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR Section 2.3, Regional Context, for a description of the other regional airport facilities and their projected role in meeting the regions air transportation needs. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

**PC02506 Ha, Kee Whan Korean-American Federation of
Los Angeles, Inc.**

PC02506-1

Comment:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE RECOMMENDED LAX MASTER PLAN

3. Comments and Responses

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

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02508 Hogenauer, Alan None Provided 9/24/2001

PC02508-1

Comment:

Most of all, I want to comment favorably on the professionalism exhibited throughout by you and your staff, under Lydia Kennard's overall direction. Clearly, under the guidelines of the FAA's master planning process, and LAWA's role and responsibilities as the executive body overseeing Los Angeles' aviation activities, you have done your duty admirably. From the point of view of a city in need of primary airport development - in an increasingly competitive environment - the plan does what it is supposed to do.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02508-2

Comment:

Having said all that, however (but in no way denigrating from the professionalism exhibited), I must disagree with the forecasts - primarily the forecast distribution among regional alternatives - upon which the plan is based, and, by inference, with the plan resulting therefrom.

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.

PC02508-3

Comment:

I think broader regional approaches - as noted, not LAWA's direct responsibility - are preferable to concentrating so much traffic at LAX. This concentration correspondingly necessitates such radical expansion measures as the proposed ring road off an already-clogged freeway system, and the major air cargo terminal close to a largely residential neighborhood. Redistribution of the forecast, and the use of numerous under/non-utilized airfields, will likely reduce the need for these drastic LAX measures.

Response:

Comment noted. Please refer to Response to Comment PC02508-2. Alternative D assessed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR does not include a ring road.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02508-4

Comment:

I look forward to the implementation of the supplemental regional master plan study already in the works, and to continuing to work closely with LAWA as a member of the Business Council representing Loyola Marymount University.

Response:

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

PC02509

Hamilton, Patricia

None Provided

10/2/2001

PC02509-1

Comment:

I agree with Mayor James Hahn that after September 11, 2001 there will not be a need for additional Los Angeles World Airport capacity however at this time Los Angeles should be extremely concerned about aviation safety and security.

The Federal Aviation Administration and LAX should be concerned about LAX and having, so to speak, "All our eggs in one basket" as the saying goes. Now, more than ever a Regional Plan is necessary for the Airport and the City of Los Angeles's safety and security. We now know with one terrorists attack they could eliminate all of the people working at the Airport, all the concentrated aircraft activity at LAX and all the aircraft carriers that serve the world.

TIME IS OF THE ESSENCE

It is imperative that LAX and the Federal Aviation Administration act swiftly for not only the aircraft carriers but for the survival of the City of Los Angeles

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments AL00051-93, PC02284-17, and PC02131-5.

PC02510

Sambrano, L. Diane

None Provided

PC02510-1

Comment:

The LAX Master Plan fails to meet the community needs by failing to indicate what penalties will be imposed on those who choose as in the past to disregard the limitations addressed. It has been and continues to be the greatest of insults to those surrounding the airport to make excuses for the 28 million passengers as well as the night curfew addressed in the last expansion plan.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels.

PC02510-2

Comment:

With regard to noise mitigation: It is an insult to consider that one side of any street is entitled to sound insulation when the other side of the street is not especially when considering the aviation agreements required.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

PC02510-3

Comment:

It is pathetic to argue that every one knew the airport was there when they purchased and noise should have been anticipated considering most of the surrounding communities grew as a result of the then new prospect of jet and aerospace technology. Even at that time the concept of tolerating inconvenience for the greater good of national defense was based on security of freedoms rather than simple greed.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise 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. Also, please see Subtopical Response TR-N-3.3 regarding increased noise from increased air traffic.

PC02510-4

Comment:

Since data exists to confirm that noise affects classroom learning it would not be difficult to conclude that noise has similar impacts on the ongoing daily lives. Surely no one would be so foolish as to believe that learning stops when one leaves the confines of a classroom.

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. It should be noted that, outside the classroom, numerous studies of human perception and annoyance have indicated that the 65-decibel (dB) level of Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) is a reliable standard for determining when the community will become 'highly annoyed' by aircraft noise. The Federal Aviation Administration has developed criteria, which describe what land uses are acceptable within a certain noise level contour. These compatibility criteria and an analysis of the build alternatives were described in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02510-5

Comment:

Curfew violations are not uncommon with excuses most definitely unrealistic.

Response:

There is no curfew on operations at LAX. However, there are special flight procedures in effect between midnight and 6:30 a.m. These procedures are not mandatory, but are generally used by air traffic controllers when practicable. For more information on this topic, please see Topical Responses TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations and TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement.

PC02510-6

Comment:

Easterly takeoffs, which all but skim our rooftops, could be solved by simply offloading the overweight products which are being shipped on the cargo planes.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The cargo flights to Asia have an enormous economic benefit to the region, and they need to leave during the night hours to meet the most efficient window of time for delivery in Asian markets. The costs of reducing their loads on these flights would likely result in additional flights to make up for the off-loaded weights. Also, please see Response to Comment PC02214-37 and see Section 4.1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for additional information regarding the effect of single events on nighttime awakenings. At times it is necessary during the nighttime hours for aircraft to depart to the east because of the wind conditions. As noted by the noise abatement procedures delineated in Topical Response TR-N-7, exceptions to the over-ocean procedures are available when weather of wind conditions require east traffic flow. LAWA will be pursuing Federal approval of a restriction to alleviate that situation by making over-ocean procedures mandatory when they are in effect between midnight and 6:30 a.m. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3, regarding aircraft flight procedures and Subtopical Response TR-N-5.2 regarding east flow operations at night.

PC02510-7

Comment:

Greedy corporations seem to matter more to those in authority than the quality of life of those who must endure disturbed sleep. Perhaps local companies should bring court action against LAX for the low productivity of employees who couldn't sleep.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program, and Topical Response TR-LU-4 concerning outdoor noise levels. In addition, the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event noise aircraft relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR .

PC02510-8

Comment:

Single Event Noise Impacts are of significance. These impacts are known by every person who remembers the sounds of either a warm fuzzy moment or the scratch of a chalkboard, the screech just before an automobile accident, or the muffled whimper of a seriously ill child. Each noise event triggers in our minds a thought or interruption of some type which cause a sense either frights or tolerance.

Response:

Comment noted. Single events are the basis for developing the cumulative noise exposure levels expressed as DNL. Please see Response to Comment SAF00005-11 which elaborates on why there are no definitive, widely recognized, single event noise level guidelines. Additionally, to further address single event impacts under CEQA case law, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included an analysis of nighttime single event sleep disturbance impacts and daytime speech disruption impacts on schools that extends into areas outside the 65 CNEL contour. That analysis was provided in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1.

PC02510-9

Comment:

While noise seems to be the most tangible issue, pollutants are certainly of more significance. Routine near LAX is the black goo on our windows, cars, lawn furniture, and garden fruits or vegetables along with the particles which can not be seen with the naked eye. There is not a person who has actually walked in the vicinity of LAX who can not relate an experience of feeling the fallout from either fuel or other liquids being dropped. While tests have been performed to suggest these are the result of tire decomposition...how are we to believe the many tons of cargo will leave the airport if not by trucks (which tend to have tires). Any increase in cargo flights automatically brings an increase in truck traffic. Therefore tire and fuel pollutants are a byproduct of LAX expansion. Consider also most additional

passengers will most likely arrive by vehicles other than trucks but also dependent on tires which slowly release pollutants in our local air.

Response:

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

PC02510-10

Comment:

Air quality is directly related to almost every aspect of life. Pollutants in lungs have cost cigarette companies a significant expense to the bottom line. Perhaps those with asthma and assorted breathing issues will consider the cancer causing elements released into the LAX surrounding area atmosphere when seeking compensation for medical expenses. Certainly those elected to protect do not want to be found guilty of contributing to the health risks of the area surrounding LAX.

Response:

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

PC02510-11

Comment:

Traffic seems to be the single greatest focus of attention for many governing bodies yet by allowing any expansion at LAX the congestion can only be increased. Poor planning on many issues seems to contribute to the problem rather than serve as a solution. How brilliant is it to have a San Diego freeway exit placed so as to cause backup when the pre-existing railroad tracks are in use! What wisdom was called upon to design Glen Anderson Freeway to end at the south-end of the Sepulveda Blvd. Tunnel to blend with the previously over congested Beach city route the Westside?

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02510-12

Comment:

The various traffic remedies presented by the LAX Master Plan suggest that communities of residents are insignificant in the pursuit of corporate dollars. While the community of Westchester has already been largely splintered and mutilated it appears the bulldozers of greed will not be content until there are no remains of once thriving communities. Having already consumed airport Junior High and the community served by 98th Street Elementary the Lennox and Inglewood areas seem doomed to the same fate. It appears those who wish to support the Master Plan have determined in their hearts that the LAX monster created to better serve the community has instead determined that the community must now served up as feed to the LAX monster.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and residential and business relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. As discussed in TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester business district.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02510-13

Comment:

Air safety seems to have become the latest ploy of LAX expansion. While those of us living along the flight path absolutely agree that safety is an issue it seems far more logical to lessen the likely hood of mid- air collisions by lessening the number of airplanes in the air rather than increasing the number airplanes in the air. On several occasions many area residents have watched as two airplane pilots seem to notice each other and move their aircraft away from the traditional flight path and go around for another landing attempt. The published incident with the stealth plane and commercial airplane was not the only incident of its type noticed by local residents. Neither of these types of situations would be lessened by an increase in air traffic. For those who work at the airport to suggest those in homes near the airport are not affected and are unaware one needs only to think of the people whose family members and homes were lost in the Cerritos plane crash. Our lives and the lives of our families are significant and we all notice that any midair collision would in fact affect those near and relatively near the flight path. Simply put more airplanes in the air gives greater possibility there is a collision in the air. The number of runway accidents (vehicle/plane or plane/plane) only serves to highlight that the possibility of greater accidents is just a matter of when. It seems wise to minimize possibilities rather than increase them.

Response:

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

PC02510-14

Comment:

Finally the concept of shared burden seems appropriate. While the grand benefits are often heralded as the justification for imposition of burden on a few, shared burden is only just as well. Why is it those who champion expansion do not live in the affected noise contours, do not choose to send their children to school where noise is an issue and tend to discount the concerns of those who do. Simply put if it is so good for us why is it not so good for other areas too. From auto- lots to shopping malls the cry of most communities is we want our own why then must the LAX surrounding area be the only group of residents to be expected to tolerate the assorted inconveniences while other communities are expected to simply reap the benefits.

The LAX Master Plan fails to meet the concerns of residents in the surrounding community and appears only to choose to enrich the pockets of a selected few at the expense of the less well paid. The interest in expansion appears not to consider genuine safety, security, silence, or sane planning, but rather greed based on the premise that the lives of those in the path of destruction are less worthy of a quality of life than those who profit would consider living.

It is my sincere hope any who support this plan will choose to prove their confidence in this plan by: 1) purchasing a home beneath the flight path 2) living in a home in the areas beneath the flight path 3) sending their children to our schools beneath the flight path and 4) living their daily lives in the atmosphere they are so willing to create.

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, schools in Section 4.27, Schools, 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 D and Technical Reports 1, 5, and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-3, and 9 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-SEC-1 regarding security issues. 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.

PC02510-15

Comment:

I would hope that the LAX Master Plan will become that group of words that will never come to past. That it will be remembered as the sorry presentation of greed that never comes to be a reality.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02511

Villa, Kuei

None Provided

7/21/2001

PC02511-1

Comment:

I am strongly opposed to all Master Plan provisions that will create more pollution, congestion, and potential economic and safety problems for my self 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, and traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socioeconomics, 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-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-2, S-3, S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. 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.

PC02511-2

Comment:

I live only a few minutes from LAX. I am certain that more flights and passengers at LAX could adversely affect my health and quality of life.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PC02511-3

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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02511-4

Comment:

I oppose any secret and or corrupt agreements and actions between politicians, bureaucrats, those who will gain financially from LAX expansion and others.

Response:

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

PC02512

Stolper, Charles

None Provided

7/15/2001

PC02512-1

Comment:

WHY SHOULD LAX HAVE TO BEAR THE TRAFFIC FOR THE SOUTH HALF OF CALIFORNIA FOR MOST ALL OVERSEAS FLIGHTS. THIS CALLS FOR A REGIONAL APPROCH FOR ORANGE CO., SAN DIEGO CO, SAN BERADANUO CO., AND RIVERSIDE CO.

Response:

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

PC02512-2

Comment:

THE ATTACHED SHEET COVERS A LOT OF THE PROBLEMS.

Response:

No sheet was attached to this comment letter.

PC02513

Smith, Larry

None Provided

10/3/2001

PC02513-1

Comment:

LAX MASTE PLAN
Safety And Security

Preface - I have heard of a safety lock - what exactly is it? And how did a safety lock come about? And if a safety lock was installed what does that mean!

September 25, 2001.

3. Comments and Responses

The scope of the proposed expansion and the resultant increase in noise, pollution, and inaccessibility, to an established client population, will have the effect of eliminating those repeat customers that represent the backbone of any successful business. This kind of interruption would probably provide us with no choice but to abandon our business completely or, suffer the pain of starting all over somewhere else.

We concur with the opinion of Councilmember Ruth Galanter, that there are alternatives to the plan that would allow the integrity of the Westchester Central Business District to remain intact and undisturbed.

We are whole-heartedly opposed to the expansion plan as it is currently designed not only because it would destroy the 15-years of hard work we've invested in developing our business, and the Westchester area, but also because it will force us, and many others just like us on Sepulveda Boulevard, and the surrounding area, to pack up and move to places unknown, exhausting the resources we depend on to exist.

Response:

Please see Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses (subsection 4.4.2.5) and note that Master Plan Commitment RBR-1, presented comprehensive provisions that would be incorporated by LAWA into 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, note that Mitigation Measure MM-RBR-1, included as a priority maximizing opportunities for businesses being acquired to relocate in proximity to their current sites, including the nearby Westchester Southside project proposed under Alternatives A, B, and C. Furthermore, 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). 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 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. Please see Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2.1, Land Use, Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding the impacts associated with noise, traffic, air quality.

PC02515

Park, Noel

**San Pedro and Peninsula
Homeowners' Coalition**

9/25/2001

PC02515-1

Comment:

Enclosed is a copy of our comment letter on the proposed LAX Master Plan. We hope that you will keep our concerns in mind as you make future decisions regarding this Plan.

We applaud your commitment to find a regional solution to airport expansion, and not to move forward with the proposed Master Plan. Our agreement with this decision is reflected in our comments. If there is any additional way in which we can support your decision on this issue, please call on us.

Thank you as well for you decision to extend the comment period, and to re-schedule the public hearings which had been canceled.

Response:

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

PC02515-2

The attachment included as part of this comment letter is identical to the attachment to comment letter PC02231; please refer to Responses to Comments PC02231-2 through PC02231-17.

PC02516 **Putnam, Peter & Mary** **None Provided** **7/12/2001**

PC02516-1

Comment:

There are many reasons to oppose the expansion of LAX, but the most obvious is the overcrowding on the 405. This freeway has moderately heavy to very heavy traffic 15 hours every day. If LAX is expanded without regard to the dire situation on the 405, there will be major repercussions within a few years when not only Westchester & El Segundo & Inglewood residents but voters from all over the Westside & the Valley find themselves locked in endless traffic jams day after day.

Response:

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

PC02516-2

Comment:

As of now, other LA residents have closed their eyes to the impact of airport expansion in an already seriously crowded area. When the rest of Los Angeles County realizes how the interests of the majority of residents have been sacrificed to the demands of the airlines for the sake of a relatively small amount of city revenue, there will be serious political fallout and finger pointing, similar to the fiasco with the ill-conceived & executed subway plan.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02516-3

Comment:

When the city does not seem able to address its current traffic problem, how can one agency acting in its own interest, add to that problem without paying some price?

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02516-4

Comment:

The LAX Master Plan is not a "master plan" but a temporary bandaid which will only delay some real solution which would provide for the kind of growth that is expected over a long period of time, 25 - 50 years, not 5 years!

Response:

Each of the Master Plan alternatives is considered constrained because none have sufficient runway capacity to meet forecast demand in 2015 without changes in the activity profiles. The constrained

3. Comments and Responses

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 PC00287-3 regarding expansion beyond 2015. Also, please note that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

PC02517 Dey, Patricia None Provided 10/12/2001

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

PC02518 Horton, Jerome California State Assembly 10/11/2001

PC02518-1

Comment:

As you know, I voiced my concerns about the proposed expansion of the Los Angeles Airport and the environmental impact it will have on surrounding neighborhoods in my letter dated July 17, 2001. As a result of the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and Pentagon, I have additional concerns regarding the LAX expansion as it relates to security issues and their impact on surrounding neighborhoods.

Currently, the disruption to communities resulting from increased security and security concerns is understandable, but unprecedented. There is no doubt that the threat of future acts of terrorism will lead to permanent and more stringent changes in security measures at all airports, especially international airports like LAX. Therefore, I would add to my previous concerns that this is no time to expand the airport operations without consideration of the impact of new security measures on surrounding neighborhoods. Specifically, there is a heavy traffic burden caused by limited routes into and exiting the Airport. We must consider other issues such as additional security and the impact of the increase in flights.

I further recommend that all plans for expansion be re-evaluated with an emphasis on increased security and I would suggest that the concept of more regional airports with limited air traffic be a primary consideration as an alternative.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comments AL00051-93, PC01881-31, and PC02131-5. Also, please refer to Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. Sections 4.3 and 4.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed surface transportation and safety, respectively.

PC02518-2

Comment:

In conclusion, I am submitting these comments to be added to my previous letter of concerns which I requested you to include in your response to the Airport Expansion Master Plan and the draft EIS/EIR.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02518-1 above and Responses to Comments PC01420-1 through PC01420-21.

PC02519 Deeter, Cheryl None Provided 10/15/2001

PC02519-1

Comment:

In favor of building an airport in Palmdale so people in Antelope Valley don't have to make the drive to LAX every time they need to fly somewhere.

Response:

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

PC02520 Deeter, Derek None Provided 10/17/2001

PC02520-1

Comment:

I am for using Palmdale as a expansion for LAX. Not only does it make sense in that impact on the Metro Area, but we up here in Antelope Valley could use the business and jobs. The infrastructure is already in place.

Response:

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

PC02521 Smart, Dana None Provided 10/24/2001

PC02521-1

Comment:

I submitted this idea to KPCC Radio's Kitty Felde in response to the town hall meeting she hosted a couple of weeks ago at Loyola Marymount College, and at her suggestion I'm forwarding it to you.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC02521-2

Comment:

Let me preface this by saying that I'm not at all familiar with the downtown area near Union Station or with Ontario Airport, so there may be limitations at either or both that would prevent this scheme from being implemented. That said, I understand from listening to the town hall meeting that Ontario Airport has real estate to expand, being able to construct approximately three more terminals.

With that in mind, I began thinking about Tokyo's Narita International Airport. Narita is built on an expanse of former farmland well outside the greater Tokyo area. While accessible by car, most travelers prefer to access it either by express bus or train.

Keeping Ontario's ability to expand and Narita's set-up in mind, the plan would make Ontario the central international hub for the greater Los Angeles area. The plan would, on the surface, provide two things: one, it would lessen the congestion at LAX, as the Bradley terminal is one of the most (if not the most) populated terminals on the property; two, it would increase security, currently a topic very much in discussion.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand. It should be noted that Alternative D, which was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, is designed to protect airport users and critical airport infrastructure in response to the increased risk of terrorism aimed at aviation and commercial assets.

PC02521-3

Comment:

LAWA and the airlines would build a terminal facility in the Union Station area. There passengers could check-in, bid farewell to friends and family and go through an initial security check. There they would board an express train that would go directly to Ontario Airport.

If the train could not directly access the airport (as it can't at Narita), passengers would disembark and board shuttle buses to the terminal. As an extra security check, passengers would have to show boarding passes and passports to board the bus (as I recall having to do in Japan).

At the terminal, passengers would go through final check-in and a final security check before going to the gates.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02521-2 above.

PC02521-4

Comment:

To help pay for this, passengers would be charged a departure tax. At Narita, there were these kiosks that look like change machines at video game parlors around the terminal. You feed your cash into the machine and it prints you a receipt. You have to present the receipt to pass through security. No receipt, and security will send you back to pay the tax.

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.

PC02521-5

Comment:

So, again, the plan would provide the following:

- Lessen congestion at LAX by transferring international carriers to Ontario, which appears to have the space.
- Increase security because of the remoteness of the Ontario international terminal.
- Boost the ridership and revenue on Metrolink, as it will be their trains and rails that will provide service to the Ontario facility.
- Boost the service and retail economy of downtown Los Angeles, as patronage of parking lots, restaurants, gift shops, hotels and the like increases with the influx of travelers and their families and associates to the area.

Response:

Comment noted

PC02521-6

Comment:

An obvious negative impact will be the increase of traffic - especially private cars and taxis - bringing passengers to this downtown air terminal. However, a downtown terminals makes the most sense as almost every freeway - save the 405 and the 210 - travels through downtown Los Angeles.

Response:

Comment noted

PC02522

Halpine, Susana

None Provided

10/30/2001

PC02522-1

Comment:

The Master Plan was faulty for several reasons, namely, it did not take airport security into consideration.

Response:

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, includes a specific emphasis on safety and security provisions, including considerations that have come to the forefront relative to airport planning and operations following the terrorists attacks of September 11, 2001. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the environmental impacts associated with Alternative D. As noted in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the design of Alternatives A, B, and C can be refined to incorporate security provisions pursuant to federal requirements.

PC02522-2

Comment:

It also placed an unfair burden on the surrounding communities by proposing the ring road, West terminal, and commercial buildings next to residential areas.

Response:

Comment noted. Land use impacts were addressed in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting documentation provided in Technical Reports 1 and S-1. It should be noted that LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative, Alternative D, does not include a ring road.

PC02522-3

Comment:

Lets use the opportunity offered by the current slow down in airport use to develop a well thought out Regional solution - an incremental expansion in the name of safety & security is not the answer.

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

3. Comments and Responses

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

PC02523 Hough, Marcus None Provided

PC02523-1

Comment:

Good Neighbor Policy
Lennox and Los Angeles World Airport

Background

The community of Lennox is located just east of the Los Angeles International Airport. The area is home to some 28,000 people, most of whom are low-income and monolingual Spanish speakers. The median household income of the area is \$28,841 and approximately 40% of the population lives below poverty level. The community, because it is not a city, but an unincorporated area, is under the administration of the county board of supervisors. A field deputy from the Second Supervisorial District is currently assigned to the area.

The community, despite some of its problems, is very vibrant and retains a sense of cohesiveness missing in many other parts of Southern California. Lennox is a place where neighbors can drop by each other s houses unannounced, where the local grocery store will cash you checks, and the neighborhood bakery sells stamps because the nearby post office employees don t speak Spanish.

The local school district is very important to the community. In addition to providing high quality education for Lennox kids, the school district is very involved in other aspects of the community through its participation in the Lennox Coordinating Council (LCC). The LCC is a community based organization, composed of representatives from the school district, the Sheriffs office, the 2nd Supervisorial District, and local CBO s and the community at large. The LCC meets regularly to plan and implement projects aimed at improving the community and to plan community based activities, like the Lennox Family Festival.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02523-2

Comment:

LAX

The Los Angeles International Airport either directly or indirectly causes a significant number of problems in the community. Lennox is directly underneath the flight path of many airplanes landing at the airport because of its proximity to half of the airport s runways. Consequently Lennox has been subject to significant amounts of noise and air pollution. Additionally, the airport is responsible for the high volume of vehicle traffic in the area. These and other problems will only be exacerbated if the airport expands. The community of Lennox, like other surrounding communities, is thus opposed to the expansion.

Despite the problems engendered by the airport and despite our opposition to the proposed expansion the community does realize that LAX is a vital component of the region s economy. However, LAWA has not taken any measures to ensure that airport related damage to the surrounding communities, especially Lennox, is minimized. LAWA s attempts to address airport related problems in the community have been perfunctory at best. Also, there has been no dialogue with the community to explore ways for LAX to become a better neighbor. In the absence of such a dialogue we, the residents of Lennox, have crafted a Good Neighbor Policy . By adopting this policy LAWA will both mitigate the

3. Comments and Responses

deleterious and other adverse effects of the airport and show a gesture of good faith that it is willing to work with and for the Lennox community instead of against it. The following outlines the various elements of the Good Neighbor Policy: (list the different elements)

Response:

Issues related to noise, air pollution, and traffic were addressed in Sections 4.1, 4.6, and 4.3, respectively, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process. Also see Responses to Comments PC02523-3 through PC02523-8 for responses to the elements referenced in the comment.

PC02523-3

Comment:

The Lennox Community, those who live and work in the unincorporated County area, is firmly against the LAX expansion efforts. This Good Neighbor Policy is not an endorsement of the expansion, nor a plan to mitigate its effects. Rather, this Good Neighbor Policy specifies what LAX can do to become a good neighbor, irrespective and independent of the expansion. This Good Neighbor Policy indicates the willingness of the Lennox Community and LAX in working together to improve the environment of the area.

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.

PC02523-4

Comment:

- Living
- Meaningful soundproofing- lessening of the code stipulations, free inspections.
 - Moratorium on Flights between 11:00pm and 5:30am- part 161 of EIR
 - Sound Wall along 405 Freeway
 - On-going funding for Healthy Start
 - Air conditioners and Purifiers for homes and school classrooms
 - Special Emergency Response Unit- Community awareness of Disaster plan

Response:

LAWA will consider the proposed items listed throughout the Good Neighbor Policy drafted by the commenter's as part of LAWA's ongoing environmental justice community outreach program. Many of the items listed in this comment letter, such as expansion of existing programs at LAWA's Jobs Outreach Center and measures to mitigate noise from aircraft operations, were addressed in the Environmental Justice Program for the LAX Master Plan described on pages 4-336 through 4-341 in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. There are restrictions with regard to the ability to enact operational limitations at public use airports. The Airport Noise and Capacity Act of 1990 ("ANCA"), as amended, directed the FAA to establish a national program to review noise and access restrictions on aircraft operations imposed by airport proprietors. FAR Part 161 are the Federal Regulations that were promulgated as a result of ANCA. Limitations on the number of operations that may occur at an airport must undergo and pass the stringent benefit-cost evaluations of an FAR Part 161 study of access restrictions. Any proposed restrictions must be proven reasonable, nondiscriminatory, and may not interfere with interstate or foreign commerce or violate a contractual agreement with the FAA as a condition of receiving federal aid.

PC02523-5

Comment:

- Recreation
- Enclose Lennox Pool, year-round staff/lifeguards

3. Comments and Responses

- Youth Activity League (YAL)- funding to help with conversion of Sheriffs Station
- Skate-Park with Insurance

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02523-4 relative to LAWA consideration of measures such as these, in conjunction with LAWA's ongoing environmental justice community outreach program.

PC02523-6

Comment:

Beautification
- Road and Sidewalk improvements reconstruct 104th, 111th, Lennox Blvd. and Inglewood Ave as well as plants/trees

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02523-4 relative to LAWA consideration of measures such as this, in conjunction with LAWA's ongoing environmental justice community outreach program.

PC02523-7

Comment:

Jobs
- Training or apprenticeship program with on-site job placement
- Airport employers must show evidence of community outreach, new hires/contractors.
- New hires are tracked for promotion.
- Shuttle/Vanpool to and from LAX

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02523-4 relative to LAWA consideration of measures such as these, in conjunction with LAWA's ongoing environmental justice community outreach program.

PC02523-8

Comment:

School District
- Land to build a High School for Lennox Students (Imperial and Aviation)
- Permanent indoor PE Facility
- Support School District s lobbying efforts for placement of billboards on Schools adjacent to 405 freeway
- Periodic school painting every ten years
- Finance School District Emergency Aid Kit
- Tours of LAX for kids with Transportation

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02523-4 relative to LAWA consideration of measures such as these, in conjunction with LAWA's ongoing environmental justice community outreach program.

PC02524

**No Author
Identified,**

El Paseo Café

10/30/2001

PC02524-1

Comment:

1) As a tenant of the airport I would like to see a more functional and safe environment. Possible a relocation of security points so that all tenants will benefit from visitors as well as passengers.

3. Comments and Responses

2) Special procedures for tenants to move goods and merchandise within the airport without disturbing passengers at security points.

3) I envision a central location, away from the airport for all deliveries of goods and merchandise.

Response:

Comment noted. Under Alternative D, visitors, as well as passengers, would have access to concessions located within the passenger check-in facilities at the Ground Transportation Center as well as within the passenger and baggage processing center to be located in the center of the loop road. The passenger and baggage processing center has been designed to accommodate concessions.

PC02525 Rodine, Robert None Provided 10/30/2001

PC02525-1

Comment:

I am Robert Rodine, speaking before you tonight as the Chairman of the Aviation Committee of the Valley Industry and Commerce Association, a business advocacy organization representing approximately 325 member companies.

In 1999, following numerous analyses, expert presentations and extensive discussion, VICA adopted a position supporting a Master Plan for LAX insuring capacity for 92 Million Annual Passengers.

With all due respect for those who hold visions for the need of less capacity, we must impose upon you to recognize two immutable facts -

We are a resilient and resourceful society, and with our economy intact, we have rebounded from far worse disasters than the Al Qaeda threat,

and,

The demographic factors fueling the need for improved facilities at LAX are ever present and will relentlessly challenge the capacity of that facility on into the future.

The only thing that has changed in the Al Qaeda era is the need for significantly heightened focus on safety and security.

Local self interest driving airport constraint is choking air commerce and the freedom of all citizens to travel expeditiously in our once proud air commerce system. This region suffers not less than three major regional commercial airports so constrained, and another has yet to be established due to the same forces. If we fail to modernize LAX, to serve the ever growing demand, and to compensate for the refusal of regional airports to serve the full demand of their constituents, then we will all be the losers, and that loss will be the equivalent of the planned capacity of LAX today and all of the benefits accruing to that capacity.

VICA strongly urges you to accept only a plan that will fully service this region's needs, and to reject any plan based on non-existent, unrealistic and phantom alternatives.

Regional Airport Capacity Analysis

Area/Factor	Losses at Other Regional Airports Unacceptable Growth Above Current Loads						TOTAL REGIONAL IMPACT
	BUR	SNA	LGB	ELT	LAX 1995	ONT	
Maximum Load to CAP or Limit	4.9	8.4	1.8	0.0	79.0	12.0	106.1
Current Load 1995	(4.9)	(7.2)	(0.4)	0.0	(63.0)	(6.4)	(81.9)
Unused Capacity	0.0	1.2	1.4	0.0	16.0	5.6	24.2

3. Comments and Responses

Projected Load	7.0	7.0	2.8	22.2	94.2	15.3	148.5
Current Load 1995	(4.9)	(7.2)	(0.4)	0.0	(63.0)	(6.4)	(81.9)
Additional Capacity Required	2.1	(0.2)	2.4	22.2	31.2	8.9	66.6
Capacity Shortfall	(2.1)	1.4	(1.0)	(22.2)	(15.2)	(3.3)	42.4

*New Landrum & Brown Forecast

Prepared by: Robert L. Rodine
The Polaris Group
September 10, 2001

Response:

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

PC02526 Ragus, Nicholas None Provided 10/30/2001

PC02526-1

Comment:

LAX has unilaterally expanded operations over Monterey Park without any of the required studies.

Response:

The 1996 environmental baseline accounts for the incremental increases in activity at LAX that have occurred up to that point, including airport-related traffic, noise, air pollutant emissions, and other environmental factors that affect the surrounding community. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels. The impacts analysis within the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the environmental effects projected to occur with ongoing increases in activity projected to occur by 2015. The mitigation measures presented in the subject documents provide for both on-airport and off-airport improvements to reduce LAX's impacts to the local community; these improvements would not necessarily otherwise occur outside of the Master Plan and EIS/EIR processes.

PC02526-2

Comment:

The noise levels and frequency of flights has negatively impacted the quality of life in Monterey Park.

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. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC02527 Nunez, Juan None Provided 10/30/2001

PC02527-1

Comment:
NO TEXT

Response:
No comments were included in this letter.

PC02528 No Author Chinese Chamber of Commerce 10/30/2001
Identified,

PC02528-1

Comment:
We have several hundred members and several thousand on our mailing list. We have many members who use LAX in order to do business (like travel internationally and receive perishable merchandise as freight). LAX is still very convenient in terms of location for many, however, traffic is a big issue. The Master Plan does have mitigation measures which makes the Master Plan viable and very workable.

We support the plan because we need to have a more modern and efficient airport and LA should have a world-renown facility (like Hong Kong!). We need to modernize our airport to make it as safe and efficient as possible and to make our region thrive as much as possible.

Modernization makes good BUSINESS sense!

Response:
Comment noted.

PC02529 Tanji, Ken None Provided 10/30/2001

PC02529-1

Comment:
Transportation aspects of EIS/EIR are inadequate, given need for less car traffic to LAX after 9/11

Response:
Following the events of September 11, 2001, the temporary remote transport of passengers to the terminal core confirmed that remote drop off points and baggage check-in is an effective way to operate at LAX, thereby reducing airport traffic congestion. As a result, the new Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, Alternative D, which is analyzed in detail in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR incorporates remote passenger parking with people mover systems, which eliminates the need for a Ring Road or a western passenger entrance from Pershing Drive.

PC02529-2

Comment:
--Green Line must be extended to terminal

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC02529-3

Comment:

--Many passengers come from Westside & S.F. Valley, but no mass transit exists for this region. Some mass transit (light rail, monorail, dedicated bus lane) is needed for this region. Otherwise the only viable alternative is car.

Response:

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

PC02530

Lopez, Sotero

None Provided

10/29/2001

PC02530-1

Comment:

(1) - We as Ironworkers & speaking for other union trades, we have 100 years experience in the trade of structural steel, past down from generations, for quality work.

(2) - We also have a 2 years apprenticeship program to train our members for the production of efficient and quality work, which works for the benefit of the public.

(3) - Our Iron workers union members volunteered and were qualified to rigg-up all the mangled iron at the world trade centers, where were the non-union Ironworkers, they are not qualified nor had the confidence to handle the tying-up of all that iron to be hauled away. Non union companies hire people off the street with no experience an pay them very low wages to make-up the difference for low bids on jobs, they sacrifice efficiency, quality work, for quick profit at the expense of Public Safety.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02531

**No Author
Identified,**

None Provided

10/30/2001

PC02531-1

Comment:

Many planes flying over South Montebello. Counted over 30 planes in one (1) hour period. Planes are flying very low. Noise is incredible.

Response:

Comment noted. Numerous cities east of LAX are impacted by aircraft operations. The commentator's annoyance with the overflights by aircraft is acknowledged. This approach is used by all traffic arriving from west coast, Pacific and European origins. Under heavy traffic conditions, the base leg moves eastward over Monterey Park to better increase the separations between arriving aircraft and to safely sequence them into the arrival flows coming directly from the east. This eastward extension of the base leg approach results in the conditions described by the commentator. Please see also the Response to Comment AL00051-3. For further information on the effect of these approaches, also see Subtopical Response TR-N-3.5, regarding the effect of elevation on noise contours, Topical Response TR-N-6, regarding noise increase. In addition, see Topical Response TR-N-5, regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC02531-2

Comment:

During summer time with windows open you can imagine this being very unsuitable for a residential area.

Response:

As was shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the City of Montebello area is outside the current ANMP boundaries that define areas exposed to high noise levels (based on the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL or greater noise contours). As was also shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the area within the 65 CNEL noise contour continues to decrease from 1992 conditions. As was shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the City of Montebello is also outside of areas exposed to high single event noise levels (as defined by the 94 dBA SEL noise contour). Therefore, based on the thresholds that were presented in Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.4), of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, no significant noise impact from aircraft noise has been identified for the City of Montebello.

PC02531-3

Comment:

Planes most heavy traffic is - Friday starting @ 9:00 PM and going through 12:30 AM.
What can we do!

Response:

Potential Noise Abatement Measures were addressed in Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR, in particular Section 7.1.2, Airport Regulation Changes, and Section 7.1.2.1, Curfews.

PC02532

**Tran-Luce,
Christella**

None Provided

10/29/2001

PC02532-1

Comment:

As a resident and a teacher of Los Angeles, I would like to state my support for the LAX Master Plan to meet the needs of the growing air transportation in Southern California.

This will bring economic opportunities to the entire Southern California. In addition, it will create hundreds of new jobs for our community and open more avenues for small business owners.

I am very excited and see the LAX Master Plan proposal as positive and supports the Los Angeles World Airports in its implementation.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02533

McIntosh, Sonia

None Provided

11/3/2001

PC02533-1

Comment:

So many LAX flights over my house. I don't live by an airport & have so many other air/noise/vibration/privacy issues. Intntl. Extrusion Aluminum & Soto Foods - 18 wheeler trucks - diesel refrigerator & flatbeds. Little Emery Park across the street also - parties. Our 2 vehicles were

3. Comments and Responses

firebombed & windows crashed - we are near El Sereno (LA). An elementary school is one block away. I have from IE crashing metal with huge fans blowing & 62 new windows blowing in & out. Towing lots of burned freeway cars are on Westminster Ave. I have tan, grey, & black dust on everything.

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

PC02533-2

Comment:

The 90 flights/day after gliding over downtown LA leave crashing noise diagonally especially my '01 4th of July. Don't increase freight or passenger flights in holding pattern over my house from Ontario Airport too. El Monte Airport propellar planes East to West Airport. I have, plus the rented police helicopters from Pasadena PD or even L.A. or sheriff's sometimes). City of Alhambra made the annoying contract.

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.

PC02533-3

Comment:

The jet gasoline smell at night, with the winds blowing the moisture holding it, gags my throat & stomach. Surely we have our share of traffic (see Fremont Ave.) & pollution but no 710 Freeway extension unfortunately.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02533-4

Comment:

Immigration causes much of the increased passenger & trade plane "needs." The US Congress should stop the terrorism & relatives coming to U.S. for our welfare benefits. Half of Alhambra is Chinese & other mostly Mexican.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02533-5

Comment:

Rail lines are boondoggles. Give us good bus transportation.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02533-6

Comment:

I wear earplugs 24 hrs. crashing jets ascending I cannot read or yardwork safely or sanely. When we came here 18 yrs. ago there were no planes over our house or rarely visible North near Pasadena. I also have landing LAX holding pattern jets West to East & then turning over South Alhambra back to the West - so low overhead.

Response:

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

PC02533-7

Comment:

Please do not let us lose our American rights, for terrorism "protection." Let the FBI do their job, ahead of the crimes.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02534 Felmar, Mimi None Provided 11/1/2001

PC02534-1

Comment:

I support the Mayor's Plan for remote checkin, a people move and an increased security program.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02534-2

Comment:

I would be happy to become a member of a Citizen's Advisory Council re input on this plan.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02535 Dalton, Sharron None Provided 11/5/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02182; please refer to the Response to Comment letter PC02182.

PC02536 Anderson, Gregg None Provided 11/5/2001

PC02536-1

Comment:

My name is Gregg Anderson and I am a local businessman.

3. Comments and Responses

Over two decades ago my company purchased 1,300 acres and one of the prime considerations was the fact that we believed that the then Palmdale Intercontinental Airport would be developed in the immediate future.

Response:

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

PC02536-2

Comment:

I have been, in a business way, involved in following airport trends for the past 30 plus years. As a developer on the Island of Maui, I'd been an advocate of lesser expansion at the Honolulu International Airport and aggressively pursued the establishment of direct flights from the Mainland to Maui. It is my view that that only occurred because the Honolulu Airport Authority would no longer give additional gates in Honolulu unless the airlines agreed to service the neighbor Islands. For the past 20 years I've been an advocate of LAWA following the same course.

Response:

Comment noted

PC02536-3

Comment:

At present, in addition to my business, I am President of the Antelope Valley Board of Trade and for the past several years have been Chairman of Supervisor Mike Antonovich's Palmdale Airport Committee.

I'm here tonight speaking as a private citizen, but I wanted to give you the previous background.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02536-4

Comment:

It is my belief that no more time needs to be spent on the EIR that has been prepared for the Los Angeles International Airport.

There's no way to comment on it intelligently and there's no way to present it intelligently as a result of the happenings of September 11. Airline travel has changed forever and the major airports are going to have to reassess their situation as it pertains' to security and how that relates to parking, concentration of flights and so forth.

Response:

It should be noted that Alternative D, which was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, is designed to protect airport users and critical airport infrastructure in response to the increased risk of terrorism aimed at aviation and commercial assets.

PC02536-5

Comment:

A unique situation exists at the Palmdale Airport. has developed as a result of these recent happenings. When asked two months ago how quickly flights could be commenced from the Palmdale Regional Airport, the response was, "Tomorrow." And that statement was accurate at that time and is correct today.

3. Comments and Responses

It seems that the Palmdale facility could become a model for development of airports throughout the Country utilizing the facilities that are available here. We could start from scratch and security at the facility could quickly be put in place as a model that the entire Country could develop for the future. The same is true of our parking facility and our terminal, as well.

Response:

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

PC02536-6

Comment:

I submit that a lot of time and money can now be saved by simply, and realistically, scrapping the plans for future expansion at LAX and concentrating on the future. I don't believe it is possible to take a plan that many felt was unworkable for the last several years and is now deemed impossible to implement.

Response:

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

PC02536-7

Comment:

I encourage you to look carefully at the facilities available here and avail yourself the opportunity to utilize an existing asset that is immediately available to you.

Response:

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

PC02537

Hanson, David

None Provided

11/5/2001

PC02537-1

Comment:

Public information available to public was minimal - The draft EIS/EIR is too massive for public to review and comment upon -

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.

PC02537-2

Comment:

It appears that the window of planning is 2020. This is hardly enough time to implement recommendations.

Response:

Comment noted. The window of planning is 2015. Please see Response to Comment AL00022-59 regarding project phasing.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02537-3

Comment:

The material provided is impressive, but recent press releases lead me to believe that the mayor has his own plan and that it differs from this on - to what value therefore is this hearing.

Response:

Please see the web site, www.laxmasterplan.org for information on the most recent Alternative D. Based on the new alternative, a Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR has been prepared and nine additional public hearings have been held.

PC02537-4

Comment:

I prefer seeing cargo shipments directed to the Palmdale Airport with some passenger flights. This would greatly relieve pressures on LAX for passengers and would result in a positive business impact for Palmdale and Lancaster as well.

Response:

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

PC02537-5

Comment:

The weather in Palmdale is conducive to flight, without delay - Has this been addressed in the Draft Report?

Response:

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

PC02537-6

Comment:

Palmdale Regional Airport needs to be a key element in the solution to LAX's growth problems - The people here are proud of their aerospace heritage and are in support of a healthy airport. We feel that the presently closed Palmdale airport is a waste of a valuable asset.

Response:

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

PC02537-7

Comment:

While solving LAX's airport problems (or at least helping to solve them) having Palmdale Regional Airport becoming active - - - particularly handling cargo but also accommodating passengers would provide a stabilizing element to the High Desert Economy.

Response:

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

PC02538 Emard, Ron Palmdale Chamber of Commerce 11/5/2001

PC02538-1

Comment:

Good evening ladies and gentlemen, my name is Ron Emard and I am the Chairman of the Board of the Palmdale Chamber of Commerce. On behalf of the over 700 members and their 35,000 potential airline passengers, I wish to voice our support for the expansion of LAX to Palmdale Regional Airport.

In May, the Palmdale Chamber of Commerce held its monthly "Hot Topics & Toast" breakfast workshop where we invited not only representatives from LA World Airports but also the residents and businesses of Palmdale to discuss how we could help make Palmdale Regional Airport a reality. Many of the attendees voiced their support for this project and offered to help in the planning stages of the project.

Response:

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

PC02538-2

Comment:

Expanding LAX to Palmdale will provide key traffic congestion relieving improvements for area freeways and surface streets in Los Angeles. Palmdale currently has a 9,000 square foot terminal that is capable of handling over 300,000 passengers annually. There are 350 FREE parking spaces right outside its doors and is located near the Foreign Trade Zone; an important benefit to new manufacturing companies seeking Palmdale as their new homes. We are ready, willing and able to handle the expansion now!

Response:

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

PC02538-3

Comment:

Palmdale Regional Airport is located in one of the fastest growing regions in California. In the next 20 years, the Antelope Valley will see over 1 million residents. With the influx of people into our community, the need for an airport will be a high priority for the City.

As you review the expansion plan for LAX please keep Palmdale in the forefront.

Response:

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

PC02539 Adams, Douglas None Provided 11/5/2001

PC02539-1

Comment:

With the major growth in Valencia, Acton, Palmdale, Lancaster, and Rosamond, it is imperative to provide air service in a closer airport.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC02539-2

Comment:

Security is a major concern. As it is now we have to drive to either Burbank or LAX airports which as they get busier, create more and more safety concerns.

Response:

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

PC02539-3

Comment:

Parking is also a major concern and will require more and more area and security as it grows to accommodate the growth.

Response:

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

PC02539-4

Comment:

Air pollution is another issue; with more cars on the freeway and in the cities to accommodate increased traffic volume.

Response:

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

PC02539-5

Comment:

Volume of air traffic As more customers use air transportation - more planes will be required to handle the volume. This requires runway access and all of the support services to handle the volume, those services are, but not limited too, parking, ticketing, baggage handling, transportation and other support to handle customer and employee service.

Response:

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

PC02539-6

Comment:

Monetary concerns

With all of the different flights more people will have jobs in our area contributing to the local economy. Airlines will stand a greater chance of continued growth by having more airports and customer access. This also will help all of the support industries such as taxicabs, airport services, bus and other ground transportation, and parking services and related support, including rental cars from all companies. This growth will also help other companies such as food services, gift shops, baggage sales, magazines and newspapers and other like business.

3. Comments and Responses

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

PC02539-7

Comment: Customer Conveniences
There is a long list that can be added here. Things such as drive time to the airports. Right now a trip from Palmdale to LAX takes a minimum of 1 hour and 40 minutes, to several hours, depending on traffic. Gasoline, insurance, parking fees are all incurred expensis on top of drive time. Time spent away from the family and all of the nuturing and caring that comes with more time home with the family and children.

Response: This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC02539-8

Comment: Security concerns are a major issue once in a large airport with many more people in it. I would say that all of this boils down to "a quality of life issue." An airport in Palmdale is a great help and as the population grows in the surrounding cities, it will become imperative to have one here. Now is the time to act, to set the groundwork in place for the benefit of Southern California. Please caste your vote for opening the Palmdale Airport in the coming year and be "pro-active." Don't wait another 3-5 years and have to open it because of growth, traffic, etc. and being "reactive."

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

PC02540 Daniels, Daisy Mae None Provided 11/5/2001

PC02540-1

Comment: I'm a 1K flyer
I have flown over a million miles with United plus other airlines.
I will fly 3 or 4 times a month out of Palmdal

Response: This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC02541 Tarwater, Marc None Provided 11/5/2001

PC02541-1

Comment: My family wants the Palmdale airport!

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC02542 Weir, Jr., Ph.D., None Provided
Alexander

PC02542-1

Comment:

In response to your mailer re LAX, I have enclosed a copy of my submittal to the Public meeting. I have read the 12,000 pages of the Master Plan/Draft EIS and I am appalled at the lack of environmental information contained in these documents.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02542-2

Comment:

There is also an attempt to deceive the public in many ways, for example the No Action/No Project alternative still has an increase in the number of flights and building in two different locations.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-2 regarding No Action/No Project Alternative assumptions.

PC02542-3

Comment:

The "decrease in Air Pollution" is a lie. By building the Westside Terminal, the Air Pollution will decrease on Sepulveda and at the present terminal (LAWA says) but they do not quantify how much the Air Pollution will increase on Pershing Drive.

Response:

Comment noted. The analysis considered all local roads, including Pershing Drive, for air quality impacts. Please see Response to Comment PC00039-1 regarding selection of local, off-airport intersections for the CO hotspot analysis. Also please note the Westside Terminal is not a part of Alternative D, the LAWA Staff-Preferred alternative.

PC02542-4

Comment:

Not mentioned in the attachment is my concern for some of the reasons advanced for the need for the Westside Terminal. One reason given was to allow more "International meeter/greeter lobbies" and to allow more foreign airlines space for their airline clubs. I propose moving all International travel to Palmdale, which is in Los Angeles County, closer than LAX to many parts of Los Angeles (City and County) both in distance and in travel time. The additional time for the international traveler to reach Palmdale is really insignificant compared to the remainder of his travel time. Your flyer mentioned Denver's Airport. It is not in the city limits. Neither are the airports at Chicago, Detroit, Dallas, New York, San Francisco, London, Paris, Amsterdam, Tokyo, and Houston, all of which I have visited.

Response:

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

PC02542-5

Comment:

The second "growth" area in the LAX Master Plan is Cargo. Cargo flights do not show up in the Annual Passenger increase used in many places, including your flyer. However, the number of trucks along Imperial Blvd will continue to increase as long as LAX is the cargo airport for the region. It would not interfere with passenger travel if all cargo flights left from Palmdale. The answer to the response that a great deal of cargo is carried on passenger flights is to have those flights also leave from Palmdale.

These two actions, requiring all cargo and all International flights to arrive and leave at Palmdale instead of LAX would eliminate any need for a Westside Terminal, increased traffic on Culver Blvd and a new "Cut-thru" through Playa del Rey.

Response:

Neither the FAA nor LAWA have the authority to direct airlines to use one airport in favor of another airport. The Airline Deregulation Act of 1978, as amended, ended federal, state, and local governments role in determining the location for air service by airlines. Please also 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 and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02542-6

Comment:

Any help you can give to these solutions to the perceived need for LAX expansion would be appreciated.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC02542-1 through PC02542-5 above.

PC02542-7

The attachment included as part of this comment is identical to PC00417; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC00417.

PC02543

Case, John

None Provided

6/10/2001

PC02543-1

Comment:

Stop LAX expansion.

I live in El Segundo

If the size of LAX is increased, we can look forward to:

- More traffic
- More pollution & noise
- A degradation of quality of life in El Segundo & Westchester

I oppose the LAX Master Plan.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC02544 Tsou, Kelly None Provided

PC02544-1

Comment:

I believe distributing air traffic to Regional airports, such as Palmdale and Ontario is a better alternative to expanding the already congested LAX area. The surrounding area, especially the Freeways, is completely saturated with traffic, pollution and noise.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; 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.

PC02545 Rose, Anne None Provided 6/8/2001

PC02545-1

Comment:

I am against any further expansion of LAX. All future plans to expand should be stopped.

Response:

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

PC02545-2

Comment:

We are already affected by severe traffic congestion through the Rosecrans and Sepulveda routes as people attempt to come west and then north to the airport area. In the past it took us fifteen minutes to drive north to the airport. The drive now takes much longer, and in some cases traffic comes to a complete stop due to traffic grid lock.

Response:

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

PC02545-3

Comment:

More takeoffs and landings mean more noise. Airport officials are not concerned about what happens in the South Bay. All they care about is their own interests. The issues have been reviewed and LAX expansion does have a negative affect on the South Bay. Once additional expansion takes place the damage will be done. And the special interests will have what they want at our expense.

The airport will continue to push for expansion until we have the courage to say no to further 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-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PC02546

Jensen, Garth

None Provided

6/8/2001

PC02546-1

Comment:

I live in El Segundo and am in the 65 + decibel range of LAX. LAX is big enough already.

Response:

Comment noted. Issues related to noise were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02546-2

Comment:

I agree with the idea of a regional plan incorporating the use of regional airports for the expanding population base. Your projections for the population growth in the areas surrounding LAX clearly indicates that those areas will need to expand their facilities to accomodate the growth.

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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02546-3

Comment:

In the long run I hope the airlines will realize the potential for expanding their services to those communities and actually reduce the numbers of flights going out of LAX. This may help the airport be more efficient and reduce the number of delays and other problems because of over crowding.

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. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-2 regarding the role of deregulation in aviation planning.

PC02546-4

Comment:

The noise level in El Segundo makes it very difficult at times to even have a conversation. I hope that the noise abatement program offered to homeowners will continue to be available in the years to come. The actual program involving refitting of windows etc. is a very slow process. I hope that additional funding and possible low interest government loans will be available to speed up the process.

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 high noise levels at the commentor's property (located at 841 Loma Vista Street), to qualify for soundproofing, properties must be exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels. As was shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S1 in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, overall areas exposed to high noise levels (defined as 65 CNEL or greater) under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions do extend south into the City of El Segundo at the subject property and therefore this property is eligible for sound insulation under the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP). A description of the ANMP, time frame for receiving sound insulation, progress (as of June 2002) in providing sound insulation, and who to contact in El Segundo for additional information is described in Topical Response TR-LU-3. As stated in TR-LU-3, the estimated timeframe for completion of residential soundproofing for all jurisdictions within the ANMP boundaries is by 2015. Sound insulation is prioritized within the highest CNEL measurement band above the 65 CNEL noise contour first. Regarding the process of retrofitting windows, additional funding, and low interest loans, the City of El Segundo has chosen not to participate in the ANMP offered by LAWA, and receives grants directly from the FAA. Therefore, comments on the noise abatement program as currently administered by the City of El Segundo are outside the scope of this document and can be directed to the City of El Segundo. However, as stated in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, under the terms of the 2001 Noise Variance LAWA continues to work with the City of El Segundo to remove barriers to full implementation of existing mitigation programs (such as requiring an aviation easement in exchange for funding of residential sound insulation).

See also Topical Responses TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels, and TR-N-6.1 regarding existing high noise levels.

PC02547 **Monkarsh, Max & Evealin** **None Provided** **6/10/2001**

PC02547-1

Comment:

Anyhow, we have been included in the people who want the airport in Palmdale and Ontario, for over twenty years. (But we didn't buy land near the airport)

Response:

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

PC02547-2

Comment:

We used to belong to a Democratic Party here in Venice Beach, California but it has disappeared.

Mark Twain said he belongs to an unorganized party - the Democrats. The same is true of now. Republicans have all kinds of organizations and make sure their people are informed. In the last two elections, we did not receive voting pamphlets or any information about the election for mayor or district attorney.

We need an outpouring of people at local meeting and messengers to our congressman and any other influential people in Congress.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02547-3

Comment:

There has to be federal funds to build super transportation to these locations but LA needs supervision or outside builders because LA doesn't know how to build anything for many billions and then they cause big problems in the city.

Response:

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

PC02547-4

Comment:

YES we are for Regional Airport Alternative.

Response:

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

PC02548

Ober, Lynn

None Provided

PC02548-1

Comment:

The written comments of this comment letter, as well as a number of other comment letters, were submitted on a form provided by Congresswoman Jane Harman's office. Constituents were encouraged to include their comments on this form, and to submit the form, along with their comments, to FAA and LAWA during the public comment period for the Draft EIS/EIR. The text of the form is provided below.

For eight years, I have advocated a regional plan that fairly shares the benefits and burdens of air transportation across our region. I oppose the proposed LAX Master Plan because it does not impose reasonable limits on growth and fails to include an adequately developed plan for building out other airports in the region.

My view is shared by many others:

- More than 80 Southern California cities have joined a coalition opposed to the proposed expansion of LAX and in favor of a regional approach.

- Four counties - Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside - have revived the Southern California Regional Airport Authority to coordinate development of a fair regional aviation system.

- Last month, 12 Southern California Members of Congress from both parties joined me to support common-sense principles for developing our airports. In a letter to Transportation Secretary Norman Mineta, we pledged to work toward a plan for Southern California that:

- Fairly distributes the benefits and burdens of aviation needs across the region.
- Gives priority to airports eager for more growth like Palmdale and Ontario.
- Does not force growth on already over-burdened airports like LAX.
- Includes ground transportation to reduce congestion and improve access to regional airports.

Now it is your turn to make your voice heard. On Saturday, June 9th, the Federal Aviation Administration and Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) will hold official hearings on the proposed expansion of LAX. I will be submitting testimony to hearings held in the 36th Congressional District at the Furama Hotel in Westchester and the Manhattan Beach Marriott. I want my testimony to reflect the views and concerns of this district and would like to hear from you. The public comment period on the Master Plan ends July 25. If you have comments on the Master Plan that you would like me to include in the official record, you can:

- Mail or fax the response form on the back of this letter to my office.
- Go to www.house.gov/Harman and click on "Comment on the LAX EIS/EIR."

You can count on my continued active involvement on this issue.

On May 3, Congresswoman Jane Harman and LA County Supervisor Don Knabe met on Capitol Hill with other Los Angeles area Representatives to support a Regional Air Growth Plan.

FACTS ABOUT LAX AND REGIONAL AIRPORTS

- A regional airport plan would generate \$98 billion in economic activity in the Los Angeles region, according to a study prepared for the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG).
- U.S. census data and SCAG projections show that population is growing faster near proposed regional airports than near LAX.

Region	Pop. Growth 2000-2020	Region	Pop. Growth 2000-2020
--------	--------------------------	--------	--------------------------

3. Comments and Responses

North LA County	762,000	South Bay	106,000
San Bernardino County	1.2 million	West Side	26,000
Riverside County	1.4 million	Gateway Cities	386,000

- This comparison shows how Denver met growing aviation needs:

	Los Angeles International Airport	Vs.	Denver International Airport
Millions of Annual Passengers (MAP)	67 MAP in 2000. Over 100 MAP capacity.		39 MAP in 2000. 55 MAP capacity.
Residents within planned 65 decibel noise boundary	82,928		0
Price Tag	\$12 billion (projected)		\$4.2 billion (actual)
Flights Per Day (average)	2,146		1,371
Size	3,425 acres		34,000 acres

Sources: Los Angeles World Airport; Denver International Airport, Alliance for Regional Solution to Airport Congestion

WHAT DO YOU THINK?

Please use the space below for comments on the LAX Master Plan. How would you be affected by traffic, noise, and pollution resulting from the airport? What economic impact does the airport have on you and your community? You can mail this form back to my office by folding it so that the return address below is visible, or faxing it to 310-372.1622. If you need more room, feel free to enclose additional pages with your name and address.

Response:

The above text is from a form provided by Congresswoman Jane Harman's office to her constituents. Constituents were encouraged to include their comments on this form, and to submit the form, along with their comments, to FAA and LAWA during the public comment period for the Draft EIS/EIR. Each form received by FAA and LAWA was identified with a unique comment letter number. Individual comments provided on these forms are responded to by comment letter number in this Final EIS/EIR. Responses to the contents of the form letter itself are provided below.

The Congresswoman's opposition to the Master Plan is noted. Regarding the projected population growth near proposed regional airports, as was discussed in Chapter 1, Regional Context, of the Draft EIS/EIR (subsection 1.2.1, Passenger Demand), and was illustrated in Figure 1-2 of that chapter, existing and projected passenger demand do not correlate to projected population growth. On the contrary, the highest level of projected passenger demand in 2015 (greater than 80,001 passengers per square mile) is centered around LAX. In comparison, passenger demand in north Los Angeles County, San Bernardino County, and Riverside County is projected to be 4,000 to 20,000 passengers per square mile in 2015. The comparisons to Denver International Airport are noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC02548-2

Comment:

Thank you for providing this easy way to reply. In MDR we are highly impacted by traffic, noise. Without any expansion, there is a good amount of noise from jets who are probably violating minimum altitude levels.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The Marina del Rey area falls beyond the contours of significant aircraft noise exposure level for both the environmental baseline and all future alternative conditions. For aircraft that are on approach or in departure climbs, there are no minimum altitude levels. Aircraft in level flight are required to maintain levels 500 feet or more above the ground in congested areas, but minimum elevations vary by area and the surface elevation. It is unlikely that noise levels will change in the commentor's location under any of the various alternative conditions. Please see Topical Response TR-N-7, regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement, in particular the aircraft noise abatement operating procedures and restrictions, and Subtopical Response TR-N-7.1, regarding enforcement of noise rules.

PC02548-3

Comment:

Another concern re: aircraft noise are the various helicopters which fly close to our rooftops. Currently, there is no law that governs the altitude for helicopters. We understand police helicopters flying low, but want a law which restricts any aircraft from flying close to residential areas. Thank you for your concern.

Response:

Helicopters that have an operating agreement with LAWA are required to abide with Section 5, Helicopter Operating Procedures of the Aircraft Noise Abatement Operating Procedures, which are delineated in Topical Response TR-N-7, Noise Abatement Measures/Enforcement. These procedures define minimum operating altitudes (2,000 feet, when safe and practicable), designated flight paths over congested surface transportation routes, and a "fly neighborly" program designed to reduce overflight of residential areas. For helicopters not operating at LAX, there are no restrictions for helicopters flying over residential areas. Since most of Los Angeles is an urban area, it would be difficult to prohibit helicopters from operating over residential areas. However, Potential Noise Abatement Measures are addressed in Section 7.1 of Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR. In particular Section 7.1.2, Airport Regulation Changes.

PC02549

Reynoso, Lolita

None Provided

PC02549-1

Comment:

I strongly OPPOSE LAX Expansion. As a Westchester resident - homeowner, I don't welcome more sound pollution, air pollution or traffic.

Response:

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

PC02549-2

Comment:

LAX and the surrounding communities are overburdened with passenger & cargo traffic.

Please work to evenly distribute the above, throughout Southern CA Regional airports.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC02550 Wharton, Mireya None Provided

PC02550-1

Comment:

Opposed to expansion of LAX -said LAX Redid her windows and doors much, much better

Response:

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

PC02551 Patton, Sharon None Provided

PC02551-1

Comment:

The traffic is already overburden with cars, taxi cabs, limos etc. Lincoln Blvd is now always jammed w/ traffic. The noise has grown along with the traffic. I feel LAX can only handle so much air traffic going out and in and I feel it is near its peak. I agree with the regional airport plan.

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-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC02552 Lee, William None Provided 6/11/2001

PC02552-1

Comment:

I live in Manhattan Beach, CA and the noise from airplanes over the South Bay is unbearable. We have commuter planes from Long Beach and John Wayne airports, and large commercial planes from LAX polluting the skies. I love to work in my yard and I like to enjoy my peace from intruding planes flying overhead.

Response:

The commentor's concern is acknowledged. The proposed operations associated with 89 MAP range from 2,141 in Alternative C to 2,535 in Alternative B. As a result of comments heard for Alternatives A-C, a No Action/No Project Alternative was developed. Alternative D is designed to serve approximately 78 MAP and 2,121 average annual day operations. The amount of noise to which any one area is exposed will vary based on the distribution of the traffic throughout the community. In the South Bay communities and Manhattan Beach, aircraft noise levels associated with the project actions will be

3. Comments and Responses

much lower than those considered to be significant by all regulatory agencies. The area may be affected by noise from other airports, as well as ongoing modifications in air traffic routes out of LAX that have nothing to do with the proposed Master Plan actions. For further information on this topic, please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1, flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay, Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2, Early turns over areas north and south of LAX, and Subtopical Response TR-N-3.3 regarding changes in noise levels relative to changes in air traffic and Response to Comment PC000552-2 for noise impacts on the South Bay.

PC02552-2

Comment:

Traffic is relative to expansion. Sepulveda Blvd traffic is atrocious heading north. There are too many cars on the highway increasing grid lock and congestion to neighboring cities.

Response:

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

PC02552-3

Comment:

Growth of cars bring pollution when they idle waiting for the traffic ahead to open up.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality impacts, including impacts 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.

PC02552-4

Comment:

There is no economic impact to the South Bay community. Majority of the residents work for aerospace companies. They are professionals. Airport employees are mostly service oriented people. Their salaries are not affordable for them to purchase a home in the South Bay area. Service employees are sacrificial victims of the airlines, large businesses and labor organizations due to corporate greed. International trade with foreign countries help large businesses not the residences near LAX.

Response:

The employment impacts of the LAX Master Plan alternatives in the communities of the South Bay are shown in Technical Report 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR, Table 48, LAX-Related Employment in the South Bay and North Bay Cities and Communities for the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR Alternatives, 1996, 2005 and 2006 and Table S13 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Distribution of Incremental Direct Job Impacts of the LAX Master Plan Alternatives, by County and City, 1996-2015. As was explained in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the economic impacts of LAX derive from a combination of business and government operations at LAX, spending by air passengers for a wide range of goods and services, and the manufacture of goods shipped by air, and the ripple effect that these direct effects have on the regional economy.

PC02552-5

Comment:

Solution to the problem -- distribute growth to other regional airports in the area (i.e. Palmdale, Ontario) or to other states (i.e. Denver, Phoenix).

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC02552-6

Comment:

Limitation of flight departure hours 10PM - 7AM Monday thru Sunday to reduce noise and pollution at LAX.

Response:

For information on proposed mitigation of night flight noise please see Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation and in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-4.1, additional mitigation actions suggested for flight activity.

PC02553

Corr, Norlynn

None Provided

PC02553-1

Comment:

There is already too, too much traffic and airport noise, as well as jet fuel and auto 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-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC02553-2

Comment:

At present the 405 freeway reaches a standstill at LA Tijera at virtually any hour of the day.

Response:

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

PC02553-3

Comment:

It is ridiculous to expand the airport here where it would so adversely congest and pollute the area, while more of the traffic would be coming from great distances, and there is really no more land. What we need is an airport outside the city (Palmdale, for instance) with high-speed transit from hubs with parking in the three counties. Check in, check your luggage, and get on the airport train.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and surface transportation impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02553-4

Comment:

The constant increase in traffic and population increase is decreasing the quality of life in the South Bay, and it has to be controlled!

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Growth inducement was addressed in Section 4.5, Induced Socio-Economic Impacts, (Growth Inducement), of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02554 Clark, Courtney None Provided

PC02554-1

Comment:

I am against LAX expansion.

Response:

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

PC02554-2

Comment:

I already see tremendous amounts of traffic as it survives now. The small area of Playa del Rey cannot accommodate a population increase because of our small roads, and how that would affect the community.

Response:

The alternatives would be designed to limit west terminal access from the north on Pershing Drive. That is, while access would be provided from Playa del Rey to and from the east on the Ring Road, direct access to and from the west terminal would not be allowed. This is designed to restrict airport cut-through traffic in Playa del Rey. This should help the airport traffic issues in that community. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road as was detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02554-3

Comment:

I hear enough airplane noise already.

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.

PC02554-4

Comment:

I also see people leave cars parked in our area for weeks so they can leave town without paying for parking. I know the expansion would only be worse.

Response:

Expanded airport parking is part of each future airport alternative proposed and addressed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. People leaving cars parked on the neighborhood streets for extended periods should be addressed with local police departments, and limitations to on-street parking should be considered.

PC02555 Francis, Hugo None Provided

PC02555-1

Comment:

Everyone knows we must increase our ability to handle increased airport capacity for both people and freight. Forward, responsible people realize the challenge is larger than LAX; so a regional plan is the only responsible way to solve the problem. A solution will take many years to accomplish; so it must be started now by someone with courage and leadership - you are a good one.

Response:

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

PC02556 Khalkhali, M.D., Iraj None Provided

PC02556-1

Comment:

I believe LAX has reached its max. capacity. We need to develop ultra fast railroad up and down the state as well as to Nevada (Los Vegas) so that one can travel between L.A. to S.F. in about 3 hours. Then people use less air flight and LAX congestion improves. I strongly oppose LAX Master Plan. We need to expand airports in Riverside, Palmdale and San Bernardino with fast train connection between these counties and L.A.

Response:

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

PC02557 Stonich, Carole None Provided

PC02557-1

Comment:

Given the fact that the changes proposed for the LAX in the Master Plan, once implemented and completed, will still not begin to accommodate the projected number of travelers, it seems ludicrous to put the communities surrounding LAX under so much strain when alternative measures will have to be addressed anyway. It is a "band aid" approach to a severed artery. Surrounding counties are going to

3. Comments and Responses

have to step up and accept both the responsibilities for transporting their taxpayers and the benefits that will also (allegedly) come with 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.

PC02558 Sumers, Lynn None Provided

PC02558-1

Comment:

My comments and thoughts on the LAX Master Plan:

It stinks.

I have lived in the South Bay for 36 years and in the South Bay are some of the jewels of all of Los Angeles County.

If the airport expands any more, the noise and pollution will be horrible and the additional traffic will be even worse.

My question is, why ruin/destroy one of the best parts of L.A. County and for what? The only answer I can think of is Greed.

Who benefits? The contractors, the airlines, other big businesses. Who loses? We all do.

Riordan is gone.

I truly appreciate all of your efforts to stop this madness that will do nothing but harm to the South Bay cities and its citizens.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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; traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; and economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2, S-3, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-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. 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.

PC02559 Kingham, Richard None Provided 6/11/2001

PC02559-1

Comment:

My family and I are opposed to the current plans for the expansion of LAX. We would support your coalition for a regional approach.

3. Comments and Responses

We have lived in the area since the early 1950's. The noise from the airport is currently horrendous, the traffic adversely affects the area for miles surrounding us. It is time to STOP the airport expansion before more residential communities are made uninhabitable. Expansion belongs in Palmdale and Ontario.

Thank you for your effort to coordinate a fair regional aviation system.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use 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.

PC02560 Chiang, Frencene None Provided

PC02560-1

Comment:

There is too much air traffic in this airport (LAX) and too many people live and work around the area. The noise and air pollution effect the lifes of these people are unspeakable. I support your idea of building airports or expand airports where the population grows the fastest and the need of airport is most earnest.

Response:

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

PC02561 Moore, Mary None Provided

PC02561-1

Comment:

WE WILL ALL BE AFFECTED BY TRAFFIC, NOISE, POLLUTION IN ONE WAY OR ANOTHER.

I RECENTLY USED LAX ON MAY 7, 2001 AND AGAIN ON JUNE 3, 2001. IT IS A NIGHTMARE !!! YOU FEEL LIKE A HERD OF ANIMALS! MANNERS OF PERSONNEL AS WELL AS THOSE OF US TRAVELING - IT'S A PUSH AND SHOVE DEAL!! IT'S A WASTE OF OUR TAX PAYERS DOLLARS!! IT'S INSANE!!!!!! EXPAND LAX!!!!!! I SHOULD SAY NOT !

I WOULD NOT BE WRITING THIS EXCEPT I HAVE JUST EXPERIENCED THE NIGHTMARE!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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, and Section 4.2, Land Use;

3. Comments and Responses

and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. 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 construction of the improvements proposed by the LAX Master Plan would be funded by airport-related revenues, not through taxpayer funds.

PC02562 Odell, George None Provided 7/8/2001

PC02562-1

Comment:

I have worked at LAX for a cumulative total of approximately 15 years; 10 yrs. for Western Airline; 1.5 yr. for Continental parking; and 3-5 yr for Pan American Airlines, during which times I lived and commuted from the South Bay beach cities. I support your position as described on the reverse side of this paper. I apologize for not responding sooner. Please keep up your very good work. I thank you for it - keep me posted please.

Response:

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

PC02563 Heiser, Dick & None Provided
Loretta

PC02563-1

Comment:

Greasy soot on windows 2 miles of LAX in Westchester

Response:

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

PC02563-2

Comment:

2. Sepulveda Blvd. like a freeway with cars, limos and shuttle buses from Valley, hotels in the area, Pasadena/Glendale, etc. all getting off 405 South bound for LAX.

Response:

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

PC02563-3

Comment:

3. When it rains, airplanes take off inland at which time we hear them and fly-overs from airplanes circling due to traffic jams in the sky sound like they are going to hit us.

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. Aircraft operating to and from LAX do not use circling holding patterns in the vicinity of the airport. However, the commentor probably observes aircraft that take off to the east in these weather conditions and circle back to depart to the west.

PC02563-4

Comment:

4. Cargo planes very noisy and congestion of trucks lugging cargo away make 105 and 405 freeways even worse. Cargo planes into LAX! - this doesn't make sense!!

Response:

This comment is concerned with the level of air cargo associated with LAX Master Plan Alternatives A, B, and C and the increase in truck traffic it might generate in the future. 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. 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.

PC02564 Clutter, Mary Jane None Provided

PC02564-1

Comment:

There have been many cases of cancer in El Segundo caused by pollution. My husband, former councilman, Jim Clutter was stricken with lymphoma and died. Lymphoma is an environmental cancer caused by carcinogens. I have heard that there are cases of lymphoma among airport employees.

Traffic and noise are a concern for our health, however I think that the silent killer is air pollution.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use and in Section 4.24.2, Health Effects of Noise, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase, Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding land use and noise mitigation, and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC02565 Scholz, Frank None Provided

PC02565-1

Comment:

I do not always agree with you but on this issue I think you are right on!!

3. Comments and Responses

A larger LAX would mean more airport congestion on the ground both at the airport and nearby. We think that spreading out the traffic to nearby locations in Riverside, Palmdale, Long Beach and Orange County is the best solution. It would also relieve the air traffic & passenger control.

Response:

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

PC02566 Kapp, Carol None Provided

PC02566-1

Comment:

Put yourself in a classroom where Plane noise drowns out the "message of the lesson". This goes on daily in many schools - public & private. No more - No Expansion. Children deserve better conditions to do their job!

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.

PC02566-2

Comment:

LAX is responsible for the most NOX emissions. They are out of compliance now. Things will be worse under the proposed plan - I say No Expansion.

Response:

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

PC02566-3

Comment:

I perform 2 Asthma treatments daily - what could it be in the future 4? - No Expansion!!

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.

PC02567 Vranesh, Phyllis None Provided

PC02567-1

Comment:

I feel with the congestion getting to the airport via surface streets or freeway, it's almost impossible to get there in a reasonable time from Redondo Beach.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02567-2

Comment:

Growth to areas outside of LA County should share in the burden of airport travel. San Bernadino should not have to drive to LAX or Riverside and Orange Co.

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.

PC02567-3

Comment:

Sepulveda Blvd is a nightmare to navigate through the Beach cities. It's enough to put homes on top of garages, businesses etc. to highten the traffic without expanding LAX.

Response:

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

PC02567-4

Comment:

Noise will be a factor and we already have enough helicopters flying over the beach cities along with planes from Torrance airport. Thank you.

Response:

Comment noted. Helicopters that have an operating agreement with LAWA are required to abide with Section 5, Helicopter Operating Procedures of the Aircraft Noise Abatement Operating Procedures, and can be found in Topical Response TR-N-7, regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement. For all other helicopters there are no restrictions for flying over residential areas. Since most of Los Angeles is an urban area it would be difficult to prohibit helicopters from operating over residential areas. However, Potential Noise Abatement Measures are addressed in Section 7.1 of Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR. In particular Section 7.1.2 Airport Regulation Changes. Operations from Torrance Airport is not a

3. Comments and Responses

comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR; therefore, no response is required. For more information on noise impacts on the Southbay, see Response to Comment PC00552-2. Please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for more information on noise and noise related land use impacts under the baseline and Year 2000 conditions and the various Master Plan alternatives. See also Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 regarding too much noise now and in the future.

PC02568 Kishady, Charles None Provided

PC02568-1

Comment:

The first week in April 1999 was unbearable for people in my neighborhood. Our Easter service had to be interrupted because of the noise. All the complaining went unheard. The jets were so low you could tell the airline logos. You could see the tail of one jet and see the nose of the next one coming up.

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.

PC02568-2

Comment:

I don't have room to talk about the pollution!

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.

PC02569 Devine, Henri None Provided

PC02569-1

Comment:

SIX YEARS AGO, FOR FAMILY REASONS, WE MOVED TO EL SEGUNDO FROM P.V. WE LIVE ABOUT 2 BLOCKS FROM IMPERIAL HWY. WE KNEW THERE WOULD BE NOISE BUT NOT THE EXHAUST, PARTICULARLY DURING SANTANAS, THAT WE ARE EXPOSED TO ON A REGULAR BASIS.

Response:

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

PC02569-2

Comment:

WITH A PROJECTION OF DOUBLE THE TRAFFIC AND DOUBLE THE FUMES, WHICH MAY OR MAY NOT INVOLVE CARCINOGENS, LAX WILL BE PLANTING SOME SERIOUS SEEDS FOR CLASS SUITS IN 10 OR 12 YEARS. I'M 72 YEARS OLD, STILL FULLY EMPLOYED, WORK OUT DAILY AND DON'T EXPECT TO BE A CANCER PATIENT, BUT - LAX BETTER COVER THEIR BETS WITH HUGE UMBRELLA INSURANCE COVERAGE.

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.

PC02570 Kasper, Eugene None Provided

PC02570-1

Comment:

It makes little sense to push for expansion of LAX, located in an area of Southern California that is already over-built, over-congested, and becoming daily less viable as a livable community. Palmdale and Ontario are both areas that show vigorous population growth and have the capacity for even greater expansion. It makes eminent sense to expand airport facilities that will provide these growth communities.

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

**PC02571 McMahan, Kreg,
Diana, Mary C. &
Fred None Provided**

PC02571-1

Comment:

We are 4 adult registered voters in Los Angeles. We agree with Jane Harmons proposal to regional airports. LAX is already over crowded - We strongly think Orange, Riverside, & San Bernardino should have a regional system - Also Palm Dale & Ontario. Please support Congresswan Jane Harmon's view on airports alternatives.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC02572 McIntyre, Delme None Provided

PC02572-1

Comment:

LAX is absolutely impossible for driving now - we can't stand more traffic there. And the parking also is impossible.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02572-2

Comment:

Planes fly over our city constantly - they're loud.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02572-3

Comment:

The idea of adding more to that airport -- with such a small area -- appalls me.

Response:

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

PC02573 Mayo, Pierce None Provided 6/10/2001

PC02573-1

Comment:

Why are we spending so much time on this subject? We can not put every damn aircraft in the country in the same place at once, so lets get off the dime or whatever and get the job done. Spread it out over all 4 counties. Put a stop to those people around El Toro airport and make it a regional airport also right now, if not sooner.

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. 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.

PC02574 Curran, Donald None Provided

PC02574-1

Comment:

I'm in favor of regional airports. We have enough traffic in area 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. 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.

PC02575 Hall, Vivian None Provided

PC02575-1

Comment:

The LAX Master Plan would be a disaster to quality of life in the area (I live in Marina del Rey -- since 1970 -- and have already experienced devastating traffic, noise & pollution).

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, 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.

PC02575-2

Comment:

The regional plan is definitely in order, and you are to be commended for being such a strong advocate - thank you!

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

3. Comments and Responses

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

PC02575-3

Comment:

I think that Orange County should be obligated to allow an International airport development as part of the plan - why should it be allowed to escape?

Response:

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

PC02576 Lombard, David None Provided

PC02576-1

Comment:

LAX should be viewed as having the same fundamental problems that Denver's former Stapleton and Dallas's Love Fields share...built decades ago within an existing municipal area on relatively small parcels and with intensive growth surrounding it. LAX should be constrained to its existing size or smaller & growth in passengers & flights should be migrated to other, regional 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.

PC02577 Dillehay, Rodney None Provided

PC02577-1

Comment:

Expansion of other airports within the region expands capacity where population is growing. Expansion of other airports will provide greater choice for carriers and passengers. LAX is a valuable regional resource - don't stretch it beyond the limits of an airport already constrained by urban encroachment.

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.

PC02578 Wight, Nan None Provided

PC02578-1

Comment:

I do not believe that LAX should be expanded.

Response:

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

PC02578-2

Comment:

The congestion and lack of parking facilities already create a critical problem. Access to LAX along an already stressed Lincoln Blvd through Marina Del Rey will further tie up traffic.

Response:

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

PC02578-3

Comment:

Noise east of the airport negatively affects residents.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02578-4

Comment:

I am in favor of the Regional Plan, more smaller 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.

PC02579 Buchanan, Kathleen None Provided

PC02579-1

Comment:

Traffic is horrible now on Sepulveda & Lincoln Blvds.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC02579-2

Comment:

We should be concerned with reducing the size of LAX, not increasing 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.

PC02579-3

Comment:

I used to work as an Immigration Inspector at LAX. I quit because of the forced overtime to accomodate all the needs of the airport. Extra growth forces other agencies to meet the demands of the airport before they have adequate personnel.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02579-4

Comment:

75% of the passengers are going to other places in the LA area. I know this first hand after admitting them for six years. Regional airports should be equipped to handle international flights or make LAX - international flights only.

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.

PC02580

Gierlich, James

None Provided

PC02580-1

Comment:

We live right in the heart of LAX flight & traffic problems. They can't handle the existing air traffic -- there's no expansion design that could solve existing problems -- it will only get worse. We have a coalition of So. Bay Cities presently fighting FAA & LAX re flights not following flight patterns -- pilots taking "shortcuts" over residential areas after midnight.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC02580-2

Comment:

We concur that regional contrl is the only plausible way to offer air traffic growth, which is needed now. ("Not in my backyard.") To make this happen, Orange Co. needs to turn El Toro into an International Facility - that alone would take a tremendous load off of LAX. Long Beach could help, but it is too close & could create flight safety problems.

Response:

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

PC02581

Huss, Bill

None Provided

6/10/2001

PC02581-1

Comment:

An International Airport should be located at Palmdale with adequate ground transportation from the outlying airports which would service domestic routes.

Response:

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

PC02581-2

Comment:

The quality of life for anyone near the LAX area is truly nonexistent if expansion occurs. The traffic & noise pollution will truly be out of control.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02581-3

Comment:

Our Bldg has never been retrofitted yet for the current problem.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program. As stated in Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.8, residential sound insulation that qualifies under the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP) is prioritized within the highest CNEL measurement band above 65 CNEL first and the qualifying property owner is contacted to participate in the current program band.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02582 Regan, Deborah None Provided

PC02582-1

Comment:

I feel that LAX should not be responsible for all of (much! most!) Southern Calif.

Let other areas share in the noise and profits.

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. 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.

PC02582-2

Comment:

*Has a study ever been done on which people are coming from where. They use LAX? What % of the passengers are from here, from Orange County from Ventura County, etc?

Response:

The distribution of the regional domestic O&D passenger demand was discussed in Chapter III, Section 5.2.3 of the Draft LAX Master Plan. The 1990 and forecast 2015 demand distribution is presented graphically in Figures III 5.7 and III 5.8. SCAG periodically does surveys that attempt to quantify the percentage of air travelers by their county (and RADAM zone) of origin for each of the regional airports. SCAG uses this information to develop its demand allocation for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

PC02582-3

Comment:

I never was aware of airplane noise from LAX jets until the last year or so. Sometimes the noise is continual and sometimes quite loud. I'm sure weather has a bit to do with that, but we don't need to ruin any more neighborhoods with noise.

Response:

Comment noted. The commentor is correct in identifying that weather at times plays a role for a perceived increase in noise levels. Aircraft noise mitigation was described in Section 4.2.8 of the Draft EIS/EIR beginning on page 4-216. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR also provided mitigation measures for aircraft noise in Sections 4.1.8 and 4.2.8. Please see Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 regarding existing and future noise levels.

PC02582-4**Comment:**

And traffic has intensified with the increase in housing density with no real open space or real parking as part of the increase plans.

Response:

Expanded airport parking is part of each future airport alternative proposed in the Draft EIS/EIR and 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, Airport Area Traffic Concerns. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PC02583

**McKenney, Clarence
Pete** **None Provided**

6/9/2001

PC02583-1**Comment:**

I want to thank you so very much for your work in trying to prevent the further expansion of this nightmare which Los Angeles calls LAX.

I moved to the East side of Manhattan Beach in 1975 from a townhouse in Cypress because of the nearly constant Helicopter/Police presence in adjacent Hawaiian Gardens night after night. Previous to that I was living in the house in which I was raised, West of the Long Beach Airport, where I clearly remember the terrible noise of war plane production flying directly overhead at very low altitude day after day during World War II and subsequently the Douglas Aircraft Jet noises. I tell you this so you will understand I tried to find a house without night airport noise, and I came to this house several nights prior to purchase to check for similar problems before signing on the dotted line!

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC02583-2**Comment:**

Now, I wish I'd stayed in Cypress. In the past 25 years there has been a tremendous increase in Jet noise day and night. There are times when climate conditions are "right" that the house actually vibrates with the rumble coming from LAX. Rarely is there a night which goes by without interruption of sleep by an unusually low flying jet craft or Twin engine PropJet.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase. Weather at times plays a role for a perceived increase in noise levels. Please see Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration. 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 and noise impacts on nighttime awakenings.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02583-3

Comment:

Add to this the Coast Guard helicopter two or three times a day passage, or the Lifeguard helicopter taking the "boss" to lunch (just kidding) while flying about 150 feet over the house, and the weekend pilots in training coming from the Hawthorne Airport who don't know how to feather their prop and they buzz the entire area one after another. Oh yes! I nearly forgot. We not have a new menace; a few private, twin engine jets which probably take off from the small Hawthorne Airport and fly directly over the house at a very low altitude, climbing at full throttle.

The Airport Expansion will exacerbate these problem a thousand times and since

Response:

The commentor's references to the Hawthorne Airport are not a comment on the contents of the LAX Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Nevertheless, the comment indicates that the airport expansion program will exacerbate problems at Hawthorne Airport a thousand times. In actuality, the expansion program at LAX is not expected to affect the operations at Hawthorne Airport. Neither are the operations at LAX expected to rise more than approximately 20 percent above current conditions under even the largest alternatives - certainly not a "thousand times". For additional information on the anticipated future changes in aircraft noise with the change in future operations, please see Topical Response TR-N-6, regarding noise Increase, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1, regarding existing and future noise levels, and Subtopical Response TR-N-6.2, regarding relationship between traffic levels and noise levels.

PC02583-4

Comment:

Manhattan Beach is over 1 mile from the airport, we'll have little if any chance to receive city sponsored noise reduction as have my friends living closer to LAX.

Response:

Please see Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4, for a description of how the noise impact boundary is determined. See also Response to Comment PC00611-2 regarding noise impacts on the South Bay area, including Manhattan Beach.

PC02583-5

Comment:

But even with noise reduction by friends can't go outside and carry on a conversation or just sit quietly reading in their own yards, listening to the birds ! (unless those birds are silver)

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC02583-6

Comment:

You completely correct that regional expansion will reduce pollution in the basin, provide quicker access to flights by the burgeoning population in the outlying counties, and give people lower fares.

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. 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.

PC02583-7

Comment:

My coworkers in Orange County are all fighting the conversion of El Toro into a new regional airport. They clearly admit they do not want to deal with the noise increase flights from El Toro might have on their neighborhoods. Yet when they fly somewhere and pay personally - not with company money - they all want to fly from LAX where a \$400.00 ticket at John Wayne Airport in Orange County can be purchased for \$320 or less from LAX - same class. Naturally they drive to the airport, usually on the already overloaded 405 Fwy, and all complain at how bad traffic is on the "405" and how badly sections of the highway are deteriorating. Needless to say I'm really steamed about that whole situation. I just don't see the need to further damage the LAX, South Bay area with a needless increase in traffic and plane noise for persons who drive right past El Toro and John Wayne in Orange County and are clearly engaging in NIMBY at it's worst.

Response:

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

PC02583-8

Comment:

We do, Mrs. Harman, really need your help and I want to urge you to keep up the excellent work to develop alternatives to LAX expansion. As a citizen of this area I have been feeling helpless to do anything to stop the LAX powerful corporate interests who obviously thought they could cram this expansion down our throats.

Response:

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

PC02584

Stapleton, Faith

None Provided

7/17/2001

PC02584-1

Comment:

Noise due to aircraft flying Northeast from LAX continues to adversely impact the quality of my life and well being. There is no way to sleep without interruption from jet as well as commuter type planes. The periods most intolerable are from ten pm to 2am and then from 5:45am to 9:30am.

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

PC02584-2

Comment:

Obviously I am OPPOSED to LAX expansion for these personal reasons as well as crowded skies, additional freeway traffic, and worst of all the excessive pollution which jets generate, and of course property devaluation.

Response:

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

PC02584-3

Comment:

Thank you for your continued support of Opposition to Expansion of LAX which is so totally propelled by greed.

Response:

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

PC02585

Reynolds, Joel

**Natural Resources Defense
Council**

11/8/2001

PC02585-1

Comment:

In light of significantly changed circumstances since the draft EIS/EIS was circulated for public comment, we believe that the document should be withdrawn and a new EIS/EIR prepared. In the alternative, we request that a supplemental environmental impact report/statement addressing the implications of the September 11 attacks for the planned expansion of LAX be prepared before any decision on the project is made. Without any doubt, this extraordinary event constitutes significant new information that may fundamentally alter the plan as proposed and, indeed, may ultimately dictate a changed result. The implications of the attack for air travel and security issues are fundamental, as is the importance of meaningful public input on a project as significant as the proposed LAX expansion. Under these circumstances, additional environmental review and public comment is unquestionably required.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

PC02585-2

Comment:

Without waiving these requests, we submit as an Attachment brief comments on the air quality and health assessment portions of the draft EIS/EIR as previously circulated for public comment.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments PC02585-3 through PC02585-18 below.

PC02585-3

Comment:

ATTACHMENT

The Air Quality and Human Health Risk Assessment portions of the LAX EIS/EIR raise a number of concerns:

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC02585-4 through PC02585-18 below.

PC02585-4

Comment:

LAWA Should Not Take Credit for Mitigation Measures It Cannot Ensure

LAWA cannot include or take credit for measures over which it has no control or enforcement, such as a requirement of all construction deliveries to be made with clean fuel vehicles. The modification of airplane operating procedures, which would contribute some of the largest emissions reductions, requires FAA approval. Other proposed measures, such as Intelligent Transportation Systems and traffic management programs require cooperation from MTA and Caltrans. LAWA's commitment to and control over the list of mitigation measures needs to be clarified.

Response:

The preliminary list of mitigation measures included in the Draft EIS/EIR was modified in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR published in July 2003. The recommended list of mitigation measures included in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR does not include two measures (single engine taxi mitigation measure, landing fees mitigation measure) that require FAA approval. In accordance with Section 15126.4 of the CEQA Guidelines, "an EIR shall describe feasible measures that could minimize significant adverse impacts." As such, the list of recommended mitigation measures includes a variety of components intended to reduce air quality impacts

PC02585-5

Comment:

Finally, the Technical Report 4, Attachment X, which contains details about air quality mitigation measures, should be redone in a legible electronic rather than scanned form.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02585-6

Comment:

The No Action/No Build Scenario Does Not Necessarily Mean Greater Public Risk

3. Comments and Responses

We disagree that the No Action/No build scenario would generate greater air quality risks to the public. Most of the air quality improving measures included in the mitigation and Environmental Action plans could be implemented under this scenario without any changes to current runways. Therefore, the EIS/EIR statements, such as "All of the Master Plan build alternatives would be better, producing lower overall emissions, than the No Action/No Project alternative,"¹ are misleading and false. The appropriate comparison would be with a project that included air quality improvement measures but did not add any changes to the current runways.

¹ On-Airport Emissions Key Conclusions, page 4-460, LAX EIS/EIR

Response:

The comparatively lower air quality impacts under the build alternatives relative to the No Action/No Project Alternative are due to two reasons: (1) The increased efficiency of airfield operations, and (2) recommended mitigation measures. Of these two factors, the increased efficiency of airfield operations has the greatest effect on reducing air quality impacts. Under all the build alternatives the runways would be reconfigured and new centerfield taxiways would be constructed in both the north and south airfields. These improvements would reduce taxi/idle times, which account for a good portion of the aircraft related emissions. If the No Action/No Project Alternative were selected there is no requirement to implement mitigation measures that would be used for the other development alternatives.

PC02585-7

Comment:

The Human Health Risk Assessment goes one step further and states that the No Action/No Project Alternative "would cause maximally exposed individual cancer risks and non-cancer hazards to increase in all areas near LAX in both horizon years."² This statement could only be true if the mitigation measures were only applied to the three build alternatives. Again, most of those mitigation efforts could also be implemented without any new runway construction or expansion. In fact, health risks from the No Action/No Project Alternative may be significantly over stated, if the recent Fleet and Commercial Airport Ground Access rules were not incorporated into the emission inventory projections.³

² 14a Human Health Risk Assessment Technical Report (HHRA), page 2, LAX EIS/EIR

³ [http://www.aqmd.gov/news1/Fleet Rule Home.htm](http://www.aqmd.gov/news1/Fleet%20Rule%20Home.htm) and <http://www.aqmd.gov/rules/rulesreg.html>

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-2 regarding No Action/No Project assumptions and 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).

PC02585-8

Comment:

1997 Air Quality Standards Should Be Included in the Analysis:

The air quality analysis in the EIS/EIR should include the ozone and fine particulate standards passed by the US EPA in 1997. The standards were unanimously upheld by the Supreme Court in February of this year. Regardless of the previous uncertain legal status of these standards, LAWA should have included analysis under the more protective standards, as a conservative precaution. Now that these standards are slated for implementation, they must be used in the EIS/EIR.

Though the EIS/EIR included California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS), which are slightly more stringent than older national standards, the new national standards are even more protective of human health. Additionally, LAWA should be more sensitive to these concerns given the current "Extreme" nonattainment status of the Los Angeles area with respect to ozone and "Serious" status with respect to particulates.⁴

4 "PM10" or PM with average diameter less than or equal to 10 microns.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-94 regarding the eight-hour ozone NAAQS and the PM2.5 NAAQS.

PC02585-9

Comment:

The "Preferred Alternative" Would Violate Standards for Particulate Matter

In the General Approach and Methodology section, it is stated that the current method to account for PM2.5 is to use PM10 as a surrogate.⁵ If this is so, then both the construction and operational unmitigated emissions from all alternatives would exceed the new PM2.5 standards by significant amounts ranging up to 550% for Alternative A during the peak of construction.⁶ With the menu of mitigation efforts in place, all alternatives are still predicted to violate the new particulate standards. The preferred alternative is predicted to be at more than twice the standard during construction and full operation.⁷ Nowhere in the EIS/EIR are these issues addressed.

5 PM2.5 are particulates with diameters less than or equal to 2.5 microns; page 4-462, LAX EIS/EIR

6 Based on Table 4.6-13, LAX EIS/EIR; Calculation: $(98 \text{ ug/m}^3 - 15 \text{ ug/m}^3)/15 \text{ ug/m}^3$, Annual Arithmetic Mean (AAM)

7 Based on Table 4.6-20, LAX EIS/EIR; 39 ug/m^3 and 34 ug/m^3 versus 15 ug/m^3 , AAM

Response:

As noted in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.6.3.2 at page 4-475 and reiterated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.6.3.1 at page 4-363, for purposes of the air quality analyses, PM10 was used as a surrogate for PM2.5, consistent with EPA's interim implementation guidance. That guidance specifically cites a lack of necessary tools to calculate emissions of PM2.5 and related precursors and to predict ambient air quality to adequately meet PM2.5 standards. According to the guidance, sources that meet requirements for controlling PM10 emissions will serve as an interim way of controlling PM2.5 emissions until EPA develops a comprehensive implementation strategy. In the absence of further regulatory guidance, EPA's interim PM2.5 implementation guidance is understood to mean that compliance with the PM10 NAAQS implies compliance with the PM2.5 NAAQS. The air quality analyses presented in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR demonstrate no exceedances of the PM10 NAAQS, implying that the PM2.5 NAAQS are also maintained within the context of EPA's guidance.

PC02585-10

Comment:

Proposed Mitigation for Particulate Matter and Ozone is Utterly Insufficient

Despite the large problems with particulate emissions without mitigation, the mitigation efforts included in the plan reduce particulates the least of all the criteria pollutants, a nominal 5 to 7 percent compared to the up to one third reductions in carbon monoxide (CO). Estimates of particulate reductions are conspicuously missing from Table 4.6-16, which lists the reductions of NOx, VOC, and CO from mitigation measures. According to Table 4.6-6, stationary sources at LAX contribute significantly to total particulate emissions, accounting for 54 of the 159 tons per year of baseline (1996) emissions, however no mitigation measures are offered to address this large source category. LAWA should focus more attention on mitigation measures that lower particulates.

3. Comments and Responses

The EIS/EIR also fails to address the impacts of any alternatives on ozone, a major air quality problem in Los Angeles, in terms of meeting state and federal standards.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01196-12 regarding air quality impacts and further mitigation measures.

Airport emissions (including 54 tons of PM10 from stationary sources) are based on the 1996 baseline. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR contained revised data relative to feasible mitigation measures and their emission reductions in Section 4.6, Air Quality, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-E.

PC02585-11

Comment:

Conformity Budgets Should Be Included:

The emission levels predicted in the EIS/EIR from the preferred alternative are stated to trigger conformity requirements. However, the conformity analysis including these figures will not be available to the public for some time. Without this analysis, it is impossible to assess the feasibility of any alternatives. LAWA should, at a minimum, include in the EIS/EIR the conformity emissions budget listed in the California State Implementation Plan (SIP), and compare the overall emissions projected in the LAX Master Plan to this budget.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AF00001-4 regarding the general conformity determination.

PC02585-12

Comment:

Questionable Emission Estimates for Toxic Air Pollutants:

Although the consultants used a wide variety of referenced sources to construct emission profiles for all of the sources at LAX, the "surveys" that were used to obtain operational factors for all of the equipment were not referenced. It is unclear why a phase I set of emissions estimates was constructed for all sources and then later revised as phase II, only changing emission estimates for aircraft.

The report states that the Phase II emission estimates were "refined based on inspections at LAX and interviews with LAX tenants identified by LAWA." It is not clear how these inspections and interviews could cause emission estimates for some of the most toxic chemicals, such as 1,3-butadiene, acetaldehyde, acrolein, arsenic, benzene, cadmium, formaldehyde, lead and styrene to be adjusted downward, while other less toxic chemicals such as hexane, copper, nickel and zinc were increased. Lead, for example, was adjusted from an estimated 1,253 kilograms emitted per year from aircraft to 29 kg per year, with no footnoted explanation of anticipated jet fuel changes or any other such possibility. It is implausible that operational parameters could drastically decrease emission estimates for certain chemicals while increasing others.

Response:

The Phase I emission estimates were general, conservative estimates based on previously available information regarding airport operations. The Phase I estimates indicated that aircraft were the primary source of emissions. Phase I estimates were revised based on more recent information and data regarding airport operations, including types of aircraft and flights. The Phase I estimates regarding non-aircraft emissions were retained and used in the Phase II estimates, rather than recalculating these values, since aircraft represented the primary source of emissions.

The aircraft modeling in Phase II was more refined. This reduced some of the conservatism for aircraft in the Phase I analysis, such as no plume rise from aircraft exhaust and inappropriate speciation profiles (metal profiles were from non-aircraft, non-turbine sources in Phase I). In Phase II, plume rise

was addressed in the dispersion modeling (and the fact that plume rise occurs was confirmed by the LIDAR study presented at the Air and Waste Management Annual Meeting in San Diego, June 2003); metal and PAH speciation profiles were developed from CATEF data for distillate fired combustion turbines (closest surrogate for aircraft turbines that we could find at the time); and the organic speciation profiles were developed from measurements of 10 aircraft engines reported in four test reports (Spicer, et al reports from 1984 through 1990).

PC02585-13

Comment:

Emissions of Lead from Airport Activity Must Be Better Addressed:

In the state of California, airports are the largest source of lead, accounting for 149 of the estimated 175 to 182 tons emitted per year.⁸ Lead was listed by the state as a Toxic Air Contaminant (TAC) in 1997, and the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) recently selected lead as one of five TACs that may cause infants and children to be especially susceptible to illness.⁹ OEHHA is currently reviewing lead standards to determine whether they are protective of children's health. The agency has already concluded that even airborne lead levels at one third of the current state standard could result in 10 percent of children having lead blood levels above official levels of concern set by the Center for Disease Control and Prevention.¹⁰

Considering these developments, the exclusion of lead from the air quality and human health risk assessment (HHRA) portions of the EIS/EIR is inappropriate. The EIS/EIR states that emissions of lead are "relatively low and would not contribute to a violation of the Pb NAAQS or CAAQS."¹¹ However, it is known that harmful effects of lead can occur from exposures below the ambient air quality standard. Since the lead standard was put in place over 20 years ago, it has become clear that lead is a potential human carcinogen and a strong neuro- and developmental toxicant at low levels.¹²

⁸ Proposed Identification of Inorganic Lead as a Toxic Air Contaminant, California Air Resources Board, March 1997.

⁹ Under the Children's Environmental Health Protection Act (Senate Bill 25, Escutia; chaptered 1999) and (Health and Safety Code Sections 39669.5(a)); the five TACs were reviewed and endorsed by the Scientific Review Panel.

¹⁰ OEHHA, Lead: Evaluation of Current California Air Quality Standards With Respect to Protection of Children, September 2000.

¹¹ Section 4.6.6 Environmental Consequences, page 4-482, LAX EIS/EIR

¹² Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, ToxFaqs, June 1999

Response:

OEHHA reviewed ambient air quality standards and identified first and second tier criteria air pollutants. First tier pollutants represent greater potential risks to public health. Lead was categorized as a second tier pollutant, because there are few areas of the State where ambient lead represents an ongoing public health concern (OEHHA, 2000). It was decided to evaluate lead as a TAC rather than a criteria air pollutant because most concerns are from site-specific emissions rather than ambient concentrations (OEHHA, 2001). No significant sources of lead exist or are proposed at LAX. Use of the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS) for lead is appropriate as a screening threshold given the lack of significant sources. Overall, screening (conservative) estimates of lead in air for the year 2015 as a result of LAX emissions are 30 times lower than the AAQS, suggesting negligible potential for lead exposure.

According to the FAA air quality handbook (Appendix C), the primary (but typically insignificant) source of lead at airports and air bases is the combustion of leaded aviation gasoline (AvGas) in piston-engine aircraft (FAA, 1997). Piston engine planes are the only type of aircraft that use leaded fuel (AvGas). The portion of fuel used for aviation that comprises AvGas is extremely small, approximately 1.9 percent of all aviation fuel (EPA 1998). Storage facilities for AvGas at LAX consist of a single aboveground tank, compared to Jet A fuel, which is stored in large aboveground tanks and numerous smaller above ground and underground tanks.

EPA. 1998. Bi-National Toxics Strategy. Stakeholder Forum.

3. Comments and Responses

FAA. 1997. Air Quality Procedures for Civilian Airports and Air Force Bases. April

OEHHA. 2000. Final Report: Adequacy of California Ambient Air Quality Standards.

OEHHA. 2001. Prioritization of Toxic Air Contaminants Under the Children's Environmental Health Protection Act. Final. October

PC02585-14

Comment:

The screening report attached to the HHRA actually named lead as a "significant community health concern... released in significant quantities (2,941 kg/yr) from LAX."¹³ It also stated that lead would be "retained as a TAP of potential concern," and the Air Quality report directs the reader to the HHRA for further analysis of lead. However, there it is stated that lead is predicted to be below the ambient standards and therefore eliminated from the analysis.¹⁴ Because lead does not have a Reference Exposure Level (REL), as with other chemicals for which "toxicity criteria are not available," a quantitative toxicity screen was not conducted.¹⁵ In fact, The California Air Resources Board has not yet set a REL for lead because they could not identify a threshold value below which exposure to lead is safe.¹⁶

The final risk analysis completely excludes noncancer effects of lead as well as cancer risks from lead despite the availability of cancer potency factors.¹⁷ The EIS/EIR for LAX is unacceptable without further analysis of such a major threat to public health.

13 HHRA, Appendix B, Page 19, LAX EIS/EIR

14 HHRA, page 12, LAX EIS/EIR

15 HHRA, Appendix B, Page 18, LAX EIS/EIR

16 Consolidated Table of OEHHA/ARB Approved Risk Assessment Health Values, July 2001.

17 Consolidated Table of OEHHA/ARB Approved Risk Assessment Health Values, July 2001.

Response:

The content of this comment is essentially the same as comment AL00034-54; please refer to Response to Comment AL00034-54.

PC02585-15

Comment:

Health Risks are Underestimated:

The Executive Summary of Human Health Risk Assessment states that "methods are used that are more likely to overestimate than underestimate possible health risks" and "risk estimates represent upper-bound predictions of exposure, and therefore health risk, that may be associated with living near, and breathing emissions from, LAX during and after implementation of the Master Plan." The risk assessment, however, upon closer examination, actually underestimates risk in many instances.

The assessment states "cancer risks were estimated for people who grow up and spend most of their adult life near the airport."¹⁸ Consequently, the analysis was based on exposure durations of 30 years for adults and six years for children. This is counter to common risk assessment guidance recommending exposure durations of 70 years for lifetime cancer risk.¹⁹ The resulting assessment, based on these low exposure duration values, underestimates exposure by over one half.

Inhalation Rates used in the analysis were also at the low end of the spectrum. The US EPA Exposure Factors Handbook²⁰ recommends an average inhalation rate of 1.07 m³/hr, more than 70 percent higher than the 15 m³/day rate used in this assessment. The assessment also selected the highest average adult body weight, 70 kilograms (kg), which leads to further underestimates in weight-adjusted exposure. Guidance indicates that lifespan exposure analysis (0 to 70 years) should use an average body weight of 62-63 kg, depending on the source.²¹ Additionally, if this assessment represents the

most sensitive populations, it should use body weight factors for adult females, which range from 62-68 kg, according to EPA's Exposure Factor Handbook.

18 HHRA, page 19, LAX EIS/EIR

19 Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, Exposure Assessment and Stochastic Analysis Technical Document, Chapter 11: Exposure Duration, December, 1996; California EPA, Practices, Needs and Methodologies for Human Exposure Assessment at Cal/EPA, Table 4-4, February, 2001; US EPA Exposure Factors Handbook, ORD, August, 1997.

20 Chapter 5, Table 7

21 The CalTOX Model uses a body weight of 62 kg for child/adult combined analysis; OEHHA's Exposure Assessment and Stochastic Analysis uses 63 kg for age 0-70 analysis, according to Practices, Needs and Methodologies for Human Exposure Assessment at Cal/EPA, Table 4-4, February, 2001.

Response:

The HHRA evaluated risks for maximally exposed individuals (MEI) at locations where maximum concentrations of toxic air pollutants (TAPs) were predicted by air dispersion modeling. USEPA guidance indicates that exposure variables should be chosen so that their combination results in an estimate of the reasonable maximum exposure (RME) for the exposure pathway. RME is the highest exposure that is within the range of possible exposures at the site (USEPA 1989). RME is designed to be conservative yet to prevent unrealistic, or "worst case" estimates from serving as the basis of risk management decisions. Under this approach, some exposure variables may not be at their individual maximum values, but when in combination with other variables, will result in estimates of the RME. The exposure duration of 30 years, recommended by USEPA (USEPA 1989), is an upper bound estimate and represents the 95th percentile of the population (i.e., only 5 percent of the population are assumed to have higher exposure). The average body weight of 70 kilograms was selected based on USEPA (1989) recommendation and provides a balance to upper bound values used for other exposure variables.

The inhalation rate cited in the comment does not accurately represent recommendations in the Exposure Factors Handbook (USEPA, 1997). As indicated in the comment, the value cited is from Chapter 5, Table 5-7. However, Table 5-7 does not summarize recommended inhalation rates; rather, this table summarizes results from Adams (1993) - Measurement of Breathing Rate and Volume in Routinely Performed Daily Activities, which is one of several key inhalation rate studies used to develop recommended inhalation values. Recommended inhalation rates are presented in Table 5-23 of the Exposure Factors Handbook. The Draft EIS/EIR used an inhalation rate of 15 cubic meters per day for the offsite resident child. This is one of the highest inhalation rates recommended in Table 5-23 for long-term exposures for children.

Although the combination of exposure variables selected represent RME, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR used an exposure duration of 70 years based on a comment from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (Comment Letter AR00004-19). Please refer to the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for an evaluation of risks based on the revised exposure duration.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 1989. Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund. Volume I: Human Health Evaluation Manual. Interim Final. Office of Emergency and Remedial Response. September 29, 1989.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 1997. Exposure Factors Handbook. EPA/600/P-95/002Fa. August 1997.

PC02585-16

Comment:

Health Risk Assessment Based on Alternative C May Underestimate Risks from Other Alternatives

The risk was also underestimated for the build alternatives under 2005 post-mitigation conditions, because it was based on Alternative C, which the assessment states is "essentially identical" to alternatives A and B.22 Alternative C, however, would include the least construction activity of the three alternatives and therefore would represent the lowest risk of any alternative. Pre-mitigation analysis for

3. Comments and Responses

2005 did not state which alternative the modeling was based on; it was simply noted that all three build alternatives were "predicted to be similar."²³ Alternative B seems to produce the highest modeled concentrations of TAPs in 2015 for both pre- and post-mitigation conditions. Therefore, it would seem to be the logical choice as a conservative estimate for all three alternatives.

22 HHRA, Page 54, LAX EIS/EIR

23 HHRA, Page 29, LAX EIS/EIR

Response:

Human health risks and hazards were evaluated in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for an interim year and Horizon year 2015. Risks and hazards were evaluated based on modeled emissions associated with the proposed alternatives. Alternative D was included in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The interim year for the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternatives A, B, and C was 2005. The interim year for Alternative D was 2013. Health impacts should not be construed to represent "point in time" estimates or to have a "cut-off" period of the horizon year. For example, risk calculations for interim year 2005 assumed that adult residents were exposed to maximum chemical concentrations for an exposure duration of 70 years.

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, the year 2005 was chosen as a reasonable interim date during implementation of the LAX where human health impacts during construction could be evaluated. The interim year was defined for each alternative as the year predicted to have the highest combined, or total, emissions from both operational sources and construction sources. The interim year for any individual alternative is not necessarily the same year of maximum operation emissions or the peak year of construction emissions.

For 2005, emissions for Alternatives A, B, and C were predicted to be so similar that a single modeling run could be used to predict air quality impacts of TAP releases for all three build scenarios. Please see Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding emission estimates associated with the four build alternatives. For 2005, SIMMOD data was developed for the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative C only. Alternatives A and B were assumed to have the same number of operations and associated impacts as Alternative C. For aircraft operations in 2005, taxi and queue times were assumed to be similar for Alternatives A, B, and C although differences in runway and gate layouts would result in small differences in taxi and queue times for each alternative. These differences were considered to be minor.

The year 2015 was projected for completion of the LAX Master Plan and is thus the first year when full operations were expected after implementation. Emissions estimated for the year 2015 were based on completion of the build alternatives and are thus not appropriate for evaluation of impacts for the year 2005.

PC02585-17

Comment:

Particulate Emissions from Aircraft Must Be Included

Particulate emission estimates from aircraft should have been considered in the HHRA. It is merely mentioned that their exclusion leads to "uncertainty in the risk estimates presented";²⁴ it should have been clearly acknowledged that it led to a significant underestimation of risk. The Air Quality analysis stated that "The major sources of PM₁₀ emissions are aircraft engines (32 percent)..." while the HHRA states that aircraft are expected to emit "relatively little" PM.²⁵ This later statement is a contradiction and serves to minimize the impacts of the build alternatives which would include more aircraft activity.

24 HHRA, Page 82, LAX EIS/EIR

25 Page 4-479 and HHRA Page 82, LAX EIS/EIR

Response:

Particulate matter (PM) is a criteria pollutant. As such, PM emission impacts were evaluated for significance in Section 4.6, Air Quality of the Draft EIS/EIR. Diesel particulates are considered a toxic

3. Comments and Responses

air pollutant and human health impacts associated with diesel particulate emissions were evaluated for significance in the HHRA. The text cited on page 82 of Technical Report 14a, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Draft EIS/EIR concerns particulate matter associated with diesel exhaust. The text indicates that diesel particulate emissions are not evaluated for aircraft due to differences in fuel properties and combustion processes. For additional information, please refer to Response to Comment AL00034-55 regarding diesel particulate emissions from jet engines. In addition, the section name for subsection 7.3.1 in Technical Report 14a of the Draft EIS/EIR was revised to "Lack of Quantitative Evaluation for Diesel Particulates in Jet Exhaust" in the Final EIS/EIR.

PC02585-18

Comment:

Finally, the last section of the HHRA concedes that "incremental cancer risks after mitigation could be underestimated by about 60 percent." This is inconsistent with previous statements that this assessment represents the upper-bound of risk. Assumptions regarding mitigation measures should have been the most conservative, eliminating the uncertainty of underestimation of risk on such a large scale. Uncertainty regarding risk from diesel particulates, which account for a majority of the cancer risk, was not directly addressed. In fact, assumptions were buried in footnotes to two tables.²⁶

26 Conversion rates noted in Pages 4-517 and 4-519, LAX EIS/EIR

Response:

The comment apparently is based on part of the analysis of uncertainties in Technical Report 14a, Human Health Risk Assessment of the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 7.5, page 84. In context, the quote in the comment refers to part of an analysis of possible taxi/idle times in single engine mode after mitigation. The analysis used the best prediction for these times, then considered the ramification if such times were not achieved. The quoted sentence does not imply that the results of the human health risk assessment were underestimated overall. Previous analysis of the conservative nature of the analysis still apply.

In any event, the analysis presented in Technical Report 14a was superseded by the analyses presented in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Mitigation measures currently proposed differ from those under consideration during the preparation of the Draft EIS/EIR and, in particular, single engine taxi is no longer considered a viable option.

All post-mitigation analyses have been revised and were presented in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment (subsection 4.24.1.9, Level of Significance After Mitigation), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02586

Tong, Kevin

None Provided

11/9/2001

PC02586-1

Comment:

I live by Sequoia Park in Monterey Park, which is situated on the highest hill in Monterey Park.

The flight pattern has the planes flying directly over this area. When this happens, the noise is as loud as the planes approaching over Century Blvd.

What compounds the noise is that my backyard overlooks Monterey Pass Road, a canyon below which amplifies this noise.

Response:

The commentor is correct in identifying that numerous cities east of LAX are impacted by aircraft operations. The commentor's annoyance with the overflights by aircraft is acknowledged. The commentor is affected by the base leg (perpendicular) segment of the westerly approaches to the airport. Please see Responses to Comments AL00051-3 and AL00051-4 for further discussion of the overflights of Monterey Park. For further information on the effect of these approaches, also see

3. Comments and Responses

Subtopical Response TR-N-3.5, regarding the effects of elevation on noise. While single event levels may at times equal those of noise in areas further east on Century Boulevard, the average aircraft noise levels would be much higher on Century Boulevard than in the vicinity of Monterey Park, owing to the concentration of aircraft along the Century Boulevard corridor. Please see Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-2.1, regarding CNEL characterization of noise events and Subtopical Response TR-N-2.3, regarding the evaluation of impacts should extend beyond the 65 CNEL contour to all sensitive areas under flight tracks.

PC02586-2

Comment:

The noise is non-existent if the planes fly about a mile south, over the Pomona Fwy (CA-60) which the planes sometimes do.

If you can limit the plane to fly over the CA-60 in MPK, the noise will be greatly reduced and affect a lot less people.

Response:

Overflight of Monterey Park occurs as the number of aircraft arriving at LAX increases and the approach route for aircraft arriving from the west is extended easterly to allow air traffic controllers to better sequence arrivals in with the approach stream coming from the east. The flights the commentator sees over CA-60 are likely the arrivals from the east or aircraft arriving from the west that have been routed farther to the east before turning to intercept the final approach paths. While it is preferable to route traffic over less, rather than more, developed areas, the ultimate flight paths used in the Los Angeles basin are controlled by a number of factors, including the amount of traffic, conflicts with aircraft from other airports, aircraft speeds, and elevations. Please see Response to Comments AL00051-3 and AL00051-4 for additional information related to the noise mitigation actions that are occurring relative to downwind and baseleg approaches in the Monterey Park area.

PC02587 Crowden, Cheryl None Provided 11/5/2001

PC02587-1

Comment:

I do not want either Master Plan or EIS/EIR

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02588 Griffin, Barbara None Provided 11/7/2001

PC02588-1

Comment:

Certainly would appreciate more info - public meeting etc - regarding spreading the runways & planning using Westchester as the airport parking lot.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included full descriptions of the alternatives and identify the preferred alternative in Chapter 3, Alternatives (Including Proposed Action), of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, the Draft Master Plan and Draft Master Plan Addendum provide further details on each alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process.

PC02588-2

Comment:

Also - spreading the runways out was not on EIS, EIR.

Response:

Proposed modifications to the airfield, including runways, under each of the Master Plan alternatives were described in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02588-3

Comment:

When will the trees on Rindge/Waterview be removed??

Response:

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

PC02589

Dorsett, Henry Ivan

None Provided

11/7/2001

PC02589-1

Comment:

Antelope Valley will grow just as the City of Los Angeles and all the lower Los Angeles area has grown in my lifetime that I have lived here in Antelope Valley since the Dorsett family moved from Indiana back in 1913 and settled on a homestead 20 miles west of Lancaster - when the Los Angeles Aqueduct was constructing the North Portal Dam at Fairmont Calif. The Aqueduct was to bring water to Los Angeles from Owens Valley. The project was completed and the water is flowing to Los Angeles to this very day. It was a very wonderful project approved by a relative small town of Los Angeles in comparison with the Los Angeles & surrounding town today - the Antelope Valley during the year of 1913 was almost a area of large dry farms and cattle heard numbering in the thousand and thousand of range cattle. At 18 years of age I was riding with the cowboys numbering into 20 to 30 cowboys driving cattle to be branded and altered to be steers - There was no need of the Palmdale airport then an some people can not understand why we do now - so I would like to explain my thoughts of why we do.

Back in the early day there were very few people in comparison of the population - today - to illustrate the growth I will relate a story of one of the cowboys horse was in need of shoes so he ask the price from a owner of a blacksmith shop in the very small town of Lancaster in 1913 - The price the owner was \$8.00 for the 4 horse shoes - or if he would rather pay 1 penny the first nail and double it for the 32 nail he could pay that. Well that sound good to the cowboy so that was his choice until he found out it was in the millions.

In Los Angeles & all the cities that developed so fast like Long Beach & Coastal Cities as well as San Fernando and all that area one person convinced a friend that was the place to be - and that is what has happened in our great Antelope Valley and like all the other inland cities. It will develop as everyone tells others what a wonderful place Antelope Valley is - and altho we are building roads and freeways we need the Palmdale Airport now and time is of the important factor.

The people living here now and those moving in have relations they need to see or have need to contact - here in Antelope Valley - such as senior citizens visiting their family member in other states. - Their destination is Antelope Valley so they need a airport close and senior citizens came here to retire, they spend retirement money by the hundreds of thousand and that alone will promote convesant homes when thousands of people can have relations visiting them all year long - bringing money with them - I have been a supporter of the Palmdale Airport for years since 1977 - vice president on two terms - a member for approx. 30 years -

3. Comments and Responses

We need the airport at Palmdale now - for the comfort of all that travel - the business establishments should all profit from those that will travel by air when accomadations are attractive to their travel.

Response:

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

PC02590 Saner, Mandie None Provided 11/1/2001

PC02590-1

Comment:

Your EIS EIR has no credibility. The events of Sept 11, 2001 points up to all of your deficiencies.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments PC02236-02, AL00051-93, and PC02131-5.

PC02590-2

Comment:

1) You do not know where your planes are. I have told you many times when planes were flying over a residential area and lodged the proper complaints. You send me flight tracks that show them in other positions to make your complaint files look good.

Response:

The locations of flights to and from LAX are recorded with sophisticated tracking software that interacts with the radar system that is used to control all operations at the airport. The system is highly accurate and cannot be altered to produce fake results. When a person observes an aircraft in flight, it may appear directly overhead, but at the commentors location immediately northwest of the airport, an aircraft flying over at 1000 feet altitude at an angle of 75 to 80 degrees will actually be approximately 200 feet away horizontally. Consequently, maps of the flight tracks may not appear to correctly locate the flights, when in fact they are precise representations of the event.

LAX does keep records of the noise complaint and complainer. In the event that a complainant does request a written response and includes a mailing address, LAWA's Noise Management staff policy is to provide them with written response. However, no more than five noise events will be investigated on a monthly basis. LAWA has also recently incorporated a policy to place the complainant on a monthly mailing list where all incoming identified noise complaint calls are put on a monthly log and addressed by LAWA Noise Management staff. Then the responses (broken down by date, time and block address) are sent to the requesting community members. LAWA has recently installed a PASSUR system to assist the community in tracking aircraft operations. By going to the LAWA website www.lawa.org and entering the Noise Management section, community members can specifically identify LAX operations that cross their community.

PC02590-3

Comment:

2) The pollution needs to be tracked wherever you have low flying aircraft = 4 nautical miles around the airport - not 4 positions on airport property.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00018-10 regarding receptor placement.

PC02590-4

Comment:

We need health risk assessment for the following chemicals and research on what diseases are disproportionate in the population of these areas.

Freon 11, Freon 12, Methyl Bromide, Dichloromethane, cis-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane, Carbon Tetrachloride, Benzene, Trichloroethylene, Toluene, Tetrachloroethene, Ethylbenzene, m,p-Xylene, o-Xylene, Styrene, 1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene, 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene, 0-Dichlorobenzene, Formaldehyde, Acetaldehyde, Acrolein, Acetone, Propionaldehyde, Crotonaldehyde, Isobutylaldehyde, Methyl Ethyl Ketone, Benzaldehyde, Veraldehyde, Hexanaldehyde, Ethyl Alcohol, Acetone, Isopropyl Alcohol, Methyl Ethyl Ketone, Butane, Isopentane, Pentane, Hexane, Butyl Alcohol, Methyl Isobutyl Ketone, n,n-Dimethyl Acetamide, Dimethyl Disulfide, m-Cresol, 4-Ethyl Toulene, n-Heptaldehyde, Octanal, 1,4-Dioxane, Methyl Phenyl Ketone, Vinyl Acetate, Heptane, Phenol, Octane, Anthracene, Dimethylnaphthalene(isomers), Flouranthene, 1-methylnaphthalene, 2-methylnaphthalene, Naphthalene, Phenanthrene, Pyrene, Benzo(a)pyrene, 1-nitropyrene, 1,8-dinitropyrene, 1,3-Butadiene, sulfites, nitrites, nitrogen oxide, nitrogen monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, nitrogen trioxide, nitric acid, sulfur oxides, sulfur dioxide, sulfuric acid, urea, ammonia, carbon monoxide, ozone, particulate matter (PM10, PM2.5)

What symptoms can occur with prolonged exposure to these chemicals?

ASPHYXIATION	LUNG DISEASE
ASTHMA	LUNG STRUCTURE DAMAGE
BRAIN CANCER	LUNG TIGHTNESS
CANCER	LYMPHOMA
CONJUNCTIVE IRRITATION	MENTAL DEPRESSION
COUGHING	MULTIPLE ORGAN INVOLVEMENT
DELAYED HYPERSENSITIVITY	MUSCLE WEAKNESS
DISTORTED PERCEPTIONS	MUTATIONS
DROWSINESS	MYELOID LEUKEMIA
DYSPNEA HEADACHE	NASAL EFFECTS
EEG CHANGES	NAUSEA, VOMITING
EMPHYSEMA	PULSE RATE DECREASE
FLUSHING	PULMONARY IRRITATION
HALLUCINATIONS	RESPIRATORY SYSTEM DAMAGE
HEART DISEASE	SKIN AND EYE IRRITATION
HODGKIN'S DISEASE	SYSTEMIC IRRITATION
KIDNEY DAMAGE	TUMORS

Response:

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

The great majority of the chemicals listed in this comment were considered in identifying those chemicals associated with LAX operations that might pose the greatest health risk. Further, for the majority of the chemicals listed in this comment, USEPA and/or OEHHA have developed detailed risk assessments aimed at developing criteria that relate the amount of exposure to possible human health effects. These criteria were used in the detailed health risk assessment that was performed for the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, with supporting information 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.

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

PC02590-5

Comment:

3) Projects listed as Southside Westchester, and Northside project are not specific enough and cannot be evaluated for environmental concerns = unsustainable development

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provide a program level analysis for the proposed project. The level of detail and extent of project information provided in the subject documents are appropriate for a program level of analysis.

PC02590-6

Comment:

4) All figures for anticipated growth need to be redone. Airline bankruptcies will follow and we should remove runways

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00051-93.

PC02590-7

Comment:

5) As for Mayor Hahn's plan five - get EIS,R new report - the people of Westchester did not approve using their town as LAX boarding area - nor do we need spreading out runways

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive analysis of Alternative D, the fifth Master Plan alternative, and was circulated for public review and comment.

PC02590-8

Comment:

6) You may try to white wash the aviation problem but I am going to vote with my money and never fly again and so are a lot of other people who know now how flakey you all are!

Response:

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

PC02591

Tiddle, Martha

None Provided

10/20/2001

PC02591-1

Comment:

The purpose of this letter and accompanying copy of my response to the Public Comments to LAX Master Plan and Draft EIS/EIR document is to acquaint and sensitize you to the impact that the over expansion of LAX has had on Inglewood, and how the proposed expansion will further destroy our already over burdened communities and their people.

3. Comments and Responses

I would hope that you will continue to be sensitive and compassionate to the people and the environment and will do what is just and right; showing courage and integrity when making decisions concerning further expansion of LAX.

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.

PC02591-2

Comment:

The Draft LAX Master Plan & Draft EIS/EIR Report for expansion of LAX presents the same concerns.

Response:

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

PC02591-3

Comment:

I . The Draft EIS/EIR does not satisfy Environmental Justice requirements.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC01499-2; please refer to Response to Comment PC01499-2.

PC02591-4

Comment:

A. It does not consider alternatives and other locations that would shift or distribute burdens of expansion more equitably and reduce risks to human health.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding the range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02591-5

Comment:

B . It unfairly and disproportionately burdens minority and low income communities that lie under the primary arrival flight path with significant impacts of noise and toxic air emission.

Response:

Noise and air toxic effects on minority and low-income communities were addressed in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

The Environmental Justice Program outlined in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR recognizes the potential disproportionate effects that the Master Plan would have on minority and low-income populations and goes beyond basic mitigation proposals to address the unique needs of these communities. With input gathered through environmental justice workshops and an extensive public outreach effort, the Environmental Justice Program presented in the Final EIS/EIR represents a full and good faith effort to identify all possible means for avoiding, reducing or off-setting

3. Comments and Responses

the impacts of the Master Plan in a manner that addresses the needs and preferences of affected minority and/or low-income communities in accordance with NEPA and CEQA requirements.

Regarding fairness, with the orientation of the runways at LAX, it is inevitable that increases in aircraft activity and associated noise would have a greater burden communities to the east of LAX than those to the north and south. It should be noted however, that LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative, Alternative D, has the least impacts of the Master Plan build alternatives and would limit operations at LAX to levels similar to what would occur with existing facilities if the Master Plan were not approved. Please also see Section 4.1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding noise impacts and Section 4.6 regarding air quality with supporting data and analyses provided in Appendices D and G.

PC02591-6

Comment:

II. The Draft EIS/EIR fails to satisfy existing law because alternatives to LAX expansion have not been adequately explored or considered.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive analysis of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Under this alternative, there would be no expansion of facilities at LAX beyond minor projects that would be reasonably foreseeable in the absence of the Master Plan. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the Master Plan. Alternative D has been designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive analysis of Alternative D and was circulated for public review and comment.

PC02591-7

Comment:

III. The Draft EIS/EIR improperly measures human health risks.

Response:

This comment is identical to PC01499-6; please see Response to Comment PC01499-6.

PC02591-8

Comment:

IV. The Draft EIS/EIR improperly measures noise increases.

Response:

The EIS/EIR uses standard methods and practices appropriate for the project. Please see Subtopical Response TR-N-1.3 regarding the use of 1996 baseline noise levels from which to measure increases associated with proposed alternatives.

PC02591-9

Comment:

A. LAWA's assertions regarding nighttime "over-ocean" operations are wrong!

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01499-11.

PC02591-10**Comment:**

B. LAWA's noise exposure contours are understated.

Response:

For information regarding noise levels please see Topical Response TR-N-1, particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-1.3 and Response to Comment PC01499-8.

PC02591-11**Comment:**

C. It fails to consider the economic impact of the LAX Master Plan on continuous suffering of housing value due to the aggravation of existing and future noise;

Response:

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

PC02591-12**Comment:**

the decrease in recreational value of local parks and residential back yards.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC01499-10; please refer to Response to Comment PC01499-10.

PC02591-13**Comment:**

V. The Draft EIS/EIR improperly analyzes the health effect of aircraft noise on human health.

A. It must consider the health effects of aircraft noise.

B. It needs to address aircraft noise interference and interruptions on human sleep.

C. It needs to address the negative impact on schools under the flight paths.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to nighttime awakenings and school disruption associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative and all four build alternatives in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC02591-14**Comment:**

The Draft LAX Master Plan and Draft EIS/EIR Report makes it clear that the expansion of LAX would unjustly, unfairly and unmercifully magnify the already over burdened conditions that have been imposed on Inglewood and surrounding communities over the last eight years because of the excessive increase in passenger and cargo air traffic.

3. Comments and Responses

Aircrafts are presently disproportionately flying over Inglewood neighborhoods, overly exposing its residents to noise and jet fuel that contains the carcinogen benzene, among other chemicals, resulting in undue health risk in our minority and low-income communities.

Response:

Please see Response to Comments AL00017-190 and AL00017-194.

PC02591-15

Comment:

Mrs. Kennard stated, "Airplane engines run quieter now and we have directed that all take offs between midnight and 6 AM must be over the ocean to the west." The above is only true on paper. The "over-ocean" night time operations curfew is frequently ignored, almost none existing.

In the last four months there have not been more than ten nights when "over-ocean" night time curfew operations were observed. Most mornings, cargo planes start flying over around 2 or 3 AM. This is what a typical night is like for us; July 3,01 - cargo planes started flying over at 2:44---4:19, 4:27, 4:37, 4:43, 4:48, 4:50, 5:09, 5:11, 5:17, 5:20, 5:29, 5:31, 5:35---on. It is impossible to sleep under these conditions. The noise hotline number has become a joke! The phone is usually off the hook, there is no answer or like this AM, 7/19/01, 3:20 I called. The phone was answered. I was immediately put on hold. I was treated as if, I am the problem! Jason, was very curt. I was told, "Yes, planes are coming in, and this is normal operations, nothing out of the ordinary." After being on the phone for almost 20 minutes I hung up the fourth time I was put on hold because I could feel my blood pressure going up.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC01499-14; please refer to Response to Comment PC01499-14.

PC02591-16

Comment:

Quieter engines? These aircraft engines are quieter only if one does not live under these conditions twentyfour/seven. Over the last eight years these airplanes are sometimes three levels coming and going. Therefore, they are flying lower, they are noisier, (you can hear every one) and they are closer together, lined up coming in. They are flying in all directions, in other than desinated flight paths. I am supposedly not in a flight path, however, more and more planes are flying directly over my home. In addition to this constant over-head noise, more and more we are getting this continuous unbearable deep roaring, rumbling vibrating noise coming from the airport shaking windows during the day and at night.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC01499-15; please refer to Response to Comment PC01499-15.

PC02591-17

Comment:

This is already a very stressful, troubling and dangerous situation; very deteriorating to the body, mind and spirit. This is much more than anyone should have to try to cope with. Where is the justice in all of this?

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise.

PC02591-18**Comment:**

In regards to regional expansion. "Our decisions about whether LAX should be expanded or whether air traffic should be based on environmental and transportation congestion impacts rather than the future economic impacts. The economic benefits to Southern CA are pretty much the same, no matter where in the region demand is met." City Councilwoman Ruth Galanter

Response:

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

PC02591-19**Comment:**

"LAX cannot stand alone, every airport in the region, both existing and planned must do their fair share." Mrs. Kennard

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.

PC02591-20**Comment:**

"LAX is already one of the top three worst airports in the state of California when it comes to air pollution and noise."

Response:

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

PC02591-21**Comment:**

"Expanding LAX would pound surrounding neighborhoods with pollution, noise and traffic gridlock."

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and traffic

3. Comments and Responses

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.

PC02591-22

Comment:

"Constructing new cargo facilities, adding to the already cargo cult in and around the airport would increase traffic congestion and new cargo flights over the already overburdened city of Inglewood & would expose its residents to increased air pollution, including toxic diesel emissions."

Response:

Please see Response to Comments AL00017-190 and AL00017-194. Please also see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

PC02591-23

Comment:

"LAX isn't critical to the health of the regional economy. rather, the region should look to expand airports in other areas, such as Orange County's El Toro site." The Wall Street Journal

El Toro still has one of the largest noise buffer zones in Southern CA. Yet, El Toro airport opponents said that their neighborhoods would be ruined by an airport at El Toro. They said that a "Great Park" is needed to keep a regional airport out of their back yards. "The average person here makes \$90,000 a year and lives in a \$400,000 home." Gordon

Response:

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

PC02591-24

Comment:

I say to you; It is all too sad that Gordon and those with like consciousness just don't get it. You need to look much deeper and know that the journey is truly about more than, "me, myself and I" and getting and having "material stuff." Even though it is not clear to you that one life (your's) is no more special or important, in the scheme of things, than another (mine). And whether you can believe it or not, we in Inglewood, too; enjoy, desire and are just as deserving of peace, beauty, quality of life and being as anyone of you in Orange County in your \$400,000 homes and \$90,000 annual salaries.

I ask this question in all sincerity; Would this issue, LAX expansion, be on the table at this time if "we", people of color in Inglewood were living in Orange County and "they" were living here in Inglewood? I feel very strongly that if this was the case, Lax would have been constrained in its then current footprint years ago and El Toro Airport would now be developed and thriving.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02591-25

Comment:

Then, L.A. Mayor Riordan stated; "it all comes down to if you want LAX to be competitive. If you want LAX to be the leader of the trade in the next century, then you have to do it." He also said that the region would lose the opportunity for business growth. The region? Regional expansion immediately comes to mind.

Response:

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

PC02591-26

Comment:

What I find missing here is compassion, sensitivity and care about other human beings or the very environment that sustains us all. His only concern is economic success. Did anyone ask the question; is this the kind of success that is going to matter in the long run? What kind of glory is obtained and for how long when economic success is achieved at the expense of a people and the environment?

I say to Mr. Riordan and those with like consciousness, wiping out a people is wiping out a people whether at Auschwitz or a slow destruction of residents in communities around LAX by means of all the additional ill effects that already out grown, over taxed LAX would bring to our already over burdened communities.

What is happening to America? "More and more we are seeing greed and power replace principles and integrity in America's character, and there is less and less room for compassion. Increasingly we see America helps others when it serves America's power structure, America's richest elite and their collective assets. Loss of compassion is followed by loss of consciousness and this breeds indifference and a false superiority, whereby the plight of others come to be ignored. We forget that the egotistical and vain actions of man, individually and collectively, carries with it a sense of personal responsibility and impending disaster." America needs to wake-up before it is too late.

It was not coincidence that this nation rose to become the most prosperous on earth. If we don't wake-up soon we can lose all that so many worked so hard to create. Is it that collectively we are starting to turn to, "In power and money we trust", rather than, "In God We Trust?" Which is worst, knowledge without wisdom or power and money without understanding? We need a change of consciousness. We need good strong leaders with principles and integrity who are not afraid to stand-up for and do what is just and right.

I don't think anyone, coming from a common sense and just position, can honestly feel that this should be happening at all, (further expansion of LAX). In closing, I ask you to think on the following:

Do you think that you would mind if you...

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. 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.

PC02591-27

Comment:

- bought a beautiful home in Inglewood 34 years ago. maintained and improved it with the intention of retiring and enjoying your home and life. You take early retirement, take good care of yourself physically, mentally and spiritually then you realize that the quality of your life is being totally destroyed and the value of your property is being so depreciated you can't afford to sell and move even if you want to. This is all happening because of the over expansion of LAX over the last eight years

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC02591-28

Comment:

- could no longer sit on your patio and enjoy the simple pleasure of reading the newspaper with a cup of tea
- could no longer enjoy an outing in your large, beautiful back yard with family and friends
- could no longer open your windows and doors and enjoy the cool ocean breeze, because of the excessive increase in aircraft noise over the last eight years
- were no longer able to sleep nights with your bedroom window open (or closed) because of aircraft noise all through the night

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC01499-27; please refer to Response to Comment PC01499-27.

PC02591-29

Comment:

- could not function sometimes for days because of loss of sleep caused by noise from aircrafts flying over all through the night
- have to leave your home some days just to get some relief from the constant aircraft noise

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to nighttime awakenings in homes associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative and all four build alternatives in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC02591-30

Comment:

- could no longer walk daily in your once beautiful neighborhood park because of the excessive increase in aircraft noise over the last eight years (there are two flight paths directly over the park and one on either side)

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels. As also stated in Topical Response TR-LU-4 and shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, areas exposed to high noise levels (as defined by the 65 CNEL contour) have decreased over time. Also see Subtopical Response TR-N-6.3 regarding present and future noise levels.

PC02591-31

Comment:

- had the exterior of your home painted and a few months later it is blacken with aircraft fall-out.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC02591-32

Comment:

- could go on and on; excessive health problems in our communities, learning problems in our schools, etc.

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.

PC02591-33

Comment:

Do you think that you would mind living under these conditions 24 hours a day seven days a week? YES, you would mind and so do we!

We don't need one more aircraft flying over Inglewood, nor do we need one more cargo facility added to the already "cargo - cult" in and around Inglewood. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH! What is going on here is unconscionable! Our communities are already over burdened and are carrying much more than any community should be burdened with. This is environmental injustice to the hilt! And it is asked; Why are we, people of color, angry?

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02592

Tonsant, Lisa

None Provided

10/30/2001

PC02592-1

Comment:

The Master Plan's/EIS/EIR Report indicates noise and smudge stops and 108th Street. My pool is covered with smudge along w/our vehicles. It should be mandatory that these organizations along with the City of Inglewood states on all documents to potential residence the conditions they will live in. The City of Inglewood has the worst, or, is in the top ten for terrible, air qualities in the Countries. People are not educated to the fact what they think is smoke from the plane is actually fuel being dumped on us. I would have never moved here.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comment PC00070-1 regarding ambient air quality near LAX during the environmental baseline period (1996) and in 2000. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02592-2

Comment:

Planes, meaning airlines, and self serving local government, with the exception of one, have sold Inglewood out.

Response:

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

PC02592-3

Comment:

I'm pushing for over the ocean take-offs and landings. Planes fly at 2:00 - 3:00 am, anytime they please. There is no regulation - especially since the 911 tragedy.

Response:

here are no restrictions on the type of aircraft that may land or depart at LAX during the night hours. 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 easterly arrivals at night, please see Topical Response TR-N-5, regarding nighttime aircraft operations, and particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-5.2.

PC02592-4

Comment:

That rumbe to call makes one feel self-serving, Yet my families health is at risk. Kids, and older people need quality sleep, and fresh air to breathe. I am totally against expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels, and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase. In addition, the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event noise at night in Section 4.1, Noise, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. 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.

PC02592-5

Comment:

We are also at higher risk for planes being shot down in our backyards to the 911 situation. How can anyone think about expansion.

Response:

Please refer to Response to Comment AL00051-93.

PC02593 Supawong, Jennie None Provided 10/31/2001

PC02593-1

Comment:

In any state of national economy and security, it is always of a great beneficial to the public to have an airport that is well-planned for both air & ground traffic. An ideal airport should provide both convenience & safety measure.

Although, as far as I understood, safety is not your coverage, but I think it should be your utmost concern and you should be able to give maximum input of suggestion to the government.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02284-17. Please also see Topical Response TR-SEC-1.

PC02594 Taggart, Mitzy Heal The Bay 11/9/2001

PC02594-1

Comment:

Although the preferred alternative for LAX will change dramatically based on the events of September 11th, the following comments should remain pertinent regardless. For the record, Heal the Bay strongly believes that additional environmental review and a detailed description of Mayor Hahn's LAX proposal is necessary to assess the environmental impacts and the adequacy of proposed mitigation. We believe that this review is required under CEQA and NEPA.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive analysis of Alternative D and was circulated for public review and comment.

PC02594-2

Comment:

1. The draft EIR/EIS fails to consider metal pollutants of concern in the stormwater pollutant loading analysis.

The two water bodies that receive stormwater from LAX include the Santa Monica Bay and Dominguez Channel, both of which are too polluted to support their beneficial uses due to excessive amounts of metals. The Santa Monica Bay is listed on the 303(d) list as impaired due to excessive amounts of metals including cadmium, chromium, mercury, copper, lead, nickel, silver, and zinc. The Dominguez Channel is listed as impaired due to metal loadings of chromium, copper, lead, and zinc. Although the draft EIR/EIS discusses the stormwater loadings of zinc, copper, and lead, the document fails to assess the additional pollutant loadings of cadmium, chromium, mercury, nickel, and silver. Cadmium, chromium, mercury, nickel, and silver are highly toxic to marine life. The California Toxic Rule1, promulgated by the U.S. EPA, sets concentration limits for these metals along with lead, copper, and zinc, above which there is a significant risk to aquatic organism in water and their uses. Given the various airport activities that are potential sources of these metals such as wear-down of airplane brake pads, metal engine parts, and airplane and vehicle tires, draft EIR/EIS must estimate the loadings of these metals and assess the environmental impacts associated with the discharge of these pollutants into the receiving waters.

3. Comments and Responses

The reason for not assessing these pollutants provided in the draft EIR/EIS is inadequate. The document states only zinc, copper, and lead were considered because these were found in higher concentrations relative to other metals in the stormwater monitoring data collected by the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works as part of the municipal stormwater permit requirements (page 22 of Part 6 -Hydrology and Water Quality Technical Report). This reasoning is faulty for three reasons. First, the municipal stormwater monitoring results do not characterize runoff from airport- associated land uses and cannot be considered to represent the runoff discharged from LAX. Second, the detection limits of the analytical methods used to obtain the Los Angeles County stormwater data were typically many times greater than the levels at which these metals are toxicity to aquatic life and humans, and are greater than the minimum levels defined as acceptable detection limits in the State Implementation Plan for the CTR2. And finally, because metals can accumulate in sediment and bioaccumulate in aquatic organisms, the total loading of these constituents is equally important to the concentration found in the stormwater. Thus, even if the concentrations of cadmium, chromium, mercury, nickel, and silver were lower than the concentrations of copper, lead, and zinc, because of the large amount of impervious surface associated with the alternative projects and the large volume of stormwater runoff, the total loadings of these constituents to the receiving waters must be considered in addition to their concentrations in stormwater.

1 The CTR sets toxicity limits for freshwater and saltwater waterbodies for cadmium, chromium, nickel, silver, lead, copper, and zinc. 40 CFR Part 131.

2 Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bay, and Estuaries of California, State Water Resources Control Board. May 2000.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HWQ-1 regarding selection of model constituents and storm water toxicity. LAWA has committed to mitigate impacts associated with storm water pollutant loading to pre-project levels. Mitigation monitoring and reporting will occur as described in Response to Comment AR00003-63. Any decisions to reduce loading below pre-project levels to address pollutant accumulation in sediments and aquatic organisms or to lower detection limits of monitoring data would be as a result of LARWQCB action. Discharges from LAX would then be subject to more stringent standards than currently exist. Also, please see Topical Response TR-HWQ-2 regarding compliance with regulations.

PC02594-3

Comment:

2. The draft EIS/EIR failed to estimate the stormwater loadings of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHS) and benzene, toluene, ethyl benzene, and xylene (BTEX), and to assess the water quality impacts associated with the discharge of these pollutants to the receiving waters.

The primary source of PAHs to stormwater is likely aerial deposition of the products of incomplete combustion associated with car, truck and jet engines. Given the large amount of combustion engines associated with the project alternatives, the activities associated with the proposed project will significantly increase the loading of PAHs to the Santa Monica Bay and Dominguez Channel. Dominguez Channel is already too pollutant to support its designated beneficial uses due to excessive amounts of PAHs.

PAHs are of a significant concern because they are toxic to humans at very low levels and can bioaccumulate in aquatic organisms. The California Toxic Rule sets limits water quality limits for the human consumption of water and organisms, and for organisms. The Dominguez Channel Estuary and Santa Monica Bay are used for fishing and the Santa Monica Bay is used for shellfishing. The draft EIR/EIS should estimate the PAH concentrations and total loading in the stormwater discharge from the proposed alternatives and assess the impacts to aquatic life and human health, and to commercial fisheries and shellfishing areas located within the receiving waters.

The draft EIS/EIR also did not estimate the stormwater loadings of BTEX, constituents found in gasoline and jet fuel. Clearly, the proposed project will be a source of these pollutants through the discharge of stormwater. These pollutants are toxic to humans and marine life. Clearly, to adequately assess the environment impacts of the proposed project, the impacts associated with the discharge of these pollutants to the receiving waters must be assessed.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HWQ-1 regarding storm water toxicity and Response to Comment AL00033-363 regarding BMPs and pollutant removal.

PC02594-4

Comment:

3. The draft EIS/EIR fails to consider the impacts of the cumulative pollutant loadings associated with the storm water discharge to the receiving waters.

Metals and PAHs accumulate in sediment and bioaccumulate in aquatic organisms. Both Santa Monica Bay and Dominguez Channel are listed on the State's 303(d) list as impaired due sediment toxicity and benthic community effects, respectively. In addition, the Dominguez Channel is listed as impaired due to the excessive buildup of metals in fish tissue. The draft EIS/EIR does not consider the cumulative loading of these pollutants over of the expected life of the various project alternatives. For example, if Alternative C has an expected life of 20 years beyond 2015, the total loading for copper, lead, and zinc into the Santa Monica Bay is estimated to be 4,400 lb., 1,420 lb., and 28,000 lb, respectively. What is the impact of these large pollutant loadings to the benthic communities in the Santa Monica Bay and the human health impacts associated with consuming fish and shellfish harvested from the Bay? What are the impacts of these loadings to Dominguez Channel, a waterbody already severely impaired due to excessive amounts of metals?

Response:

Please refer to Topical Response TR-HWQ-1 regarding selection of model constituents and storm water toxicity.

PC02594-5

Comment:

4. The estimates of stormwater pollutant loadings are inadequate because only the average rainfall amounts were considered.

A complete analysis of the stormwater pollutant loadings should include estimates of pollutant loadings from the 90th percentile storm. The EIR/EIS should assess the impacts associated with these loadings.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HWQ-1 regarding model parameters - average annual rainfall.

PC02594-6

Comment:

5. The Master Plan commitment HWQ-1 appears to be inadequate to mitigate the impacts associated with pollutant stormwater runoff because pollutant concentrations are not addressed.

The proposed mitigation (Master Plan Commitment HWQ-1) of the increase in stormwater pollutant loading is to implement BMPs to ensure no net increase in pollutant loadings above baseline levels. Limiting pollution loading to pre-project levels will not mitigate the water quality impacts associated with the stormwater runoff because the concentrations of lead, copper and zinc in the stormwater are estimated to be many times greater than the toxicity levels set in the California Toxic Rule for aquatic organisms. Thus, as proposed, the stormwater runoff may cause toxicity in the receiving waters, both of which are already impaired due to excessive levels of copper, lead, and zinc, despite any mitigation efforts to ensure no net increase in stormwater pollutant loadings.

As shown in the table below, based on the information on annual runoff and metal pollutant loading provided in the draft EIR/EIS, the stormwater runoff discharged from the preferred alternative C project is estimated to contain concentrations of lead, copper and zinc many times over the level at which these

3. Comments and Responses

pollutants are toxic to organisms. For example, concentrations of copper estimated to be in the stormwater discharge from alternative C are estimated to be 476 times greater than the concentration that will cause toxicity to aquatic organisms in the Santa Monica Bay. Clearly, even if the alternative C includes BMPs that reduce that result in no net gain of pollutant loadings, the stormwater runoff leaving the project site will have metal concentrations that will contribute to toxicity in the receiving waters.

Comparison of Estimated Metals Concentrations in Stormwater Discharge from Alternative C 20015

Pollutants	Loads(lb/yr) ¹	Runoff(ft ³ /yr) ²	Estimated Stormwater concentrations (µg/l)	CTR toxicity level (µg/l) ³	Stormwater - to-CTR ratio
Santa Monica Bay					
copper	222	80387162	1474	3.1	476
lead	71	80387162	472	8.1	58
zinc	1399	80387162	9292	81	115
Dominguez Channel					
copper	139	50071549	1482	9	165
lead	46	50071549	490	2.5	196
zinc	907	50071549	9671	120	81

1. Pollutant loads from draft EIR/EIS Table 17, page 38 of Part 6 - Hydrology and Water Quality Technical Report.
2. Annual Stormwater runoff from Table D-19, Part 6 - Hydrology and Water Quality Technical Report.
3. California Toxic Rule, 40 CFR Part 131. Saltwater values used for Santa Monica Bay. Freshwater values used for Dominguez Channel.

Response:

As per its Industrial NPDES storm water permit, LAWA is currently required to achieve BAT/BCT standards for runoff leaving LAX. In addition to this requirement, LAWA has proposed to mitigate storm water pollutant loading to pre-project levels. Any decisions to reduce loading below pre-project levels would be as a result of the LARWQB instituting total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) in Santa Monica Bay or the Dominguez Channel. Discharges from LAX would then be subject to more stringent standards than presently exist. Currently, however, LAWA is in compliance with the standards set forth in its Industrial NPDES stormwater permit. Also, please see Topical Response TR-HWQ-1 regarding storm water toxicity and Topical Response TR-HWQ-2 regarding compliance with regulations.

PC02594-7

Comment:

6. The current description of the BMPs that will be implemented to fulfill the Master Plan Commitment HWQ-1 is woefully insufficient.

The draft EIS/EIR states the Master Plan Commitment HWQ-1 is to design the storm water system to meet

- a) The requirements in Los Angeles County's SUSMP through incorporation of source control, structural, and treatment control BMPs, and
- b) these BMPs will be designed to achieve "no net gain in pollutant loads discharged to receiving water bodies."

Given the significant size of the proposed project alternatives and the number of different types of land uses the project will encompass, design and implementation of BMPs will be a significant part of the project. However, there are no details provided on the specific types of BMPs that will be installed, their locations in the project, who will maintain them and how they will be monitored to determine whether the HWQ-1 goals are met. In addition, there is no discussion of how the "no increase in net loading" promise will be kept during years of high rainfall.

Since the pollutant loadings from the proposed alternatives are large and the potential impacts to the receiving waters significant, the EIS/EIR cannot adequately assess the water quality impacts of the proposed alternatives without a more comprehensive and detailed discussion of the feasibility to design BMPs that will ensure no net increase in pollutant loadings.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HWQ-2 regarding Master Plan Commitment HWQ-1 and performance standards and Response to Comment AR00003-63 regarding mitigation monitoring.

PC02594-8

Comment:

7. The draft EIS/EIR fails to assess the water quality impacts associated with the aerial deposition of contaminants from the project operations.

One of Heal the Bay's biggest concerns is the lack of a scientific analysis on the impacts of LAX expansion on aerial deposition of contaminants in the Los Angeles Basin. Heal the Bay is greatly concerned about the impacts of LAX expansion on pollutant loadings to Santa Monica Bay and the tributaries discharging to the Bay. Aerially deposited contaminants can either land in the Bay directly or on hard surfaces that get scoured during a rain. All of these contaminants get discharged to Santa Monica Bay without any treatment whatsoever. The Southern California Coastal Water Research Project has performed numerous studies over the last twenty years that have demonstrated that both dry-weather and stormwater runoff from Ballona Creek (adjacent to LAX) is toxic to marine life. In fact, both Ballona Creek and Santa Monica Bay are listed on California's S.303d list as impaired water bodies for a wide variety of pollutants including heavy metals, PAHs and toxicity. In addition, all land east of Sepulveda Blvd. drains to Dominguez channel, the most polluted water body in the Los Angeles/Ventura County region.

Recently, UCLA and SCCWRP researchers released a report entitled Measuring and Modeling of Atmospheric Deposition on Santa Monica Bay and the Santa Monica Bay Watershed to the Santa Monica Bay Restoration Project (Stolzenbach et al. 2001). Researchers found that the annual rate of atmospheric deposition of trace metals was significant (up to 50% for some metals) in comparison to other inputs of metals (sewage treatment plants, the Chevron refinery) to the Bay. They also found that the annual total of atmospheric deposition of metals to the Santa Monica Bay watershed and the Bay was predominantly the result of daily dry deposition throughout the year, not the result of Santa Ana conditions or wet deposition.

This was the first significant study of aerial deposition of contaminants in the Southern California. Due to funding constraints, the study focused on the Santa Monica Bay watershed as a whole, and not on individual point sources of contaminants. Also, the study focused on metals with very little effort to assess the aerial deposition of organics to the watershed and the Bay. Both of these issues are of great concern because LAX is a major source of aerially deposited contaminants to Santa Monica Bay and the watershed.

Within this D-EIS/EIR LAX should have assessed their current impacts on aerial deposition within the Santa Monica Bay watershed, the Bay, and the Los Angeles Basin as a whole. While the UCLA-SCCWRP aerial deposition study was being designed, LAX was approached to provide funding to assess the role of the airport on aerial deposition in the watershed and to the Bay. For whatever reason, LAX chose not to provide additional funding for the study so the impacts of the airport, arguably the largest single source of aerially deposited contaminants to the Bay, was not assessed. Unfortunately, without data on the current contribution of aerially deposited contaminants to the Bay and watershed, it is impossible to accurately estimate the impacts of LAX expansion on pollutant loadings to the watershed and the Bay. Heal the Bay strongly urges LAX to fund a specific component of UCLA's follow-up study in order to assess LAX's environmental impacts on pollutant loadings to Santa Monica Bay. Phase II of the study will begin very soon.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AR00002-7 regarding impacts to water quality from aerial deposition.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02594-9

Comment:

As you know, Santa Monica Bay, Ballona Creek and Dominguez Channel are all listed as impaired for a variety of contaminants on California's S.303d list. As such, Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) must be developed for all contaminants in these waterbodies. Estimates of pollutant loads from LAX to these receiving waters will be a critical portion of these TMDLs. There is a strong possibility that LAX will get assigned Waste Load Allocations for heavy metals, PAHs and maybe even toxicity as part of these TMDLs. The TMDL approach leads to reductions in pollutant loads to impaired water bodies, not increases. Any alternative for LAX expansion must take in to account the TMDL process, loadings from aerial deposition, and the need to reduce contaminant loads to impaired waters. The D-EIS/ EIR does not take any of these issues in to account and certainly does not include an assessment of the impacts of any of the LAX alternatives on these critical water issues.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HWQ-1 regarding storm water toxicity, Topical Response TR-HWQ-2 regarding Master Plan Commitment HWQ-1 and compliance with regulations, Response to Comment AR00003-63 regarding mitigation monitoring, Response to Comment AL00033-363 regarding BMPs and pollutant removal and Response to Comment AR00002-7 regarding aerial deposition impacts to water quality.

**PC02595 Ludwig, Mary Jane & None Provided
Mark**

11/6/2001

PC02595-1

Comment:

My husband and I are 20-year residents of Westchester, and as concerned neighbors of LAX, we've been involved in one way or another in the battle against the continuing onslaught by LAX to completely swallow up our community. There are many technical inaccuracies in the Riordan LAX Master Plan, most of which have been articulated by people far more knowledgeable than me.

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.

PC02595-2

Comment:

Nevertheless, I would like the record to reflect our disapproval of the referenced EIR/EIS, as well as the naive approach taken by our newly-elected Mayor James Hahn. Former Mayor Riordan's 12,000 page report does not adequately address safety issues, even pre-terrorist attacks. The placement of National Guard Troops at our airports are merely for good PR, and offer little deterrent to determined suicidal zealots. Unless and until all baggage, including that which is placed in the cargo hold of the plane, is thoroughly examined by whatever means is necessary (CT scan, human checking, etc.), and every bag is matched to a passenger boarding the plane, our safety is in jeopardy.

There has been talk about "renovating" LAX for security purposes. PLEASE... Everyone is aware that renovation is a euphemism for expansion!

We cannot understand the reasons behind proposing the federalization of baggage screeners. The public finds little comfort in that fact for the simple reasons that the "FEDERAL" Aviation Administration (FAA) has whined about LAX's poor safety record vis-a-vis near misses on runways, yet it has not had

the will to regulate flights into and out of LAX. Unless the FAA and LAWA have the courage to stop pandering to the airlines, our airport will never be safe because at the rate we've been going, if the terrorists don't get us, we'll get ourselves!

And by the way, wasn't it the "FEDERAL" Bureau of Investigation (FBI) that has had major security breaches within its own ranks due to complacency?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02284-17.

PC02595-3

Comment:

What about increased traffic, both in the air and on the ground, which of course translates into more noise and pollution?

Response:

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

PC02595-4

Comment:

Mayor Hahn's commitment to limit growth at LAX flies in the face of his appointments to the Board of Airport Commissioners, having reappointed several of Former Mayor Riordan's appointees, who by the way, have been PRO-LAX Expansion, but who now claim to have abdicated their convictions about the necessity to expand LAX in order to follow their new leader. Why do we have Airport Commissioners if they are there simply to do the bidding of the Mayor?

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02595-5

Comment:

Further, Mayor Hahn's expectation that any meaningful dialogue can be engaged in with respect to his new alternative proposal when only an abstraction has been presented to the public. Incidentally, we may not have the clout or credentials of constituents in certain other parts of Los Angeles, but we should not be underestimated and insulted.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive description and analysis of Alternative D and was circulated for public review and comment.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02595-6

Comment:

California has always been a leader...we led the movement towards cleaner car emissions, and the nation as well as other countries followed. Because smoking was banned on flights originating in and bound for California, other states and countries have followed our lead.

Now it's our turn to follow the standards set by other countries in the area of airport security.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02595-7

Comment:

We respectfully request that the existing EIR/EIS be declared obsolete, and we welcome the opportunity to become involved in real dialogue with any and all agencies who would be willing to explore a truly regional solution to our air traffic dilemma.

Response:

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

PC02596

Fredericks, Beverly

None Provided

11/9/2001

PC02596-1

Comment:

As longtime residents of Westchester, all of our families have put their hearts and souls into making this community comfortable to live in. With each one of the airport additions, we have tried to work them into our lives. But now, it seems like it is all going to be taken away from us, if the proposed expansion takes place. The future of Westchester and El Segundo and other heavily populated communities around us, all hang in the balance. Is there no end to it ?

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.

PC02596-2

Comment:

Since the events of September 11th, we are even more concerned than ever. In the event of an attack on LAX, especially if there is added expansion or more air traffic, it could cost us and our nation, loss of life, even beyond that of the Twin Towers disaster in New York. Too large of an airport, with all the surrounding communities, makes us a 'sitting duck' for a terrorist attack.

If any of us were able to survive, it would become almost impossible to start all over again. Many of us here, have been dedicated to helping each other for more than 50 years now. In recent years, we have been attracting numerous younger families with their children, who are also delighted with the sense of an untroubled community, as well. They are looking forward to a comfortable place to live and grow.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC02131-5.

PC02596-3

Comment:

It seems like the wise thing to do, would be to follow the example of several other major airports in the United States that have limited their sizes or relocated their sites. Denver, Chicago and New York, all had similar problems, and they finally moved their major facilities about 20-30 miles outside of the city limits.

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.

PC02596-4

Comment:

The ideal spot for a major Los Angeles airport for the city, could be in Palmdale, just to the north of us, which already has good runways. It will probably never out grow itself there. It ought to be more convenient for dispersing cargo shipments too. A short rail system could be set up to transport people, through or over the mountains, where a central receiving station could be located on the city side to disperse passengers to all parts of the Los Angeles basin. Then so many passengers wouldn't have to drive so far to get to LAX.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 which discusses high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC02596-5

Comment:

The Los Angeles basin has enough other airports in other outlying areas of southern California that should help to carry their own load, in order relieve our terrible congestion. Also, March Air Force Base, in the inland empire, has good runways too, which is still sitting empty.

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government.

PC02596-6

Comment:

LAX is long over due for a location change, in order to allow for expansion !

3. Comments and Responses

Most of us have felt comfortable with an airport that was a reasonable size. But as LAX keeps expanding, we have been forced to tolerate each new addition and our concerns and requests have been completely ignored. This final push for another runway will eventually take away all we have worked for, as well as our sanity. The latest expansion plans for the airport will completely destroy our communities !

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternatives C and D do not include the construction of additional runways, but do include lengthening and relocation of runways to accommodate a new parallel taxiway to reduce runway incursions and improve airfield operations. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC02596-7

Comment:

Our loss will be great, at least 250 businesses will be taken from us, and we will be forced to drive greater distances to buy food and other necessities. We will be left with only about a two city blocks wide downtown district. And if the LA Department of Transportation gets it's way to widen Sepulveda Boulevard to 8 lanes, and remove more businesses, Westchester will almost be wiped out !

Response:

Please see Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses (subsection 4.4.2.5), and note that Master Plan Commitment RBR-1, presents comprehensive provisions that would be incorporated by LAWA into 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 note in subsection 4.4.2.8 that Mitigation Measure MM-RBR-1 includes as a priority maximizing opportunities for businesses being acquired to relocate in proximity to their current sites, including the nearby Westchester Southside project proposed under Alternatives A, B, and C. Furthermore, 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).

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 for further discussion of effects on the community of Westchester.

PC02596-8

Comment:

With more jumbo jets arriving and taking off, 'around the clock', and almost on top of us, it will be extremely difficult for our schools and universities, to operate, and church services to be held.

Response:

Sections 4.1.6, Noise, and 4.2.6, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR analyzed impacts on noise-sensitive uses from aircraft noise under Alternatives A, B, C, and D. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR evaluated an additional Master Plan alternative (Alternative D), incorporated information on Year 2000 conditions, and provided new analysis of single event aircraft noise levels that result in nighttime awakening and classroom disruption. As presented in Section 4.2.8, residential and noise-sensitive uses newly exposed to significant noise increases and residential uses newly exposed to high single event noise levels would be eligible for sound insulation under mitigation measures MM-LU-1 and MM-LU-2. Schools newly exposed to single event noise levels and not subject to an aviation easement would be eligible for additional sound insulation under mitigation measures MM-LU-3 and MM-LU-4. In addition mitigation measure MM-LU-1 would incorporate eligible schools which are significantly impacted by high single event noise levels into the ANMP and provide sound

3. Comments and Responses

insulation to reduce interior noise levels at or below the aircraft noise thresholds evaluated for classroom disruption.

PC02596-9

Comment:

The few shops that will be left, will have a hard time trying to survive. So many people will be out of jobs.

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided additional discussion beyond that presented in the Draft EIS/EIR of potential acquisition effects on the Westchester Business District. As described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsections 4.2.6.2 through 4.2.6.4), acquisition within the Westchester Business District would be about 16 acres or 31 percent of the District under Alternative A, about 11 acres or 21 percent under Alternative B, or approximately 13 acres or 26 percent of the District under Alternative C. Under Alternatives A through C, relocation opportunities would be available for some uses nearby within Westchester Southside. Also, many of the uses that would be acquired are airport related and a number of the community related uses that would be acquired (a bank, an office supply store, a bar and beauty shop) would still remain available through similar businesses that are located in close proximity within the Westchester Business District.

Also, as described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6.5), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, in contrast to the other build alternatives, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative), does not include any acquisition within the Westchester Business District. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

Regarding the loss of jobs, see Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses (subsections 4.4.2.6.2 through 4.4.2.6.4), and note that new jobs would be created on the airport and in nearby Westchester Southside, and the loss of any jobs due to acquisition of businesses under Alternatives A, B, and C would more than off-site by the direct jobs generated by the alternatives.

PC02596-10

Comment:

Sound proofing our homes hasn't help a lot either, and we might as well forget about relaxing in our back yards. Presently, sound levels already reach 65 decibels.

Response:

The content of this comment is essentially the same as comment PC00284-6; please refer to Response to Comment PC00284-6.

PC02596-11

Comment:

Many long time residents have been driven out of their homes and forced to relocate, due to this continual expansion all along the airport corridors.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00040-46.

PC02596-12

Comment:

The surrounding communities are also affected by a constant spray of a soot and oily residue from the jets exhaust. It settles on cars, pitting the paint, and on homes and plants, even floating on the water in swimming pools and fish ponds, causing damage and excess upkeep.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC02596-13

Comment:

Trying to breathe fresh air is often difficult, adding to the residents Asthma and other respiratory problems, partially caused by this exhaust residue, which saturates the air around us.

Response:

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

PC02596-14

Comment:

Before recent events, traffic was already beginning to be a major problem, also, with so much congestion on all the highways by people driving from all over the city to catch flights.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02596-15

Comment:

As far as the noise at night goes, I wish someone from the Airport Commission would come to my house, just to hear the roar of engines that we have to put up with during a 24-hour period. It's bad enough now, but can you imagine how unbearable it will be with closer runways and more aircraft over our neighborhoods, especially for those people who live closest to the north runway? Not much attention is paid to the night curfew issue, either. Of course, during this tragic time, I can understand why flight schedules are very unusual.

Response:

There is no curfew on operations at LAX. However, there are special flight procedures in effect between midnight and 6:30 a.m. These procedures are not mandatory, but are generally used by air traffic controllers when practicable. For more information on this topic, please see Topical Responses TR-N-5 and TR-N-7. Also please see Responses to Comments PC00284-13 and PC02214-37.

PC02596-16

Comment:

Why can't we just be good neighbors and have a community, friendly airport (without the latest north runway)? Everyone would be happier and healthier again. Palmdale could be a life saver !

Response:

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

PC02597 **Lund, Ph.D., P.E.,** **None Provided** **11/9/2001**
Russell

PC02597-1

Comment:

After careful consideration, and review of several portions of the extensive Draft EIS/EIR document, on September 20, 2001 I submitted an eight-page letter presenting my comments and criticisms of LAWA LAX expansion proposals. I have since read that, motivated by the change in our world caused by the September terrorist attacks, fundamental changes in the proposals are now under consideration. I am not aware that details of any such changes have been made public. LAWA cannot proceed with major airport modifications or expansion without providing the public an opportunity to review and comment. LAWA must offer a new, detailed, and complete plan for public comment. To do otherwise would violate the trust placed in our governing bodies, and might well be illegal. I do not want my tax dollars spent in court trying to justify a program that I've not even had an opportunity to review.

Response:

The letter to which the commentor is referring is Comment Letter PC02143. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive analysis of Alternative D and was circulated for public review and comment.

PC02598 **Bell, Sam** **Los Angeles Business Advisors** **11/8/2001**

PC02598-1

Comment:

The Los Angeles Business Advisors considers adequate air transportation capacity in Southern California to be a very high priority. Clearly we are one interdependent economy that must engage in a competitive global economy where convenient and accessible air transportation is a vital necessity. Regardless of the ultimate configuration of a regional airport system, LAX will remain the primary international hub in Southern California.

We support prioritizing security and safety as the modernization process of LAX progresses. When the final details of the revised project are unveiled we will respond more specifically. In conclusion, we are pleased that the Mayor and Los Angeles World Airport staff has moved expeditiously in responding to a crisis in civilian aviation.

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

PC02599 **Sheehan, Jeanine** **None Provided** **11/8/2001**

PC02599-1

Comment:

In light of heightened security concerns for LAX after Sept 11th's events, I support a combination of Mayor Hahn's Alternative 5 Proposal & a regional airport expansion Plan for the LAX master Plan.

3. Comments and Responses

The features I support in Mayor Hahn's proposal include:

1. Capping LAX at 78 million annual passengers
2. No ring road
3. No western Terminal
4. Removing parking lots in the Central Terminal area
5. Constructing a new "check-in" bldg. with parking east of CTA
6. Moving runways further apart

I do not support the extension of the No. runway over Sepulveda Blvd., causing the loss of some Neilson Pk. homes & partial loss of Westchester's Central Business district.

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been designed to serve a level of future (2105) 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 extension of the north runways over Sepulveda Boulevard and does not require any residential acquisition within Westchester or acquisition within the Westchester Business District. Moreover, Alternative D would not have any impacts on Nielson Park.

PC02599-2

Comment:

Secondly, Since the population is growing faster near proposed regional airports (Ontario, Palmdale, Orange Cty., etc.) than near LAX (according to U.S. Census & SO. CA. Association of Governments data), it would be very sensible to have airports in these areas absorb some of the expansion proposed for LAX.

Response:

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

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.

PC02599-3

Comment:

Please do your best when discussing the Alternative 5 Proposal and the LAX Master Plan with Mayor Hahn to delete expansion of the No. runway over Sepulveda and to promote a plan of regional expansion instead of a mammoth LAX expansion.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02599-1.

PC02599-4**Comment:**

As a homeowner and voter here in Westchester, I want our community not to be spoiled with additional traffic and noise and air pollution, resulting from an unwise LAX expansion.

Thank you for your help.

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.

PC02600**Lindsay, Cathy****None Provided****11/8/2001****PC02600-1****Comment:**

I have already written to you, opposing the LAX Expansion, but I am writing again, because additional considerations have evolved as a result of the September 11th World Trade Center attacks. Many people in this area feel as I do, that expanding LAX would make our area more of a target for terrorists, which is the last thing we want! In addition, with the airlines doing so poorly, and people being reluctant to fly, expanding at a time like this would be ridiculous.

Response:

Please see Response to Comments AL00051-93 and PC02131-5.

PC02600-2**Comment:**

Mayor Hahn has tacked on an "Option 5" plan, which he claims focuses on security, rather than expansion. However, his plan would still allow for raising capacity to 78 million, when the all-time high was 67 million, or 27 million over current capacity! If we raise capacity by almost 100%, how many people will REALLY be coming through our airport? How will the increase in jet fuel and car exhaust affect those of us who breathe this air every day? Why should our neighborhood bear the weight of more pollution and traffic congestion, not to mention more lost homes, when there are outlying areas eager to share in a plan for a regional solution?

I strongly resent the fact that Mayor Hahn has tried to push this fifth plan through at the last minute, tacking it onto the Master Plan - without an EIR, or any consultation with members of the community this will affect most. Last-minute hearings on the plan were scheduled for this week, but not one was held in Westchester. I feel he has shown a complete lack of consideration for our community, and I find it hard to believe that throwing in this eleventh-hour plan is even legal!

Please listen to our voices, even though our mayor won't.

Response:

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 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. The

3. Comments and Responses

Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive analysis of Alternative D, the fifth Master Plan Alternative, and was circulated for public review and comment. Although the conclusion of the Draft EIS/EIR was that Alternative C would have the fewest negative impacts to the surrounding communities and the region, that conclusion has been superseded by the conclusion of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D is now considered to be the Environmentally Superior alternative and would have the fewest negative impacts to the local communities and the region. Air quality, traffic and acquisition impacts were addressed in Sections 4.6, 4.3, and 4.4.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, respectively. It should be noted that Alternative D does not propose the acquisition of any residences.

PC02601 Burns, Barbara None Provided 11/5/2001

PC02601-1

Comment:

The following comments are submitted to be included in the public record of the LAX Draft Master Plan and Draft EIS/EIR.

The September 24th letter from Mr. Manzanilla to Mr. Withycombe states that:

1. All three action alternatives, as well as No Action, cause violations of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards;
2. The DEIS/R acknowledges high adverse impacts from aircraft noise;
3. There are potential adverse health effects from air pollution increases, especially diesel particulates;
4. The LAX Master Plan proposals fail to fully analyze a regionally-based alternative.

These serious objections, as well as others specified in the cited documents, should be given full consideration.

Response:

The September 24, 2001 letter from Mr. Enrique Manzanilla of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, to Mr. William Withycombe, Regional Administrator of the FAA, Western-Pacific Region, is identified as Comment Letter AF00001 on the Draft EIS/EIR. Responses to the portions of Mr. Manzanilla's letter included in this comment letter are provided in the responses to comment letter AF00001. Impacts to air quality, noise, and human health were addressed in Sections 4.6, 4.1, and 4.24.1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, respectively. 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.

PC02601-2

Comment:

A new plan for LAX must be prepared based on a regional Southern California solution encompassing a three-county or a five-county 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02602 Burns, Barbara None Provided 9/23/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02211; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC02211.

PC02603 Burns, Bruce None Provided 11/5/2001

PC02603-1

Comment:

The following comments are submitted to be included in the public record of the LAX Draft Master Plan and Draft EIS/EIR.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC02603-2

Comment:

The pollution produced by LAX can injure and kill people. The referenced documents from the EPA prove that LAX, even with no expansion, inflicts upon residents of the area dangerously unhealthy 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.

PC02603-3

Comment:

The LAX Master Plan and all five of the Alternatives are totally unacceptable. They should be completely removed from consideration on the basis of environmental evidence alone.

A new plan for LAX, conforming to existing clean standards, must be prepared.

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-the 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02604 Burns, Bruce None Provided 11/6/2001

PC02604-1

Comment:

The following comments are submitted to be included in the public record of the captioned proposals.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC02604-2

Comment:

Alternative 5 patches some revisions on the LAX Master Plan in a feeble attempt to redeem it.

The Los Angeles area needs a safe airport, with a guaranteed cap of no more than 65 MAP. The 78 MAP in Alternative 5 will not relieve the over-crowded airspace. Therefore, Alternative 5 is unacceptable.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D, the fifth Master Plan alternative, has been designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding the ability of LAWA to establish capacity limits at LAX.

PC02604-3

Comment:

Alternatives A, B and C are unworkable. The No Action/No Project Alternative wrongly allows existing projects and excessive MAP.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-2 regarding the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC02604-4

Comment:

Thus, it is obvious that the LAX Master Plan is a flawed concept. The LAX Master Plan and all of its five alternatives should be completely abandoned.

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.

PC02605 Hefner, Roy None Provided

PC02605-1

Comment:

#1. Project the number of passengers, number of aircraft operations, amount of cargo tonnage, etc. that would exist in the year 2015 if no LAX expansion takes place.

Response:

In 2015, the No Action/No Project Alternative assumes 78.7 million annual passengers, 783,430 operations and 3.12 million tons of cargo. Please see Chapter V, Section 3.3.1.1.1 regarding a more detailed discussion of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC02605-2

Comment:

#2. Project the number of potential job losses or gains if one of the four expansion project is not adopted.

Response:

To clarify, the No Action/No Project Alternative is not considered an expansion or build alternative. As described in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Draft EIS/EIR, the No Action/No Project Alternative represents the continuation of the existing land use or regulatory plans, policies, or operations at LAX, as well as the future consequences of foregoing the federal action, which in this case is implementation of one of the four Master Plan build alternatives (Alternatives A, B, C, and D). The definition of the No Action/No Project Alternative as such is based on CEQA and NEPA requirements. Therefore, as discussed in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, of the Draft EIS/EIR, LAX would support net growth of approximately 17,298 jobs by 2005 and a net loss of 57,560 jobs by 2015, based on the baseline (1996) employment level of 407,670, if none of the build alternatives were adopted. Please also see Responses to Comments PC001030-4 and PC02664-11.

PC02605-3

Comment:

FAA regulations require that the 'total proposal' be considered. The regulations state the "total proposal includes the proposed action and all other actions reasonably related to it in time and probability." On this basis I have the following questions and comments. The EIR/EIS should address any mitigation activity they might incorporate as a result of the LAX Master Plan evolution.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC02605-4

Comment:

#3. What will be the landing and takeoff patterns for all alternatives?

Response:

The content of this comment is similar to Comment PC01881-87. Please see Response to Comment PC01881-87 regarding the landing and takeoff patterns of the Master Plan alternatives.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02605-5

Comment:

#4. What will be the impacts and mitigation measures for any change in landing and takeoff flight paths?

Response:

The proposed modifications to the runways under all four build alternatives would result in changes in noise and air quality. These changes were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02605-6

Comment:

#5. What will the environmental impact be when more commuter planes are jets and carry 50 or more passengers on any proposed runway used for primarily commuter aircraft? What mitigation measures will be implemented?

Response:

The Master Plan forecast projects 36.5 percent of the commuter fleet will be made up of regional jets and larger props with 50 or more seats by 2015 (see Chapter IV, Table IV-2.3 of the Master Plan). This fleet mix assumption has been incorporated into the simulation modeling. The environmental analyses in the Draft EIS/EIR, including noise and air quality, addressed the potential impacts under the most practical and most likely activity level for each alternative in the Master Plan. Please see Response to Comment PC00225-5 for a more detailed discussion on regional jet forecast.

PC02605-7

Comment:

#6. What affect will the increase capacity of LAX have on over ocean takeoff and landing procedures from 12:00 a.m. to 6:30 a.m.? Will this over ocean window be decreased as a result of increased operations?

Response:

There are no plans to modify the hours of over-ocean procedures under any of the alternatives, whether capacity of the airport is increased under Alternatives A or B or remains approximately the same as under current conditions, with the No Action/No Project Alternative, or build Alternatives C or D. Currently, there are no restrictions on the type of aircraft that may land or depart at LAX during the night hours. 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.

PC02605-8

Comment:

7. What affect will increased aircraft traffic have on preferential runway utilization of 24R and 25L?

Response:

During the noise sensitive hours of 10:00 p.m. to 06:30 a.m. the inboard runways are preferred in order to reduce airport impacts on neighboring communities. During these hours, arriving traffic approaches from over the ocean and departs over the ocean. Most landings are accomplished on Runway 6R/24L with departures occurring on Runway 25R/7L. These procedures are assumed to remain in effect and were incorporated in the airside simulation analysis for all alternatives. The aircraft activity levels are not projected to increase significantly from current level for No Action/No Project and Alternative C of

the Master Plan since both alternatives maintain a four-runway system similar to the existing airfield. The increased aircraft activities in Alternatives A and B would have a little effect on the preferential runway use since the aircraft activity dose not projected to increase significantly during the noise sensitive hours of 10:00 p.m. to 06:30 a.m. Please see Appendix H of the Master Plan Chapter V, Tables V-H.31 to V-H.33 for the projected hourly profile of aircraft activity for each alternative.

PC02605-9

Comment:

#8. Will a potential new Primarily Commuter Runway be used for west to east takeoffs in inclement weather? If so what will be the landing and takeoff flight path patterns?

What will be the mitigation procedures?

A. How about flyovers and wave offs of possible west to east landings? What will be the mitigation procedures?

B. How about flyovers and wave offs of east to west landings? What will be the mitigation procedures?

C. Where will the air traffic controller direct those aircraft to fly? Where will the flight paths be located?

D. What size planes would be able to use the so-called commuter runways? (727, A320, 757, etc.)

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. By adding a third runway and increasing other runways the intent is to 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. Alternative C does not add substantial numbers of operations to the levels currently experienced, so there should be no projected growth of missed approaches under that alternative. Assumed Flight Tracks for the various alternatives are located in Section D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR.

The new south runway in Alternative B would be used occasionally to accommodate commuter departure operations when LAX operates in an easterly flow (from west to east) as depicted in Figures V-J.36 and V-J.43 in Appendix J of the Master Plan Chapter V. Departure operations on the new south runway would consist of southbound regional jet and turboprop departures to Oceanside, Santa Ana, Ontario and Paradise.

A new 6,700-foot runway would be able to accommodate regional jet and turboprop departures, but would be too short in length for departure operations of narrowbody jets such as Boeing 737s and larger. Please see Figure IV-3.8 and Section 3.2.2 of the Master Plan Chapter IV for detailed information.

Arriving aircraft require less runway length than departures and many narrowbody jets can land on 6,700 feet of runway, in addition to turboprops and regional jets. Aircraft such as the Airbus A310, Boeing 737-200, 737-300, 737-500, and the Boeing 757-200 can be accommodated on this length. Please see Chapter IV, Figure IV-3.9, page IV-3.35 of the Master Plan for a summary of the runway length requirements. See Master Plan Appendix J, Figure V-J.60 for a summary of the aircraft that were assumed to land on the new runway in the airside simulation analysis.

PC02605-10

Comment:

#9. What effect will the changing of the landing and takeoff thresholds have in changing the noise contours and the distribution of polluted air if any of the existing runways are extended to the east and/or north and/or south?

(The thresholds will no doubt change if any runway is extended especially toward the east has been presented on some of the alternatives.)

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of the runway relocations on noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendices D and G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR, and Appendices S-C and S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Aircraft Noise Technical Report.

PC02605-11

Comment:

#10. How will the FAA improve on the methods to enforce its own rules and regulations pertaining to:

A. no turns until the aircraft crosses the shoreline,

1. Under what conditions may this rule be changed?

B. utilization of the inboard runways at all possible times instead of outboard runways,

1. Under what conditions may this rule be changed?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures and Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement.

PC02605-12

Comment:

#11. What changes in your 'Rules and Regulations' could be anticipated with the expansion of LAX?

Response:

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

PC02605-13

Comment:

#12. What potential flight paths, for take offs and landings, will be used for all existing runways and all potential new runways in each concept?

Response:

The content of this comment is similar to Comment PC01881-87. Please see Response to Comment PC01881-87 regarding takeoff and landing flight tracks for each runway in each configuration.

PC02605-14

Comment:

#13. What effect will 'single' event noise have on the adjacent neighbors as a result of LAX expansion? Please include in your answer this very important item of single event noise.

Response:

Single event Lmax levels are identified in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, Section 5, Location Impact Analysis, of the Draft EIS/EIR. Single event metrics have limited use in determining long-term noise impacts. When SEL is used to supplement DNL as it was in this case, it serves only to provide additional information. Please see Response to Comment PC02605-29. 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.

PC02605-15

Comment:

#14. What impact would the increase of minimum flying elevations to 2000' of all helicopters in the LAX area have on any expansion program. Where is this mentioned in the EIS/EIR.?

Response:

The Los Angeles World airport's (LAWA) Aircraft Noise Abatement Operating Procedures and Restrictions require helicopter operators with a valid LAWA Operating Agreement to maintain an altitude of 2,000 feet when operating along designated flight routes, weather, traffic and safety permitting. A complete copy of the Aircraft Noise Abatement Operating Procedures and Restrictions can be found in Topical Response TR-N-7.

The proposed improvements under each of the alternatives described in the Draft EIS/EIR (Alternatives A, B, and C) and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR (Alternative D) do not address helicopter operations, however, to assist the commentor in understanding helicopter operations, an overview of the rules for helicopter operations, which differ from fixed-wing operations, and a general discussion of helicopters in the vicinity of LAX is provided. Federal air Regulations, Part 91.119 provides for the minimum safe altitude for operation of aircraft. Except for landing and takeoff, the minimum safe altitude for an aircraft over congested areas such as towns and cities is 1,000 feet above the highest obstacle within a radius of 2,000 of the aircraft. In other than congested areas, (open areas such as rural areas, or over water) the minimum safe altitude is 500 feet Above Ground Level (AGL) or person, vessel or vehicle. Helicopters may be operated at less than the prescribed minimum altitudes if the operation is conducted without hazard to persons or property on the surface. Additionally, helicopters must comply with any routes or altitudes prescribed for helicopters by the FAA Administrator.

Within the Los Angeles basin there are several published helicopter routes that are generally aligned along freeways or major thoroughfares. Within the immediate vicinity of LAX several routes are used for ingress/egress to/from the airport or to transit the Los Angeles Class B airspace. These routes are assigned by Air Traffic Control (ATC) to preclude interactions between helicopters and fixed-wing operations arriving and departing LAX. Except where noted, the altitude assigned by ATC along the route is normally is at or above 1,500 feet Mean Sea Level (MSL). The assigned altitude may be lower when clouds preclude flight at the normally assigned altitude. The following routes are used in the vicinity of LAX:

Sepulveda Route - North and South along Sepulveda Boulevard between Imperial Highway and Lincoln Boulevard;

Industrial Route - South along Sepulveda Boulevard to Imperial Highway, then east along Imperial Highway to Nash Street. South along Nash Street to the Artesia Freeway (91 Freeway);

Imperial Route - East or West along Imperial Highway between the Harbor Freeway (110 Freeway) and Sepulveda Boulevard;

Marina Route - North along Sepulveda Boulevard to the Marina Freeway (90 Freeway), then west along the Marina Freeway to Ballona Creek;

Harbor Route - North and South along the Harbor Freeway (110 Freeway). The altitude on this route is at or below 900 feet MSL.

Shoreline Route - North and South along the shoreline west of LAX between Imperial Highway and Marina del Rey. The altitude on this route is at or below 150 feet MSL.

On weekends and holidays, there are a significant number of helicopters engaged in towing advertising banners along the beaches of southern California. These operations must conform to the minimum safe altitudes provided in the FARs. Except for those operations along the Shoreline Route between

3. Comments and Responses

Ballona Creek and Imperial Highway, the banner tow operations are not under the control of air traffic control.

PC02605-16

Comment:

#15. This concept should have been included in the EIS/EIR. The FAA should have considered 60 DNL (CNEL) as a new measuring standard since single event operations will increase at LAX as well as most every major airport in the U.S.A., over time, and we know people complain about single event noise not DNL (CNEL) noise.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences, in particular 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. 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.

PC02605-17

Comment:

#16. If the FAA is no longer involved in the 'promoting of air commerce, then I suggest you allow LAX to use the ARTS III system of reporting procedures of aircraft operations to be used for enforcement purposes of FAA and LAX Rules and Regulations. This should be included as a mitigation measure to lessen negative environmental impacts as a result of increased aircraft operations.

Response:

LAWA has entered into a MOU with the FAA to provide ARTS III data. The MOU does not allow LAWA to use ARTS III data for enforcement purposes. However, LAWA has invested in a PASSUR system that can assist them and the community in tracking aircraft operators. In addition, see Topical Response TR-N-7 to review the limitations on LAWA in the enforcement of noise abatement procedures for aircraft in flight.

PC02605-18

Comment:

#17. Will one of the mitigation measures be to have the ATC hold an aircraft in a landing pattern longer in order to avoid a wave-off when there may be congestion on the runways? This should be considered.

Response:

Aircraft approaches to LAX are presently sequenced to ensure safe separation distances and to minimize operating delays. To increase those separations would increase delays and reduce the operational capacity of the airport. 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 rather than because there are too many departures. 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. The standard missed approach procedure is not a noise mitigation measure. It is designed to allow safe aircraft operation during abnormal conditions. For additional information on standard missed approach procedures at LAX, please see Topical Response TR-N-3, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.4.

PC02605-19

Comment:

#18. What impact will reducing the separation of independent parallel instrument approaches below 4500' or even going as low as 2500'?

Response:

FAA standard for conducting simultaneous parallel instrument approaches is 4,300 feet between runway centerline. This can be reduced to 3,000 with the use of high update radars such as the Parallel Monitor Radar (PRM).

PC02605-20

Comment:

#19. Consideration should be given for the FAA to help LAX enforce their Rules and Regulations to mitigate noise?

Response:

The FAA assists the airport proprietor with its noise abatement program. However, because a violation of the LAWA noise rules and regulations is a violation of a local ordinance and not a violation Federal Aviation Regulations, it would be difficult for the FAA to enforce because there would be no federal offense.

PC02605-21

Comment:

The Master Plan Brochure states on the first inside page, first paragraph, "The purpose of the LAX Master Plan process is to allow the Los Angeles Department of Airports the best means possible to determine: How best to ensure (my highlight) that the impact of LAX improvements will also improve (my highlight) the environment and quality of life." It appears that this is a commitment by the LAX Department of Airports to the local communities. Is it??

#20. Include in the EIR/EIS materials the methods you plan to use to ensure and improve the environment and quality of life.

#21. Explain how you plan to ensure and improve the environment and quality of life if of the approximate 91 'Initial Study Checklist' items 20 say no impact and the other 71 say yes there is an impact or maybe there will be an impact.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AR00003-63.

PC02605-22

Comment:

#22. Please give all the potential new runways an identifying number such as 26, etc.

Response:

Comment noted. The standard convention for identifying runways is the magnetic heading inbound. When there are parallel runways, they are further delineated as Left (L), Right (R), or Center (C). In both Alternatives A and B, where a new runway would be constructed, the additional runway would run parallel to the existing runways. The runway identification given to the new runways in the Master Plan followed common practice and was for analytical purposes. The final runway identification would be decided by the Federal Aviation Administration when the operating procedures are developed for the new runways.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02605-23

Comment:

#23. Provide the exact boundaries by street name and number of dwelling units, businesses, hotels, etc. in each concept that may be included in any land acquisition program.

Response:

Chapter 3, Alternatives, (subsection 3.2), of the Draft EIS/EIR described property acquisition that would occur under Alternatives A, B, and C and showed these parcels on Figures 3-8, 3-12, and 3-16, respectively. Appendix P of the Master Plan includes parcel-level detail of these properties (including type of business and address) by alternative. Acquisition that would occur under Alternative D was presented in Chapter 3, Alternatives, (subsection 3.2), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and shown on Figure 3-14. Chapter 2 of the LAX Master Plan Addendum provided parcel-level detail of these properties that would be acquired under Alternative D.

PC02605-24

Comment:

#24. Describe commuter aircrafts that may be using a potential new 'commuter' runway.

Response:

The new 6,700-foot runway in Alternatives A and B was proposed to accommodate primarily arrival operations. Arriving aircraft require less runway length than departures, and many turboprops, regional jets, and narrowbody jets can land on 6,700 feet of runway. Turboprop aircraft include Beechcraft 1900s, Jetstream 31s, Saab 340s, and DeHavilland Dash 7s. Regional jets include the Canidair Regional Jet and the Embraer 145. Narrowbody jets that are able to arrive on a 7,600-foot runway include the Airbus A310, Boeing 737-200, 737-300, 737-500, and the Boeing 757-200. See Chapter IV, Figure IV-3.9, page IV-3.35 of the Master Plan document for a summary of the runway length requirements. See Master Plan Appendix J, Figures V-J.60 and V-J.61 for a summary of the aircraft that were assumed to land on the new runway in the airside simulation analysis.

PC02605-25

Comment:

#25. Prepare noise contour maps to project the noise contours for five year periods for all Lax Master Plan Project concepts.

Response:

Comment noted. The noise analysis was done in complete compliance with scientific principles and FAA Order 1050.1D and Order 5050.4A. Noise contours for the 1996 Baseline, Year 2000 Conditions, ANMP, 94 dBA SEL, No Action/No Project Alternative and build alternatives (2005 (for Alt. A-C) and 2015) are addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02605-26

Comment:

#26. All direct and indirect impacts of the proposed actions and their alternatives must be considered. Amongst these are:

1. Air space.
2. Water quality
3. Social impacts

4. Land use
5. Air quality
6. Hazardous waste
7. Flight safety
8. Noise

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air space and flight safety issues in Section 4.24.3, Safety, water quality in Section 4.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, social impacts in Section 4.4, Social Impacts, land use in Section 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, hazardous waste in Section 4.23, Hazardous Materials, and noise in Section 4.1, Noise. Supporting documentation is provided in Appendices D and G of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendices S-C and S-E of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 13, and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2, S-4, S-5, and S-8 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-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC02605-27

Comment:

#27. Did the EIR/EIS address the noise impacts resulting from the combination of the Airside expansion proposed, such as constructing new runways and extending and moving existing runways?

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed all airside changes in Section 4.1, Noise. For more information please see Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix SC-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02605-28

Comment:

#28. Did the EIR/EIS address the increased noise impacts resulting from the increase of operations, as well as the dispersion of the noise over a larger area to the east, north, and south?

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts as a result of increased operations were addressed in the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase and Topical Response TR-N-1, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-1.4 regarding dispersion of flight tracks.

PC02605-29

Comment:

#29. Did the EIR/EIS should address single event noise analysis? (The FAA specifically has agreed to include single event analysis at Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport, Memphis International Airport, Detroit City Airport, Philadelphia International Airport, and Baltimore International Airport.)

Response:

In compliance with CEQA, 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 following the Court of Appeal's Berkeley Jets opinion, which held that a supplemental single event noise analysis was required to provide a more accurate and complete picture of the disputed airport development plan's future noise impacts. Single event Lmax levels are identified in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, Section 5, Location Impact Analysis, of the Draft EIS/EIR. In compliance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and in accordance with EPA proposals on aviation noise standards, FAA Order

3. Comments and Responses

1050.1D, Policies and Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts, established DNL as the descriptor of choice in representing environmental effects upon public health and welfare; and categorized compatibility of existing and planned land uses as the extent of the noise impacts. FAA's choice of DNL as its primary airport noise descriptor does not negate the supplementary use of single event noise analysis. As FAA Order 1050.1D states, 'Any noise impact study will be enhanced by single event analyses. In some situations the single event analysis is absolutely essential to evaluating noise impact.' This statement, taken out of context, seems to say that single event noise analyses will provide additional information on community annoyance that is not incorporated in DNL. But, the paragraph in Order 1050.1D, from which this quote was taken, goes on to say, 'An example would be the measurement of noise from the flyover of a single aircraft for comparison with other single event flyovers.' Thus, Order 1050.1D identifies single event noise analysis as a means to compare aircraft operating procedures, such as, quantifying the merits of different noise abatement procedures. In a later section, the order also indicates that single event levels, in terms of sound exposure level, maximum A-weighted sound level and one-third octave sound pressure levels, are important for investigating noise sensitive sites for possible soundproofing projects. But, single event noise levels have never been shown to be of any use in predicting community reactions to aircraft noise or developing compatible land use plans. EPA selected DNL as the single-number measure for the purpose of identifying levels of environmental noise, in part to achieve, as is stated in the Levels Document: '...the ultimate goal is to characterize with reasonable accuracy the noise exposure of whole neighborhoods (within which there may actually exist a fairly wide range of noise levels), so as to prevent extremes of noise exposure at any given time, and to detect unfavorable trends in the future noise climate. For these purposes, pinpoint accuracy and masses of data for each location are not required, and may even be a hindrance, since one could fail to see the forest for the trees.'

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. Additionally, please see Tropical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences.

PC02605-30

Comment:

#30. Did the EIR/ EIS must not only examine the combined effects of the actions proposed in the Master Plan, but also consider the combined effects of the proposed actions with other projects both on and off airport property?

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.

PC02605-31

Comment:

#31. Consider another Master Plan option of expanding the airport without adding any new runways.

Response:

Neither Alternative C nor Alternative D would add any new runways at LAX.

PC02605-32

Comment:

#32. Consider limiting the new runways to turbo prop aircraft only.

Response:

Comment noted. As indicated in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Draft EIS/EIR (Subsection 3.1.2), there are difficult legal issues involved with restricting airport use by class of aircraft. It should be noted that Alternatives C and D do not include any new runways.

PC02605-33

Comment:

#33. Consider the availability of other airports when their existing restriction expires such as Long Beach and John Wayne Airports.

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC02605-34

Comment:

#34. Consider the mitigation measure of expanding the existing airports or building a new airport in the distant future.

Response:

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

PC02605-35

Comment:

#35. Consider mitigation measures pertaining to the health of children and adults as a result of air and noise pollution.

Response:

Proposed measures to reduce potential health effects associated with air quality and noise were included in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and Section 4.1, Noise, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, which provided the basis for the Master Plan commitments and mitigation measures presented in this Final EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02605-36

Comment:

#36. Considered mitigation measures which will lessen the harmful effects of noise and air pollution in the learning process of young people.

Response:

Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included an analysis of single event noise levels that result in classroom disruption as a result of developing the Master Plan alternatives. Schools without aviation easements that are determined to be newly exposed to significant aircraft noise levels are eligible for mitigation. Mitigation Measure MM-LU-1 provides mitigation for schools determined to be significantly impacted by aircraft noise, excluding schools with aviation easements. Mitigation may take the form of sound insulation or relocation. Further mitigation is provided under Mitigation Measures MM-LU-3 and MM-LU-4 in the form of study of aircraft noise levels that result in classroom disruption and sound insulation for schools determined by the study or interim noise measurements to be significantly impacted. Regarding harmful effects of air pollution on the learning process of young people, air quality impacts and health impacts were described in Sections 4.6.6 and 4.24.1.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, respectively. Corresponding mitigation measures to reduce air pollution impacts on all sensitive receptors (including school age children), were presented in Sections 4.6.8 and 4.24.1.8 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02606

Edie, Jay

None Provided

PC02606-1

Comment:

1. The recent terrorist attack on WTC will likely reduce demand for air travel significantly for an extended time period due to the increased cost of security as well as passenger fears. Therefore, all plans for LAX expansion should be suspended pending further demand and security evaluations.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comments AL00051-93, PC02236-2, and PC02131-5.

PC02606-2

Comment:

2. There are three components of surface traffic to/from LAX that need to be addressed in better ways, even at the present traffic levels.

(a) Passengers: There is now and in all LAWA proposed LAX expansion alternatives too great a concentration of surface traffic into the terminal areas. The proposals to build added parking facilities at the west end of the LAX property will add to rather than reduce surface traffic congestion. Therefore, all private vehicles should be banned from LAX and the passenger parking structures eliminated. Remote parking east of LAX with people movers should be used.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PC02606-3

Comment:

(b) Cargo: The principal regions within Greater Los Angeles which are the destinations/sources of most air cargo are remote from LAX. There appears to be inadequate assessment of the impact of any

3. Comments and Responses

increases in truck traffic and the huge costs of providing necessary freeway and other infrastructure improvements that would be required if LAX air cargo were increased. All cargo-only flights should therefore be banned from LAX and relocated to Ontario and Orange County airports. This will require adding Federal Customs capabilities at those other airports, which is much lower cost than road improvements and should be done anyway.

Response:

The technical traffic analysis for the Master Planning effort did include a complete assessment of truck volumes for all categories of trucking (expressed in Passenger Car Equivalents [PCE]) in the analysis of alternatives. The analysis accounted for all the trucking associated with the projected cargo activity of LAX Master Plan Alternatives as well as projected background truck traffic in the local and regional transportation system. 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. Also, please see Response to Comment PC02252-3.

PC02606-4

Comment:

(c) LAX Employees: People who work at the airports constitute a major fraction of the surface traffic in/out of the LAX area. There should be much greater use of incentives to these people to use mass transit and people movers from remote locations. The ban of private vehicles from LAX should include those of people who work at LX. This will also improve airport security.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC02252-4. In addition, airport security is a key consideration of Alternative D.

PC02606-5

Comment:

3. Landing fees, parking fees, and other incentives should be used to eliminate small private aircraft from LAX and to shift much of the short haul passenger traffic to other regional airports. This will make runway and taxiway time available for long haul passenger aircraft and so accommodate any needed growth of that segment and will significantly improve airports safety.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC02252-5.

PC02607

Barnett, Elaine

None Provided

PC02607-1

Comment:

I am opposed to the proposed expansion for Los Angeles International Airport. I have been a homeowner at the above address since 1970 when the air traffic was far less than what it is today. The homes in our tract are spacious and well built. Many of our neighbors have nice yards, patios, decks, spas and pools. We are at a point of retirement, having paid for our home, as are many of our neighbors. We are concerned that our property values will decrease in our community due to increased 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

3. Comments and Responses

Alternative. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

PC02607-2

Comment:

Despite the no fly time between midnight and 6:30 a.m., many airplanes are flying over our home. When I called to complain about airplane noise, I was told that the overcast conditions at LAX do not permit the landing and taking off of airplanes over the ocean. The coastline is very frequently overcast which means that our nights are frequently violated by airplane noise. Please see attached letter from the Aircraft Noise Complaint Hotline at LAX.

Response:

There is no curfew on operations at LAX. However, there are special flight procedures in effect between midnight and 6:30 a.m. These procedures are not mandatory, but are generally used by air traffic controllers when practicable. For more information on this topic, please see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement, and Topical Response TR-N-5, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-5.1 regarding description of over-ocean procedures. Mitigation Measure MM-N-5 calls for LAWA to initiate a 14 CFR Part 161 study to seek Federal approval of a locally-imposed restriction on departures and approaches from the east when over-ocean procedures are in effect.

PC02607-3

Comment:

I do not believe that your Environmental Impact Study accurately documents the effects of increased aircraft emissions on the air quality, health of residents, and, property in the flying zones. Since I have been living at my home I have seen a black sooty residue collecting on my home, my cars, plants and trees and it has increased since 1970. Surely this increase in residue is a direct result of aircraft emissions. The color of the paint on my home does not last as long as it did in times past. Additionally, we have been wondering if airplane emissions caused two orange trees and a grapefruit that were in our yard to die.

Response:

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

PC02607-4

Comment:

My son and daughter who were born while we have been living at this home both have been asthmatic since they were children. My other children who were older when we moved to our home do not 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.

PC02607-5

Comment:

Did the environmental study responsibly document the effect of airplane emissions on the health of the children who attend the schools under the landing path of LAX? Has the environmental study responsibly documented the effect of airplane emissions on the health of residents of all ages?

Response:

Please refer to Responses to Comments AF00001-30 regarding the use of health risk assessments to determine whether chemicals pose a significant risk to human health and AF00001-35 regarding impacts to children in schools.

PC02607-6

Comment:

I firmly believe that the increase in air traffic must be shared by Palmdale and Ontario airports and by developing the site at El Toro in, Orange County. The skies over Inglewood and South Central Los Angeles are already over crowded, polluted and noisy.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No 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-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

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

PC02608

Curtiss, D. A. Curt

None Provided

11/5/2001

PC02608-1

Comment:

As a former LAWA Airport Commissioner, I want to voice my opposition to any expansion of LAX.

Response:

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

PC02608-2

Comment:

First, there have not been any adequate studies on aircraft capacity, either in the air or on the ground.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC02608-3

Comment:

Second, The current ground access is totally inadequate for the current 60 MAP

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02608-4

Comment:

Mayor Hahn's proposal, what ever it is, is based on "safety and security" If one was interested in safety and security, the answer would be in expanding the other airports in the region. There would not be the current congestion in the air and on the ground at LAX. Terrorists would have to destroy two or three airports to impact air transportation instead of one. increasing the distance between the runways has nothing to do with safety or security. It will allow the giant Airbus to land.

Response:

The airfield improvements proposed as part of Alternative D would help to improve the level of safety at LAX in addition to enhancing the airport's ability to safely and efficiently accommodate the Airbus A380. Please see Response to Comment PC00543-1. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1.

PC02608-5

Comment:

Neither customs or immigration can handle 600 passengers at one time. Ten days ago, I returned from Australia. Due to increased tail winds, we were ahead of schedule. There were several overseas flights arriving at the same time. Due to the number of people, it took a half an hour to clear immigration and another half an hour to clear customs.

Response:

The commentor is correct in stating the airport is congested today. The Central Terminal Area (CTA) is reaching its capacity limit. The four build alternatives would be designed to ease that congestion by: (1) improving the CTA facilities and (2) creating new, modern terminal facilities on the west side of the airport. The new and improved facilities should help better accommodate arriving international passengers by providing adequate space for Federal Inspection Service (FIS). See Chapter V, Tables V-3.10, V-3.18, and V-3.26 of the Draft LAX Master Plan for detailed information on the allocated space for FIS for Alternatives A, B, and C and Section 2.2.6 of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum for Alternative D. Without the project, congestion would continue to build and worsen in the CTA.

PC02608-6

Comment:

Instead of further destroying Westchester for the sake of a European Airbus, Ontario airport could be expanded to handle this larger plane. Even though the Sepulveda tunnel has been strengthened, will it support this monstrosity?

Response:

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. The Sepulveda Tunnel will support the weight of the New Large Aircraft (NLA) such as the Airbus 380.

PC02608-7

Comment:

I do not believe that it is legal to consider Mayor Hahn's proposal without knowing exactly what it is and then having public hearings on that specific plan.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive description and analysis of Alternative D and was circulated for public review and comment. Twelve public hearings were held during the 120-day review period for the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02608-8

Comment:

There are so many "errors of fact" in the current EIR, it should be scrapped.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02609

Fisher, Lawrence

Transportation California

11/5/2001

PC02609-1

Comment:

Transportation California, a non-profit coalition dedicated to highway improvement and safety, wishes to go on record in support of continuing the LAX Master Plan process. Both LAX and ground transportation access to the airport must be improved to avoid gridlock and inconvenience for LAX travelers and the surrounding communities.

In light of the events of September 11, the Master Plan must be looked at from a new perspective, while keeping in sight the realities that have not changed. The people of Southern California and the state's economy depend on LAX and will not be well served if the airport and its access infrastructure remain inadequate and inefficient.

Certainly, security and safety must now take center stage with regard to LAX, but the problem of traffic congestion must also remain a central concern. The likelihood is that passenger and freight levels at LAX will "normalize" within a matter of years, if not months. This will happen whether or not the airport is improved.

Before September 11, the recommended LAX Master Plan called for significant ground transportation improvements, including a ring road, a 405 Expressway and bringing the Green Line directly into the airport. Obviously, some of these elements will change as the plan is reconfigured, but it would be unfortunate if the emphasis on upgrading ground access is lost in the process.

The 405 is one of the most congested highways in California. While LAX is by no means a principal culprit in creating this congestion, there is no question that more efficient access to LAX from the 405 would ease the burden on this freeway. Likewise, the 105 and surface streets around LAX will all flow more freely if the LAX Master Plan includes major commitments to ground transportation.

We look forward to commenting on the revised LAX Master Plan as it evolves.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Alternative D, the Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, which was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, does not include the proposed LAX Expressway or the ring road. Please see Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for an analysis of surface transportation impacts associated with this alternative.

PC02610

Kerzie, David

None Provided

11/6/2001

PC02610-1

Comment:

Comments: I was unable to attend the public hearing held at Palmdale Airport last evening (5 Nov2001). The following comments are submitted concerning possible development/expansion of air service at Palmdale Regional Airport. The comments are personal opinions and do not necessarily reflect those of the USAF and aerospace contractors of which I have served with and been employed for over forty years.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC02610-2

Comment:

1. Numerous attempts at providing commercial air service out of the Antelope Valley (both PMD and WJF) have failed through the last three decades. The demand for airline service and/or excuse to relieve traffic at LAX, in my humble opinion, simply does not exist at Palmdale.

Response:

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

PC02610-3

Comment:

2. Palmdale Airport is located at a relatively high elevation. The high pressure altitude coupled with the high outside temperatures common at Palmdale yield very high density altitudes. Those that are familiar with aircraft performance are aware of the limitations and possible safety implications especially when operating a heavy airplane in those adverse conditions.

Response:

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

PC02610-4

Comment:

3. A complex of Restricted Areas exist to the immediate north and northeast of Palmdale Airport. These areas include R2515, R2508, R2505, 2524, 2502, among others. Military test activities, which could include the live firing of missiles and other weapons, are conducted on a routine basis. The areas would preclude direct departure and arrival routes for aircraft to and from the north or northeast.

Response:

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

PC02610-5**Comment:**

4 . As far as I know, PMD is a military installation with respect to the runways and most of the surrounding facilities. Has consideration been provided for the military production and test activities that are currently conducted and planned for at Palmdale? For example....who would have priority.....a military or contractor test mission or arriving or departing commercial airline flight?

Items 2,3, and 4 above are provided in that they have never been addressed to my knowledge.

Response:

Palmdale Regional Airport is currently located on the Palmdale Production Flight/Test Installation Air Force Plant 42 - a military installation. The City of Los Angeles has a joint use agreement with the U.S. Air Force to permit up to 400 operations per day of civilian air carrier aircraft to occur at Plant 42. Air Traffic Control would continue to sequence both military and civilian aircraft operations on the military installation to ensure safety of aircraft operations. If a special aircraft operation required additional separation, the U.S. Air Force would coordinate that operation with the FAA to ensure safety. The U.S. Air Force is the owner of the property and the City is a tenant with a long term lease. This property is located west of the 17,000 acre parcel that is owned by the City of Los Angeles and planned for the future development of Palmdale International Airport.

PC02611 Fickenscher, Edgar None Provided 11/7/2001

PC02611-1**Comment:**

We wish to reiterate our objection to the expansion of LAX. Not only would it destroy more of Westchester's business center and homes, but also the additional traffic and air pollution would affect the quality of life and health for Westchester residents.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, 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. 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. As indicated in TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not include acquisition within the Westchester business district or any 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.

PC02611-2**Comment:**

Since the terrible events of September 11, 2001 led to the closing of the airport and subsequent increased security needs, we feel "all the eggs should not be in one basket." Make better use of Palmdale and Ontario airports. We also believe Orange County should carry its share at El Toro perhaps, instead of adding to the traffic at LAX.

Our city has done its part already and we should not be expected to sacrifice more.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments AL00051-93, PC01881-31, and PC02131-5. Please also see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding the elimination of El Toro as a commercial airport and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the Master Plan's role in regional approach to meeting demand.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02612 Booth, Mary None Provided 11/5/2001

PC02612-1

Comment:

Please notify me of the next meeting.

Last Saturday's meeting at L.A. High School I heard about on the radio and my car was in the shop. The announcement on the radio was too late for me to get a bus to that location.

Please notify me at the address below:

Mary E. Booth
1019 Ozone Ave.
Santa Monica, CA 90405

Response:

Comment noted. LAWA will ensure commentor is on all notification lists.

PC02612-2

Comment:

I work as a Travelers Aid every Saturday night at Terminal 1. I have come by bus since Sept. 11's event until allowed to park at T-1 parking and even last Sat. showed up by bus because my car was in the shop.

I am deeply concerned with the LAX MASTER PLAN .

I am encouraged with the rerouting of traffic into the airport since Sept 11; it is very good.

Much unfoldment and good is coming forth at LAX.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02613 Harman, Jane U.S. House of Representatives 11/9/2001

PC02613-1

Comment:

Enclosed with this letter are comments from more than 1,000 residents of the 36th Congressional District on the proposed expansion of Los Angeles International Airport.

As you know, I expressed serious concerns about the proposed LAX Master Plan. I and many other residents of the South Bay and communities impacted by LAX expansion concluded that the plan would greatly increased noise, air pollution and traffic in our neighborhoods and ill-serve residents in other parts of our region. In July of this year, I led a coalition of Members of Congress, local elected officials and community leaders from Southern California who met with Transportation Secretary Norman Mineta and Federal Aviation Administrator Jane Garvey to urge them to work toward a regional approach to our air transportation needs. Secretary Mineta committed to the establishment of an inter-modal task force on aviation in Southern California.

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

PC02613-2

Comment:

Since September 11, Mayor Jim Hahn has proposed development of a new master plan that focuses on aviation security and safety. The Mayor has discussed incorporating a regional approach and taking steps to limit the volume of air traffic at LAX. I applaud the direction he has taken and look forward to studying the details of that plan once they are available.

Response:

Comment noted. A description of Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Additionally, the environmental impacts specific to Alternative D are fully addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02613-3

Comment:

While LAX priorities have changed, the community's views on the airport are still an important factor in any decisions about airport expansion. I urge you and the FAA to review these comments carefully and provide responses as directed by the EIR/EIS process. I have also attached a summary of those comments and the text of my public comments on the plan.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC02613-1 and PC02613-2 above and Responses to Comments PC02613-4 through PC02613-44 below.

PC02613-4

Comment:

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS
LAX MASTER PLAN EIR-EIS

Congresswoman Jane Harman
November 9, 2001

Against expansion
Overview

After review of nearly one thousand constituent responses about the proposed LAX expansion, it is evident that a great majority (over seven hundred) of those who responded opposes the proposed "LAX Master Plan." Constituents throughout the district replied, and their concerns covered a broad range of issues related to the airport. Most frequently, issues with increased noise, traffic congestion, transportation, air and water pollution were raised, and most respondents favored a regional approach to the congestion problems at LAX. Some additional comments included safety and property value concerns relating to the proposed expansion of LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments PC02613-5 through PC02613-36 below regarding specific comments related to being against expansion of LAX provided in this comment letter.

3. Comments and Responses

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the following items identified in the comments as follows: noise in Section 4.1, Noise; traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; water quality in Section 4.7, Hydrology and Water Quality; and aviation safety in Section 4.24.3, Safety. In addition, please see Topical Responses TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety, and TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

PC02613-5

Comment:

Noise

One of the most frequently cited issues among constituents responding to the June mailer was that of increased noise in the areas surrounding the airport. Many respondents included in their opinions the fact that noise levels in their areas have become increasingly noisy and unbearable in the past years. Some constituents complained that noise from planes overhead wake them in the middle of the night, and that flights disturb them throughout the day. Other constituents even took the time to record the number of noisy flights over their homes and passed the information on to our office. The following are some assessments of the noise problem in the areas surrounding LAX, written by constituents:

Response:

Noise issues 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. Please also see Responses to Comments PC02613-6 through PC02613-33 below.

PC02613-6

Comment:

- "We now have flights from LAX over our homes all day. The most annoying flights are from 1 AM, 2 AM- 4 AM which have increased the last year. The planes are extremely large, very noisy, and very low and still climbing. We are awakened and the whole house shakes. It sounds as if the planes are going to crash into our homes. We can't get back to sleep."

-Clara Delperdang
Torrance, CA

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC03518-1.

PC02613-7

Comment:

- "I have been scared out of bed in the middle of the night by commercial aircraft, by sound levels I believe greater than 100 decibels, flying very unusual flight patterns. Although these have subsided in recent months, I have a grave concern these disturbances would resume if expansion is allowed."

-Tom Pacheco
Redondo Beach, CA

Response:

Table A5-5, Regular and Special Grid Point Assessment - Aircraft Lmax, located in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Table S-C1-15, Regular and Special Grid Point Assessment - Aircraft Lamax, located in Appendix SC-1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided single event noise levels computed for many locations surrounding the airport. In only limited locations immediately under the flight paths of landing and departing aircraft at very low altitudes do the noise levels exceed 100 decibels. No locations near Redondo Beach are exposed to such levels by operations at LAX. Based on a recent Court of Appeals

ruling in the "Berkeley Jets" case at Oakland International Airport, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included a comprehensive analysis of single event noise events. These are more thoroughly discussed in Section 4.1, Noise, Appendix SC-1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, Section, 4.2, Land Use, Appendix S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report. Additionally, please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement, Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, and Response to Comment PC03376-1.

PC02613-8

Comment:

Our community is already plagued with air pollution and noise pollution. We are planning on moving from the area because of the air and noise pollution. But for our neighbors' sake, we want no more growth.

-Marianne and Gary Peattie
Westchester, CA

Response:

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

PC02613-9

Comment:

- "As an Audobon Program docent at the Ballona Wetlands for the past nine years, I have noticed a constantly increasing amount of air traffic noise. It is now so bad that we must shout to be heard by the school children who are trying to have an outdoor learning experience. Airport noise pollution is ruining the wetlands for people."

-Barbara O. Courtois
Redondo Beach, CA

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. However, as shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S1 in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, overall areas exposed to high noise levels (defined as 65 CNEL or greater) under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions do not extend into the Ballona Wetlands and, in fact, high noise levels in this area have decreased over time compared to the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL contour. As presented in Section 4.2.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, parks within the 75 CNEL contour (and where there is a substantial interference with the normal use of the park) are considered to be incompatible with airport uses. As also stated, although exposure of noise-sensitive uses to outdoor noise levels in the 65 to 75 CNEL range is not considered to be incompatible, areas exposed to these noise levels would still have some impact on outdoor speech and the quality of outdoor activities. See also Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02613-10

Comment:

- "Last night I laid sleepless in bed listening to the endless sound of jets taxiing...Unfortunately, this has been typical of late night noise, which has been on the increase over the past two years.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01879-5.

PC02613-11

Comment:

That airport is maxed out, and so is the surface street traffic in the South Bay area."

-James Kokalj
Hermosa Beach, CA

Response:

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

PC02613-12

Comment:

Traffic

Another issue of major concern to constituents is the congestion and traffic in and around the LAX area. Many of those who responded referred to an increase in traffic both on the surface streets surrounding the airport and on the 405 and 105 freeways. Several made mention of literal gridlock on the streets, and the increase in time that it takes them to get to and from the airport and destinations in surrounding areas. Others also cited the increase in congestion at LAX itself, with long delays in finding parking and other issues. Some of the comments on the LAX traffic are as follows:

Response:

Issues related to traffic and parking were addressed in Section 4.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC02613-13

Comment:

- "We live near Lincoln Boulevard in Venice where traffic has become increasingly dense in recent years. Currently it takes 40 minutes to travel less than 5 miles during peak traffic hours. For this reason alone, the impact of further airport expansion does not make sense."

-Joan J. Miner
Venice, CA

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02613-14**Comment:**

- "I commend you for a job well done! I work at LAX. I work for the INS as an Immigration Inspector. I see firsthand the millions of people suffering at LAX due to over-congestion. It has taken me 2 hours to find a parking space. Tom Bradley Terminal can not accommodate any more passengers. Please, hear me, do not expand LAX."

-Marissa Leong-Solano
Redondo Beach, CA

Response:

Comment noted.

LAX Master Plan Alternative D would provide 4,610 additional employee parking spaces as described in Table S3-2 in Chapter 3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02613-15**Comment:**

- "Many times it takes longer to get to the airport (coming from Torrance) than to get to your destination by air. We need other facilities where people can fly from, not only LAX."

-Nora Holm
Torrance, CA

Response:

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

PC02613-16**Comment:**

- "It seems like LAX is 'maxed out' already!"

-Patricia Murphy Johnson
Palos Verdes Estates, CA

Response:

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

PC02613-17**Comment:**

Transportation

Another frequently cited issue in the responses to the LAX mailer was the issue of transportation to and from the airport. Many constituents, while mentioning the traffic and congestion issues around the airport, also mentioned improving public transportation options to also help alleviate some of the congestion and pollution issues. Most frequently, responses included suggestions of building a metro station closer to LAX to allow resident to take the light rail trains into the airport. Other suggestions

3. Comments and Responses

included the use of high-speed trains in the southern CA area to alleviate some of the freeway traffic concerns and lessen the need for short commuter flights from LAX. Another suggestion that was received more than once was the idea of expanding a train system from San Diego to the San Francisco area, and perhaps including Las Vegas, to further decrease traffic at LAX.

Response:

This comment is citing others who are in favor of more mass transportation connections to LAX. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail and transit plan (see Subtopical Response TR-ST-5.3 on Transit) for more information. In addition, the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation.

PC02613-18

Comment:

Environmental Concerns

Very frequently, residents of the area responding to the mailer discussed concerns with LAX's impact on the environment in the area. There were many complaints of black soot covering constituents' yards, and several even claimed that their health has already been negatively impacted by the air pollution in the area. Complaints about the air pollution caused by the airport were very frequent, and many residents had concerns about the future impact that such pollution may have on their health.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition. 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 also Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PC02613-19

Comment:

- "The environmental impact of the LAX expansion cannot be overstated. The residents in this community have in the most cases invested their lives working to develop a community that is safe and healthy to live and retire in...it is now one of the most desirable areas in the LA area to raise a family. To ask us to quietly relinquish this to allow LAX to expand would be cheating our children of their future homes."

-Jim Westhoff
El Segundo, CA

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 14a and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC02613-20

Comment:

- "I am a pilot and feel that LAX is at capacity. I live here in Westchester and clean the black fallout off of my patios, windows, cars, and I breathe it!"

- Nancy Reed

Los Angeles, CA

Response:

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

PC02613-21

Comment:

- "I concur with Congresswoman Jane Harman's position statement on the reverse side of this form. In particular, the air pollution for more fly-overs to this area concerns me as a medical provider. After living in Los Angeles County for 23 years, I've been treating an increasing number of new asthma cases, including adult-onset in nonsmokers. Unfortunately, I have also become one of those health statistics. In addition to its many other attributes, my husband and I chose to buy our single family house in Manhattan Beach because of its relative lack of air pollution and its unusual presence of ocean breezes. I breathe easier here. Why should we pay so much to live in a place where this vital health aspect can be destroyed at LAX expansionists' whims?"

-Vickie Ruch, MSN, RN-CS, ANP, FNP
Manhattan Beach, CA

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.

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.

PC02613-22

Comment:

Safety

Several respondents showed concern with safety at LAX. There were some comments citing LAX as one of the more dangerous airports in the country when it comes to accidents and near- accidents on the runway. Incursions were often cited as major concerns to those who frequently use the airport and have experienced the increase in runway traffic first-hand.

Response:

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

PC02613-23

Comment:

- "The critical problem is runway incursions. LAX has the highest and growing number of near-collisions on the ground. Twice within the last year we have had to go around at the last moment due to an incursion.. .the accidents will happen and probably soon. Construction will only increase accident probability."

-John McGuire

3. Comments and Responses

Torrance, CA

Response:

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

PC02613-24

Comment:

- "Also forgotten- nearly every other major city in the US has more than one major airport...This area knows all about safety issues. We are the ones who live with the knowledge that at some point, a plane unable to land properly could do so in our own living rooms. We are the ones who could hear the crash of the one plane landing on another a few years back. Not one of my neighbors want to relive that again....In my opinion, you can't put an elephant in the middle of a playground. It looks great and you may be able to stay out of its way for a while, but sooner or later, it's going to step on someone."

- David Mamann
Redondo Beach, CA

Response:

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

PC02613-25

Comment:

Property Value and Economic Concerns

Another part of expansion heavily opposed by respondents was the forced relocation of many homes in the area of LAX. Some older residents who have lived in the area for years have written about how many people have been negatively affected by the expansion and have been asked to move from their homes to make way for the airport. One respondent has had to move twice for expansion of the airport in the years she has lived in the area, and she revealed that the money that was given to her was never comparable to the resale value of her home. Others also complained about loss of property value due to the increase in traffic, noise and pollution in the area.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-121 and Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding the opportunities to alleviate impacts associated with past or present airport activities at LAX, Response to Comment PC01051-6 regarding property acquisition, and Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding residential property values.

PC02613-26

Comment:

- "I've looked over the area surrounding LAX, and I see no way to expand it without moving a lot of people out at a great inconvenience and astronomical expense."

- Edward H. Johnson
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA

Response:

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

PC02613-27**Comment:**

- "LAX expansion not only drives down property values but is a deterrent to an upscale community in the beach towns that is in need for more services-

Response:

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

PC02613-28**Comment:**

more traffic impacts local traffic to local services and will drive local businesses out."

- Shiela Hoff
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA

Response:

Traffic impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting documentation provided in Technical Reports 2 and S-2. See also Topical Response TR-LU-1 for a summary of overall traffic effects on adjacent communities.

PC02613-29**Comment:**

- "As an employee of a major airline with a major presence at LAX... keep in mind that I for one would certainly benefit from LAX expansion since more flights would arrive and depart creating more premium flying at my airline...however, I am not willing to sacrifice the quality of life issues that surround an expansion of this size only to benefit from personal job growth at my airline."

- Anonymous
Redondo Beach, CA

Response:

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

PC02613-30**Comment:**

A REGIONAL Approach

Nearly all of the respondents who opposed the LAX Master Plan also offered their support on a regional solution to the impacted LAX situation. Many constituents provided suggestions of ways to make a regional approach to alleviating LAX congestion more feasible. One of the most frequent suggestions was to make use of existing airports in the area to take on some of the air traffic normally channeled through LAX. A large frustration among constituents responding is the "not in my backyard" sentiment that has contributed to the blocking of the use of regional airports such as El Toro. Some suggested prohibiting all cargo from flying in and out of LAX, suggesting Palmdale for those purposes. Others suggest the use of all regional airports in the area to help spread the burdens and benefits of air travel throughout the region. Overall, the regional approach was overwhelmingly the favorite solution of respondents in order to avoid the need and impacts of an expansion at LAX.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In addition, please see Response to Comment PC00281-19 regarding cargo operations.

PC02613-31

Comment:

- "The site at the Long Beach Naval Shipyard should be considered. Take offs and landings are over water instead of residential areas. The surrounding space that would be impacted is commercial and industrial. Easy access to freeways and Blue Line transit!"

-Dorothy Hall
Torrance, CA

- "A system of regional airports encompassing all of Southern California is the only way to go. LAX is as big as it ever should get. LAX handles a huge volume of air traffic on a relatively small piece of land. The traffic problems at LAX already resemble a zoo. To enlarge LAX will create a situation bordering on chaos! It is already not a pleasure going there. The increasing volume of air traffic must be spread around to other airports!"

-Kermit Olson
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA

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-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. Decisions to develop the airports are the responsibility of local government.

PC02613-32

Comment:

- "I know of friends who drive over 100 miles just to take a flight out of LAX. They live in developing areas where there is room for population growth, and they deserve regional access to air travel."

-Jean Takara
Los Angeles, CA

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government.

PC02613-33

Comment:

- "The airline industry needs to rethink its 'spoke and hub' system which forces 90% of the US air traffic through a few large hubs. There needs to be more point to point service which better utilizes the nation's total airport capacity."

-Jerry Lockenour
Manhattan Beach, CA

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02613-34

Comment:

- "We are pleased to know of your strong opposition to the proposed LAX expansion, our view is that one positive way to solve some of the problems is to completely eliminate all air freight from LAX. In so doing, there can be added terminal space, much less air traffic, and considerable easing of traffic on the 405 caused by trucks that deliver and pick airfreight from and to LAX. Move all freight to an air freight terminal in Palmdale.

Add more passenger space to Ontario, and push hard for the opening of an Orange County major terminal at El Toro."

-Richard Dickens
Westchester, CA

Response:

Comment noted. Neither the FAA nor LAWA have the authority to direct airlines to use one airport in favor of another airport. The Airline Deregulation Act of 1978, as amended, ended federal, state, and local governments role in determining the location for air service by airlines.

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. 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 Response to Comment PC00599-54 for more information about cargo activity.

PC02613-35

Comment:

- "Expanding regional airports would not only alleviate the burden from LAX itself, but would lessen traffic on all LAX bound freeways. In turn, this could have a positive effect on our air quality. Please consider expanding regional airports instead of going forward with the LAX Master Plan."

- Tate Lundy
Los Angeles, CA

Response:

Some airports cannot meet the demand as a result of government caps (i.e., Long Beach and John Wayne) or longstanding opposition (Burbank). Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, 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.

PC02613-36

Comment:

- "As 27 year residents of the Palos Verdes Peninsula, we strenuously object to ANY further expansion of the Los Angeles International Airport.. the time has come to develop regional airports and for the FAA to admit it has increasingly allowed expansion without any representation by voters."

-Mary Lu and Glenn Swartz
Palos Verdes Estates, CA

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC02613-37

Comment:

Pro Expansion

While the constituent responses to the mailer were overwhelmingly against expansion, there was a group of approximately 300 who did support expanding LAX. There were various reasons for which these respondents supported expansion, but the most commonly cited issues were the positive impact expansion would have on the economy, and the convenience of LAX to the South Bay. Other constituents felt that the problems of LAX were ours, and should not be shifted to other areas in an attempt to alleviate those around this area.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02613-38

Comment:

Economic Concerns

There were quite a few constituents who felt that an expanded LAX would be a positive force for the economy in the South Bay. Many cited a need for the increase in jobs created by an expansion, and some felt that expansion would be good for existing local businesses. The sentiment that LAX is a driving force in the economy of the South Bay area was repeated by several respondents, and many hoped that expansion would boost the area's economy. Some constituents responded that LAX was the "gateway to the Pacific" and is economically successful because of its popularity as a travel hub to and from Asian nations.

- "I'm a small business owner operating from Redondo Beach. I think that the business opportunities that this expansion brings to our community far outweigh the negative short-term impact due to the added construction and traffic. The business that is generated impacts our entire community and it gives our community a much-needed facelift...I know that there are a lot of cities that want the business-let's not give the business and opportunity away. There are solutions to these challenges."

-Stella W. Samples
Redondo Beach, CA

- "We have our good economy because LAX is the gateway to the Pacific. Companies locate here for that reason. We must expand LAX to remain the gateway to the Pacific."

-Alvis Johnson
El Segundo, CA

- "I favor expansion of LAX as it is vital to the economic welfare of the LA area. The people complaining of the noise moved in after LAX was opened and knew of the noise."

-Fredrick Newman
Marina Del Rey, CA

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02613-39**Comment:**

Convenience

For many of the respondents favoring expansion of LAX, convenience was one of their main reasons for supporting growth at LAX. For most constituents, having an international airport so close to home is a very positive thing, and many are willing to endure noise and other problems in exchange for the convenience that LAX offers. Some cited the fact that the South Bay area is growing and expected to expand further to support the expansion of the airport. In order to account for population growth in the area, many felt that LAX needs to be expanded and modernized. Additionally, constituents responding in favor of expansion stated that they would be unhappy and unwilling to make use of regional airports, with LAX so close by. Another issue cited by several respondents is the current state of LAX. Some felt that in order to best serve the area, LAX should be expanded, modernized and improved to better reflect the Los Angeles area.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02613-40**Comment:**

- "[LAX] is convenient to millions of passengers and is well established. It is easy for us to get to LAX by taxi, bus, shuttle, etc"

- Alan Carlan
South Bay resident

- "I probably will not be affected by the LAX Master Plan except to give me a closer, bigger, more modern airport. I do not relish the idea of having to go to Ontario or Palmdale."

- Kathleen Quadrato
Torrance, CA

- "Everyone wants to travel from big hub airports."

- David Talbot
Marina Del Rey, CA

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02613-41**Comment:**

- "LAX's overcrowding and conditions are an embarrassment to LA. I want the world's greatest city to have the greatest airport."

- Robert Miller
Torrance, CA

- "Los Angeles is a major city and must have a major airport. LAX must be expanded if Los Angeles is to stand proud in the eyes of the world. Today LAX is a disgrace for a city the size of Los Angeles."

- Irving Levine
Carson, CA

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02613-42

Comment:

Against a Regional Plan

While many of those who responded in favor of expanding LAX had regional reasons for their positions, there were some who felt that LAX is an entity belonging to the South Bay region, and that its issues should be dealt with in the region. Several respondents were opposed to a regional plan because it meant more traveling time for them to reach the airports. Others, however, felt that the LAX situation was ours alone, and expansion should occur so as not to burden other areas with the problems that come along with a major international airport.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02613-43

Comment:

- "I don't believe we should attempt to solve our noise problems by shifting them to another area."

- Bradley Fox
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02613-44

Comment:

Summary

For many of those responding in favor of expanding LAX, the choice seemed to be simple- for them, expansion is worth the problems it may cause, as long as the airport undergoes what they feel are long overdue improvements. Constituents are proud to have such an airport in their neighborhoods, and some wished to see it improved upon despite other concerns. Constituent Tim Ihle stated a position that seems to be widely held by those in support of an expansion, by stating:

- "I believe the benefits far exceed any negative impacts that may result."

- Tim Ihle
Redondo Beach, CA

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02614 McDaniel, Ramsey None Provided

PC02614-1

Comment:

We live (& are homeowners) in Venice Beach. We would be affected by the LAX Master Plan in:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC02614-2

Comment:

Volume of traffic. Increase traffic on Pacific Ave. (a 2 lane road) of people trying to get around traffic on Lincoln Blvd.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02614-3

Comment:

Noise - We currently can hear the plane take-offs. More planes may push the air passages close to us.

Response:

Comment noted. 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. Also, please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PC02614-4

Comment:

Economic - the above mentioned could decrease the value of our property.

Response:

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

PC02615

Yu, Edwin

None Provided

6/14/2001

PC02615-1

Comment:

I. LAX Master Plan - I have not seen the Master Plan, and I don't see how the Plan can relieve the problem of ground transportation to the airport, let alone the future growth. Further expansion of LAX without accommodating the number of cars commuting to the airport would be an expensive failure in terms of time, money and aggravating the situation. Developing regional airports will certainly be an achievable solution. Metropolitans such as New York, San Francisco and others have demonstrated the success of regional airport system.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 for an analysis of airport area traffic congestion issues. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02615-2

Comment:

Please also consider the idea of regional check-in stations more than twenty miles away. Each bus connecting the airport and the regional check-in stations will replace over thirty cars. I have seen regional check-in stations in Paris and New York more than thirty years ago, and I believe that it will relieve the immediate traffic congestions of present days in LAX.

Response:

An expanded FlyAway service is part of each alternative. This service is similar to the concept of regional check-in stations that the commentor refers to.

PC02616 Boboweiber, None Provided
Fermigad

PC02616-1

Comment:

I am opposed to these loaded questions. Aren't there other impacts that are relevant besides economic? Los Angeles develops (read spreads) like a cancer; I see no reason to 'develop' airports in the same fashion. When a cancerous tumor is centralized in one area, it is much simpler to treat via amputation (local) than it is to treat a cancer that has spread throughout the system. It is a mistake to create more noise, pollution, traffic throughout L.A.* Rather, castrate the burden at its source before it gets more out of hand. Introduce a dialogue of conservation, of a life of realized art so that travel becomes unnecessary, so that consumption that plagues American society is drastically curbed. Local production, local consumption. Strong community bonds. Elimination of alienation from work, each other. This is what will reduce our reliance on LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; 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.

PC02616-2

Comment:

Have you not learned enough from the "Trail of Tears?" Do not displace the indigenous of El Segundo!

Response:

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

PC02617 O'Neal, Elsie None Provided 7/17/2001

PC02617-1

Comment:

I am in favor of LAX Master Plan to some extent.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02617-2

Comment:

I also favor a regional airport at the closed El Toro facility. I oppose any priority given to Palmdale.

Response:

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

PC02617-3

Comment:

On a hot summer day, I doubt that an airplane could take off from Palmdale with full fuel tanks and a full load of passengers.

Response:

Comment noted. Any future development of Palmdale would require analysis of airfield requirements some of which would include analysis of climatic issues.

PC02618

Mellor, Philo

None Provided

PC02618-1

Comment:

I strongly disagree with your opposition to LAX's expansion - you can't stop progress, only screw it up by trying. Example: our old P.E. Red Car Rail System - best in the west - until the politicians tried to "improve it". The most ironic part is that the majority of the people "bitching" are employed by airport related businesses; wait until their job goes to Arizona or Nevada. But then, this type person has "tunnel vision" - "I've got mine - don't change anything," = "Not in my back yard", = "No I didn't vote - couldn't find time".

Believe me! Many people will vote, if their jobs disappear.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02619

Dove-Reitter, Bianca

None Provided

PC02619-1

Comment:

I don't have no comments for LAX Master Plan. I think it's good to expand LAX to avoid air and ground traffic and also cars traffic. Also it is good for tourist to see that we have nice International airport better than the others all over the world!

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02620 Mozeleski, Theodore None Provided

PC02620-1

Comment:

Expand LAX a new airport will destroy natural habitat.

LAX is convenient, I do not want to drive 60 miles to the inland empire for a flight.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02621 Fernandez, Armando None Provided

PC02621-1

Comment:

THE COMPARISON OF LAX AND DENVER DO NOT MAKE ANY SENSE. LAX WAS HERE BEFORE ALL OF US. DENVER WAS BUILT IN THE PAST FEW YEARS IN THE MIDDLE OF NOWHERE. I AM A RESIDENT AS WELL AS A INCOME PROPERTY OWNER AND BUSINESS OWNER IN WESTCHESTER. THERE IS NOTHING WRONG, IN MY OPINION, WITH THE EXPANSION PLANS. MY LIFE IS HERE IN WESTCHESTER. WITHOUT LAX - WE ARE DEAD!

LET IT GROW!

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02622 Nelson, Robert None Provided

PC02622-1

Comment:

EXPANDING LAX IN ITS CURRENT LOCATION (RATHER THAN EXPANDING TO A REGIONAL CONCEPT) MAKES PERFECT SENSE. THE EFFECT FOR MY FAMILY (OF EXPANSION) WILL BE LONG TRIPS TO DISTANT AIRPORTS ON ALREADY CROWDED FREEWAYS - THE MAJOR ONE FOR US WOULD BE THE INFAMOUS '405'. TRAFFIC, NOISE AND POLLUTION IMPACT FOR US WOULD BE NIL. LAX IS IN A LOCATION ALREADY WELL PLANNED FROM AN ACCESS VIEWPOINT AND THE NEARBY COMMUNITIES ARE USED TO ITS PRESENCE/PROBLEMS. I BELIEVE THIS COULD BE YET ANOTHER PROPOSAL TO SPEND EVEN MORE TAXPAYER MONEY IN REGIONAL EXPANSION THAT IS UNWARRANTED (BECAUSE IT WOULD NOT BE UTILIZED EXCEPT BY THOSE NEARBY. (THE EXPANSION EIR, AS YOU KNOW, IS A MONSTER DOCUMENT OF 12,000 PAGES, 10,000 FORCED BY CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL FOLKS - SEE 'AVIATION WEEK' PICTURE. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02623 Ehlenberger, Arthur None Provided

PC02623-1

Comment:

The traffic near the airport, at the airport and parking will only get worse & it is bad enough now. That only affects me when I go to the airport or near it.

Response:

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

PC02623-2

Comment:

Don't know of anyother affect on my life but, since others will, other sites should be used.

Response:

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

PC02624 Moore, Garland None Provided 6/10/2001

PC02624-1

Comment:

I favor a well-planned approach to meeting future LAX passenger growth, I do not favor trying to force Palmdale and/or El Toro to be something they are not and can not ever be: airports that would alleviate passenger growth at LAX.

The result of your approach is that passenger growth at LAX will continue, but ad hoc, after-the-fact, catch-up infrastructure improvements will be required after the added passenger load gridlocks us.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02624-2

Comment:

Noise is not a factor. LAX is among the quietest I've lived near. Quieter than National Airport when I lived 3 miles north of Mt. Vernon. Commercial airplanes will continue to get quieter. Recently I stood on the "Greenbelt" between Valley and Ardmore; motorcycles, regular traffic, and crows made more noise than commercial air traffic out of LAX. Most annoying to me are helicopters and light aircraft flying out of Hawthorne and Torrance. If you want to stop the banner flyers over the beach be my guest.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02624-3

Comment:

Traffic will be the biggest impact. Especially if we block the improvements the Master Plan offers. Ever drive the Van Wyck expressway between JFK and La Guardia? The Port of NY has for years tried to force more air traffic to JFK, but customers want La Guardia. So vehicle traffic crawls. Nothing I've seen in LA matches that.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02624-4

Comment:

One reason I like Manhattan Beach is proximity to LAX. I have no desire to drive to El Toro or Palmdale. (Especially not Palmdale where the combo of temperature and altitude conspire to make aircraft engine-out operation quite interesting. While an instructor pilot in the Air Force, I used to take my students there to demo the effects.) (No, I'm not an airline pilot. Never was.)

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02624-5

Comment:

If the legislation or court cases denying LAX expansion would require that all opponents drive to your touted "regional" airport, the real opposition might mute.

I favor planned expansion of LAX for a few other reasons, but this is too long already, I know, as a Democrat, that you must respond to the majority. Just wanted you to know that it's not a 100% majority.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02624-6

Comment:

P.S. Your mailer picked Denver as a comparison. I fly into there at least once a month. Poor choice -- very poor--- for a comparison!

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02625

Grandpre, J.

None Provided

PC02625-1

Comment:

Can you explain why it is impossible to extend the airport through the dunes out part way onto the ocean? It would stop noise and be safer. Are we afraid of hurting a few moths? I have never heard this discussed. This isn't Denver that has huge open areas around it!

Response:

Section 4.11, Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna, of the Draft EIS/EIR discussed the status of and impacts to the El Segundo Blue butterfly. This potential alternative was considered but rejected as not feasible as discussed in Section 3.1.3.1 of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02626 Sword, M.D., Randall None Provided

PC02626-1

Comment:

We need to expand LAX now & not be short sighted just to get re-elected again. Forget regional plans!

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02627 Kiernan, Jeffrey None Provided

PC02627-1

Comment:

I support limited expansion of LAX. Specifically, Alternative "A" which has a limited increase in the number of residences subjected to airport noise (this according to the draft EIR). I feel as though LAX is already too crowded. The problems I see are the increased taxi time that I spend when I travel. Also, it is not realistic to expand the other regional airports to relieve the increase in passengers that Los Angeles can expect.

Response:

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

PC02628 Frazer, Sam None Provided

PC02628-1

Comment:

Yes Expand LAX as much as possible. A regional approach is unworkable! I fly frequently in my job. Nothing is more of a pain than airports that are spread out all over the place. How the hell do you get from one airport to another when you need to connect? Answer: You don't. And little local airports are always more expensive w/ less flights to choose from. I promise the spread out regional approach will be hated by all who have to use it. I say make LAX as big as possible!! One stop shopping is always easier. Noise? Who are you kidding? I live in Redondo Beach and I never hear airplanes! LAX traffic takes off over the water! And I've flown into and out of Denver airport. I hate Denver Airport and so does everybody in Denver. The Airport is in the middle of nowhere. Everybody -- I do mean Everybody hates Denver Airport. It is a mega million dollar of what not to do!! So for once do the smart thing. Put the \$ into LAX!! Make it bigger more efficient better parking freeway access one stop shopping. Please don't make us have to driver all over hell to make airplane connections!!

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC02629 Kendall, Dr. E. G. None Provided

PC02629-1

Comment:

Senior Cit., Regist Democrat, 36th District.
Residence: El Segundo adjacent to South runways LAX
Ignorant of Details of Master Plan e.g.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC02629-2

Comment:

Systems Engineering Study & Plan

Response:

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

PC02629-3

Comment:

Statistical Risk Analysis (Murphy's Law)
South runways now considered dangerous relative to near collisions & potential strays.

Response:

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

PC02629-4

Comment:

Sound frequencies equally of concern as decibel level.

Response:

Comment noted. There are no federal or state requirements to monitor, track, or mitigate sound frequencies. Please see Response to Comment SPC00274-41 regarding low frequency noise. Please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and the related appendices Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report; Appendix S-C-1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report; Technical Report 1, Land Use Technical Report; and Appendix S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, for more information on noise impacts. Additionally, please see Topical Response TR-N-6, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.2 regarding the relationship between air traffic and noise.

PC02629-5

Comment:

Ground auto traffic: Major impact on feeder freeways (405, 105, 91) Sepulveda, Imperial, Century Blvds etc. These routes overworked now. What is in Plan for Re-Engineering; congestion could be unbelievable.

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Regarding existing traffic concerns surrounding LAX, percent contribution of airport traffic in the adjacent communities, and how traffic conditions around the airport would change with implementation of the Master Plan Alternatives, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4. Regarding traffic measures to minimize neighborhood impacts, please see Topical Response TR-ST-6.

PC02629-6

Comment:

A "time-scaled" expansion would seem warranted to better define the choke points in the execution of the plan.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02629-7

Comment:

A limiting factor could be something seemingly benign such as the inability of A/C to taxi within the runways to maintain a flight schedule.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02629-8

Comment:

Would be most happy to assist in a review of any Consulting Engineering firm's preparation & analysis of a Master Plan.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02630

Reza, Ali

None Provided

PC02630-1

Comment:

I support additional growth @ LAX. I DO NOT support additional growth @ regional airports. Pls discontinue yr efforts against LAX growth.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC02631 Lotrick, Barbara None Provided

PC02631-1

Comment:

I live in So. Torrance so whatever happens at LAX would not impact me, however, I feel that the airport was there long long ago before any of the people living there were there & I cannot have any sympathy for all the people complaining all the time.

LAX definately needs to be expanded & I am all for it. It would take many more traveling hours if it was in Palmdale or in Orange County. That means more people on our crowded freeways.

Response:

Comment noted.

**PC02632 French, M.D.,
William None Provided**

PC02632-1

Comment:

1. Like Denver, if Palmdale were the only airport, everyone would need to drive there. But today, Denver is much too far from the people of Denver and there is poor public transportation (taxi fare excessive).

Response:

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

PC02632-2

Comment:

2. LAX can be made more efficient & effective. Why fight that for currently other 'pie in the sky' plans? Surely, LAX can expand to some extent - let that happen - Now! e.g. Phase I

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02632-3

Comment:

3. Where and what is your plan? What are the details that "everyone" agrees on? Our political (politician) plans to serve mass transportation in LAC, etc have done a very poor job in the past. Why expect anything different?

Response:

The commentor is referring to information provided on a form prepared by Congresswoman Jane Harman's office. This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. However, it should be noted that subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been added to 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. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive description and analysis of Alternative D and was circulated for public review and comment.

PC02633 Codman, Murray None Provided

PC02633-1

Comment:

LAX is convenient to the majority of people. Land is available for xpansion. Planes take off over the ocean limiting the noise. I'm all for the xpansion. Addaquate hotels at airport

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02634 Chung Lin, Wen None Provided

PC02634-1

Comment:

I THINK WE WILL NOT BE AFFECTED BY TRAFFIC, NOISE AND POLLUTION RESULTING FROM THE AIRPORT, BECAUSE TRAFFIC IS ALREADY HEAVY IN RUSH HOURS, NOISE AND POLLUTION WILL BE RESPONSIBILITY OF EPA TO CONTROL IT, WHICH IS BEYOND OUR HANDS. FOR THE BUSINESS VIEW, I LIKE LAX EXPENSION PLAN.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02635 Moss, Douglas None Provided

PC02635-1

Comment:

Personally, I think the expanded LAX plan is the best. It reduces the redundancies and provides for a modern facility - with mass transit options - for the people of L.A. & surrounding communities.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02636 Tersigni, J. None Provided

PC02636-1

Comment:

SEND AS MUCH TRAFFIC TO LAX AS POSSIBLE. WE NEED THE JOBS.

SEE WHAT YOU CAN DO TO GET THE GREEN LINE INTO THE AIRPORT.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC02637 Waters, Linda None Provided

PC02637-1

Comment:

WE NEED TO EXPAND LAX TO IMPROVE THE USAGE OF THIS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02637-2

Comment:

WE ALSO NEED TO CREATE ANOTHER MAJOR AIRPORT IN ORANGE COUNTY. OTHER AIRPORTS IN OUTLAYING AREAS SHOULD BE DEVELOPED TO LOCAL AND USA TRAVEL AND CARGO SHIPMENTS.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No 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-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand.

PC02638 Wickwire, Robert None Provided

PC02638-1

Comment:

1. LAX NEEDS TO BE EXPANDED. WE DO NOT MIND ANY INCONVENIENCE IF AIR TRAVEL DELAYS ARE IMPROVED FROM/TO LAX. LAX IS OUR MAJOR TRAVEL HUB AND WE TRAVEL FREQUENTLY. WE LIVE ONLY 4 MILES FROM AIRPORT. ECONOMIC IMPACT ON SOUTH BAY COMMUNITY FOR LAX IS ENORMOUS AND AIR TRAVEL FOR LAX NEEDS TO BE IMPROVED WITH EXPANSIONS AND WHATEVER IT TAKES.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02638-2

Comment:

ALSO RECOMMEND THAT ONTARIO AIRPORT BE MADE A PRIMARY HUB TO LAX WITH HIGH SPEED TRANSPORTATION (ERD) BETWEEN THE TWO. FORGET PALMDALE FOR ANOTHER 15 YRS.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the 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.

PC02639 Bishop, Barbara None Provided

PC02639-1

Comment:

I live in Marina del Rey - 10 minutes from LAX. I hope never to have to travel to outlying areas for flights. I do believe if other areas are developed - a very Rapid transit system should be available. Ex. Itrail etc. I generally think expansion of LAX is OK.

Response:

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

PC02640 Capp, Angela None Provided

PC02640-1

Comment:

We live at Venice and Lincoln: 7 min driving from airport. Regional airports is only a good idea if we can still enjoy all our flights at LAX. We would not be happy driving anywhere other than LAX to catch a plane. That is our only concern.

Response:

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

PC02641 Freeman, Don & None Provided 6/10/2001
Suzanne

PC02641-1

Comment:

In regards to the proposed 'expansion of LAX,' we in the South Bay badly need the improvements proposed by this plan. Expanding the roadways and transit system directly into the airport would greatly reduce the congestion on Sepulveda & other nearby boulevards. Your attempts to stop the completion of these thoroughfares in & out of the airport is a disservice to those of us who live near it & it will not prevent other expansions of LAX which appears to be your reason. Additionally, the airport is very handy to the area, unlike Denver (your example) where you think you are driving clear to the Mississippi River before you get there. I do not want a half day's trip to Palmdale before getting to the airport.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02641-2

Comment:

As far as noise pollution, we live quite close to LAX and rarely hear airliner noise. This is because take off (when noise is produced) is out over the ocean.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, with supporting technical data and analyses in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, and Appendix S-C, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02642 Chambers, Richard None Provided

PC02642-1

Comment:

I support both the LAX Master Plan and a regional airport plan. We will need both in the coming years.

I travel (as does my family) often and we need better service at LAX. For me time is a priority.

The noise has no impact on me.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02642-2

Comment:

Pollution can be mitigated by using modern aircraft.

Response:

Aircraft types are one of many components at an airport that contribute to air pollution. Please see Response to Comment PC02585-4 regarding the authority to regulate aircraft operations.

PC02643 Samples, Stella None Provided 6/8/2001

PC02643-1

Comment:

First of all, I'm a small woman owned business operating from Redondo Beach. I think that the business opportunities that this expansion bring to our community far outweigh the negative short term impact due to the added construction and traffic. The business that is generated impacts our entire community and it gives our community a much-needed facelift.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02643-2

Comment:

Secondly, I must applaud LAWA for their outreach efforts,, unfortunately quite a few residents do not feel that it is their responsibility to become involved or informed. LAWA has been very proactive in setting up forums for the public to be involved.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02643-3

Comment:

Third, what I as a constituent would like to see is better traffic and noise controls implemented and perhaps a share of the tax revenue generate by the tariffs imposed on using LAX. We have just begun to understand the requirements for developing an infrastructure plan that will allow for continued non-

3. Comments and Responses

invasive growth and be able to accommodate the neighboring communities need for controls on the noise and traffic impact from this expansion.

Response:

There are strict rules as to how airport tax revenue can be utilized, which goes beyond the scope of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Nonetheless, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Regarding existing traffic concerns surrounding LAX, percent contribution of airport traffic in the adjacent communities, and how traffic conditions around the airport would change with implementation of the Master Plan Alternatives, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4. Regarding traffic measures to minimize neighborhood impacts, please see Topical Response TR-ST-6. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting data and analyses provided in Appendix D.

PC02643-4

Comment:

I know that there are a lot of cities that want the business let's not give the business and opportunity away. There are solutions to these challenges. I know a lot of people are frustrated due to the traffic, this is a short-term problem -they just don't have the patience to envision what can be.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02644 Howey, James None Provided

PC02644-1

Comment:

CONGRESSWOMAN HARMAN, I BELIEVE THAT AN EXPANSION FOR THE LAX AIRPORT IS A GREAT IDEA. IT SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE TWENTY TO THIRTY YEARS AGO. THE AIRPORT WAS HERE LONG BEFORE MOST OF THE PEOPLE WERE HERE. IF THEY DIDN'T WANT TO BE NEAR AN AIRPORT THEY DIDN'T HAVE TO BUY OR RENT THAT CLOSE TO AN AIRPORT. WHEN THEY WERE LOOKING TO RENT OR BUY, I'M SURE THEY WERE IN THE AREA LONG ENOUGH TO BE AWARE OF AIRPLANES FLYING OVER OR NEAR WHERE THEY WERE LOOKING. LAX COULD EXPAND AND THE OTHER AIRPORTS IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA COULD ALSO EXPAND, BUT WE STILL NEED THE EXPANSION FOR GROWTH IN ALL AREAS BECAUSE OF THE POPULATION GROWTH.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02645 Willock, Donald None Provided

PC02645-1

Comment:

I would like to see the expansion of LAX. The business is here so let's take care of it here.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02645-2

Comment:

We should have rails to the airport to handle a large part of the traffic.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

This comment is in favor of expanding rail service to LAX Airport to remove traffic from the roadways to/from the airport. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan for more information.

PC02646 Johnson, Alvis None Provided

PC02646-1

Comment:

We have our good economy because LAX is the gateway to the Pacific. Companies locate here for that reason. We must EXPAND LAX to remain the Gateway to the Pacific.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02646-2

Comment:

Our Main Street company are suffering because most are afraid to drive on Main - I am. Give us back our safe Main Street.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02647 Black, M.D., Joseph None Provided

PC02647-1

Comment:

I want LAX to expand where it is! It drives the economy of the South Bay.

Your attitude is the same thinking as the environmentalists who refused to build power plants for years.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02648 Carlan, Alan None Provided

PC02648-1

Comment:

I think that expansion of LAX is the way to go. It is convenient to millions of passengers and is well established. It is easy for us to get to LAX by taxi, bus, shuttle, etc.

Industry in the south bay depends on LAX. It creates many jobs and enriches our communities. With improved aircraft, pollution will be reduced.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02649 Miller, Robert None Provided

PC02649-1

Comment:

It is a little tough to oppose something not described. I use LAX a lot in my travels. If the airport I use becomes better - great! But, without knowing what the expansion is all about - how can I endorse or oppose it? Luckily, I found [HTTP://www.laxmasterplan.org](http://www.laxmasterplan.org). Now I endorse the expansion. LAX's overcrowding and condition is an embarrassment to LA - I want the world's greatest city to have the greatest airport! (Get more money, and expand the all!!!)

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02650 Levine, Irving None Provided

PC02650-1

Comment:

Los Angeles is a major city and we must have a major airport. LAX must be expanded if Los Angeles is to stand proud in the eyes of the world. Today LAX is a disgrace for a city the size of Los Angeles.

Regional airports are a necessity, but will not and cannot be the substitute for a new LAX. I urge you to support an expanded and improved LAX.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02651 Quadrato, Kathleen None Provided

PC02651-1

Comment:

I probably will not be affected by the LAX Master Plan except to give me a closer, bigger, more modern airport. I do not relish the idea of having to go to Ontario or Palmdale.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02652 Talbot, David None Provided

PC02652-1

Comment:

EXPANDING LAX IS A GOOD PRACTICAL PLAN.

PLACES LIKE PALMDALE ARE UNREALISTIC. EVERYONE WANTS TO TRAVEL FROM BIG HUB AIRPORTS. PLEASE SUPPORT YOUR BUSINESS AND FREQUENTLY TRAVELLING CONSTITUENTS.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02653 Wollner, Jr., Joseph None Provided 6/8/2001

PC02653-1

Comment:

At the risk of being in the minority, I feel compelled to indicate that I support the proposed expansion of LAX as currently defined. LAX must be further modernized to support growing area needs. The proposal put forth by the LAX staff should be approved if we are to be prepared for the days ahead.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02654 Newman, Frederick None Provided 6/9/2001

PC02654-1

Comment:

I favor expansion of LAX as vital to the economic welfare of the LA area - The people complaining of the noise, moved in after LAX was opened & knew of the noise etc. They are just looking for monetary compensation - (unreasonably)! Without train or other decent connections, alternate airports would be too time consuming etc.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02655 Rigney, Stanley None Provided

PC02655-1

Comment:

How great it is to have LAX so handy to the South Bay. You have again identified with a non issue that will be resolved by market forces. When Palmdale Ontario ect can support more traffic it will happen.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02656 Overstreet, James F. None Provided 6/8/2001

PC02656-1

Comment:

THE ERRONEOUS COMPARISON WITH DENVER IS APPLES & ORANGES. WHILE I UNDERSTAND THE PC OF CATERING TO YOUR CONSTITUENTS, THE ONLY PRACTICAL SOLUTION IS TO EXPAND LAX, AS I AM SURE YOU KNOW. THE SMOKE ABOUT EXPANDING TO PALMDALE HAS BEEN GOING ON FOR 30 YEARS AND STILL JUST TALK, BECAUSE IT IS JUST NOT PRACTICABLE OR IN THE LONG RUN COST EFFECTIVE. YOUR PANDERING & DELAYING WILL ONLY MAKE THAT \$12 BILLION ESTIMATE GO HIGHER AND THAT'S MY OPINION.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02657 Magers, Keith None Provided

PC02657-1

Comment:

I HAVE SUPPORTED JANE HARMON FOR A NUMBER OF YEARS, BUT I TOTALLY DISAGREE WITH HER ON THIS ISSUE. I HATE TO SEE HER GIVE IN TO A VERY VOCAL GROUP REPRESENTING A SELECT, SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP OF HOMEOWNERS. THEY KNEW THEY WERE NEAR AN AIRPORT WHEN THEY BOUGHT THEIR HOMES, WHICH IS PROBABLY WHY THEY PURCHASED THEIR HOMES AT A DISCOUNT. WOULD THESE NIMBYS PROMISE NEVER TO USE LAX EVER AGAIN. I DON'T THINK SO!

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02658 Wilmot, Ingrid None Provided

PC02658-1

Comment:

I believe that LAX definitely needs improvement. If that means expansion - so be it.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02658-2

Comment:

Top priority is public transportation to the airport to alleviate congestion. Also, a separate approach for Super Shuttle type vehicles, would help.

Response:

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

PC02659 Caprio, Carl None Provided

PC02659-1

Comment:

Expansion is definitely necessary regardless of traffic, noise and air pollution. The major problem will be transportation, access and egress in a timely manner. Science will eventually solve the other problems with a little pressure from government.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02660 Ihle, Tim None Provided

PC02660-1

Comment:

I whole-heartedly support the expansion/modernization of LAX. I believe the benefits far exceed any negative impacts that may result. I have lived in the South Bay for six years and I hardly ever see or hear any large passenger aircraft flying overhead. Anyone driving on L.A.'s freeways see the need to improve L.A.'s transportation infrastructure now. I do not want to see the gridlock that occurs daily on the freeways also occur at LAX. Especially since we have the opportunity to mitigate the gridlock before it occurs.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02661 Fox, Bradley None Provided

PC02661-1

Comment:

There is no noise problem in my neighborhood in R.P.V. My most serious problem is the traffic congestion (auto) & parking.

Response:

Issues related to traffic and parking were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02661-2

Comment:

I don't believe we should attempt to solve our noise problem by shifting it to another area by supporting the building of a new airport at El Toro. This will inflict noise pollution & property value loss on our neighbors to the south.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02662 Buch, James None Provided

PC02662-1

Comment:

PLEASE JANE - DON'T PLAY WITH US, WE BOTH KNOW THAT THIS IS NOT AN "EITHER-OR" CHOICE. WE WILL NEED BOTH "LAX" EXPANSION AND MORE REGIONAL AIRPORTS. YES I KNOW - ANTI-LAX EXPANSION GETS VOTES BUT THE EXPANDING DEMAND FOR AIR TRAVEL WILL DETERMINE THE FUTURE. IT IS TIME FOR A HIGH SPEED RAIL SYSTEM FROM UNION STATION DOWNTOWN DIRECT TO PALMDALE AIRPORT THROUGH THE SAN GABRIEL MOUNTAINS. (20 MINUTES). THEN THE PALMDALE AIRPORT CAN BE DEVELOPED. WITHOUT THIS FORESIGHT WE WILL BE IN THE SAME SITUATION AS WE ARE NOW WITH THE ELECTRIC MESS.

3. Comments and Responses

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.

PC02663 Galanter, Ruth City of Los Angeles 11/9/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00106; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00106.

PC02664 Bonin, Mike None Provided 11/8/2001

PC02664-1

Comment:

The Master Plan proposal for expansion of Los Angeles International Airport is a profoundly and inherently flawed document that never should have been brought forward for approval. While it promises expansion of regional airport capacity, its true impact would be to devastate surrounding communities, generate horrendous environmental consequences, and perpetuate a needless chokehold in regional transportation.

The result of years of labor and millions of dollars, the Draft Environmental Impact Report is insulting. It practically ignores the potential for a regional plan for airport expansion that would share the many burdens of air transit throughout Southern California.

Crafting sound and responsible public policy is about making choices. Yet the choices presented by the DEIR are flawed because they answer the wrong question. LAWA does not ask: "How does Southern California handle the anticipated growth in air traffic in the region?" Instead, LAWA asks the far more restrictive question: "How does LAX handle the anticipated growth in air traffic in the region?"

The answer is predictable. The choices are narrow. The consequences are dire.

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.

PC02664-2

Comment:

DEVASTATION OF THE SURROUNDING COMMUNITY

As proposed in the DEIR, the expansion of Los Angeles International Airport would continue a generations-old assault on the communities of Westchester and Playa del Rey, as well as El Segundo, Inglewood and Lennox. Over the past decades, large swaths of Westchester and Playa del Rey have been lost to airport expansion. With proposed runway extensions, a new ring road and other features, large stretches of a residential community and a large chunk of the Westchester business community would be displaced. This is clearly unacceptable.

In addition to lost homes and businesses, remaining elements of the community would be constantly under siege by dramatic spikes in noise and traffic congestion. Talk in the DEIR of mitigations means little to Westchester and Playa del Rey. Commitments of traffic mitigations and pledges of noise reductions from LAWA ring hollow to those with lengthy lists and accurate memories of unkept or broken promises.

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

3. Comments and Responses

Section 4.2, Land Use and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-121 regarding historical airport activities, and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. As indicated in TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not include any acquisition within the Westchester business district or any 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. Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or the ring road.

PC02664-3

Comment:

In the sprawling metropolis that is Los Angeles, Westchester and Playa del Rey are small towns, true neighborhoods, with "mom and pop" stores, weekend barbecues, Little League games, Elks and Rotarians. For generations, residents have tried to coexist peacefully with the airport. With each passing year, with increased noise, with more planes and passengers, that relationship has suffered. This expansion plan would surely kill that relationship. More significantly, it threatens - perhaps promises - to kill the spirit and small-town quality that makes Westchester and Playa del Rey special.

Response:

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

PC02664-4

Comment:

THE TRANSPORTATION CHOKEHOLD

By concentrating airport expansion predominantly at LAX, the DEIR would continue, exacerbate and stimulate a phenomena that has been surely and rapidly undermining the quality of life in Los Angeles: congestion.

Millions of additional passengers at LAX each year means considerably more traffic - regardless of mitigations that might tinker at the margins of the problem. The 405 Freeway, already a traffic nightmare for most commuters, will grow ever worse. As a result, frustrated motorists will seek speedier routes on the few remaining north-south thoroughfares: Lincoln and Sepulveda. As those roads grow more congested, a domino effect takes hold, forcing drivers onto residential streets throughout the Westside: Motor Avenue, Centinela Avenue, Inglewood Avenue, and Walgrove Avenue.

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Regarding existing traffic concerns surrounding LAX, percent contribution of airport traffic in the adjacent communities, and how traffic conditions around the airport would change with implementation of the Master Plan Alternatives, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4. Regarding traffic measures to minimize neighborhood impacts, please see Topical Response TR-ST-6.

PC02664-5

Comment:

The impacts of increased traffic throughout residential communities are myriad and virtually impossible to measure. How does one mitigate the impacts of a parent who loses precious time with a growing child because of a two-hour commute home from work? How does one mitigate the impacts of a child unable to play Frisbee or catch in the street because his or her road has been clogged with traffic?

How does one mitigate the peace and quiet lost to honking horns, automobile accidents, increased levels of frustration?

Clearly, the impacts of LAX expansion are far greater than those contemplated by the DEIR.

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, 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.

PC02664-6

Comment:

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

The environmental impacts from the DEIR are profoundly frightening. The proposed plan does not adequately address the significant threat to air quality in the Los Angeles area.

Air pollution would result from two sources: increased air traffic and increased automobile traffic. The proposed plan underestimates both.

Air traffic: LAWA's projections assume LAX will handle 98 million passengers annually. But there is no way for LAX to cap that figure or limit the number of flights. Air traffic could - and likely will - exceed the projected number of passengers and flights. As a result, there will be more delayed flights, more planes idling on the ground or circling the skies waiting for landing clearance. Those air pollution impacts are not considered.

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. 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.

PC02664-7

Comment:

Automobile traffic: The LAWA proposal does not mitigate pollution; it merely redistributes it within the same area through new or expanded roadways. That is not a solution; it is barely a magician's cheap card trick.

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. The level of significance following mitigation of these impacts was addressed in Section 4.6.9 of each document.

PC02664-8

Comment:

The question of environmental justice gets little more than lip service from the DEIR. The worst impacts from LAX fall disproportionately on those communities under the landing pattern: South Los Angeles, Inglewood, and Lennox - communities with predominantly African-American or Latino populations.

3. Comments and Responses

Increasing capacity and operations at LAX will unavoidably exacerbate this situation. The only way to approximate environmental justice is to distribute the burdens more equitably across the region.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed environmental justice in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

Please 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.

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.

PC02664-9

Comment:

Moreover, the potential impact of human health in these communities from the increased pollution gets short shrift in the LAWA proposal. The DEIR fails to comment specifically on the impacts to seniors and young children - who make up larger than average percentages of the population in the areas near LAX. LAWA should be more vigilant, not less, when it comes to our most vulnerable residents.

Response:

Some people may be more sensitive than the majority of the population to the effects of toxic air pollutants. These people are considered sensitive receptors, and may include children or the elderly. Sensitive receptors were accounted for through the use of conservative toxicity criteria designed to protect the most sensitive individuals in the population. In addition, conservative exposure assumptions were used to evaluate potential exposure. For example, the exposed population was assumed to be located at the point of maximum contaminant concentrations and to have continuous inhalation exposure for 24 hours per day for the entire exposure period. Estimated health risk and hazards presented in the health risk assessment are considered the worst possible due to the conservative exposure and toxicity criteria used in the evaluation.

Cancer risks and chronic non-cancer hazards in the Draft EIS/EIR were presented graphically 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 is provided in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR about risks and hazards for individual communities. Risk and hazard isopleths based on residential exposure are presented on maps that identify community boundaries. Please refer to Section 4.24.1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 4.1.3 of Technical Report S-9a, Supplemental Human Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, for additional details and results of the evaluation.

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.

PC02664-10

Comment:

A further concern is the threat to the several federally protected endangered species in the El Segundo Dunes Preserve. Development of a Ring Road and increased use of LAX's Westside would threaten many of the 30 species, which would have to be relocated - a risky and a likely unsuccessful proposition.

Response:

As stated in Section 4.11, Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna, of the Draft EIS/EIR, only one listed species, the federally endangered El Segundo Blue butterfly, occupies the Los Angeles/El Segundo Dunes. Based on results of habitat restoration activities conducted by LAWA within the Los Angeles/El Segundo Dunes, occupation of restored habitat was observed to occur within 1 year of restoration efforts. Any impacts to the El Segundo Blue butterfly would be mitigated to a level less than significant through implementation of habitat restoration 3 years prior to the proposed impact. With regard to the latter part of the comment, the proposed ring road in Alternatives A, B, and C would not be constructed in the El Segundo Blue Butterfly Habitat Restoration Area (HRA). Alternative D does not propose the ring road, however, Alternative D does include conversion of a small portion of habitat within the HRA to accommodate relocation of existing navigational aids for Runways 6R/24L and 6L/24R. FAA has determined that the proposed Alternative D would not have an adverse effect on the El Segundo blue butterfly. Appendix S-H, Updated Biological Assessment Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provides additional information on the El Segundo blue butterfly.

PC02664-11

Comment:

JOBS

An argument in favor of LAX expansion has been that it will generate jobs, particularly construction jobs. That is a most worthy goal. But like most else in the fight over airport expansion, the myopic focus on LAX alone obscures greater opportunities -in this case for more jobs.

Granted, expansion of LAX will mean more jobs. But it seems logical that expansion of several regional airports -- less constrained by geography or nearby residential communities - would mean more and larger projects -and therefore even more jobs. Moreover, since the population of Southern California is growing at faster rates in outlying areas than in the communities near LAX, the jobs created would be closer to the homes of working people.

Response:

The Regional Aviation Plan adopted by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and published as part of its 2001 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) addresses the need for a decentralized regional commercial airport system. The Regional Aviation Plan strives to constrain growth at airports located in built-out urban environments, such as LAX, and to focus growth at former military and other underutilized airports outside of the region's urban core. As noted in the comment above, increased air service at peripheral facilities would be consistent with the distribution of projected population growth forecasts and could stimulate economic growth and development in those areas. While the Master Plan acknowledges that other airports throughout the region are expected to serve an increasing share of regional air travel demands, Alternatives A, B, and C would assume more growth at LAX than is forecasted in SCAG's adopted Regional Aviation Plan. However, 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. Designed in part to address the need for a decentralized regional commercial airport system, Alternative D is generally consistent with SCAG's forecast for LAX in the Regional Aviation Plan. The net reductions in employment that would result from implementation of Alternative D would not be of consequence to the extent that development occurs at other regional airports. Please see Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for further discussion.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02664-12

Comment:

REGIONAL SOLUTIONS

LAWA insists repeatedly that it is without power to influence the decisions of the airline industry. LAWA claims it can no more create regional air transportation than human beings can make the sky open up and rain. The experience of other cities and other airport agencies tells us otherwise.

My family lives in Massachusetts, an hour outside of Boston. Ten years ago, a holiday visit meant an expensive flight to Logan International Airport, a long commute in heavy traffic for my family, and a fierce battle for parking. Today, after an aggressive marketing campaign by Massport and a commitment to regional airport expansion by local officials, easier, quicker - and far cheaper options - are available at any number of outlying airports. Hartford, Providence, Manchester are all much further away, but cheaper destinations and easier to access by car.

LAWA has even greater opportunities to develop, market and build for regional expansion. Palmdale and Ontario, owned by LAWA, are merely two of the options. The region has 12 airports available for commercial use. Many would welcome the opportunity to develop passenger and cargo service and absorb their fair share of the 157 million annual passengers expected to flood Southern California skies by 2015. Many have strong community support in part because buffer zones help keep airport impacts a safe distance from residential areas.

Nowhere in this proposal can I find evidence that LAWA gave serious or thorough consideration to a truly regional plan for airport expansion.

Response:

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

PC02664-13

Comment:

SECURITY

This DEIR is by-product of a world and a way of thinking about air travel that no longer exists. The tragic events of September 11, 2001 require an entirely new plan that makes as its chief concerns security and safety.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00051-93, PC02226-3, and PC02131-5.

PC02665 **Reynolds, Joel** **Natural Resources Defense Council** **11/8/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02585; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC02585.

PC02666 **No Author Identified, None Provided**

PC02666-1

Comment:

After attending and speaking briefly at a sparsely-attended LAX expansion hearing at San Pedro earlier tonight (I'm gonna guess about 30 people showed up total), I had the pleasure of talking at length with Jim Ritchie, who is the deputy executive director of LAWA (LA World Airports).

After hearing my little 3-minute input, Mr. Ritchie jokingly told me after the hearing that I could have a "plant" having attended the recent transportation meetings conducted between LAWA and the MTA. In other words, our goals are quite similar with respect to the Green Line, and certainly Mr. Ritchie held a great deal of respect and sympathy for our efforts to revive rail as a way to improve Southern California living. Green Line in the future.

Response:

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

PC02666-2

Comment:

Although Mr. Ritchie asked me not to elaborate on any specific details (because they are still a work in progress and cannot be confirmed yet), I got the idea that those of us in Friends of the Green Line will appreciate the compromise, security-minded LAX modernization plan supported by Mayor Hahn.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02666-3

Comment:

To summarize:

1)Any people mover plans on the part of LAWA to connect the Green Line to the LAX terminals would be like a connecting rail line and NOT a busway. Furthermore, it would NOT be mutually exclusive from any long-term plans to connect the Green Line with any future Crenshaw Line.

Response:

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

PC02666-4

Comment:

2)And speaking of the Crenshaw Line, both Mr. Ritchie and a Robert Gilbert (Deputy Program Manager of URS, which I guess is affiliated with the LAX expansion/modernization plans) mentioned that the MTA and LAWA were both excited at the prospect of the heavy rail/freight line MTA-owned right-of-way to connect with the Blue

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02666-5

Comment:

3)Mr. Ritchie and I agreed that it was important to distinguish between short-term solutions (which the voting, taxpaying public wants NOW) and the longer-term, more expensive and legally-difficult solutions of connecting light rail to LAX. Since the latter might take 20 years or more to fund and build, it was critical to focus on short-term solutions that would provide immediate relief but which would NOT preclude future MTA rail connections.

4)Distant parking/passenger and luggage check-in using the Green Line is NOT fantasy, but already being actively considered by LAWA-who is trying to emulate the successful and popular Valley Flyaway Shuttle program. I emphasized to Mr. Ritchie that a "win-win" scenario of LAWA constructing parking structures along the Green Line to enhance both Green Line ridership and LAX access was one that offered LAWA a deserved o

Response:

This comment is in favor of expanding parking lots along the Metro Green Line for use by trip makers to LAX. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan for more information.

PC02667

**Alpern, M.D.,
Kenneth**

None Provided

PC02667-1

Comment:

As promised to Mr. Ritchie of LAWA and Airport Commissioner Mahala Walter, I am forwarding a summary of my statements at the San Pedro LAX Expansion Hearing last night. Although opinions abound as to what the future of LAX should be, I feel a greater emphasis of simultaneously improving our local infrastructure to enhance access to LAX and decrease freeway congestion requires more attention.

I am forwarding a copy of this E-mail to MTA and local city governments, in that I sincerely hope they will cooperate more in the future to address one of Southern California's greatest problems: congestion and the lack of mass transit to mitigate this congestion.

We all wear many hats in addressing the different issues in our jobs and lives (I wear a few of my own!), and I feel this issue is too critical to ignore.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC02667-2

Comment:

To LAWA and the Los Angeles City Council:

1)To improve LAX security and our local economy, we must update/improve/modernize LAX, especially with respect to access.

2)Both Mayor Hahn and the MTA have committed to connecting LAX with the Green Line, in particular via an Inglewood intermodal Transportation Center from which a people-mover would connect to LAX airport terminals.

3. Comments and Responses

3)A direct LAX-to-downtown rail line, particularly in the form of the proposed Crenshaw-Prairie light rail line (which enjoys overwhelming support by the business community and the government of the City of Inglewood), would be extremely helpful both for the local economy and for LAX access.

4)Connecting LAX to Orange County, and potentially Ontario airport, by linking the Green Line to the Norwalk Transit Center, would enhance a truly regional approach to Southern California air travel.

5)LAWA should assist in constructing distant parking structures and passenger/baggage check-in in lots along the Green Line, Blue Line and Red Line should LAX be connected to our growing mass transit system--and would therefore deserve to profit financially by operating these parking lots.

6)Our elected local, state and federal representatives should lobby to garner citizen support and state/federal funding to expedite the expansion of the Green Line to LAX and the Norwalk Transit Center. Such connections between LAX and both Los Angeles and Orange Counties are years, if not decades overdue.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02668

Folan, Gail

None Provided

11/5/2001

PC02668-1

Comment:

We are writing to voice our strong opposition to the expansion plans proposed for Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) and the EIR/EIS prepared in connection therewith. Any proposed expansion or addition of runways beyond the existing airport perimeter will be seriously detrimental to all of the surrounding communities, and the additional passenger and flight traffic created thereby would adversely impact both adjacent and remote communities.

Response:

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

PC02668-2

Comment:

We are longtime residents of the Westchester community, adjacent to LAX. We enjoy living in an environment that still maintains a "small-town" feel despite the surroundings of a sprawling metropolis. Our two young children attend school in the community and we are active participants in local YMCA, church, park, AYSO and numerous other activities that bring our community together. Part of what makes this community so special is the large number of families and others of all ages who are willing to patronize local businesses in our revitalized business district, as well as live and play in the neighborhood without great fear for personal safety.

An increase in passenger and airline traffic at LAX, and/or the expansion, in any manner whatsoever, of LAX facilities beyond the existing airport boundaries (we do not, for example, support inclusion of any Manchester square property), would severely and detrimentally impact our community by bringing added noise, air and ground commuter traffic and pollution.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, and Topical Response TR-MP-3 regarding Manchester Square.

PC02668-3

Comment:

Additionally, since the events of September 11, it has been suggested that expansion of LAX to accommodate more passengers, planes and cargo would only serve to increase its potential as a target for terrorist activity.

Response:

Please see Response to Comments AL00051-93, PC01881-31, and PC02131-5.

PC02668-4

Comment:

Finally, but not any less significant, the expansion of LAX would destroy the ability of our community to exist peacefully next to LAX. Thriving businesses would be eliminated, requiring residents to shop elsewhere (adversely impacting remaining businesses and ultimately inconveniencing the consumer);

Response:

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

PC02668-5

Comment:

residents would become frustrated by unbearable noise and pollution levels ! ! from ground and air traffic; ground traffic transversing our community, without stopping to patronize any businesses and in great haste to make airline connections would raise great safety concerns for pedestrian traffic and neighborhood tranquility;

Response:

Effects associated with traffic were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation (subsection 4.3.2.6), of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As 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 neighborhoods in Westchester are not expected to be significantly affected by traffic impacts on local streets or increases in auto accidents. Regarding increases in noise, overall for the community of Westchester, the number of dwelling units that would be exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels in 2015 would decrease under all of the build alternatives when compared to the 1996 baseline or Year 2000 conditions. The greatest reduction in dwelling units exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels would occur under Alternative D, LAWA Staff's preferred alternative, with 4,431 fewer units exposed compared to the 1996 baseline and 2,589 fewer units exposed compared to Year 2000 conditions. Similarly, new analysis of single event noise levels presented in Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.6), and Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR shows that the number of residential units in Westchester exposed to 94 SEL or greater noise levels would be reduced in 2015 under all of the alternatives when compared to 1996 and Year 2000 conditions. The greatest reduction in 94 SEL exposure or nighttime awakenings would occur under Alternative D, 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.

PC02668-6

Comment:

and the increase in transient and/or temporary visitors does little to enhance the feeling of security and safety that comes with knowing your neighbors.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00378-2 regarding crime impacts.

PC02668-7

Comment:

All of the above would necessarily result in the destruction of life as we know it today in Westchester (and all of the other communities surrounding LAX). The skies above Los Angeles are already too crowded and pose known safety hazards. Efforts are being undertaken to preserve and improve upon neighborhoods and quality of life throughout Los Angeles. The health, safety and welfare of Westchester residents is of paramount importance, and, fortunately, there is a viable alternative to the expansion of LAX.

We support the efforts of those groups that have promoted a "regional" approach to airport expansion. It is time to stop wasting time and money on LAX expansion and instead refocus the issue to quickly and efficiently developing regional alternatives. In light of the September 11 events, this approach also gives the added benefit of decreasing the visibility of LAX as a possible terrorist target. While we agree, conceptually, that some safety issues with the LAX facility need to be addressed, it should be within the strict confines of maintaining or reducing current passenger, airline and cargo capacity, and be accomplished without any further destruction of homes or businesses.

Response:

Please see Response to Comments AL00051-93, PC01881-31, and PC02131-5.

PC02669 Davis, M.D., William None Provided 6/9/2001

PC02669-1

Comment:

Thank you for this (important) information. Alas, I lack the wisdom & awareness to substantively comment, but (humbly) offer these two notes:

- 1) Surely we wish everyone to have convenient access to air transportation.
- 2) At the same time it would seem problematic to do anything that would undervalue or neglect LAX (whose role/significance in the life of our state (& nation) may go well beyond mere numbers).

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02670 Rey, Janice None Provided

PC02670-1

Comment:

The LAX Master Plan makes no sense because of the already crowded air traffic and freeway/street conditions getting to & from the airport. That relatively small area should not bear more of the responsibility for the greater LA area. Regional airports should be developed.

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. 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.

PC02671 Ecklund, Ann None Provided

PC02671-1

Comment:

I support you in your regional airport alternative with further expansion to Palmdale & a more common sense approach to the problem. We need a safer LAX.

Response:

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

**PC02672 Abramofsky,
Melinda None Provided**

PC02672-1

Comment:

I didn't receive this until after the 9th but I wanted you to know that your views are the same as mine.

Response:

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

PC02673 Vranicar, Gail None Provided

PC02673-1

Comment:

LAX IS MAXED

I oppose the LAX Master Plan. LAX is encroaching on our wonderful South Bay and West Side neighborhoods. Additional growth cannot be absorbed in this location. It affects our quality of life (air, noise, congestion) and increases flight safety concerns. We need another International Airport to share the benefits & burdens. With good planning areas such as Palmdale or Riverside \$0 could see economic benefits & with careful planning burdens would be minimized.

Response:

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

approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale, Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. 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.

PC02674 Stecker, F. Frank None Provided

PC02674-1

Comment:

A regional airport plan is the way to go. LAX cannot be increased in size forever and the service to airline passengers would get worse.

Response:

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

PC02675 Newburn, George None Provided

PC02675-1

Comment:

Thank you for the position you have taken on the Los Angeles Airport issue. As a neighbor and former frequent user of LAX I have experienced its tremendous growth. Actually, one of the reasons for locating in the South Bay 30 years ago was its proximity to LAX. We still are able to enjoy its proximity for meeting visiting friends and family. Having said that, I can't for the life of me understand why in an area as spread out as Los Angeles and Orange Counties, it would not be to everyone's benefit to enlarge the other regional airports.

Response:

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

PC02675-2

Comment:

The South Bay area with its high population density cannot absorb any more traffic. The 405 and Sepulveda Blvd. have reached their maximum capacity which even now pushes traffic into neighborhoods ill equipped to handle it.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC02675-3

Comment:

This leads to more dust & grime, air pollution, increased noise level & even ocean pollution from run off. My neighbors and I are all opposed to further 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, noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, water quality impacts in Section 4.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, and coastal zone impacts in Section 4.14, Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 4, and 6 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.

PC02676 Cotton, Donna None Provided

PC02676-1

Comment:

I am totally against any expansion of 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.

PC02676-2

Comment:

Aside from the additional traffic, noise & pollution, it will be even more of a nightmare to pick up or drop off someone at the airport. I live at the north end of Manhattan Beach. The normal drive to LAX is about 12 minutes. With any traffic, it takes about 30 minutes. With additional traffic that expansion will bring, it will take an hour for a 12 minute drive.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02677 Levinson, Florence None Provided

PC02677-1

Comment:

We do not need anymore congestion in Westchester. What this area needs are regional airports that will save passengers travel time & relieve the streets and freeways of some of the traffic especially during the rush hours.

As for those people who are NYMBE's, other people want a decent life too! We need to share the noise, congestion and disruption.

Response:

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

PC02678 **Van Leeuwen, Andrew** **None Provided**

PC02678-1

Comment:

(1) POLLUTION & NOISE ARE ALREADY OVERBURDENING OUR AREA.

(2) THE TRAFFIC SITUATION IS BECOMING INTOLERABLE TO IMPOSSIBLE

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.

PC02678-2

Comment:

(3) THERE IS CONSIDERABLE SOOT CONDENSATION ALREADY OUTSIDE & INSIDE MY HOME!

Response:

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

PC02678-3

Comment:

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!

NO LAX EXPANSION AT 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.

PC02679 **Krahenbuhl, Peter** **None Provided**

PC02679-1

Comment:

Thank you for your interest in correcting the LAX air and ground traffic congestion by proposing a regional plan. Traffic and pollution in and around LAX has reached the limit. Let us build/expand regional airports where lots of land is available and is more economical. Am losing precious time whenever I must drive on P.C.H. or the 405 Hwy.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 for analysis of congestion issues. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC02680 Porter, Bruce None Provided

PC02680-1

Comment:

I concur with your approach regarding LAX & 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.

PC02681 Balderston, Authur None Provided

PC02681-1

Comment:

WE ARE ALREADY IMPACTED BY NOISE FROM LOW FLYING JET AIRCRAFT

Response:

Comment noted. 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. Also, please see Topical Response TR-N-6, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 regarding present and future noise levels.

PC02681-2

Comment:

HAVING LIVED IN THIS HOUSE FOR OVER 30 YEARS WE FIND EACH YEAR THE POLLUTION ON OUR PROPERTY IS INCREASED YEAR BY YEAR, EVEN THOUGH SOUTH REDONDO IS APROX 12 MILES SOUTH OF THE AIRPORT.

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.

PC02681-3

Comment:

ALSO PCH FROM TORRANCE BLVD USED TO BE AROUND 20 MINUTES BY CAR - NOW - ESPECIALLY AT PEAK PERIODS TAKES AROUND ONE HOUR.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02681-4

Comment:

WE DO NOT WANT ANY MORE EXPANSION OF LAX, SPREAD THE EVER INCREASING AIR CRAFT TRAFIC EITHER - NORTH, SOUTH OR EAST. MAYBE AT MIRA MAR- PALMDALE OR ORANGE!

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. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government.

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC02682 Manfredo, Joseph None Provided

PC02682-1

Comment:

INCREASE TRAFFIC, NOISE & POLLUTION FROM AN EXPANSION OF LAX WOULD DE-VALUE MY HOME AND MAKE ACCESS TO BEACHES HARBORS & ENTERTAINMENT MORE DIFFICULT. THE SOUTH BAY AREA WOULD BECOME A LESS DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values. Traffic and access issues were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and Section 4.4.4, Community Disruption and Alteration of Surface Transportation Patterns, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Noise and air quality impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.6, Air Quality, respectively of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC02683 Lin, Ben H. & Huey None Provided

PC02683-1

Comment:

Does not force growth on already over-burdened airport like LAX Give priority to airports eager for more growth like 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

3. Comments and Responses

approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC02684 Ford, Kathryn None Provided 6/8/2001

PC02684-1

Comment:

TRAFFIC ON THE 405 FREEWAY & SURROUNDING SOUTHBAY MAJOR ROADWAYS IS CURRENTLY SO ROADBLOCKED, IT INHIBITS TRAVEL & COMMERCIAL EXCHANGE. ALL TYPES OF BUSINESS TRANSACTIONS MUST BE IMPACTED ADVERSELY. MORE & MORE, PEOPLE WE TALK TO WANT TO LEAVE THE AREA & ARE RESTRICTING THEIR TRAVEL. WE HAVE BEEN PERSONALLY AFFECTED.

Response:

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

PC02684-2

Comment:

AIR TRAFFIC IS CURRENTLY BREAKING INTO OUR SLEEP AT NIGHT. WE WORRY ABOUT LOSS OF SLEEP AND/OR A COLLISION OVER THE COASTLINE AS SMALL PLANES ADD TO THE CONGESTION.

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-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC02684-3

Comment:

TRAFFIC FROM ADDED PLANES AND INCREASED PASSENGER & EMPLOYEE GROUND TRAVEL TO AND FROM THE AIRPORT INCREASES POLLUTION - TRASH, FUMES, FUEL DUMPING -IN A VERY SMALL, CONGESTED AREA.

Response:

Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC02685 Sandifur, William None Provided

PC02685-1

Comment:

We do need to improve our airport systems without long delays. I support a regional approach.

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.

PC02686 Dennis, Pamela None Provided

PC02686-1

Comment:

Los Angeles International Airport should be considered at full capacity. No expansion should be allowed.

Response:

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

PC02686-2

Comment:

There also should be no building west of Lincoln Blvd. in the Playa Vista area. The building east of Lincoln is ENOUGH!

Response:

The LAX Master Plan would not involve any building in the Playa Vista area. However, under all five alternatives, development in the northern portion of LAX would occur west of Lincoln Boulevard (as part of LAX Northside under the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative D, and as part of the project referred to as Westchester Southside under Alternatives A, B, and C).

PC02687 Jones, Roy None Provided

PC02687-1

Comment:

- Orange Co. airport can't be expanded.
- Expansion of LAX would result in traffic gridlock
- Converting El Toro Air Base into a commercial airport appears most feasible.

Response:

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

PC02688 Mucha, Jeannette None Provided 6/8/2001

PC02688-1

Comment:

Opinion: The size of the proposed Regional airport Plan is too large for the number of acres at LAX;

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC02688-2

Comment:

and, the noise these airplanes emit has already become so bothersome I no longer enjoy or look forward to my hobby - working in the family garden.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC02689 Dickson, Dan None Provided

PC02689-1

Comment:

1. BUSINESS SAVVY DEVELOPERS NOT POLITICIANS OR MAD-CAP DEVELOPERS NEED TO HEAD THIS.
2. BIGGER IS NECESSAIRLY BETTER. AN ORGANIZED AND WELL LAYED OUT PROJECT & DEVELOPMENT OF THAT PROJECT IS REQUIRED.
3. DO IT RIGHT. DON'T RE-DO IT IN TEN YEARS BECAUSE IT WASN'T THOUGHT OUT.

Response:

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

PC02690 Doud, Don None Provided

PC02690-1

Comment:

- (1) Build roads dedicated to airport
- (2) Adequate parking
- (3) Good runways
- (4) ATC improved
- (5) Buy land as far as necessary for noise abatement
- (6) Keep politicians & beaurocrats out of the decision making

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02690-2

Comment:

- South Bay Impact
- (1) We have no noise problem
 - (2) Roads for access are problem now and getting worse
 - (3) Let local folks do the planning and please stay out of it yourself and other gov't employees too.

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.

PC02691 Bledsoe, Anthony None Provided

PC02691-1

Comment:

I now understand that one of the proposed plans in the LAX expansion is to close Pershing Drive and use it for an airport entrance.

Between Playa Vista and the LAX expansion how can Playa del Rey survive?

I live on Pershing and would like to trust that my investment as well as the quality of life for my family will be intact.

DO NOT CLOSE PERSHING DRIVE.....

Thank you for your support

Response:

Comment noted. As proposed, all of the LAX Master Plan build alternatives, with the exception of Alternative D, include improvements to provide access to the West Terminal Area along the Pershing Drive corridor. None of the build alternatives would result in the closure of Pershing Drive. However, with construction of the ring road under Alternatives A, B, and C, Pershing Drive would no longer provide southbound access to Imperial Highway. Alternate southbound access to Imperial Highway would be available along Vista del Mar (please refer to page 4-441 in Section 4.4.4, Community Disruption and Alternation of Surface Transportation Patterns, of the Draft EIS/EIR, and page 4-345 in Section 4.4.4, Community Disruption and Alternation of Surface Transportation Patterns, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR). In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00018-19 regarding the cumulative impacts analysis included in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC02692 Zymet, Robert None Provided

PC02692-1

Comment:

I feel the area is already overburdened with heavy traffic and noise. I live in Palos Verdes dread the thought of going near 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, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02692-2

Comment:

Also, in this area we are besiged by turbo prop airplanes during the early morning and late evening. Some times the jets get too close to shore and you can hear them as well.

Response:

The commentor is correct identifying hearing more aircraft during peak periods of the day which occur during the early morning and late evening hours. Aircraft flight procedures are addressed in Topical Response TR-N-3, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1.

PC02692-3

Comment:

The more power the airport has, the more they will take advantage of the niehboring communities.

Response:

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

PC02693 [unreadable], Myra None Provided

PC02693-1

Comment:

We appreciate your stance in advocating for a regional plan rather than a dramatic expansion at LAX.

Hong Kong should serve as our model by locating the airport out of the city and providing first class transportation to and from the airport. The cut off of Century Freeway's light rail system short of LAX never made sense.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand.

PC02693-2

Comment:

LAX and surrounding communities are already over burdened; it is only fair to share the development/perks/burdens with other regions that presently utilize LAX, having few alternatives.

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

3. Comments and Responses

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

PC02694 Stuver, G. None Provided 6/9/2001

PC02694-1

Comment:

I DON'T KNOW WHY I'M WRITING THE MAYBE ITS BECAUSE I'M NOT VERY SMART.

THE L.A. AIR PORT SHOUD NOT BE EXPANDED, BUT IMPROVED,

Response:

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

PC02694-2

Comment:

THE PALM DALE DEVELOPEMENT SHOULD TAKE PLACE BY ZONEING THE AREA TO BUSINESS AND MANUFACTING ALLOWING FOR EXPANSION.

Response:

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

PC02694-3

Comment:

1. IMPROVE HWY 2 NORTH OF HWY 210 TO INTERSECT WITH HWY N3 AND ON TO PALM DALE LOCATION AS A HIGH SPEED HWY

PROVIDE SERVICE FROM RECEDA, BURBANK & W COVINA PROVIDE UNLIMITED PARKING, SHUTTLE SERVICE AND BAGGAGE SERVICE TO AIRPORT AT BURBANK LOCATION & RESTRUANT & TOILET FACILITIES

(NOTE) RAIL SERVICE FOR FREIGH INTERSECT AT VICTORVILLE.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC02694-4

Comment:

COST YES BUT CONSIDER THE FUTURE AND THE POSSIBILITY OF CLOSING OR RESTRICION OF THE L.A. AIRPORT AND THE ADVANCMENT OF AIR TRAVEL AND EQUIPMENT - HIGH SPEE RAIL

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC02694-5

Comment:

THE POPULATION OF PALM DALE VICTORVILLE HISPERIA, APPLE VALLEY THESE AREAS WILL CONTINUE TO EXPOND AND WE WILL NEED A AIRPORT TO COVER COVER THIS AREA.

Response:

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

PC02694-6

Comment:

I REMEMBER L.A. AS IT WAS IN 1926 AND MINES FIELD AS A BIG PIECE OF DIRT WITH A 30' TOWER. CLOVER FIELD IN SANTA MONICA HAD MORE TRAFFIC.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02695

Woodall, Wililam

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC02695-1

Comment:

We have lived in the South Bay for the last 35 years. During that time we seen a lot of growth. We are not among the people who are against growth, but there comes a time when things like the Airport have gotten as large as they should be.

I lived and grew up in West Los Angeles, and I remember when I flew to New York City in the '50s. That is now where the freight flights are. Then they built the tunnel under the runway on Pacific Coast Highway. I remember this because my Grandma and Grandpa lived in Manhattan Beach and we would visit them.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02695-2

Comment:

I have heard talk about the creation of the Palmdale Airport since the 1950's and nothing has been done about it. A fast rail system could be built into L.A. from there. I used to hunt rabbits out where there are thousands of houses now. If we wait any longer to start another International Airport for all of that area we will be the losers.

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.

PC02695-3

Comment:

We cannot drive the 405 Freeway between El Segundo Blvd. and Jefferson most of the time because it is stop and go, and at peak times it is a parking lot. For example, we left Manhattan Beach recently

3. Comments and Responses

around 5:30 on a Saturday night to go to Westwood, and it took us 1 hour to get there. When traffic is moving it usually takes about 20-25 minutes.

Response:

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

PC02695-4

Comment:

There are 3 airports not including LAX within an 18 mile circle of where we live -- Torrance, Hawthorne and Santa Monica airports, and a little father east, Long Beach airport. So we have not only small aircraft flying about, but also the large jets. The jets seem to take advantage of low clouds and fog, (as we are unable to see them) and fly over our area.

Response:

Comment noted. Weather plays a factor in the perception of noise. Aircraft are flying under designated flight procedures and a layer of cloud cover or fog would have no effect on their location in flight.

PC02695-5

Comment:

We do need relief from any more airport traffic. When we go on vacation my wife and I notice that our noses do not run as they usually do. Planes drop a lot of pollution in the air and to increase flights will make it even worse. One doesn't have to be an expert to determine if more traffic should be allowed at the airport. All one has to do is go to the airport and open their eyes as to what is happening going to and coming from, and especially while one is there at the airport (as I'm sure you know).

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-2, S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects.

PC02695-6

Comment:

We live about 15-20 minutes from the Airport. With the population growth you have estimated in the next 20 years, LAX will not have to worry about losing revenue to another international airport in another area. After all, what we are really talking about is money, isn't it? It is time to start thinking more about people's lives and the quality of life. We hope for once the FAA will listen to the people and use a little common sense. We hope you can convince them that they will destroy a beautiful area if they continue with the expansion plans.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC02696 Nivans, Martha None Provided

PC02696-1

Comment:

Thank you for your efforts to keep the airport from unreasonable expansion.

My problems in El Segundo.

1. Runways seem to get closer

Response:

Comment noted. In Alternative A, the centerline of Runway 7R/25L would be moved approximately 156 feet south, closer to El Segundo. In Alternative B, a new Runway 7R/25L would be located on a centerline 2,500 feet south of the end of new Runway 25R. In Alternatives C and D, the centerline of Runway 75/25L would be moved approximately 50 feet south. As shown and described in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, there would be no significant increase in noise in El Segundo due to these changes.

PC02696-2

Comment:

2. Airplanes make early turns (particularly at night) and fly right over the house.

Response:

Please See Topical Response TR-N-3, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2 regarding early turns over areas north and south of LAX.

PC02696-3

Comment:

3. We installed double pained windows but the jets seem to create more & more noise & pollution.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program, which includes the use of acoustically-rated windows to reduce interior noise levels. Please see Response to Comment PC01377-9 for a discussion of the effect of high noise levels on the City of El Segundo. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1, regarding existing and future noise levels. Please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. Regarding more pollution from jets, the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions for air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment.

PC02696-4

Comment:

4. With the energy "crunch" we cannot afford or in good conscience use air conditioning - yet opening our windows is out of the question.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC02696-5

Comment:

5. The traffic has really gotten congested.

Response:

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

PC02697 Stadvec, Marguerite None Provided

PC02697-1

Comment:

I BELIEVE WE NEED REGIONAL AIRPORTS TO MORE FAIRLY DISTRIBUTE TRAFFIC CONGESTION, NOISE AND OTHER POLLUTION.

WE ALREADY HAVE AN AIRPORT IN TORRANCE WHICH CONTRIBUTES ITS OWN SHARE OF NOISE.

Response:

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

PC02698 Proctor, Virginia None Provided

PC02698-1

Comment:

From my home I watch planes taking off from LAX one right after another, trailing black clouds of pollution. They fly out over Santa Monica Bay, then swing back, depending on weather and time of day (usually midnight or later) over my house, very noisily. More importantly, the airspace is too crowded to be safe.

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 safety in Section 4.24.3, Safety. 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-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety, Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02698-2

Comment:

I use LAX myself, hate it, don't see that enlarging it would in any way benefit anyone except whoever stands to gain financially, know people in other areas who would be happy to use an airport closer to their homes.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02699 Woolman, Jack None Provided

PC02699-1

Comment:

Very much against LAX expansion. I think it needs improved not expanded. Their boarding ,etc. methods are obsolete.

The regional alternative should make sure it doesn't bother nearby communities.

Response:

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

PC02700 Robertson, Lois None Provided

PC02700-1

Comment:

TRAFFIC DEFINITELY. I GO TO THE AIRPORT A COUPLE OF TIMES A MONTH AND NOTICE AN INCREASE EVERY TIME. AN INCREASE IN PASSENGERS ALSO CALLS FOR AN INCREASE IN HOTELS, MOTELS, RESTAURANTS AND OTHER AMENITIES. AS A 50 YR + RESIDENT OF THE AREA, ENOUGH ALREADY.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and growth in Section 4.5, Induced Socio-Economic Impacts (Growth Inducement). Supporting technical data and analyses are 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. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC02700-2

Comment:

ORANGE CO. SHOULD HELP WITH EL TORO FOR THEIR RESIDENTS.

Response:

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

PC02701 Cummings, T. None Provided

PC02701-1

Comment:

CLEARLY WE NEED ADDED AIRPORT CAPACITY, BUT THE CURRENT PLAN FAILS TO MEET ANY LOGICAL CRITERIA FOR ACCEPTABILITY EXCEPT INCREASED LA CITY TAX INCREASES AND MINIMUM COST TO THE AIRLINES. THE INCREASED NOISE, POLLUTION, AND CONJESTION WILL SERIOUSLY IMPACT THE ENTIRE WESTSIDE.

Response:

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

PC02701-2

Comment:

AT A TIME OF HIGH FUEL PRICES, DOES IT MAKE SENSE TO BRING TRAVELERS FROM UP TO 50-60 MILES TO LAX RATHER THAN PALM DALE, ONTARIO, ETC.? NO!!

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC02702 Dorman, Margaret None Provided 6/12/2001

PC02702-1

Comment:

I like your suggestion to promote airport growth at Ontario and Palmdale; also to provide ground transportation that will reduce congestion and improve access to other airports. This should have a favorable impact on our smog problems.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC02703 Schuegraf, Brigitte None Provided 6/8/2001

PC02703-1

Comment:

I am already affected by traffic. Why? Because our county and city and state & federal government people never focused on public transportation. We are the lousiest city re public transportation. We were better 100 years ago.

The last thing I want is an airport farther away, because of our inferior public transportation.

Please don't tell me we can't afford. All you are spending is our tax money anyway, so let's spend it to the benefit of the people.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02704 Carter, John None Provided

PC02704-1

Comment:

The regional plan fits the needs of all the people and not the wants of a few. The population of Southern California is growing and will continue to grow. To concentrate the needs of air travelers in one specific location is small minded and self-serving to a small group of business people. Looking down the road a hundred years future generations will say that it was smart to distribute air traffic all around So. California and will thank you for 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.

PC02705 Ongarato, John None Provided

PC02705-1

Comment:

INCREASED FLIGHTS WILL OCCUR OVER THE SOUTH BAY CITIES AND MORE PILOTS WILL SHORT-CUT THEIR FLIGHTS OVER THE PALOS VERDES PENINSULA ESPECIALLY DURING INCLIMATE WEATHER RATHER THAN FLYING OUT OVER THE OCEAN AND AROUND THE PENINSULA.

Response:

The commentor's concern is noted. For information about flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay communities, please see Topical Response TR-N-3, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 and Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2.

PC02705-2

Comment:

IT IS AT BEST A BAD EXPERIENCE TO DRIVE TO LAX TO CATCH A FLIGHT BECAUSE OF ROAD CONGESTION, POOR PARKING, AND OFF-LOADING SHORTCOMINGS AT THE TERMINALS. AN EXPANSION OF LAX WILL BRING MORE OF THE SAME JUST TO SATISFY THE GREED OF MAKING MORE MONEY FOR L.A. CITY.

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. Alternative D has been designed to make the airport more secure, convenient, and efficient. 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.

PC02706 Babbe, Mary Elen None Provided

PC02706-1

Comment:

I agree with the concept of developing regional airports to cope with the already serious problems at LAX and the projected growth of surrounding regions. The congestion on the field and the long lines at counters are already insupportable. As a resident of the Palos Verdes Peninsula I am also concerned with aircraft noise and pollution, to say nothing of the hair-raising sight of planes coming in for landings at chillingly close intervals.

Having read James Fallows cogent article, "Freedom of the Skies" in the June Atlantic Monthly, I am convinced that the 80 So. Cal. Cities and 12 So. Cal. Members of Congress have the right 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 and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, 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.

PC02707 Dugel, Ramesh None Provided

PC02707-1

Comment:

I strongly support the regional airport plan and oppose the proposed LAX Master Plan which, if implemented, will substantially increase noise, pollution and traffic in my community 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

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. 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.

PC02708 Dunn, Judy None Provided 6/11/2001

PC02708-1

Comment:

My family and I are opposed to the current plans for the expansion of LAX

We would be very interested in joining your coalition supporting a regional approach. We have lived in Westchester since 1945 and have been "condemned and moved" twice to make room for LAX expansion. The noise from the airport is currently horrendous, the traffic adversely affects the area for miles surrounding us. It is time to STOP the airport expansion before more residential communities are made uninhabitable. Expansion belong in Palmdale and Ontario.

Thank you for your effort to coordinate a fair regional aviation system.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use 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.

PC02709 Ross, Mary None Provided

PC02709-1

Comment:

Now, about LAX. Already we have more noise the last 6 years since we moved here.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increases and Topical Response TR-N-3, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1, regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay. 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.

PC02709-2

Comment:

We hear about the air traffic controllers problems at the present level. I hate to think how much harder it would be with additional air traffic.

Response:

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is responsible for the operation of the air traffic control system. The FAA will ensure adequate staffing of air traffic control personnel to ensure the continued safety of flight operations at LAX.

PC02709-3

Comment:

Consumers travel less time to get to and from airports when there are several in various areas as opposed to one great one!

Response:

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

PC02710 Kayon, Renee None Provided

PC02710-1

Comment:

It seems obvious to me the regional plan makes more sense since the people using those airports would also have a smaller commute to the airport, lessening overall environmental impact.

Response:

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

PC02710-2

Comment:

The South Bay already tolerates a large amount of traffic and noise, the property values would be adversely affected by LAX expansion, the noise levels would rise and coastal environmental concerns would also be adversely affected. NO ON 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 coastal zone impacts in Section 4.14, Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers. 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impact 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.

PC02711 Kane, Barbara J. & Ernest D. None Provided

PC02711-1

Comment:

The LAX airport has been a problem concerning us for more than a year. Now take-off patterns have been changed so that planes are looping back over our home toward the ocean, I've been to many meetings concerning this and the airport expansion. I used to call all the time to the noise complaint number. Sometimes letters come a few days later explaining there were no planes at the times I called,

3. Comments and Responses

Even the people at the noise complaint line say that it useless to call because no one pays attention to their tally. I've given up trying to report those late night incidents (some after midnight even up to 2 AM that wake me out of sleep fearing a plane will crash because it is so loud). So expansion of LAX is out of the question for us. If they are not considerate enough to pay heed to our calls, what will they do with the excuse of more air and land traffic.

Response:

Regarding nighttime overflights by easterly departing aircraft, the commentor may be affected by easterly takeoffs circling back to the west. During east flow operations, these effects will continue. 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. However, LAWA will be pursuing Federal approval of a restriction to alleviate that situation by making over-ocean procedures mandatory when they are in effect between midnight and 6:30 a.m. For further information about overflights south of the airport, please see Topical Response TR-N-3, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding new routes over the South Bay and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding east flow operations. LAX does keep records of the noise complaint and complainant. In the event that a complainant does request a written response and includes a mailing address, LAWA's Noise Management staff policy is to provide them with written response. However, no more than five noise events are 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.

PC02711-2

Comment:

What happened to the Palmdale airport location???

Response:

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

PC02711-3

Comment:

Even a bullet train out there from LAX???. Why doesn't the metro greenline go into the airport?? People moving will have to improve a great deal.

Response:

This comment is in favor of more mass transportation connections to LAX in the future. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan (see Subtopical Response TR-ST-5.4 regarding Metro Green Line extension to the West Terminal Complex) for more information.

PC02711-4

Comment:

What about extra air pollution over the South Bay???

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC02711-5**Comment:**

Our opinion is a resounding NO to expansion. Help keep our home investment (which is our future retirement money) a reality and eliminate the further disruption of peace and quiet in our neighborhoods.

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-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

PC02712 Hannon, Geraldine None Provided**PC02712-1****Comment:**

We are so congested here, especially with Playa del Rey buildup...it will be impossible to get anywhere along Lincoln Blvd & 405.

Response:

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

PC02712-2**Comment:**

I live in Venice & work in Long Beach. Please don't allow this to happen. Our quality of life is already threatened with Playa del Rey planned buildup

Response:

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

PC02713 Hogan, Marguerite None Provided**PC02713-1****Comment:**

Expansion is ridiculous.

Denver airport is a good example of airports away from the city. Hong Kong has an airport about 25 min. out of the city. So does Korea. We can adjust

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02714 Epps, Genice None Provided

PC02714-1

Comment:

My comment on the LAX Master plan can cause major health problems, louder noise and danger of over crowded cars and airplanes landing every 2 seconds. Please consider we families with children have to live with the noise of plane landing and the inhalation of airplane poisons fuels not the business people. We choose to live here and enjoy the airport the way it is. But if expansion occur people are forced to move.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR address human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. 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-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, 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.

PC02715 Morris, Glynn None Provided

PC02715-1

Comment:

We are strongly opposed to any expansion of LAX. The traffic, pollution and noise at current levels is excessive.

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.

PC02715-2

Comment:

We found the 6/9 hearings at the Furama Hotel to be a well orchestrated "snow job." For example, projections shown for 2015 included 20 million passengers using El Toro. Do the people in Orange County know this?

Response:

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

PC02715-3

Comment:

Another poster stated that pollution would be reduced with the expansion. When asked the consultant replied that the reduction would be only around the current terminals and did not take into account "new pollution" at the proposed new north terminal. Misleading? Yes. STOP EXPANSION!!

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC02716 Scolinos, Mariann None Provided

PC02716-1

Comment:

I have lived in Hermosa Beach for over 30 years. Quality of life is very important to me. I see the expansion of LAX as putting an unnecessary burden on the surrounding communities. I have noticed more airplane noise in the past 5 years. I understand the need for airport growth. But I believe other region of So. Calif. should share the responsibility.

Response:

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

PC02717 Schachter, AI None Provided

PC02717-1

Comment:

Please continue your efforts advocating the regional plan that more fairly shares the good and bad of air transportation across our area. There is no question that LAX is already over-burdened as well as the surrounding neighborhoods.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC02718 Blackwelder, Ron None Provided

PC02718-1

Comment:

Both my wife and I believe that a higher priority should be placed on developing other airports rather than increasing the size of LAX. Admittedly, LAX is a night mare right now. Possibly the greatest problem is not the air traffic, but rather the ground traffic (over Memorial day, we spent 30 minutes just trying to get out of the parking structure at 11 pm! Due to such a traffic jam!!

Response:

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

PC02718-2

Comment:

Since Orange Country is one of the fastest growing regions, we would like to see El Toro developed into a regional and international airport. At the present growth rates of the different regions in Southern California, more people will live closer to it than to LAX in 40-50 years. Also more dollars should be placed into increasing the traffic into and out of Palmdale and Ontario.

Response:

Comment noted. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC02719 Dunne, Robert None Provided

PC02719-1

Comment:

I do not want to see LAX expanded. A regional approach is much more fair and practical.

Response:

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

PC02720 Poritzky, Charles None Provided
Mark

PC02720-1

Comment:

I support a regional solution. Modernization is not the same as expansion. Expansion will hurt the quality of life for humans and animals

Response:

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

PC02721 Rasenstein, Joanne None Provided

PC02721-1

Comment:

As a resident of Marina del Rey, I live in the shadow of LAX. It is no longer a fair option for the residents of this area to bear most of the burdens of L.A. county air transportation. I strongly support the regional airport development/expansion plan.

Response:

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

PC02722 Krinsky, Laurie None Provided

PC02722-1

Comment:

Please count this family as opposed to the proposed LAX expansion. We can barely drive by the airport during busy times. The infrastructure cannot handle additional airport traffic without severely impacting us at home. We don't want it!!! There's just no more room here. Please don't let it happen!

Response:

Comment noted. Traffic was 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 Report S-2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02723 Lagatree, R. None Provided

PC02723-1

Comment:

Clearly, the economic plus that the airport provides must be weighed against the environmental impact that expansion & increased traffic would bring.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02723-2

Comment:

I favor your proposed regional plan. Place some aircraft activity in someone else's backyard.

Response:

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

PC02724 Blatt, Muriel None Provided

PC02724-1

Comment:

We are in total agreement with your position in regards to the immediate development of Regional Airports. Continue, please, your efforts in opposing the current proposed LAX Masterplan.

Response:

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

PC02725 Mohajerin, Francis None Provided

PC02725-1

Comment:

Polution -- Noise -- traffic already impact us in the South Bay. Expanding LAX should be limited or not allowed!

Response:

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

PC02725-2

Comment:

Already too much traffic on Sepulveda & 405 - expanding the back will be terrible for Pershing & Vista Del Mar.

Response:

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

PC02725-3

Comment:

Allready too many planes taking off & idleing. El Toro, Palmdale, etc...should be utilized.

Response:

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

PC02726

**Gardner, D.D.S.,
Linda Jo**

None Provided

PC02726-1

Comment:

Increased traffic, noise & pollution.

When I use the LAX airport, it will be more crowded. This airport should be for people in this area. There is increased danger for residents who live here.

I AM AGAINST LAX EXPANSION - WE NEED AIRPORTS IN OTHER 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 and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. 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.

PC02727

Dvosin, Nora

None Provided

PC02727-1

Comment:

I support the Regional Airport plan and am opposed to the proposed expansion of LAX. LAX is already an over-taxed and dangerous airport. As well, the immediate neighborhoods, including Westchester,

3. Comments and Responses

Marina Del Rey & Venice will suffer the noise consequences plus the traffic congestion consequences of an expanded LAX. We need a Regional System like NYC & Chicago.

Response:

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

PC02728 Berry, Jr., Richard None Provided

PC02728-1

Comment:

I support your position for a regional airport plan.

1.We have too much congestion

- a.People
- b.Vehicles

2.We have too much pollution

- a.Air
- b.Noise

3. Every takeoff and landing is a potential accident.

Response:

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

PC02729 Griego, John None Provided

PC02729-1

Comment:

I, as, other's, oppose L.A.X. 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.

PC02730 Adams, Ph.D., Gladi None Provided 6/9/2001

PC02730-1

Comment:

This arrived yesterday sorry for my late response.

I own a property in South Bay which is already impacted by noise and pollution from jet fuel. The airport is already a nightmare to use - making it larger would be such a mistake.

We are impacted with traffic and noise now and unless we regionalize, it will be worse.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No 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-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition. 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.

PC02731 Lively, William None Provided

PC02731-1

Comment:

I oppose the LAX Master Plan and fully support your regional plan.

Response:

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

PC02732 Conlon, David None Provided

PC02732-1

Comment:

You're right on, Jane! Expanding LAX is ridiculous.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC02733 Matharu, Edwina None Provided

PC02733-1

Comment:

I live on the East side of R.P.V. When the weather is foggy - heavy rain or Santa Ana's - or shift in air current - we are disturbed by jet noise - even to accoustical ceiling droplets - As I sit by my window - I can see & sometimes hear the planes.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-3, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1, regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay and Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration.

PC02733-2

Comment:

We have most of our savings invested in our home - I am a senior lady & enjoy relative peace and quiet - (except for airlines - private planes - helicopters. Good Year Blimp - all passing over!

Please no more planes - of any kind!

Response:

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

PC02734 Klier, Ken None Provided

PC02734-1

Comment:

Before expanding LAX, planners should first solve the traffic problem. What good would it be to take a 90 minute flight to San Francisco if it takes 3 hours to get to the terminal?

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02735 Smith, Aurora None Provided

PC02735-1

Comment:

IT IS TRUE THAT TRAFFIC AND NOISE & POLLUTION HAS INCREASED IN THE LAST YEARS NEAR THE AIRPORT. ECONOMIC IMPACT IS GOOD CONSIDERING THAT THE AIRPORT EMPLOYES THOUSANDS OF PEOPLE, MANY OF THEM ARE LIVING IN THE AREA OR CLOSE FOR THAT REASON.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02735-2

Comment:

THERE IS ONE THING FOR SURE, IF SOMEONE HAS TO GO TO THE AIRPORT AT THE PICK OF THE SEASON WILL HAVE TO ENTER THROUGH ONLY 2 ENTRIES AND FACE AN HOUR OF GOING AROUND JUST TO PARK. THERE SHOULD BE OTHER ACCES TO ENTER LAX. I BELIEVE SOMETHING HAS TO BE DONE TO AVOID MORE CONGESTION.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02735-3

Comment:

MAYBE IF THE AIRLINES HAVE THE SAME FARE PRICE, SAY GOING TO ONTARIO, JOHN WAYNE AND OTHER AIRPORTS BESIDES LAX, THIS WOULD NOT BE A CHEAPER FARE COMING TO LAX, IN OTHER WORDS, SAME PRICE FOR COMING TO LOS ANGELES.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01583-10.

PC02736 Schoetzow, Karl None Provided

PC02736-1

Comment:

The first thing to think about, is who the land at the airport really belongs to! The (U.S.A.F) owns the land the airport sets on.

Response:

The land upon which LAX is located is owned by the City of Los Angeles.

PC02736-2

Comment:

Now I'll answer the questions you asked:

- 1.Would not
- 2.Would not.
- 3.None

Response:

Comment noted. This comment responds to questions presented in a form letter prepared by Congresswoman Jane Harman's office asking her constituents to identify how they would be affected by (1) traffic and (2) noise and pollution, and (3) asking them to identify the economic impact the airport has on them and their community (numbers correspond to those used by the commentor in this comment letter).

PC02736-3

Comment:

- 4.Talk to the (USAF) about this problem, what about a war also.
- 5.Only Let military & overseas carriers land at LAX, and have other airports take in small aircraft

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-37 regarding the ability of LAWA to limit aircraft activity at LAX.

PC02737 Lago, Kathleen None Provided

PC02737-1

Comment:

If the expansion involves only LAX, that is fine. Please DO NOT try to involve Municipal Airports, including Torrance. We are already dealing with UNBEARABLE noise from the Torrance Airport, and this would make it worse. Torrance would become an entirely industrial city if this plan involves Torrance Airport.

Personally I think expansion should take place in the Valley that is where it is needed. The South Bay is served fine by LAX.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02738 Hoppe, James None Provided

PC02738-1

Comment:

As a professional having served on airports development committees I can assert that your plan would have disastrous effect on Southern California including those of secondary cost.

Denver International was a prime example of politically influenced bungling. Try: Dallas - Ft. Worth Dubai or Singapore.

Response:

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

PC02739 Demas, John None Provided

PC02739-1

Comment:

By the way your flyer is written you are not being open minded. LAX is critical to a strong local economy. It not only contributes but supports & enhances our competitive position in the world economy. LAX is the "gateway" to Asia. We cannot afford a weak airport infrastructure. I don't know when you last traveled through LAX but the congestion, traffic, and parking is terrible. I think your comparison above "says it all". Denver, with 10X the area has a capacity of about ½ of what LAX will have. Denver also has the luxury of open space within 40 min drive of downtown. We don't! We need a strong & efficient airport. I urge you to support the LAX Master Plan.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02740 Barron, Katherine None Provided

PC02740-1

Comment:

Because 405 will be at gridlock, more traffic on PCH, then more on Valley Dr. & Hermosa Ave. noise & air pollution from this. Longer commute times due to congestion on PCH.

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. Section 4.1, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed aircraft noise impacts to the surrounding communities. Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air pollution.

PC02740-2

Comment:

The desirability of South Bay communities will decline because of these problems, so property values & economic development will be adversely affected.

Response:

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

PC02741 Cain, Jeanne California Chamber of Commerce 11/2/2001

PC02741-1

Comment:

The California Chamber of Commerce would like to submit the following comments on the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) Master Plan.

The Chamber agrees that the decision by Mayor Hahn and the Board of Airport Commissioners to refocus the LAX Master Plan process on safety and security decisions is both responsible and prudent given the events of September 11 and their aftermath. Now, more than ever, it is important that the Master Plan process move forward, while taking into consideration the new realities and economics that have emerged since September 11.

Recent events have underscored the critical role played by airports and, particularly, LAX, underpinning California's economy. Consistent with safety and security, the LAX that emerges from the Master Plan process needs to be an efficient, user-friendly facility that accommodates business and leisure travel, as well as a significant share of cargo volume.

Decisions about the future of LAX will impact virtually every segment of the California economy—from travel and tourism to manufacturing, from entertainment to aerospace, from high tech to fast food. Confidence, comfort and convenience are essential ingredients in restoring "normalcy" to air travels. Planning for both the short and long term at LAX must factor in those considerations.

The California Chamber recognizes that no single airport can carry the whole load and that regional airport development is essential. At the same time, it is important that every airport be optimized, especially LAX, which is the West Coast's gateway to the world.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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 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.

PC02742

Attias, Ruth

None Provided

10/31/2001

PC02742-1

Comment:

1. Instead of writing a lengthy list of disagreements with the EIR, I must state as input commentary that: THE CURRENT PROPOSED MASTER PLAN FOR LAX SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN FROM ANY FURTHER CONSIDERATION !!

-- THE EIR DATA IS OUTDATED - AND 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, 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. Please see also Topical Response TR-GEN-1 regarding environmental baseline.

PC02742-2

Comment:

-- THE EXISTING PROPOSED MASTER PLAN DOES NOT OFFER ANY ADDITIONAL ALTERNATIVE THAT DOES NOT INCLUDE "EXPANSION"

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 will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

PC02742-3

Comment:

-- SEEMS TO USE THE TERM "MODERNIZATION" WHEN IT REALLY MEANS "EXPANSION".

Response:

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

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

PC02742-4

Comment:

-- THE PUBLIC WAS NOT GIVEN AN "EXECUTIVE SUMMARY" OF THE PROPOSAL THAT WOULD GIVE THE KEY IMPACT FEATURES OF THE EXISTING PROPOSAL. SUCH A SUMMARY SHOULD HAVE BEEN MADE AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC. LAWA surely knew that 12,000 pages of reading that was only accessible only on a very limited basis was not realistic. Public Libraries have limited days and hours; the Public Hearing site copy on a table surrounded with citizens trying to get a glimpse of the volumes...and no place to sit and read, etc.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR contain Executive Summaries. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding content and availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review.

PC02742-5

Comment:

2. I did hear the hours of verbal presentation made by the LAWA proponents followed by the public responses at the Hearing at Furama Hotel. From that experience and from all the other sources from which I have gleaned information, I MUST COME TO THE CONCLUSION THAT I MUST OPPOSE THE MASTER PLAN FOR LAX AS IT HAS BEEN PROPOSED AND NOW EXISTS !!

ANY FORM OF EXPANSION OF THE LAX AIRPORT IS UNACCEPTABLE, INCLUDING ACQUISITIONS OF PROPERTY IN THE SURROUNDING AIRPORT AREA THAT AS A RESULT WOULD DESTROY BUSINESSES AND RESIDENTIAL AREAS OF WESTCHESTER, INGLEWOOD, PLAYA DEL REY AND EL SEGUNDO. THIS INCLUDES INFRASTRUCTURES SUCH AS "WIDENING OF SEPULVEDA BLVD." AND "ARBOR VITAE OFF RAMP INTER-CHANGE". THE COMMUNITIES ARE NOT STUPID ENOUGH TO THINK THAT SUCH VENTURES ARE NOT FOR THE BENEFIT OF ALL FUTURE PROPOSALS FOR EXPANSION !! TOO MUCH IS ALREADY DESTROYED !!

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and residential and business relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. As discussed in TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester business district. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The proposed Arbor Vitae interchange is not a part of the LAX Master Plan and has had the federal funding withdrawn.

PC02742-6

Comment:

3. THE AIRPORT COMMISSIONS (AS THEY COME AND GO) HAVE NOT TAKEN ACTIONS NECESSARY TO FOCUS ON THE REGIONAL APPROACH TO ACCOMMODATE PASSENGERS AND CARGO AT THE OTHER LA-OWNED AIRPORTS. THE COMMISSION MUST TAKE STEPS NOW ... AND NOT DRAG FEET ANY LONGER !!

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.

PC02743 Migliazzo, Vincent None Provided

PC02743-1

Comment:

There must be an alternative to expansion.
Use Palmdale or Orange County
No more expansion 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-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.

PC02744 Casey, Andrew None Provided 11/2/2001

PC02744-1

Comment:

I know we are crowded when I make a trip by plane.

It seems adding new airports or at least expanding accommodations at existing facilities could alleviate the present conditions at LAX - Please do not compound an existing overloaded 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.

PC02745 Eidsmoe, Martha None Provided

PC02745-1

Comment:

I have lived in Westchester since 1951. Since then I have seen the airport expand many times. I saw whole neighborhood disappear. I thought things only got worse.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02745-2

Comment:

I believe the problem of traffic is the result of not correcting the bottleneck the airport has. You can't just make wider streets and continue to acquire more land when everything still goes to the same bottleneck.

My suggestion is to change the existing problem by relocating the main entrance and changing the total layout of the airport.

If you use the southeast side that is between the 105 and the 405 freeway to enter. And if you widen LA Cienega Blvd. instead of Sepulveda and Lincoln Blvd. you could create a direct route for traffic.

If you would use people movers like the ones in Los Vegas to move people from parking to entrance and out to terminals.

There are many exit along La Cienga to the 405 freeway
The freeway are to move cars why not use them

The new airport could be something like this

Response:

The concept the commentor refers to is similar to the Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, Alternative D. That alternative is analyzed in detail in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the Congestion Management Program and TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC02746 Escher, Amelie None Provided

PC02746-1

Comment:

I think that LAX is already a nightmare - there should be more airports spread throughout the Los Angeles 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.

PC02747 Bell, Michael None Provided

PC02747-1

Comment:

If LAX expands - we are moving out of 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02748 **Blankenship, Candace** **None Provided**

PC02748-1

Comment:

I was born in Westchester in 1953 & have lived here all of my life - I want this ridiculous expansion of LAX stopped! I have lived with the noise pollution, the fuel pollution & the traffic pollution for almost 50 years. These items need to be mitigated - not enlarged nor expanded! I deserve the right to enjoy as much peace & tranquility as possible & it is the duty of our elected officials to stand up & fight for us! Thank you for your opposition, Jane.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase, and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase. It should be noted that under Alternative D, air pollution and noise pollution are expected to be less than under the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC02749 **Butorac, Suzanne** **None Provided**

PC02749-1

Comment:

I, also, oppose the LAX Master Plan in conjunction with support for developing our other So. Cal. regional airports. It only makes sense. I feel LAX has been developed to it's full potential.

Response:

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

PC02750 **Tourino, John** **None Provided**

PC02750-1

Comment:

I agree with your expansion concerns regarding the regional approach to accommodate the present & future growth of the air transportation system.

I would like to offer that regional development may mean

1) More direct/non-stop flights to other regional airports.

2) The revenue sharing of airport terminal facilities available to airlines loading terminal docking facilities (i.e. the viable dismantling of the current "Hub" system.

Response:

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

PC02751 Danryd, Lennart None Provided

PC02751-1

Comment:

NO TO EXPANSION OF LAX
DISTRIBUTE TRAVELLERS EVENLY TO ORANGE, RIVERSIDE, ONTARIO OR LONG BEACH SO
LA WON'T BES CROWDED AN DIGESTED.

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.

PC02751-2

Comment:

WE HAVE NOISE ENOUGH IN PALOS VERDES PENINSULA!

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02552-1.

PC02752 Boller, Jeannette None Provided

PC02752-1

Comment:

I AM NOT IN FAVOR OF ANY LAX EXPANSION AT ALL! BESIDES TRAFFIC, AIR AND SOUND
POLLUTION WILL BE OUT OF CONTROL - IT IS PRETTY BAD ALREADY.

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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02753 Adams, Robert None Provided

PC02753-1

Comment:

[No text]

Response:

No comments were included in this letter.

PC02754 Wyche, Jennifer None Provided 11/8/2001

PC02754-1

Comment:

I am & have been a Westchester resident for over 40 yrs. I am opposed to the expansion of LAX because LAX is now a huge burden to ours & surrounding communities. I do not expect LAX to move - just not to expand more than it has already. Past expansions & increased volume of flights & passengers base all but destroyed the Westchester I grew up in. We now deal with more traffic, congestion, pollution & resulting health concerns than we can bear. I believe it would be not only unwise but truly unsafe for the LAX expansion to move forward-with any expansion!, which would, last but not least surely compromise the quality of life for Westchester residents & those of surrounding communities. Please ditch this flawed plan.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, 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-1 regarding impacts to quality of life and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC02755 Coppin, Linda None Provided 11/1/2001

PC02755-1

Comment:

In light of the terrorist attacks, we need another international airport in the region. Ontario, Palmdale and El Toro should be developed and would be more convenient airport for travelers who live in those areas.

Response:

Please see Response to Comments AL00051-93, PC01881-31, and PC02131-5 regarding security issues. Please also see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding the elimination of El Toro as a commercial airport.

PC02755-2

Comment:

I live a mile from LAX and I have to hose down my windows one a month to remove the "soot" from the airplanes.

Response:

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

PC02755-3

Comment:

The noise now wakes me up at night now - I can't imagine the noise if the airport increases.

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.

PC02756

Davis, Andrea

None Provided

11/5/2001

PC02756-1

Comment:

The fruit on the trees in my backyard is annually coated with jet fuel;

Response:

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

PC02756-2

Comment:

I can not open my windows because of discomfort and disruption caused by the noise pollution of nearby air traffic at LAX.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. Please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a discussion of noise levels under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions and projected noise increases under the Master Plan alternatives.

PC02756-3

Comment:

Now, even more horrible than all this, is the realization that I am now living next to a gigantic Terrorist bulls-eye. One big bloated airport. When worldwide example (and common sense) would have a true "world class" Los Angeles with at LEAST two true international airports, if not MORE.

Unforgivable, when you note that LA has other airports and residents that need and want the monetary benefit and convenience of competitive air travel at additional existing and could-be expanded LA airports. Not to mention the thousands that hate the inconvenience of a drive to LAX and the additional

3. Comments and Responses

thousands of LAX neighbors who hate the negative consequences to their homes, health and neighborhoods.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00051-93.

PC02756-4

Comment:

To continue to overburden LAX, surrounded by thriving neighborhoods and built on top of/next to fragile natural resources, is not forward thinking and it is not necessary. To many of my neighbors, it is unconscionable

I ask you to Kill the LAX Master Plan. It is fatally flawed.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed impacts to surrounding land uses in Section 4.2, Land Use, and impacts to biological resources in Section 4.10, Biotic Communities, and Section 4.11, Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix J and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-H 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.

PC02757

Daniels, Daisy

None Provided

11/9/2001

PC02757-1

Comment:

I am Director over eight states for Royal Neighbors of America. I fly over one hundred thousand miles a year, for United plus, other airlines. I have flown over a million miles with United. I have six trips booked with United before end of this year. Hope Palmdale airport opens soon. I will be a regular passenger.

Response:

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

PC02758

Wyche, M.

None Provided

11/7/2001

PC02758-1

Comment:

September 11 should have spoken to LAX in ways that the residents could not. Any expansion of LAX would be gross irresponsibility toward the residents and taxpayers.

Response:

Please see Response to Comments AL00051-93, PC01881-31, and PC02131-5.

PC02758-2

Comment:

At present LAX is too large and has destroyed much of the quality of life for airport area residents; congestion, air & noise pollution, diminished emotional & physical health.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, 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-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC02758-3

Comment:

Trying to "shoehorn" any expansion under the guise of modernization & safety is just plain dishonesty. Safety and modernization and a little down-sizing would really help and show good will. We need more airports, not bigger!

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

PC02759 Boughton, Charles None Provided

PC02759-1

Comment:

1985 we purchased our current home. Jan. 1997 LAX & Long Beach began departures over our home. We did not move to the airports. They came to us. LAX departures start at approx 11:30 PM and continue till approx 2:30 AM. A FEDEX aircraft departs Long Beach nightly 9:00 PM - 10:00 PM straight down the 91 fwy West to the beach then turns north to Oakland to their sorting center. I'm glad to see that Supervisor Don Knabe has become involved. Its already out of control!!! Help!!

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures at LAX. Operations at Long Beach Airport are not part of the Master Plan project. Please also see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations at LAX.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02760 Dixon, Dorothy None Provided

PC02760-1

Comment:

I believe that Lancaster would be the best place to build a regional airport to supplement the needs of LAX. Lancaster has a huge amount of land available for such use. My guess is that it might be less expensive than land in other areas and easier to purchase.

Response:

The closest LAWA operated airport facility to Lancaster is Palmdale Regional Airport. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC02761 Healy, Helen None Provided 6/13/2001

PC02761-1

Comment:

I was at the LAX airport expansion meeting at the Furama Hotel in Westchester and join you "in action". Bravo!!!

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02762 McRight, Susan None Provided

PC02762-1

Comment:

My husband and I would be greatly affected by traffic, noise and pollution resulting from an LAX expansion. We oppose it. Since we live in Venice our whole community would be subject to a decreased quality of life as a direct result of the expansion. Traffic congestion, noise & pollution are all highly stressful. As voters you have our support.

Response:

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

PC02763 Meehan, Donna None Provided

PC02763-1

Comment:

Opposes 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.

PC02764 Lauery, Terrie None Provided

PC02764-1

Comment:

The traffic on the 405 is already terrible. I have noticed increase noise over the past few yrs.

Response:

Issues related to noise and traffic were addressed in Sections 4.1, Noise, and 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02764-2

Comment:

The increased traffic from planes imposes a greater risk of one crashing in our back yards. We have no more room to expand.

Response:

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

PC02764-3

Comment:

The pollution is really bad now. My screens & window sills are black in a matter of days and I live about 4 miles away from LAX.

Response:

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

PC02765 Warne, Rose None Provided

PC02765-1

Comment:

I am against expanding LAX. I have lived in the area 50 years and worked for CAA and then FAA for many years. There was an EIR for Palmdale in the 1980's. I would hate to see more pollution, hear more noise - etc.

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-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02765-2

Comment:

Also, an important point - the airport traffic controllers are too busy now - how would that problem be addressed? Bigger control tower? etc etc

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02709-2 for a discussion of the air traffic control responsibilities. A need for a bigger control tower or a new location for a control tower has not been identified.

PC02766 Hagen, Sharon None Provided

PC02766-1

Comment:

I live 15 minutes (in "good traffic times) from the airport, therefore I'm often the designated "taxi-service" for friends. It is lunacy to consider expanding LAX, especially in light of the instant city on the wetlands, Playa Vista, that Los Angeles and the State of California insist on building congruent with the only non-freeway route in and out of LAX. Traffic on the 405 is already bumper-to-bumper at all times of day or night. Noise and pollution are already horrendous.

Response:

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

PC02766-2

Comment:

San Bernardino and Riverside Counties are the fastest-growing areas in the state (I know, I was raised there and my dad is a real-estate developer.) They need a closer airport (Ontario will be inadequate & too close to existing homes.) El Toro is a much better solution for all counties.

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. 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.

PC02766-3

Comment:

I don't care about the economic impact for Los Angeles, I don't think expanding LAX is the answer. Business travelers and especially private jet owners should not take precedence over quality-of-life. They can shuttle or will have limosines. Same for tourists. If people want to come to L.A., they will get here regardless. I've lived in L.A. for 37 years on my own, and visited my grandparents here all through my childhood. L.A. is becoming absolute hell, even in my neighborhood where I'm lucky enough to live at the beach.

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.

PC02767 Owens, John None Provided

PC02767-1

Comment:

LAX has a big impact on our community now without consideration of expansion. It is all negative with heavy, speeding traffic, noise and dirt all over the area from rubber to soot and jet fuel.

Other than hotels, car rental and a few food outlets, I don't believe we derive that much benefit to offset all the aggravation.

Response:

Comment noted. Issues related to traffic, noise, and air quality were addressed in Sections 4.3, 4.1, and 4.6, respectively, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition and soot.

PC02768 Santillan, Claudia None Provided

PC02768-1

Comment:

Currently the noise is very disturbing. You become tolerant of it but you wonder what effect does it have on you or your kids.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments AL00017-52 and AL00038-11 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise and the impact of high noise levels on children, respectively.

PC02768-2

Comment:

The expanding of the airport would create more traffic and they would not do anything to the communities surrounding it. Making these communities better would help. I do not agree with it. This proposition for expansion would only push the people who live here out of the area.

Response:

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

PC02771 **Baca, Tony** **None Provided**

PC02771-1

Comment:

Living in Westchester we would definitely be affected by an expanded LAX. More traffic congestion noise and pollution from both cars and planes.

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.

PC02771-2

Comment:

Westchester has been a quiet community but with an expanded LAX we would see more traffic traveling through residential streets trying to avoid gridlock on Sepulveda. There are a lot of young families here and the extra traffic would endanger the kids.

Response:

This comment expresses concern over the impact of increased traffic on neighborhood roadways and the effect this might have on livability within the neighborhoods. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts. Note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or the Ring Road. 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.

PC02771-3

Comment:

I also believe Long Beach airport should be included in the regional plan.

Response:

Some airports cannot meet the demand as a result of government caps (i.e. Long Beach and John Wayne) or longstanding opposition (Burbank). 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.

PC02772 **Tilkin, Lori** **None Provided**

PC02772-1

Comment:

AS A RESIDENT OF EL SEGUNDO, EXPANSION IS NOT A DESIRABLE PLAN.

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.

PC02772-2

Comment:

AIR TRAFFIC NOISE/POLLUTION CAN BE HEARD WELL INTO THE NIGHT (1 AM, 2 AM) AND ENHANCED ACTIVITY WOULD NOT BE WELCOME.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations and Section 4.1, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Those sections of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR together with supporting information in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 present an analysis of single event noise impacts during the night. Mitigation Measure MM-N-5 provides mitigation for those impacts.

PC02772-3

Comment:

ALSO, PROPERTY VALUE WOULD SIGNIFICANT BE AFFECTED FOR PLAYA DEL REY & EL SEGUNDO RESIDENTS.

Response:

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

PC02772-4

Comment:

I SUPPORT YOUR EFFORTS TO OPPOSE AND SEEK OTHER AREAS WHICH ARE NOT AS "MAXED OUT" [NOT TO MENTION THE SEPULVEDA HELL CREATED AROUND THE AIRPORT (INCL. 405)].

STRONGLY OPPOSE URBANIZING WHAT LITTLE SERENITY IS LEFT OF THE BEACH COMMUNITIES AFFECTED!

Response:

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

PC02773

Sampson, Judith

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC02773-1

Comment:

I live 9 miles from LAX. I see 3 problems: noise, pollution & traffic. For this area it would definitely not be a benefit. I vote for the "Regional Plan".

Response:

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

PC02774 Williams, Harry None Provided

PC02774-1

Comment:

I think it is only a matter of time before there is a major catastrophe over the City of L.A.

Response:

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

PC02774-2

Comment:

We need to move LAX to an area less inhabited, combined with a loop rail around the City with parking, connected to the airport.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02774-3

Comment:

El Toro is absolutely the ideal location. If we can convince all the Yuppies in Orange we have a perfect location, almost ready for use.

Response:

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

PC02775 Lillo, Angelica None Provided

PC02775-1

Comment:

Traffic is already congested in all areas around the airport.
Pollution - I can live without it.

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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02775-2

Comment:

& noise is not to bad now since I have sound proof windows - but I don't like to be living in a taper ware feeling home.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program, which provides alterations to the existing ventilation system or a new system to maintain fresh air circulation and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC02776 **Voss, Philip, Philip** **None Provided**
C. & Elaine P.

PC02776-1

Comment:

No L.A.X expansion

No Arbor Vitae interchange

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The proposed Arbor Vitae interchange has had the federal funding withdrawn and is not a part of the LAX Master Plan.

PC02777 **Gifford, Jane** **None Provided** **6/11/2001**

PC02777-1

Comment:

Sorry I didn't receive this on time to get this to you by June 9 but I definitely agree with your opposition to the LAX expansion. It is bad enough now. I have to go to the LAX frequently to pick up - and return - various artists for the L.A. Opera, so have watched the congestion grow over the past years.

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.

PC02777-2

Comment:

There are even occasions when an airliner is routed over Manhattan Beach and the noise is extremely nerve-racking.

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 of 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. Additionally, for easterly flow operations at night, please see Topical Response TR-N-5, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-5.2. Please also see Mitigation Measure MM-N-5.

PC02778 Howard, Richard None Provided

PC02778-1

Comment:

I feel that LAX is sufficient and any additional building would increase traffic on Sepulveda unbearably.

Response:

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

**PC02779 Aitken, Robert & None Provided
Marilyn**

PC02779-1

Comment:

Thank you for advocating the regional plan. Airport traffic should be distributed throughout the area, not concentrated in the beach cities. We live in Palos Verdes Estates and have already been disturbed at night by low flying airplanes. Our son lives in Marina del Rey and is looking forward to buying a house in the coastal region but is worried about the impact of noise and traffic. What is burdensome to us would be economic opportunity for neighbors in the Inland Empire.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No 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-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations. 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.

PC02780 Ramos, Benjamin None Provided

PC02780-1

Comment:

The new expansion plan for LAX will definitely have a bad impact on the Los Angeles Area and specially for neighborhoods surrounding it. We already have a tremendous nuisance with the present levels of traffic besides the environmental factor. The pollution from all the traffic plus the several refineries in the South Bay worsen our daily way of life.

My family and I trully hope that there can be a better solution to this problem.

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-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.

PC02781 Kline, Billie None Provided

PC02781-1

Comment:

I do not travel, at all, unless it is absolutely necessary. LAX is so clogged with traffic - it takes an hour to get around & out. Lines get longer & longer & is generally congested in every way. Let's share some of the "wealth" with Orange County Riverside & Palmdale. In 2 more years LAX will be a complete nightmare with no place to go. Leave those poor people in Inglewood & West L.A. in their homes & stop taking property & homes away! We don't need more "tourists" coming to L.A.X.

Response:

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

PC02782 Wilson, Samuel None Provided

PC02782-1

Comment:

1. Extend light rail (The green line - currently the train to nowhere) into the airport circle - every other world class city has!

Response:

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

PC02782-2

Comment:

2. Regional flights (S.F, OAK, Phoenix etc) to be scheduled from Van Nuys, Long Beach, Orange Co, Ontario,etc.

3. Cross country and international passenger flights from LAX

4. Cargo into Victorville, Palmdale, San Bernadino etc

Response:

Comment noted. 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.

PC02782-3

Comment:

5. NO, NO, NO to 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.

PC02783 Zamberlin, Joseph None Provided

PC02783-1

Comment:

Emphatically -

No - expansion LAX

Yes - Expand outlining airports

NO BRAINER!!

Response:

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

PC02784 Pemanehr, Ras None Provided

PC02784-1

Comment:

The Atlantik Ocean was called Aethioupis Oceanus for ever but since a couple centuries that man knew what paper knowledge that was behind more than a couple thousand years war against Nile river civilization of natural pipurs plant that put other rivers like Mesopotamia, in Persian Christianity out of Tigri & Euphrates River God, so is the River Ganja for Budha, Jah is resting & offering the whole universe identified on the Zion of Ethiopia the first. When they found out a couple hundred years ago the peace producer Hemp the didn't do nothing brainstorming their brain against it (hemp)

The American Constitution writings on hemp papers a couple hundred years ago (sorry if I keep using "a couple" continuously but it is my respectful Afrikan accent to say it's not on my responsibility of perfectness of health, time and knowledge) says any one wearing not Hemp or linen uniform is a extra universal enemy robot against nature nothing to be but criminal. And it say again don't loose your mind, time and nature but save them because it's now very easy to pot military & prisinors to hemp civil action they are not now but eating at least 3 times a day pig production weather in jail or in a tank for war,

3. Comments and Responses

sausage, bolgna and HAM. To keep them thirsty of blood out of their incense consumption of their God Jesus Christ, the food cloth and shelter out of his BODHY for food and his blood to kill thirst (thirstiness water) so for their alternative and chosen power coming nothing tempebting weakdness continuously loved their trebellous Lucifer they end up on the Lake of Fire without any need of help because the hate cannabiss they got keep them existing by only burning it and sale pure people \$1.25 a 12 ounce of water. That's from Abraham no matter is getting called Sara Lincoln, so effectively you see the Amerikan Constitution doesn't have nothing to do with Indians Budhist from the River Ganja, same the Mesopotamia civilitation of Abraham and company too is a river civilization but never form the Nile. So they think they are stealing the name of the ocean of Ethiopia at the same "a couple of hundred years ago" this snakes united through Arabia a North Afrika Allah Allah to is anothe my land enemy forgetting the samo Zeus from Panamas Amazon against me see pure Afrikan from and to Ras tision Ethiopia son of "our Father his imperial mases ras Tafari first "a couple world wars winners and still sitting in the middle of thic (the) universe on his natural cannabiss thron with no hell or Coptic (helicopters deceitfull war rumors tounge) offering natures banner as

green for lands

Yellow for shines

Red for univers and

Trumpet of Raggae rythms proofed out of his 1960s official visits through carreabian islands it end each airport of islands that he was going through to make done his works, airports were holding about five or six different stages that each one was recording as a stage for because on TV and radio start getting heard the mix of different tribal sound in one aim existing knowledg because airoplane is nothing a better bus trasportation, but the mix of rivers against the Nile the take airoplan as Louxorios and poisonous tool against nature. If you go in Ethiopia you have to make travel by bus to see differen natures offering but them roads made by the wind on the top mass and chain of mountain, you would see clouds and sun and stars shine under the bus and the road is rough of rocks day and night but right there you would feel "saying" why this plane is getting called bus when from here I see green down there for ilanders that plays Samba, same another stage not more than 100 feet far for islander playing maringhy chacha and another stage so on and not far than "a couple hundred feets" and still between his Imperial Majestic Airoplan with the lions of Judha and others beautiful creatures from the river of Nile, such the two ever seen white bears that offered to the county of California they are still living here since 60s they live for ever don't worry. Same not that much far each others bands at fence in and out of the airport there were tribal stage like for Calypso and Soka and etc...you know went born raggae at each airport of father trip work introduced in the 60s, just at the same time of his official Carreabian Islands visit work it was planned by the Carnificato of Jesus and Exetera work at the beginning of the last century (1900) at the Island of Capri the now helpfull only for rich pollution consumers touristical sex drug and rock roll that was a weapon & since the Roman fascist and Mafia constitution cause was pontious pilatous and extra universal like Pluto and Platinium poisonous extra uyirersal chemical liquid - Yes it was in Capri Island that the empire of Rome constitution was getting writtin out of wrong and blood fool papers that helped out a Nile enemy claiming beeing born "a couple of hundred of miles and time of lights from the Nile beeing and yellow light day or night red the univers with stars falling and reaching as unharfulness clouds. Yeah our Father make stars fall as clouds never spelled chicken wngs and called then different Angels Kinol good just to usefull interpretetion of the real paper book Cannabiss to the people of Britain dealing with worlds geograph maps helpful for skin loosers race participating Anglo sasson civilization derivated Anglo from angle ex 90 but not Angels as Mykael, Gabriel, Rootael etc.. of Ecs Sasso in Latin means rock not sex, rock, drug culture resuracted out of fifty years on geographical poisoning map weather by navigators and land pioneers as the vampire Rhodesians. It end up the carnafication the falseever known ressuraction for nothing falling on the name of Hitler by burning his own people on fire lakes as offering for their trebelous what ever sound God or the Acte native samo ass doubleous Satan Lucifer, you can't know nothing out of them because they are bourn "a couple of hundred of mile and lights from Tigri and Euphrates Rivers but never in Betelhem or Airusalam that are Niles ras baptisimal and weeding works is like you get baptized in the temple to learn how to obtain self food, cloth and culture, you eat, wear and live in the universe as a shelter is not difficult you have just to become Rasta it means noting consumption security. If the seed that had made food, cloth and shelter had planted by your fingers you won't worry that they are not dirty food, they are not bloody cloth and of course out knowledge you gain which passion = light you would make your shelter travel through the universe and find out who you are and never beg yours identifiican existence by no need miserability help manifastration out nothing but enemes of the Nile, don't call nothing else.

OK, I was forgetting to tell you this Atlantic civilization falling to the triangle Bermuda made the name of land that was called Aethiopus to a filthy poisonous or unpoisonous reptical mythology "Afrika" so please madame politician I admire for your bus turtng side effects but as son of respectfull King of King

3. Comments and Responses

of any war happened you need to see Mr. La Rouch I'm sure you know him better than me, but he will tell where basically and generally poison are situate, they are all over and each river dams starting from Awsan of the Nile to the Venice Beach canal they nothing to be destroy and respect Nile civilization by bombarding each dam in this world properly you obtain the same kind of fertility because of water greenig around you might don't seed even by your own fingers cause of waterproolueing green herbs as food then you save time to go find by yoor self through and beyond the universe that simple that you don't need no doctrine Iskim Iskimization so don't forget to fight to decriminalization of cannabis because is the King of King of Ethiopia that gave back Moses generation but only for 50 years so they would stop talking that reptail rules the frouit of the tree and that onrl Jews can enjoy the holy wood as knowledgeable cross.

Please don't let me write by decetfull tounge ink for your love of deniety of simplicity same airport needs and is made of petrolium wich contains our ancestors blood that they are death waiting for cannadis be free and polution dead, that the only judgement available not "a couple hundred troubles, of carnivor creatures loving hate I mean it vampires same bus road and each is the whole time on reparation you know how much shine money spent for billion roads in the world that there is no a calender of year that they on reconstruction and need of bloody vampire system Ford fix or Repar Daily yes fix or repair daily

That was in 1948 by 1998 they are back already far away for Father Nile to their carnivorous rivers Tigri Reuphrates Lady it's not a joke, go to United Nation and check the rules of it. This Christian, Jew, Hebrew and other name getting called the don't do nothing but against Cannabis since ever till diamond came out their doublous and shine wrong time and sky color so raspect your own constution just by wearing actually using Hemp. Go for it I'm no scared at least of you but Father Nile, Ras Yemanehb

I'm adding this paper to ask a couple appoulowjahis for every wrong overstanding that may occur but write me at my usual P.O. Box 926 Venus LA-CA 90294 we could use HEMP and pleausure of HEMP.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02785 Tanchum, Lannon None Provided 6/12/2001

PC02785-1

Comment:

Thanx so much for assisting us in making our skys safer, cleaner and quieter. I have been a founder member of PANIC for many years. We have been lied to, conned and ignored by the FAA and LAWA and the airlines for years in our fight to keep the turboprops from overflying the P.V. peninsula. Any increase in the already overburdened map of LAX is counterintuitive. We cannot expect the airlines to look after our health or airspace -my concern is that I'm not sure I can trust our Federal or State government to do that either.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 14a and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC02785-2

Comment:

The EIR is a joke and the attempt to muscle it through without sufficient time to completely review it by the public is simply greed if not graft at work.

Response:

Comment noted. The public comment period for the Draft EIS/EIR extended from January 18, 2001 to November 9, 2001, a period of 295 days. In addition, the public comment period for the Supplement to

3. Comments and Responses

the Draft EIS/EIR extended from July 11, 2003 to November 7, 2003, a period of 120 days. The comment period for both documents exceeded the public comment period required by federal and state laws and regulations.

PC02786 Kaye, Karen None Provided

PC02786-1

Comment:

We would be greatly affected by the noise and air pollution. The only time LAX was shut down was years ago and we could see forever and breathe normally. Let the other 10 million people in LA build an airport near them.

Response:

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

PC02787 Rubio, George None Provided

PC02787-1

Comment:

I oppose expansion of LAX because of increased traffic, noise, and pollution. In addition I oppose development of more housing and commercial sites. We are too crowded in LA, and I don't want any more growth. Traffic is insane, and we don't have the resources we need.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and growth in 4.5, Induced Socio-Economic Impacts (Growth Inducement). Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC02788 French, Karl & June None Provided

PC02788-1

Comment:

Thank you for representing us and providing this opportunity. We, too, favor the regional plan. Living in Playa Del Rey, we would experience unbearable traffic, noise, and more black dirt/dust in & around our home. This could possibly lower our property values.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No 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-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition, and

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

PC02789 Knauer, Marilyn & None Provided
David

PC02789-1

Comment:

Please keep working hard for a fair regional air traffic plan that has other communities sharing the burden.

Response:

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

PC02790 Winkler, L. None Provided

PC02790-1

Comment:

Expansion of regional airports is long over-due particularly in the Palmdale area. As an ex-resident of Westchester residing 2 miles from LAX, I know first-hand of the impact on the area i.e., traffic congestion for one which has a negative impact on the surrounding area..... & then there is the congestion within in airport itself. Whoever decided to expand LAX is/was either brain-dead or given a major incentive to vote for it!

Response:

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

PC02791 Thompson, Mary None Provided

PC02791-1

Comment:

I will not be personally affected at my home by the LAX expansion because we bought our home far enough away on purpose 43 years ago in Westchester. However, my community and many friends will be affected and I'm not happy about it. Why are we picked on when Palmdale, Ontario and El Toro stay the same. Those residents fly from our airport and make traffic and noise and pollution worse. The FAA and LA World Airports don't give us a chance to have a nice community when they just do what they want. Please vote to stop the expansion. Thank you for trying to do something about the expansion plan in the State Legislature and your Congress.

Response:

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

PC02792 Given, Doris None Provided

PC02792-1

Comment:

We live in W.L.A. nowhere near the airport, but we travel quite a bit. We don't drive there anymore because of the terrible traffic & parking. We must take a taxi there now. The airplanes are so overcrowded, it's almost impossible to get booked on a plane unless you do it months in advance.

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.

PC02792-2

Comment:

Why not spread it out? We have family in Orange County. They often have to drive to LAX to catch planes East & to Europe & to the Orient. This is ridiculous. They need their runways lengthened & more planes starting, or going through closer to them, in Orange County or close to them (not an hour or 2 hours away!

Response:

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

PC02793 Lutz, Charlene None Provided 6/8/2001

PC02793-1

Comment:

The congestion and pollution caused by LAX is already unbearable. It's so unhealthy we may have to move, - a tremendous trauma for our family. We have invested a great deal in this community and would never leave but for LAX's negative impact. The traffic congestion is also already unbearable.

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, 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.

PC02793-2

Comment:

Why expand at all? Take the expansion elsewhere. Get the cargo completely out of LAX.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding the role of airline economics in shifting operations to regional airports.

PC02794 Cleere, Laura None Provided

PC02794-1

Comment:

As a resident of El Segundo since the age of 2 years I object strongly to any expansion of Los Angeles International Airport. I grew up on McCarthy Court which is somewhat near the run ways and witnessed first hand damage done by both noise and air pollution. As the South Bay has continued to dramatically grow out the last 38 years, traffic and over population are serious concerns.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and growth in Section 4.5, Induced Socio-Economic Impacts (Growth Inducement). Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC02794-2

Comment:

This expansion to LAX would make it virtually impossible for me to drive 14 miles to work on the Westside within 2 hrs. time. Traffic is already annoying, any additional traffic would be dangerous as well as create hours of deadlock.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02794-3

Comment:

With so many other viable options I see no reason to consider expansion at LAX.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC02795 Watson, Carolyn None Provided

PC02795-1

Comment:

Why spend millions to destroy a lovely, established community of homes, schools, and business.

Response:

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

PC02795-2

Comment:

Besides more planes (and pollution) what about ground traffic? More cars, buses and trucks! Streets will be impassable.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding 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.

PC02795-3

Comment:

Increasing the size of LAX will create jobs, but so will increasing the size of Palmdale, Ontario, etc.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC02796 Sheehan, Jeanine None Provided

PC02796-1

Comment:

In 1997, we sold our home of 35 yrs; in mid-Wilshire and bought a home in Westchester to get away from some of the crime & traffic, noise & pollution of the mid-city. If the airport at LAX expands too greatly by closing off more streets near Manchester and puts in a lot of new runways to accommodate many more flights than we presently have, we will be forced to sell our "new" home here & move back to our old area to escape pollution from more planes & jet fuel & noise & traffic.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

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. Alternatives C and D do not include the construction of additional runways, but do include lengthening and relocation of runways to accommodate a new parallel taxiway to reduce runway incursions and improve airfield operations.

PC02796-2

Comment:

My husband has a long commute daily to his office in Pasadena (which he can handle now, but couldn't if traffic increases),

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02796-3

Comment:

plus I have chronic respiratory problems that would prohibit my living here if pollution increases.

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.

PC02796-4

Comment:

Airport expansion could cost us a lot of money if we have to move again.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

PC02796-5

Comment:

We favor regional expansion by dividing airport expansion to take place in several airports in different locales.

Response:

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

PC02797 **Wuerker, Joanne** **None Provided**
Scott

PC02797-1

Comment:

Thank you for your efforts to solve a regional problem on a regional basis. To increase the already impacted traffic around LAX is obviously ridiculous. To expand in a densely populated area rather than using more open land where the population growth is located is equally ridiculous. Good luck.

Response:

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

PC02798 **Klusmeier, Rosmarie** **None Provided**

PC02798-1

Comment:

I STRONGLY PROTEST AGAINST ANY AIPORT EXPANSION AT LAX. WE ALREADY HAVE MORE THAN ENOUGH NOISE TRAVELING ALL THE WAY TO NORTH REDONDO BEACH. THE AIR POLLUTION IS ALMOST GETTING TO THE POINT TO MAKE US THINK ABOUT LEAVING THE AREA.

Response:

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

PC02800 **Epp, H.** **None Provided**

PC02800-1

Comment:

We are affected by prop planes having turned 180 and climbing over the peninsula while heading East.

Response:

Comment noted. In the South Bay communities aircraft noise levels associated with the project actions will be much lower than those considered to be significant by all regulatory agencies. The area may be effected by noise from other airports, as well as ongoing modifications in air traffic routes out of LAX that have nothing to do with the proposed Master Plan actions. For further information on this topic, please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 and Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2.

PC02800-2**Comment:**

A distributed airport system with high speed rail interconnects ("Red cars") would do much to reduce congestion.

Response:

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

PC02800-3**Comment:**

Get the airlines to buy into the plan also!

Response:

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

PC02801 Gottlieb, Siegard None Provided**PC02801-1****Comment:**

Would like to see the use of Long Beach airport by some of the smaller airlines, this could help the traffic congestion at LAX.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02771-3 regarding the use of Long Beach Airport.

PC02802 Moak, Patricia None Provided**PC02802-1****Comment:**

*Traffic: The traffic is already incredible & extremely dangerous with reckless and speeding limos & shuttles on La Tijera & Sepulveda. They run red lights, speed, and tailgate.

Response:

Comment noted. The primary surface transportation components of the alternatives, such as the Ring Road and LAX Expressway, would benefit nearby residents by encouraging commercial vehicle drivers to use the primary freeways and arterial routes and stay off local streets. Combined with the locations for the two commercial vehicle staging areas, it is anticipated that most commercial vehicles would find it beneficial to use these new facilities, rather than off-load onto surface streets. In Alternative D, most commercial vehicles would use a staging area south of Arbor Vitae, which would be near I-405. This location should encourage many commercial vehicle drivers to stay on I-405 and not off-load onto adjacent surface streets.

PC02802-2**Comment:**

*Noise: Jet noise is bad enough now - more flights will simply increase the duration.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase for more information about the relationship between the number of flights and the future noise levels. Aircraft noise mitigation was described in Section 4.2.8 of the Draft EIS/EIR beginning on page 4-216. Mitigation measures for road traffic, construction equipment, and automated people mover noise were provided in Section 4.1.8 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR beginning on page 4-78. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR also provided mitigation measures for aircraft noise in Sections 4.1.8 and 4.2.8.

PC02802-3

Comment:

*Pollution: More flights = more "jet dirt" - black soot all over our cars, landscaping & homes.

Response:

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

PC02802-4

Comment:

*Economic Impact: The close proximity of LAX has encouraged airport-related businesses to proliferate along Sepulveda - tacky valet/shuttle businesses, prostitution, sleazy motels.

Response:

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

PC02802-5

Comment:

MOVE THE AIRPORT TO PALMDALE!!

Response:

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

PC02803

**Scott, Elizabeth
Anne**

None Provided

PC02803-1

Comment:

Please don't let LAX grow any more.

Response:

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

PC02803-2

Comment:

The black dust I get in my house is getting worse. I have to keep my furniture covered in the living room. I live in Westchester.

Response:

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

PC02803-3**Comment:**

The traffic is getting worse and worse.

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.

PC02804 Hardin, Joseph None Provided

PC02804-1**Comment:**

AS A RESIDENT OF VENICE, CA., I AM OPPOSED TO THE LAX EXPANSION - LINCOLN BLVD. & SEPULVEDA BLVD ARE BOTH EXTREMELY OVER CROWDED 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. 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.

PC02805 Chase, Harriet None Provided

PC02805-1**Comment:**

The quality of life in the South Bay will diminish with the LAX Master Plan. Traffic, noise and air pollution will increase. The South Bay has had a growth spurt this past year & I am already feeling like I want to stay in my house rather than drive the crowded streets & freeways!

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, 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-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02806 Paul, Howard None Provided

PC02806-1

Comment:

Opposed to LAX Expansion. Wants JH to stop the flow of money to LAX. If the money stops the expansion stops. He said LAX was proceeding with the expansion just calling it upgrading and repairing. Wants JH to do something about it.

Response:

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

PC02807 Gustafson, David None Provided

PC02807-1

Comment:

I am opposed to LAX Expansion and strongly believe that a Regional Airport Alternative is a much better solution. These are the main reasons I'm opposed:

Response:

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

PC02807-2

Comment:

Increased Traffic to El Segundo and surrounding areas will be terrible - more terrible than it already is especially during Rush Hour. I work in El Segundo so I know 1st Hand.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding existing traffic congestion, neighborhoods, and I-405. 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.

PC02807-3

Comment:

More Cargo Activity will increase Truck Traffic and along with it Deisel Emmissions (Pollution)

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. 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.

PC02807-4

Comment:

Noise from Aircraft is already unbearable -- more Noise from more Flights will destroy our Quality of Life in the So. Bay.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02203-41. Please also see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increases and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC02808 Neal, Mark None Provided

PC02808-1

Comment:

The LAX Master Plan would have a material negative adverse impact on our community and my family.

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

PC02808-2

Comment:

I currently live more than 5 miles from LAX and I am effected by the noise when planes disregard the "turnaround" rules.

Response:

The commentor did not provide a residential location. He may be affected by easterly takeoffs circling back to the west on their departures to Asia. During a recent 18 month period, 82 jets departed to the east when over-ocean procedures were in effect, an average of about one per week. LAWA has committed to 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. Please also see Topical Response TR-N-3, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1, and Topical Response TR-N-5, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-5.2.

PC02808-3

Comment:

If the airport is significantly expanded this problem will only get worse. When I settled my family here I took into account that we are far enough away from the airport that we should not be effected by noise.

Response:

Comment noted. 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. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding existing and future noise levels.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02808-4

Comment:

Finally, I believe this expansion will have a very negative adverse impact on property values due to the added noise and congestion.

Response:

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

PC02809 Chan, Jerry None Provided

PC02809-1

Comment:

PLEASE NO EXPANSION ON LAX WE DO NOT WANT ANY MORE CONGESTION, AIR POLLUTION, NOISE, ETC. -

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.

PC02810 Theess, Oliver None Provided

PC02810-1

Comment:

I would like to know how the LAX Expansion would effect the City of Lawndale. Where I own property, and run my Motion Picture Company, Hollywood Way Pictures.

Response:

As described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.2), of the Draft EIS/EIR, the study area for Land Use is focused on the potential for land use incompatibility due to physical or functional impacts on land uses caused by the LAX Master Plan or the potential for the Master Plan to result in inconsistencies with land use plans, policies or regulations. The study area generally coincides with the geographic area covered by LAWA's Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program. The vast majority of the impacts identified in the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR fall within this study area. The City of Lawndale falls outside of this study area and no land use incompatibilities or conflicts with land use plans have been identified.

PC02811 Gleim, Roger & Vesna None Provided

PC02811-1

Comment:

I agree that too much of one thing is not sensible. I support your plan to concentrate on other airports in the region first in order to fairly distribute noise, pollution as well as economic levels. Even though, I

work right by the airport and work for an airline I support your healthy, responsible and economically sensible 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. 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.

PC02812 Massman, Linda None Provided

PC02812-1

Comment:

I own a house in Manhattan Beach and am very opposed to the expansion of LAX. It is time that the other regions around Los Angeles share in the burden of growth that is occurring. Note: that growth is not happening in the communities that border LAX, they are mostly seeing the growth in communities away from LAX. The residents near LAX suffer enough w/daily & evening airport noise - it is time for others to share the burden. 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. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02813 Walthert, Leah None Provided

PC02813-1

Comment:

I live in PDR and can see /hear all the airplanes take off. So I am familiar with the noise. More of it? No.

Response:

Comment noted. Efforts to eliminate early turns over El Segundo and Playa del Rey were incorporated into the recommended mitigation actions for each project alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2, regarding early turns over areas north and south of LAX. For information regarding future noise increases, please see Topical Response TR-N-6. For more information on noise impacts on Playa del Rey, see Response to Comment PC00499-1.

PC02813-2

Comment:

Besides that, it makes no sense at all to have people from Riverside, Simi Valley, etc.. drive to LAX. This makes a trip to SF longer by public transportation than by driving. The freeways are already so congested that centralizing all the air traffic at LAX in kind of insane.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02813-3

Comment:

There is also the desperate need for a high speed train from SD to SF, via Riverside, LA, LA North, the valley. Trains for the residential public and not only for business executives. These stops will slow down the time from SD to SF but not much from LA to SF. In Europe high speed trains stop for exactly one or two minutes at cities and this works well.

Response:

This comment appears to be in support of developing high speed train service in southern California. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan for more information.

PC02813-4

Comment:

Decentralization to some major areas is to me much more sensible than one center at Lax or anywhere.

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.

PC02814 Cirincione, Dominic None Provided

PC02814-1

Comment:

We are almost in grid lock on PCH in Manhattan and Hermosa Beach.

Response:

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

PC02814-2

Comment:

We already hear late night flights overhead 1:30 am 2 am.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02772-2.

PC02814-3**Comment:**

We have lived in the South Bay for over twenty years - the quality of our space & life goes down hill with noise and congestion. Rosecrans Blvd & Aviation are just two examples. - Please oppose all LAX expansion and look to Ontario, Orange Co. etc.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use 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.

PC02815 Schubert, S. Roy None Provided

PC02815-1**Comment:**

I completely support Rep. Harmon's concept for a regional solution for Southern California's air traffic problems. However, in no case should LAX be allowed to expand beyond its current MAP burden. The South Bay infrastructure and environment cannot cope with the current situation at LAX, it will collapse under expansion. I use LAX several times per month, and I have first hand knowledge that LAX utilization is stretched to its limits (in terms of land area, air space, and land use encroachment), which cannot be enlarged by any expansion plan, no matter how creative it is.

I look forward to Rep. Harmon's continued efforts and support on this most important of South Bay quality of life issues.

Response:

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

PC02816 Griffith, Carole None Provided

PC02816-1**Comment:**

Always thought That Palmdale and Lancaster would expand. Every other major city has an airport outside of the city, so why Shouldn't we

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC02817 Hays-Content, Sara None Provided

PC02817-1

Comment:

Traffic is drastically slowed now by increased airport activity & this would be exacerbated by further development.

Response:

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

PC02817-2

Comment:

Noise has increased & is very noticable at night as increased flights go over Manhattan Beach. Subsequent pollution is inevitable.

Response:

LAWA will be pursuing Federal approval to restrict easterly takeoffs circling back to the west on their departures to Asia 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 also see Topical Response TR-N-3, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1. Air Quality is addressed in detail in Appendix G, Air Quality Impact Analysis, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the following parts of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR: Section 4.6 Air Quality, Appendix S-E Supplemental Air Quality Impact Analysis and Technical Report S-4 Supplemental Air Quality 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 and impacts on nighttime awakenings. Please also see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increases.

PC02817-3

Comment:

Further development will degrade severely & perhaps destroy the life surrounding communities - particularly those in the beach areas. It is fair, just, important & appropriate for a regional plan to utilize more sites & locations for the sharing of effects. Otherwise we will unnecessarily be creating a blighted area.

Response:

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

PC02818 Powell, Wayne None Provided

PC02818-1

Comment:

PLEASE PUT THE PRESSURE ON LAX & FAA TO ADOPT A REGIONAL APPROACH TO EXPANSION (I.E., ONTARIO, PLAMDALE, EL TORO, JOHN WAYNE, ETC).

Response:

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

PC02818-2

Comment:

ALSO, MAKE THEM GO OUT OVER THE OCEAN FARTHER, BEFORE TURNING LEFT & COMING BACH (LIKE THEY USED TO DO)!

Response:

For information about recent changes to aircraft flight procedures, please see Topical Response TR-N-3, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 and Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2.

PC02819 Nichols, Jerry None Provided

PC02819-1

Comment:

Traffic congestion and noise levels are already very high near LAX. Property values will suffer.

Response:

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

PC02819-2

Comment:

It makes a lot more sense to me to expand in areas where there will be higher growth, and where land is more plentiful, and where congestion is not so high.

Response:

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

PC02821 Hockett, Donald & None Provided
Deanna

PC02821-1

Comment:

We agree and support your position of non-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.

PC02821-2

Comment:

We have lived in the South Bay (P.V.E.) for 27 years, and, in our opinion, further development of the facility would increase traffic congestion even more on the already over-burdened streets in the area.

Response:

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

PC02822 Garsen, Diane None Provided

PC02822-1

Comment:

As it is now..... every time we have a Santa Ana wind, all out going planes fly directly over my home! The noise is stead with the current traffic flow.

Response:

Periods of Santa Ana winds are the principal exception to the use of westerly traffic flow at LAX. When wind speeds exceed 10 kts. from the east, all operations are conducted in that direction. Consequently, areas east of the airport (and south of the airport) will experience take off overflights that are uncommon in the general operating conditions at the airport. These conditions occur between 2-5 percent of the time each year. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures and Topical Response TR-N-7, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-7.1, regarding early turns over areas north and south of LAX. Also, please see Mitigation Measure MM-N-5.

PC02822-2

Comment:

The house gets residual shaking

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-8 which discusses noise-based vibration. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix D, Aircraft Technical Noise Report. Please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for more information on and comparisons of noise and noise-related land use impacts under the baseline and Year 2000 conditions and the various Master Plan alternatives, including new Alternative D.

PC02822-3

Comment:

and fuel emissions fall out and I have had to hire someone to clean outside weekly!

Response:

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

PC02822-4

Comment:

My tenants complain about noise while on the phone. We are about 7 miles from airport, but increasing so it's not enough.

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 2258 Monterey Boulevard in Hermosa Beach), 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 and Year 2000 conditions, as shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

See also Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels, Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding existing high noise levels, and Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

PC02823

Mallette, Gary

None Provided

PC02823-1

Comment:

I am against expanding LAX. Why should we pay the penalty in noise, pollution, traffic congestion, & safety for others to commute here. Regional airports seem fair 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. 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 safety impacts were addressed 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02824 Babikion, George None Provided

PC02824-1

Comment:

I am totally opposed to the planned expansion at LAX, our City is already impacted with jet noise compromising our Quality of Life and we should not allow LAX to increase airplane takeoffs & landings.

Other airports in the Region should absorb increased demand.

Response:

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

PC02825 Meldrum, Claudia None Provided

PC02825-1

Comment:

I support the regional airport plan as opposed to the LAX Master Plan.

Response:

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

PC02826 Hausrath, Mary None Provided
Elizabeth

PC02826-1

Comment:

LAX seems to overschedule flights now, with numerous delays both inbound and outbound. The noise is bothersome only when it is foggy in PVE, so it does not affect us personally now, except when we travel.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02826-2

Comment:

Long Beach is equidistant. Can it expand? From our position, El Toro would be ideal to relieve Orange County John Wayne. Norton Air Force Base would relieve SB County. Ontario would help, if there were regular express busses or helicopter service into the city.

Response:

Comment noted. Long Beach airport is a municipal airport owned and managed by the City of Long Beach. San Bernardino International Airport is located on the former Norton Air Force Base and is owned and operated by the San Bernardino International Airport Authority. The City of Los Angeles has no authority to implement development at either of these two airports. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC02827 Reff, M.D., Albert None Provided

PC02827-1

Comment:

I support regional expansion using other airports but NOT expansion of LAX.

Response:

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

PC02828 Hadley, Joanne None Provided

PC02828-1

Comment:

We live in Manhattan Beach and are seriously affected by traffic on Sepulveda, Vista Del Mar & freeway.

Response:

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

PC02828-2

Comment:

While we appreciate using our airport for passenger travel we feel there should be no forced expansion and no expansion of freight travel at LAX. Freight does not need to further clog up our already congested area. It should use alternatives.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC02829 **Epstein, Stanley & Renata** **None Provided**

PC02829-1

Comment:

The views expressed by you are also shared by myself and my wife. Anything that you can do to avoid any avoidable noise, traffic and pollution would be most appreciated.

Response:

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

PC02830 **Jones, Betty** **None Provided**

PC02830-1

Comment:

Sharing the growth among all the regional airports makes the most sense to me.

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.

PC02830-2

Comment:

Move cargo out of LAX to Palmdale.

Response:

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

PC02830-3

Comment:

And definitely, no more expansion of LAX until surface transportation problems are solved.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02831 Wagner, Karl None Provided

PC02831-1

Comment:

We moved from Play del Rey to Torrance because of the intense noise problem as the airport grew over the last 15 years. As it continues to grow we hear its impact around the south bay and feel the impact as traffic near LAX makes travel in that area prohibitive.

Please expand other airports, 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. 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.

PC02832 Benner, Ronald None Provided

PC02832-1

Comment:

I believe in a plan to distribute air traffic throughout LA and Orange County. There is very little space left in LA County to expand, but much more in Orange County.

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.

PC02832-2

Comment:

There should be an easily way for air traffic to reach Orange County without coming from LAX. Or a high speed transport such as a train from LAX to Orange County might help.

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-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02833 Bertrand, Ann None Provided

PC02833-1

Comment:

I disapprove of the LAX Master Plan. The traffic will adversely affect my commute to work, & will increase auto 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. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC02833-2

Comment:

I live in Palos Verdes, & in bad conditions they will plane "around" the Peninsula; in actual fact they cut the corner & fly over us. The noise is entirely unacceptable.

Response:

In periods of off-shore storms, all aircraft will be directed to areas that avoid the bad weather. For westerly takeoffs, that may result in overflight of the south bay communities for safety purposes. Procedures southwest of the airport were recently changed. For information about these recent changes to traffic patterns during departure procedures, please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 and Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2, and Topical Response TR-N-7, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-7.1 regarding early turns over areas north and south of LAX.

PC02833-3

Comment:

Increased noise will decrease property values.

Response:

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

PC02833-4

Comment:

The increase in jobs would be better placed closer to where people who will hold those jobs will live (such as San Bernadino & Riverside Ont), so they will not have to commute hours into neighborhoods they will be unable to live in, since the houses are too expensive for the salaries they will make.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02664-11 regarding a regional approach to airport growth. Also see Response to Comment PC01045-2 regarding the geographic distribution of job growth associated with the Master Plan.

PC02833-5

Comment:

The airport is already unsafe (my husband had 2 close encounters on his last business flight, one with the wake of a previous plane & one with a light plane reported by the traffic controller). More planes will only worsen this situation.

Response:

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

PC02834 Ellman, Ira None Provided

PC02834-1

Comment:

WE ALREADY GET AIRPLANES FLYING OVER OUR HOUSE AT ALL HOURS, ESPECIALLY LATE AT NIGHT. AT TIMES IT IS DIFFICULT TO SLEEP!

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.

PC02834-2

Comment:

WE DO NOT NEED ANY MORE TRAFFIC IN THE SOUTH BAY. THE CURRENT TRAFFIC LEVEL CAUSES ENOUGH NOISE, CONGESTION & 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.

PC02835 Biffar, Woodrow None Provided

PC02835-1

Comment:

As for expansion of the airport, I am against 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02835-2

Comment:

I live on Airport Blvd and making that an expressway would just about eliminate this area of Westchester! Heavy traffic 24 hrs a day, noisy semi-trucks within 30 or 40 ft of my bedroom window, diesel fumes pollution,

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC00934-6 regarding Airport Boulevard. See also Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC02835-3

Comment:

I think Westchester has sacrificed enough for the airport.
I am in favor of upgrading what we have and not 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.

PC02835-4

Comment:

there are several military air bases that are closed. Use them for cargo planes and passengers instead of funneling everything into LAX. Regional airports could share in the growth.

Response:

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

PC02835-5

Comment:

There will come a day when L.A.X. will have to stop growing. Improve but not expand. Vote no on expansion and Arbor Vitae interchange!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The proposed Arbor Vitae interchange has had the federal funding withdrawn and is not a part of the LAX Master Plan.

PC02836

Memmen, Ruth

None Provided

PC02836-1

Comment:

In 1984 I moved from 9422 Glasgow Place in Manchester Square to get away from aircraft noise and fuel droppings. I moved to a new senior housing complex on Via Dolce Way in Venice peninsula. It was so clean and quiet here. That's all an old, old, dream. The take-off patterns are in all directions

3. Comments and Responses

now. The planes vary from monster passenger to private buzzy propeller twin-wings headed north towards Santa Monica & poies of police & television news heliohopper that hover this neighborhood. The traffic polution & noise already worse. The 11 pm curfew is now 2 am.

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 also see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations and Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

PC02837 Suree, Sapon None Provided

PC02837-1

Comment:

I agree with the regional airport alternative as oppose to the expansion of the already congested LAWA.

Response:

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

PC02838 Coons, Susan None Provided

PC02838-1

Comment:

I am outraged to learn that LAX would even consider expansion. Thirty years ago, we had to travel to LAX to fly to most places, and the same is still true today, despite Palmdale being eager to have an airport. LAX should be attempting to route traffic to other airports. We are suffering in the South Bay from noise, air pollution, and 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 and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02839 Body, Stephanie None Provided

PC02839-1

Comment:

We support your view for the development of regional support for LAX air traffic as outlined on the reverse side. But we do not want the regional approach to stop improvements to the overburdened LAX airport. Plase fix what used to be a fabulous airport.

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.

PC02840 Mack, Silvio None Provided

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01303; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01303.

PC02841 Baviscky, Ras None Provided

PC02841-1

Comment:

JAH IS RESTING & OFFERIIING SABATH. ISIAS (18) GOES DEEP. THE LAX MASTERPLAN, AND ALL PLANS UTILIZING THE CURRENT DESIGNS AND CONFIGURATIONS OF FOSSIL FUEL VEHICLES (AIRCRAFT, IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE) WOULD SERVE THE PUBLIC (AND NATURE) BY DEVELOPING INNOVATIVE ALTERNATIVES TO PETROLEUM-BASED FUEL POLLUTANTS. HEMP, FOR EXAMPLE, IS A DURABLE, LIGHTWEIGHT MATERIAL THAT IS PERFECT FOR THE FUEL IT CAN PRODUCE, AS WELL AS FOR THE AIRCRAFT ITSELF. PLEASE REFER TO ISIAH:18 FOR SCRIPTURAL REFERENCE TO OUR PLIGHT.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02842 Pallares, George None Provided

PC02842-1

Comment:

NO ON LAX MASTER PLAN!

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02843 Jenkins, Julian None Provided

PC02843-1

Comment:

Stop it. Fight it. Love what you are doing.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02844 Rest, Hillard None Provided

PC02844-1

Comment:

Where's the infrastructure supposed to occur? Already, the San Diego freeway is one of the worst in the entire country...and they want to put even more traffic on it? Is there any thought to how this airport expansion will affect such transportation issues for L.A.?

Response:

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

PC02845 Puskin, Trudi None Provided

PC02845-1

Comment:

I think it is unfair to burden the Westchester, beach areas and areas surrounding LAX to bear any more of the congestion, noise and pollution than they already to. The streets and freeways leading to and from LAX are bumper to bumper. If Ontario and Palmdale are viable, let's grow 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 and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02846 Newberry, R. None Provided

PC02846-1

Comment:

It is essential for the economic growth of L.A. county that airport expansion be started. We are looking at 3-5 years away to completion. Nobody wants an airport expansion near to them. People object to El Toro & Ontario expansions and will block expansion. Long Beach & John Wayne are flight controlled. The courts will block March A.F.B. expansion. Palmdale is too far away. The only solution is to expand LAX. We already have the noise and traffic and the new generation of planes will control pollution.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02847 Dahlgren, William & Audrey None Provided

PC02847-1

Comment:

Palmdale makes the most sense to handle our long term needs. Would not like to see LAX expanded. We have too much noise and traffic right now.

Response:

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

PC02848 Erskine, Peter None Provided

PC02848-1

Comment:

Please do not expand LAX. Let the other regionals pick up slack. It is not fair.

Response:

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

PC02849 Staff, Evelyn None Provided

PC02849-1

Comment:

Do not expand LAX and create more traffic and environmental problems for the convenience of other cities in our own back yard.

Response:

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

PC02849-2

Comment:

Make use of El Toro and Palmdale for additional airports and create rapid transit into downtown Los Angeles.

Response:

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

PC02850 Treanor, John None Provided

PC02850-1

Comment:

I AM VERY OPPOSED TO 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.

PC02850-2

Comment:

IT WILL IMPOSE AN UNREASONABLE BURDEN ON THE ALREADY OVERCROWDED STREETS OF SEPULVEDA, CENTURY, LINCOLN AND THE 405.

Response:

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

PC02850-3

Comment:

WE NEED TO IMPLEMENT 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.

PC02851 Hoover, Elizabeth None Provided

PC02851-1

Comment:

As residential property owners in Manhattan Beach, we are already affected by noise pollution and car traffic, due to LAX. We are awoken in the middle of the night by low flying planes and tied up in traffic around LAX at all hours and days of the week, both on Sepulveda Blvd. and 405/105 Freeways. With the LAX master plan in effect these problems will only worsen.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. Also, please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC02851-2

Comment:

The addition to LAX will make Manhattan Beach a less desirable area to live and visit, affecting home prices and the town economy in general.

Response:

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

PC02851-3

Comment:

Let's let other communities help share the load of air travel, they use it too!

Response:

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

PC02852 Snyder, Gladys None Provided

PC02852-1

Comment:

I agree with Jane Harman views wholeheartedly. I am affected now with LAX's pollution and don't like it at all.

Response:

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

PC02853 Jordan, Beverly None Provided

PC02853-1

Comment:

Good Idea

Very needed.

Response:

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

PC02854 Loty, Fernande None Provided

PC02854-1

Comment:

I agree with Jane Harman

Response:

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

PC02855 Dunlap, Marolyn None Provided

PC02855-1

Comment:

(noise) getting worse in Manh. Bch. all the time.

Response:

Issues related to noise were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02855-2

Comment:

Basically, I agree with the regional plan for airport expansion which you have outlined on the other side of this letter. I work at LAX for an incentive travel company several days per month and am highly aware of its 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.

PC02855-3

Comment:

Also, Lot "C" where my company requires us to park is often full on weekends, especially at holiday times.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02856 Gaafar, Ahmed None Provided

PC02856-1

Comment:

OUR EFFORT SHOULD BE DIRECTED TOWARD ERECTING NEW AIRPORT FOR GROWING COMMUNITIES NOT TO ENLARGE LOS ANGELES 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.

PC02857 Grebliunas, John None Provided

PC02857-1

Comment:

I have lived near LAX for a number of years. From 1982-1984 I lived in Playa Del Rey and had to contend with constant air plane noise and the residue of jet fuel on my car and other personal belongings left outside.

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-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC02857-2

Comment:

From 1992 until present I have lived in Manhattan Beach and hear the planes from LAX every evening. There is a daily flight at approximately 11:00 PM that for some reason seems louder than most. My wife and I are disturbed by it daily. We could only imagine this situation worsening with LAX expansion.

Response:

Please Topical Response TR-N-3, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay. Also please see Response to Comment PC02772-2.

PC02858 Frieders, Lisa None Provided

PC02858-1

Comment:

STOP THE AIRPORT EXPANSION. TRAFFIC IS BAD ENOUGH WITHOUT FURTHER DEVELOPMENT. (NOT TO MENTION THE POLLUTION).

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

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.

PC02859 Cook, David None Provided

PC02859-1

Comment:

I feel sorry for those who put up with the noise factor around the airport. This and flight safety should require a regional airport plan. You are on the right track this time.

Response:

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

PC02860 Prescott, Ardis None Provided

PC02860-1

Comment:

I am very much opposed to the expansion of LAX. During the past 4 yrs, we have been fighting the FAA to get flights over the PV Peninsula routed around the Peninsula and 5 miles off shore.

Response:

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

PC02860-2

Comment:

Property values on the Peninsula and South Bay communities will decline and this is a beautiful Peninsula.

Response:

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

PC02860-3

Comment:

Safety on the ground and in the air will be jeopardized.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC02860-4

Comment:

Quality of life will be severely impacted with high levels of pollution, noise and ground transportation issues. Regional airports is the only 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-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. 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.

PC02861 Judkins, Bernadine None Provided

PC02861-1

Comment:

It would affect me. I live on Carrier & Airport Blvd - Flight PI - my garage is on Airport Blvd - I will never be able to get out driveway - With cars parked there you cannot see till you get out - So would be very dangerous - Besides they will take 5 ft off my parkway. They go fast enough now & if expressway I will be worse & dirty -

Response:

Comment noted.

**PC02862 Reilly, Emmett B. & None Provided
Betty J.**

PC02862-1

Comment:

I would be sickened and generally annoyed by the increase of traffic, noise and pollution resulting from the plans proposed at the June 9, 2001 meeting. The proposal would force more people and cars into an already overcrowded airport located in a residential area. There was no consideration of redistributing to the other local airports.

We need to have a study made and regional plan developed by a group with no interest in LAX which includes consideration of all airports in this 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 and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts. 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.

PC02863 **Elson, Hilari** **None Provided**
Hanamaikui

PC02863-1

Comment:

I oppose the LAX Master Plan for the reasons set forth in your letter. I do not believe it is fair for residents of other communities, especially Orange County, to oppose the building or expansion of airports in their areas because they don't want increased noise & congestion in their neighborhoods, while their use of LAX is one reason why LAX expansion is being sought.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, 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.

PC02864 **Keith, Mollie** **None Provided**

PC02864-1

Comment:

The use of the Palmdale Airport would be the best for expansion.plus when LAX - John Wayne & Ontario are covered with fog. Palmdale IS NOT. Also this would help to build up this area

Response:

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

PC02865 **Reynolds, Patrick** **None Provided**

PC02865-1

Comment:

I SUPPORT THE REGIONAL AIRPORTS PROPOSAL. IT MAKES NO SENSE TO KEEP EXPANDING LAX.

Response:

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

PC02865-2

Comment:

THE TRANSPORTATION IMPACTS HAVE ALREADY BEEN EXCEEDED. THE 405 & SURFACE STREETS ARE GRID LOCKED NOW. THE RAIL SERVICE DOES NOT CONNECT TO THE AIRPORT, NEITHER DOES THE 105, THUS EXACERBATING THE PROBLEM.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail and transit plan.

PC02865-3

Comment:

THE ADJACENT CITIES CANNOT BE PUSHED BACK ANY FURTHER TO ACCOMMODATE MORE 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.

PC02865-4

Comment:

WHAT ABOUT PRESERVATION OF THE REMAINING SAND DUNES AND BLUE BUTTERFLY HABITAT?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ET-1 regarding preservation of the Los Angeles/El Segundo Dunes and El Segundo blue butterfly habitat.

PC02865-5

Comment:

SATELLITE AIRPORTS IS THE ONLY ANSWER. WE NEED PLANNING, RESPONSIBLE PLANNING BY OUR ELECTED OFFICIALS IN MEETING THE EXPANDING DEMAND OF AIRPORTS IN GROWTH AREAS THAT RELIEVE SOME OF THE IMPACTS AT LAX, NOT COMPOUND 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.

PC02866 Biddle, William None Provided

PC02866-1

Comment:

I agree with Congresswoman Harman in that I oppose the LAX Master Plan and I am in favor of a 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.

PC02866-2

Comment:

The LAX Plan would have a decisive adverse affect on the traffic, noise, pollution, and population surrounding Torrance and the South Bay area in general.

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.

PC02867 Crane, Elihu None Provided

PC02867-1

Comment:

The LAX Master Plan is all wrong. Regional Airports are the ONLY FAIR and responsible answer. Of course rapid transit ground transportation must be included. Area City streets and the 405 Freeway are already impacted at almost any hour.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 for an analysis of traffic congestion issues. 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-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

PC02868 Goldberg, Jay None Provided

PC02868-1

Comment:

No LAX expansion!!! Already so much activity that it creates major roadway traffic, expecially the 405.

I would never support a politician or community leader who supported any expansion of LAX and that means 0 (zero) expansion, not some expansion in conjunction w/ a regional 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. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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.

PC02868-2

Comment:

The only intelligent major project would be to link LAX by rail to other areas so passengers could get to the airport quickly and without driving private cars.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan for more information. Alternative D would connect a people mover to an Intermodal Transportation Center near the Aviation station of the Green Line, with no extension of the Green Line necessary for terminal access. 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.

PC02869 Crow, Kenneth None Provided

PC02869-1

Comment:

I am a frequent flyer and depend on LAX for my business. I have seen the increased growth and congestion with the current facility and strongly support LAX expansion. The need for additional airport and runway capacity has been cited by the FAA in its National Aerospace Plan. I also favor expansion or development of other regional airports as well. I want to avoid a "not in my backyard" paralysis which will lead to under capacity airports, delays, lack of competition and increased ticket prices. This will only stifle our economy.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02870 Frank, Elizabeth None Provided

PC02870-1

Comment:

I live in a densely populated, low-rent housing area directly east of LAX. Under the proposed expansion plan, all apartment houses in this area will be demolished to make room for new cargo facilities. This expansion creates hardship for low-income retirees and employees of LAX and the surrounding hotels and businesses. As I'm sure you know, low-rent housing is shrinking rapidly in Los Angeles.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation issues, including affordable housing.

PC02870-2

Comment:

Increased traffic, congestion, noise and pollution will make the area for miles around a nightmare to access or work in.

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.

PC02871 Dajani, Nabil None Provided

PC02871-1

Comment:

YES! A REGIONAL AIRPORT PLAN W/GROUND TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS IS DEFINITELY PREFERRED TO LARGE-SCALE LAX EXPANSION.

BUT WHAT ABOUT HIGH SPEED RAIL TO REPLACE ALL THOSE SHORT HAUL FLIGHTS (< 500 MILES)?

THOSE FLIGHTS ACCOUNT FOR A GOOD PERCENTAGE OF THE REGIONAL AIRPORT TRAFFIC!!!

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand. Also, it would not be cost effective to construct a separate high-speed rail line between LAX and all destinations within 500 miles.

PC02872 Sigl, Virginia & James None Provided

PC02872-1

Comment:

WE SUPPORT EXPANSION OF LAX FOR MANY REASONS, BUT ONLY ONE IS NEEDED AS AN EXAMPLE OF USING PALMDALE OR ONTARIO - JUST YOU TRY DRIVING TO THESE AIRPORTS - AT ANY TIME OF THE DAY - OR NIGHT FOR THAT MATTER - IT TAKES HOURS & LOTS OF GAS FOR THESE TRIPS.

FOR ONCE - THINK OF THE PEOPLE WHO USE AN AIRPORT GETTING TO IT ETC.

P.S. WE LIVE IN VENICE - UNDER SANTA MONICA AIRPORT - IT ISN'T SO BAD.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02873 Henkhaus, Robert None Provided

PC02873-1

Comment:

I would be adversely affected by additional airport traffic. I work 1 block from LAX, live in So. Bay. Noise pollution, air pollution, chronically inadequate and disrepaired roads are what LAX expansion mean to me.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR address 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02873-2

Comment:

Please oppose this expansion and find other regional solutions.

Response:

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

PC02874 Kennedy, Emma None Provided

PC02874-1

Comment:

(1) First of all I am in the flight path, and as it is the FAA Air Traffic are not observing the curfew. They still fly between 12:00 A.M. and 6:00 AM. I think they should be fined everytime curfew is violated.

Response:

There is no curfew on operations at LAX. However, there are special flight procedures in effect between midnight and 6:30 a.m. These procedures are not mandatory, but are generally used by air traffic controllers when practicable. For more information on this topic, please see Topical Response TR-N-5, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-5.1 regarding over-ocean procedures and Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement. Also, please see Response to Comment PC01879-5 regarding nighttime single event noise impacts and mitigation.

PC02874-2

Comment:

(2) Bad for our community & neighborhood.

(3) Increase and concentrated noise, air, and water pollution

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, land use impacts in Section 4.2, Land Use, air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and water quality impacts in Section 4.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendices D, G, and S-C, and S-E and Technical Reports 1, 4, 6, S-1, S-4, and S-5. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding quality of life.

PC02874-3

Comment:

(4) Concern about air traffic safety due to overcrowded skies also increased air traffic would result in thousand more vehicles added to our freeways and congested streets

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02874-4

Comment:

(5) The proposed LAX Master Plan is 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 environmental impacts in Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures, see specifically wetlands impacts in Section 4.12, Wetlands, and coastal zone impacts in Section 4.14, Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers. Supporting technical data and analyses is provided in Appendix J2 of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02874-5

Comment:

(6) The City of Los Angeles owns two key airports in the heart of high growth areas of the region - Ontario and Palmdale. It would be more efficient to develop the airport as opposed to LAX. El Toro (Orange County) should be developed.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. 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.

PC02875 Forsman, Hans None Provided

PC02875-1

Comment:

I do believe in the expansion of LAX, but not without a resolution to the traffic congestion that already exists. I do not believe buses are the answer, nor do I feel expanding our freeways are the answer. We must take our future generations and the earth into consideration. In order to make this consideration, a usable rail system providing transportation to all airports and major business districts must move to the forefront of planning LA's future. Chicago and New York are perfect examples where the taxi driver/union and a rail system can thrive together. Traffic in any direction is always going to increase without a usable rail system.

Response:

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

PC02876 Balak, Marta None Provided

PC02876-1

Comment:

My reply is a little late, but my feelings against expansion of LAX are still very strong. I have enclosed some copies of letters to the Daily Breeze, two of which are mine; which show you how I feel regarding

3. Comments and Responses

this issue. We must stop this madness and the greed of the airlines that don't like using 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.

PC02876-2

Comment:

Palmdale remains answer to L.A. airport expansion

In a letter to the editor Aug. 14, 1998, I stated that Los Angeles International Airport was an accident waiting to happen. Dec. 22's Daily Breeze headline reads: "LAX is inches away from disaster."

Now the question is: When?

One need not be an Einstein to figure out that this airport cannot safely handle more traffic yet the Los Angeles City Council and other monetary seekers are pushing for expansion. Where?

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC00297-9, PC00281-25, and PC00543-1. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC02876-3

Comment:

There is no space left in which to expand unless they buy out the cities of Inglewood, Westchester, Playa del Rey and El Segundo or construct floating runways on the Pacific Ocean.

Response:

The build alternatives demonstrate how LAX could expand without buyout of the cities of Inglewood, Westchester, Playa del Rey, and El Segundo, or runways in the ocean. Please see Response to Comment PC00539-6 or Chapter V, Concept Development, Section 3.3.1 of the Draft LAX Master Plan and Chapter 2, Alternative D Development and Refinement, Section 2.7 of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum for a description of the land acquisition required for each alternative.

PC02876-4

Comment:

Palmdale should have been expanded in the 1970s when the city of Los Angeles purchased acres of desert land intended for an international airport. It now sits idle wasting taxpayers' money? Get real!

Response:

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

PC02876-5

Comment:

Palmdale should expand; LAX is just too crowded

I am in full agreement with Robert Pullen-Miles (Letters, July 27) that our voices must be heard regarding the expansion of Los Angeles International Airport. LAX is an accident waiting to happen!

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments to PC00297-9, PC00281-25, PC00543-1, and PC02876-2.

PC02876-6

Comment:

As a former airline employee and resident of El Segundo for many years, I have noticed a tremendous increase in traffic (both air and ground) noise, pollution and early turns over our city, as well as aborted landings due to runway congestion.

We do not need another runway, as this airport has outgrown its capacity to accommodate more traffic.

Response:

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

PC02876-7

Comment:

Must we experience a disastrous mid-air collision to convince the greedy pro-expansionists that our skies are already overcrowded?

Response:

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

PC02876-8

Comment:

Palmdale would be a good alternative and has ample runway space. It should have been further developed when expansion of LAX was first proposed in the 1970s.

Response:

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

PC02876-9

Comment:

Expansion would make LAX traffic unbearable

Whenever we have to go to Los Angeles International Airport, the traffic is just terrible, and it's almost impossible to pick up someone, or even to find a parking space. It is dangerous to drive with all this congestion, and your odds are very high that you could have an accident no matter how good of a driver you are.

We do travel a lot now that we are retired, so we fly into many states and to several large airports such as Orlando and Miami. None of them seems to have the problem we have at LAX.

It has been impossible for the state Department of Transportation to build roads fast enough to handle the traffic surrounding LAX. How is Caltrans going to handle the added traffic if LAX expands?

Shuttle buses and parking areas are very expensive and not the answer.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02876-10

Comment:

We cannot understand why the region has not taken advantage of some of these military bases such as Norton Air Force Base. This base has potential. It has one of the finest landing strips around. It is just sitting out there with weeds growing all around, with a freeway next to it. El Toro Air Base also has great potential.

Both airports are able to handle large aircraft and have lots of space to be able to handle traffic and are close to freeways. We feel that using either one of these bases would sure help the traffic problem we have in the South Bay, West Los Angeles and even the San Fernando Valley.

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. 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.

PC02876-11

Comment:

Do we need to spend all this money on LAX to make our lives more miserable? We don't think so.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02877 Ricardo, Foster None Provided

PC02877-1

Comment:

1. Reduce service, and surrounding activity in gen. area of LAX by 50%.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02877-2

Comment:

2. Upgrade Long Beach airport to handle approx. 50-60% of LAX traffic.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02771-3 regarding the use of Long Beach Airport.

PC02877-3

Comment:

3. Explore site for an additional airport.

Response:

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

PC02878 Franko, Robert None Provided

PC02878-1

Comment:

Please do not expand LAX any further.

Response:

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

PC02878-2

Comment:

The traffic situation in the South Bay is already bad and any expansion will make it worse.

Response:

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

PC02878-3

Comment:

Please restrict all traffic over Manhattan Beach and South Bay Cities.

Response:

Comment noted.

**PC02879 Fitzgerald, Sr.,
Glenn None Provided**

PC02879-1

Comment:

LAX AS EXIST NOW IS A TRAFFIC NIGHTMARE ON THE 405 FREEWAY. P.C.H. SURFACE STREET AND ALL ADJOINING CONNECTING SURFACE STREETS.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02879-2

Comment:

ADDITIONAL EXPANSION SHOULD BE PROHIBITED.

Response:

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

PC02879-3

Comment:

THE ADDITIONAL AUTOMOBILE TRAFFIC WOULD TURN THE AVAILABLE STREETS INTO A GIANT PARKING LOT.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02879-4

Comment:

REGIONAL EXPANSION IS THE ONLY INTELLIGENT EXPANSION FOR ALL OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA - RESIDENT OF SOUTH BAY SINCE 1948.

Response:

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

PC02880

**Fung, D.D.S.,
Carlton**

None Provided

PC02880-1

Comment:

No noise, no pollution, no traffic. Please no airport expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; 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.

PC02880-2

Comment:

Denver moved its airport far East of the city. Expansion should be made in Palmdale!

Response:

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

PC02881 Churg, Antonie None Provided

PC02881-1

Comment:

I support your opposition to LAX expansion. Overpopulation, consumption & unnecessary travel cannot be supported indefinitely. Evidently other cities can tolerate the expansion, but eventually we must stop expansion because it will be intolerable everywhere

Response:

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

PC02882 Yamamoto, John None Provided

PC02882-1

Comment:

We strongly oppose additional and disproportionate enlargement of LAX, both in terms of geographic expansion and MAP capacity. As it is, the taxpaying citizens of the South Bay bear most of the burden from flight noise, surface street and freeway congestion, and safety and environmental risks.

We strongly support a regional plan that more equitably and intelligently distributes benefits and burdens.

We hope and trust that parochial political interests and shortsightedness does not prevail to produce a poor outcome. Our public officials may be able to escape political accountability but the impact on real people will be tangible. Please remember this in your advocacy. Don't cave.

Response:

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

PC02883 Verman, Herbert None Provided

PC02883-1

Comment:

Traffic is impossible now - must be improved by providing other regional airports. This is long over-due. Orange Co. must be made to provide adequate air traffic in Orange County.

LAX is maxed-out.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, 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.

PC02884 Nelson, Dency None Provided

PC02884-1

Comment:

For all of the reasons you state on the front of this form, I wholeheartedly support a regional plan rather than the LAX Master Plan. Even if I didn't live in the South Bay, where LAX's expansion would negatively impact my way of life with increased traffic, noise and pollution, I would like to believe that common sense would still tell me that the regional approach is what will best serve the transportation and economic needs of all of Southern California.

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.

PC02885 Melinz, Elisabeth None Provided

PC02885-1

Comment:

1) I am not for expanding LAX Airport. I live in Playa Del Rey and the noise level is very high 24 hours a day and the pollution resulting from the heavy traffic is unconscienable.

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-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC02886 Crandall, Gary None Provided

PC02886-1

Comment:

I support the Regional Plan to airport growth. LAX is too crowded with nowhere to grow.

Response:

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

PC02886-2

Comment:

And it threatens what's left of Ballona Wetlands with noise and pollution.

Response:

Potential impacts of noise levels and air quality on sensitive biotic communities and sensitive flora and fauna were analyzed in Section 4.10 Biotic Communities (subsections 4.10.3, 4.10.6, and 4.10.7) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Cumulative impacts to wetlands were analyzed in Section 4.12 (subsection 4.12.7) of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

LAX Master Plan improvements have been determined to have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to sensitive biotic communities, sensitive species of flora and fauna, or wetlands; however, implementation of proposed mitigation measures would reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels. Impacts to biotic resources in the Ballona Wetlands were anticipated to occur in conjunction with the Playa Vista Second Phase Project as originally proposed; however, the subject project was substantially reduced in size and scope in November 2002. As currently proposed, the Playa Vista Second Phase Project, now referred to as the Village at Playa Vista Project, has no improvements or development proposed within the Ballona Wetlands.

PC02886-3

Comment:

But also include rapid train transit to airports in Ontario and Palmdale - like the TGV bullet trains of Europe. They're superb. Let's get out of this archaic automobile mindset!

Response:

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

PC02887 Mone, Lorraine None Provided

PC02887-1

Comment:

The traffic around and into LAX is one big traffic jam. It's almost grid-lock. We don't need more of it.

All the surrounding cities are plagued by the noise and pollution from so many airplanes. We don't need more of it. The United Airlines terminal is so large now that to get to some of the "gates" requires a long, time consuming hike. Some of their flights should be moved to other airports now.

I don't feel that the airport should gobble up more houses and ruin more cities in an effort to have all the airlines at one airport. The noise level is not acceptable at night at my house at the present time.

We don't need more 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. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, and

3. Comments and Responses

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.

PC02888 Paul, Betty None Provided

PC02888-1

Comment:

I would heartily recommend that LAX not be expanded or enlarged. Rather, make better use of the existing regional airports with absolute emphasis on the Palmdale airport.

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. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC02889 Cilurzo, Joseph W. & Margaret C. None Provided 6/29/2001

PC02889-1

Comment:

I feel strongly that LAX should not be expanded, for the following reasons:

1. The airport and supporting roadways are already operating at or above capacity

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please note that Alternative D is 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. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the impacts of Alternative D.

PC02889-2

Comment:

2. Other municipalities need to step up and accept their share of the responsibility for airport capacity, including Orange County.

3. Comments and Responses

3. Increasing the size of LAX will ultimately stifle growth; future expansion can better be accommodated in other areas such as El Toro.

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. 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.

PC02890 Shipper, Sander None Provided

PC02890-1

Comment:

I chose to live near LAX because I am an aircraft mechanic for Northwest Airlines. But I am not in favor of extreme expansion at LAX. Yes the airport must be refurbished. Passenger movement and traffic is awful. Technologically the airport is a relic of the 60's. Expansion must be spread out in a regional manner.

Response:

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

PC02890-2

Comment:

I have tried to access the airport by bicycle and foot and found it impossible from the south, since Sepulveda turns into a tunnel with no pedestrian walk or bike path. Even Aviation Blvd to the east has neither access. Therefore I am forced to drive to employee parking over roads not designed for the high volume now common. Many roads are also in disrepair, despite high revenue at LAX.

Response:

The project would incorporate bicycle paths along the Ring Road on the south, west, and north sides. This should assist the commentor for bicycle and walking access to the future west terminals. From there, people mover access could be obtained for access to the CTA.

PC02890-3

Comment:

In summary: improvement will result in expansion through higher efficiencies. Bigger is not always better, sometimes making it better for everyone is the answer.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

As described in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D, Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, does not increase capacity beyond that which would occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC02891 Oliver, Gertrude None Provided

PC02891-1

Comment:

Since I frequently fly out of LAX my biggest concern is safety, if LAX is expanded that means more planes & more congestion in the air.

Response:

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

PC02891-2

Comment:

If other areas want regional airports I personally think its a good idea.

Response:

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

PC02892 Anderson, Sylvia None Provided

PC02892-1

Comment:

Living so close to the airport (about 3 miles South) we have already been affected by increased flying into LAX and changes in flight patterns over the beach cities. Sometimes we have noise from helicopters that have stayed from the Sepulveda corridor.

Response:

Residing in Manhattan Beach, the commentor may be affected by easterly takeoffs circling back to the west on their departures to Asia. During a recent 18 month period, 82 jets departed to the east when over-ocean procedures were in effect, an average of about one per week. As noted by the noise abatement procedures delineated in Topical Response TR-N-7, exceptions to the over-ocean procedures are available when weather of wind conditions require east traffic flow. LAWA will be pursuing Federal approval of a restriction to alleviate that situation by making over-ocean procedures mandatory when they are in effect between midnight and 6:30 a.m. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 for more information. Additionally, for east flow operations at night, please see Topical Response TR-N-5, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-5.2.

Helicopters that have an operating agreement with LAWA are required to abide with Section 5, Helicopter Operating Procedures of the Aircraft Noise Abatement Operating Procedures, which can be found in Topical Response TR-N-7. However, all other helicopters can operate near the shore and during the nighttime hours without any restrictions.

PC02892-2

Comment:

Holiday times block up traffic all around. If we are spending the holiday at home we stay off the roads. Increased flights into LAX would make fighting the traffic a daily event & make it tough for me to travel north of Man. Bch.

Response:

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

PC02892-3

Comment:

I favor spreading the flight load between LAX & other local airports (Palmdale Ontario etc.)

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.

PC02892-4

Comment:

& PLEASE how about a rail line between airports like they have in Europe so that people can catch other flights if they want to.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC02893 McRitchie, Greig None Provided

PC02893-1

Comment:

I live on Sunridge (225); when the planes take the path they are supposed to use, the noise isn't too bad. However, as I'm sure you know many times the take off over the houses, I assume because of air traffic, increasing the flights is a concern. I feel each county should handle the flights for their population. Living on the North side of the Airport I of course would rather see a strip added to the South. Can't they build sound walls or absorption cones. Or take off heading South just a little. You have your hands full. Keep up the good work!

Response:

Regarding the location of flight paths, mitigation measure MM-N-4, Update the Aircraft Noise Abatement Program Elements as Applicable to Adapt to the Future Airfield Configuration, includes a call for all westerly takeoffs to fly to the shoreline before initiating turns on course. Historically, numerous flights have begun their turns before passing the shoreline, so the mitigation measure should alleviate much of the noise impact associated with early turns. See Topical Response TR-N-3.2, regarding early turns over areas north and south of LAX for additional information on this topic. In respect to the portion of the comment addressing each county handling the flights for its own population, LAWA is attempting to serve a portion of the market area of LAX and to induce airline service of the highest level to capture the international markets. It is the economic linkages to the major foreign economies that provides the highest value of return to the people of the region in terms of sales, employment, tax revenues, and investment. None of the other airports in the region can effectively compete against other major west coast cities for a significant portion of this share of the market. For further information on the effect of increased flights at LAX, please see Topical Response TR-N-6, regarding noise increases, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.2, and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. Alternative A is the only one of five alternatives that show the building of a runway on the north side of the airport, whereas, Alternative B shows the building of a runway on the south side of the airport. The communities to the south have the same concerns for Alternative B as are expressed by the commentor for Alternative A. Noise barriers and sound walls are limited in their ability to mitigate noise over large areas by their geographical position relative to both the noise source and the noise receptor. Properly placed, they may reduce noise several decibels in small areas near the barrier, although as distance is increased from the barrier to the receptor, the reduction gradually declines to zero. For additional information on these issues, noise mitigation measures are addressed in Topical Response TR-N-4, in particular TR-N-4.2, regarding berms, barriers, urban forest, walls proposed to interrupt ground noise.

PC02894 Leathers, Raymond & Ruth None Provided

PC02894-1

Comment:

Auto traffic to and from L.A.X. is already extreme, resulting in accidents, pollution, and Road Rage. Plus the pollution from the noisy planes and their filthy exhaust, is not healthy for anyone in the Southland cities.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR address traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In

3. Comments and Responses

addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects.

PC02894-2

Comment:

L.A.X. should not be expanded for any reason, there is no room for them. A regional plan to expand the other airports where they have the room to grow, and serve the population living there is the only sensible answer.

Response:

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

PC02895

Sarkisian, Alan

None Provided

6/8/2001

PC02895-1

Comment:

Palmdale is the proper place for a regional airport due to land availability. Most large airports are well outside of population centers. Kansas City is one such example. They have many airport busses.

Response:

The last several new airports to be built in North America are much closer to their respective downtowns than Palmdale. Washington Dulles is approximately 25 miles from the central business district (CBD), and required restrictions on Washington National to be successful. Denver's new airport is also about 25 miles from the CBD and required the closing of Stapleton to be successful. The Mirabel Airport is more than 30 miles from downtown Montreal. Its construction and the planned split of domestic and international traffic caused the loss of a major gateway connecting hub and the airport now sits virtually idle. Palmdale is more than 50 miles from downtown. As a responsible public agency, LAWA will only develop Palmdale when demand can be demonstrated. Even then, Palmdale will be a supplemental airport to LAX and the other regional airports, not a replacement for LAX. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding LAWA's efforts to encourage operations at Palmdale, planned improvements at the airport and nearby by LAWA and Caltrans, and the master plan update that is currently underway.

PC02896

Lefritz, Norman M. & Betty L.

None Provided

PC02896-1

Comment:

We live in the Palos Verdes area. If the LAX airport is enlarged, we feel jets will be flying over the peninsula. Many people in area have recorded fts & noise levels.

Response:

For information about recent changes to traffic patterns during departure procedures, as they affect the Palos Verdes area, please see Topical Response TR-N-3, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02896-2

Comment:

We find traffic around LAX very heavy, I cannot imagine additional cars on the road. We need traffic relief as well as better airport service.

Response:

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

PC02896-3

Comment:

We agree with your plan to expand other airports, other cities such Chicago, N.Y., London, Paris etc have 2 or more big airports, why not LA?

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.

PC02897

Duvall, Mark

None Provided

PC02897-1

Comment:

We definitely need to increase flights from regional airports other than LAX. An expansion of LAX would adversely affect traffic in my area, would increase the already sizeable noise problem, and would create additional pollution in my nearby environment.

Response:

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

PC02897-2

Comment:

Better connections out of Burbank, John Wayne, & Ontario might even decrease traffic in my area.

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC02897-3

Comment:

I am completely against 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.

PC02898 Sommer, Mark None Provided

PC02898-1

Comment:

We live on the N. side of Manchester and are concerned about LAX expansion. We feel the noise level is already great enough and support the regionalization of 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. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02899 Hahn, Michael None Provided

PC02899-1

Comment:

I think we need to accommodate growth, but I think other airports should shoulder their share, particularly Long Beach, which appears to be very underutilized.

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

3. Comments and Responses

intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding 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 City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Long Beach Airport is a municipal airport owned and managed by the City of Long Beach.

PC02900 Grapperhaus, Ann None Provided

PC02900-1

Comment:

I agree! Please continue to oppose the LAX Master Plan.

Response:

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

PC02900-2

Comment:

Safety factors, noise factors, plus traffic congestion make the plan so undesirable.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed safety impacts in Section 4.24.3, Safety, 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, 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. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC02901 Carr, Virginia None Provided 6/8/2001

PC02901-1

Comment:

27 Extended family members CA Registered Voters all, also 95% of my tennis club members and every teacher I know are vehemently opposed to L.A.X. expansion. We are watching and expecting you and Sen. Boxer to represent our viewpoint. Orange County and others must bear their share of expansion. LAX is already over-taxed & dangerous. No expansion.

Response:

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

PC02902 Contreras, Fernando None Provided

PC02902-1

Comment:

LAX, Master Plan, will affect me by traffic in those near areas by 405 and 105 Fwys. 405 Fwy has already a traffic problem, I think we don't need more than that.

Response:

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

PC02903 Wolf, Frank None Provided

PC02903-1

Comment:

Safety: According to the data cited on this circular, a takeoff or landing will occur every 40 seconds. Is this an adequate margin?

Response:

Normal operation of the airport results in two runways being dedicated to departures and two runways to arrivals so it is quite conceivable the 40 second interval can be achieved safely. Please also see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding safety.

PC02903-2

Comment:

Surely there are sufficient airports in Southern California to distribute the load.

Why must we darken the sky of the 36th District?

Response:

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

PC02904 Michel, LaVerne None Provided

PC02904-1

Comment:

I think the airport is plenty big now. The other two airports should be enlarged and take the other flights.

I would want to sell my house if it is enlarged, and I don't want to. I love where I live.

It was ruin some very expensive property like mine.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

PC02905 Hakim, Hosny None Provided

PC02905-1

Comment:

All Roads, Freeway around the port LAX getting real crowded. Any Addition will make the traffic miserable. Please fight any LAX addition.

Response:

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

PC02906 Bales, Jackson N. & Alice Wilk None Provided

PC02906-1

Comment:

We agree with you. We are opposed to the expansion of LAX. We feel that the surrounding counties should share in the benefits and burdens of an airport in their backyard

Response:

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

PC02907 Kaerskov, Rene None Provided

PC02907-1

Comment:

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH. NO MORE AIRPORT EXPANSION IN AN ALREADY "CROWED" 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.

PC02908 Daraban, Louis None Provided

PC02908-1

Comment:

To become bigger, is not necessarily better. The increase in traffic, noise and pollution is going to detract from our Quality of Life here in the South Bay. Please oppose it at LAX

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, 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 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-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02909 Kotoff, Bettie None Provided

PC02909-1

Comment:

We feel it is unfair to the businesses and residents of Westchester to bear the brunt of the proposed expansion. And the surrounding cities will suffer also. There is a need & room to expand the other airports - that could be a lot more convenient for everyone.

Response:

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

PC02910 Silverstein, Elliot None Provided

PC02910-1

Comment:

The 405 Freeway is the main route to LAX, and this freeway is already so overcrowded that it is almost useless during portions of each day. If the number of passengers using LAX increases, traffic will become even worse.

Response:

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

PC02910-2

Comment:

Developing new or existing airports in surrounding regions, away from LAX, will be much better for passengers and for local 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02911 Meyer, David None Provided

PC02911-1

Comment:

LAX is already busy enough. I am a pilot and my wife is a controller at LAX. The notion that traffic can be increased to proposed levels is ridiculous accounting by people who have never been in the front of a jet or control tower.

Response:

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

PC02911-2

Comment:

El Toro should be used as a reliever airport at a minimum. Make surrounding communities utilize their existing airports to reduce congestion.

Response:

Comment noted. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC02912 Higgins, Sharon None Provided

PC02912-1

Comment:

Expanding LAX means more traffic congestion, noise & considering that the 405 fwy is a parking lot 7 days per week, how could you think you can bring more people to the Airport? It will be more time sitting in your car,

Response:

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

PC02912-2

Comment:

the surrounding neighbors will have to sound proof their homes

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

PC02912-3

Comment:

and many will suffer hearing loss from outdoor exposure to airplane noise.

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.

PC02912-4

Comment:

Westchester will lose its community center shopping area.

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided additional discussion beyond that presented in the Draft EIS/EIR of potential acquisition effects on the Westchester Business District. As described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsections 4.2.6.2 through 4.2.6.4), acquisition within the Westchester Business District would be about 16 acres or 31 percent of the District under Alternative A, about 11 acres or 21 percent under Alternative B, or approximately 13 acres or 26 percent of the District under Alternative C. Under Alternatives A through C, relocation opportunities would be available for some uses nearby within Westchester Southside. Also, many of the uses that would be acquired are airport related and a number of the community related uses that would be acquired (a bank, an office supply store, a bar and beauty shop) would still remain available through similar businesses that are located in close proximity within the Westchester Business District.

Also, as described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6.5), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, in contrast to the other build alternatives, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative), does not include any acquisition within the Westchester Business District. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC02912-5

Comment:

Regional Airports need to be developed to provide accessible transportation for all residents.

Response:

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

PC02913

**Ramniceau,
Nicolas**

None Provided

PC02913-1

Comment:

I hate the idea of expanding LAX, particularly given the above figures, when other regional airports are willing to expand.

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

3. Comments and Responses

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

PC02913-2

Comment:

I used to live in Westchester in an area with heavy airplane noise where LAX is now buying the houses.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02913-3

Comment:

Manhattan Beach is now getting more (illegal?) fly over traffic than before. I hate it!

Response:

The commenter may be affected by easterly takeoffs circling back to the west on their departures to Asia. During a recent 18 month period, 82 jets departed to the east when over-ocean procedures were in effect, an average of about one per week. 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. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.2 regarding relationship between traffic levels and noise levels. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay.

PC02914 Hoffman, Steve None Provided

PC02914-1

Comment:

I'm with you! LAX is already overcrowded and overburdend,

Response:

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

PC02914-2

Comment:

much of the traffic due to freight cargo that is then driven back out to the countryside.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02914-3

Comment:

Plus, I'm tired of those 1 AM low flights over South Redondo & PV.

Response:

Living in the South Bay area, 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 wind conditions require east traffic flow. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay. Also, please see Response to Comment PC01879-5 regarding nighttime single event noise impacts and mitigation.

PC02914-4

Comment:

Keep LAX as is & build outlying airports to accommodate growth!

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.

PC02915

Simison, Jam

None Provided

PC02915-1

Comment:

Because I live in Redondo Beach the airport has a large negative effect on the quality of my life. For selfish reasons I would prefer not enlarging 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC02915-2

Comment:

I also think that it is very short sighted planning to put all the eggs in one basket. If the Inglewood fault were to have a major quake almost all the air traffic in and out of L.A. could be halted for an extended period of time.

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

3. Comments and Responses

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

PC02915-3

Comment:

Having several major airports 50 or more miles apart serves our "spread out population" much better. A good rapid transit system between airports should also be planned.

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand.

PC02916 Peck, M.D., Joseph None Provided

PC02916-1

Comment:

I support a regional plan as the best solution to an increasing number of air passengers. I believe that this burden should be distributed throughout the greater LA & Orange Co areas. LAX already is a challenge for frequent air commutes.

Response:

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

PC02917 Culbertson, Barbara None Provided

PC02917-1

Comment:

I live about 1 mile from LAX and the traffic, pollution & noise is already intollerable.

Response:

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

PC02917-2

Comment:

I am a widow and do not have the funds to paint my home every 2 years which is necessary because of the pollution from planes flying over which is not suppose to be.

Response:

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

PC02917-3

Comment:

The airport doesn't seem to care if the planes follow the law. They have been very bad neighbors.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02917-4

Comment:

I can't imagine what any expansion would mean. Why when two areas are asking for an airport - greed.

Response:

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

PC02918

Michel, Dorothy

None Provided

PC02918-1

Comment:

Expand other So. Cal. regional airports. LAX is already too busy - many arriving passengers are not staying in the LA area - expand airports where passengers live or plan as their destinations.

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.

PC02918-2

Comment:

We in the South Bay are aware of the incremental changes and expansion LAX is already undertaking; subtle changes we resent without proper impact studies.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels. LAX is a large heavily-used public facility that operates 365 days a year. LAWA implements, on an ongoing basis, a very active operations and maintenance (O&M) program to provide a high level of safety, security, efficiency, and convenience for passengers, visitors, and employees at LAX. Various improvement and O&M projects in support of existing operations occur on a regular basis and are exempt from NEPA and CEQA. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed a

3. Comments and Responses

variety of major improvements to LAX as proposed under four build alternatives designed in light of projected growth and demands at the airport.

PC02918-3

Comment:

Quality of life, even in greater Los Angeles, should have some merit even if it interferes with so called economic benefits - whose benefits?

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. The economic impacts were addressed in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02918-4

Comment:

Please look at expanding Ontario or other regional airports.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC02919 Anderson, Ken None Provided

PC02919-1

Comment:

I think that Palmdale/Ontario locations should be developed.

Response:

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

PC02920 Woodmansee, R. None Provided

PC02920-1

Comment:

The Politicians have forced LAX exp on us long enough. Push for alternative plan to develop - Palmdale & Ontario & Orange Co.

Response:

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

PC02921 Curran, Rose Marie None Provided

PC02921-1

Comment:

We do not want LAX to expand. It's big enough already. We do not want more traffic, pollution and noise. We have lived in our house at 1831 Stanford, RB since Jan. 1960, and it has certainly changed and not for the better.

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.

PC02922 Tyree, Jr., Robert None Provided

PC02922-1

Comment:

I am not affected by traffic, noise and pollution resulting from LAX airport, neither do I think others are on the P.V. Peninsula. They're just looking for something to complain about. I have been very disturbed by low flying helicopters, however. There is no argument that LAX needs to have operations reduced and that expansion needs to be stopped.

Response:

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

PC02922-2

Comment:

We need to have Long Beach operations increased to provide the South Bay with more departure options by major air carriers.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02771-3 regarding the use of Long Beach Airport. Some airports cannot meet the demand as a result of government caps (i.e., Long Beach and John Wayne) or longstanding opposition (Burbank). 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.

PC02922-3

Comment:

Palmdale is a ridiculous choice - The summers are far too hot & there's no efficient surface transport to that airport.

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

PC02923 **Wooldridge,
Elizabeth & D.E.** **None Provided**

PC02923-1

Comment:

I feel that Palmdale and Ontario would be more appropriate for expansion than LAX. LAX is too congested including surrounding areas with traffic and residential homes and businesses. We do not need more congestion in this area. Palmdale and Ontario have a great deal of area for expansion and more favorable.

Response:

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

PC02924 **Hassoldt, Elizabeth
A. & Arnold** **None Provided**

PC02924-1

Comment:

LAX is a nightmare - no parking to pick up people & too congested

Response:

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

PC02924-2

Comment:

How about George Air force base or the area around Riverside & San Bernardino County - where there is a population explosion & why not El Toro - It was a Marine air base -

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. 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.

PC02924-3

Comment:

We think LAX is already over burdened.

Response:
Comment noted.

PC02925 Forman, Angela None Provided

PC02925-1

Comment:
I advocate a regional plan to share the burden of heavy traffic at LAX. With population growth, other airports should expand and help LAX in a reasonable manner.

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

PC02926 Vendeland, Richard None Provided

PC02926-1

Comment:
TO DATE LAX HAS BEEN SELF SERVING. BETTER OR MORE UNSELFISH PLANNING COULD HAVE REDUCED TRAFFIC IN AND AROUND THE AIRPORT. WHY WOULD THINGS BE DIFFERENT NOW?

MY VOTE - EXPAND SURROUNDING AIRPORTS. WE HAVE ENOUGH POLUTION!

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

PC02927 Matson, Elizabeth None Provided
D.& Donald H.

PC02927-1

Comment:
WE STRONGLY OPPOSE ANY EXPANSION OF LAX
WE ALREADY HAVE TOO MUCH IMPACT ON SOUTH BAY AND 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02928 Baldwin, Eve None Provided

PC02928-1

Comment:

I agree with a regional solution. Not only is it safer to have the air traffic spread out instead of congested in one area, it just makes sense. I live about 10 mins. from LAX so it is great for me, but many must travel far distances to travel to and from LAX - only adding more ground transpo traffic.

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-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC02928-2

Comment:

Plus, there are so many local residents opposed to expansion of LAX because of noise and air pollution.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, 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.

PC02929 Call, Connie None Provided

PC02929-1

Comment:

I support construction of airports based on a regional airport 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.

PC02930 **Miller-Sheehan,** **None Provided**
 Janet

PC02930-1

Comment:

The LAX Master Plan will severely impact the quality of life for myself, my family & our community. The Plan is one sided & careless. This plans reflect a lack of responsibility & foresight. The Plan must be stopped & a more regional approach must be 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 and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC02931 **Swallow, Ellen** **None Provided**

PC02931-1

Comment:

(1) Lower property values. Higher stress levels. More street traffic. Worsening on-time departure & arrival records. Noise noise noise. Pollution3, too

(2) Don't know except (1)* above!

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 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.

PC02931-2

Comment:

Please get direct rapid transit into LAX (like London, Paris, Soon JFK-NY, et al

Response:

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

PC02932 **Muskardin,** **None Provided**
 Marguerita

PC02932-1

Comment:

LAX IS BIG ENOUGH!

I DO NOT WANT TO SEE AN EXPANSION AT LAX.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC02932-2

Comment:

I LIVE IN THE SOUTH BAY AND ALREADY AM PERTURBED BY EVENING PLANE NOISE. I MOVED TO HERMOSA BEACH TO BE WHERE I WILL NOT HEAR PLANES FLYING OVERHEAD.

Response:

Comment noted. In the South Bay communities aircraft noise levels associated with the project actions will be much lower than those considered to be significant by all regulatory agencies. The area may be effected by noise from other airports, as well as ongoing modifications in air traffic routes out of LAX that have nothing to do with the proposed Master Plan actions. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay, Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2 regarding early turns over areas north and south of LAX, and Subtopical Response TR-N-3.3 regarding changes in noise levels relative to changes in air traffic. For more information on noise impacts on the South Bay, see Response to Comment PC00552-2.

PC02932-3

Comment:

AIRPORT TRAFFIC IS ALSO A NUISANCE.

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.

PC02933 Miraula, Susan None Provided

PC02933-1

Comment:

Although I'm not affected by extra traffic, I think Orange Co should assume their responsibility & either increase John Wayne's capability or use the former US base for a regional airport

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 for a discussion of the El Toro conversion, constraints at John Wayne Airport, and the Ontario Master Plan.

PC02934 Young, Esther None Provided

PC02934-1

Comment:

I live in Playa Del Rey. The jet noise is already unbearable. This area is already impacted too much. It has capped oil wells, diesel fumes from the Marina Boat Harbor & LAX, garbage processing plant & gas

co. The Serma Corporation's massive building plans will add massive traffic congestion & fumes from car exhausts.

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. Regarding the Serma Corporation development, it is believed that the commenter is referring to the Playa Vista project. The Playa Vista project was addressed in the cumulative impacts analysis of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02934-2

Comment:

With expanding population growth in outlying areas wouldn't it make more sense to use regional areas available to the airport authority? What do we have to do to accomplish this, die from the pollution?

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects. 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.

PC02935 Hondrick, M. None Provided

PC02935-1

Comment:

When it is raining or other weather conditions, we hear jets going over our house making loud noise just continuously at night when we are trying to sleep.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01879-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC02936 Perkins, Charles & Joan None Provided

PC02936-1

Comment:

Very little or no downside

Traffic - Little if any affect

Noise - None or less if over ocean routing increased

Pollution - None with improvements in routing & technology

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

3. Comments and Responses

Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

PC02936-2

Comment:

Personal Economic Impact - Residential values would probably increase with the increase of traffic

Response:

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

PC02936-3

Comment:

Economic impact on community with increased traffic would definitely be maintained and most likely improve.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02937 Gleghorn, George J. None Provided & Barbara M.

PC02937-1

Comment:

We support the regional plan and oppose expansion of LAX.

Response:

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

PC02938 Shelton, Nadyne None Provided

PC02938-1

Comment:

We are definitely in agreement with your views on the regional airport plan - every time we have to use LAX it becomes more and more apparent that no more expansion should be allowed.

Response:

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

PC02940 Thompson, Tim None Provided

PC02940-1

Comment:

The effect on my immediate neighborhood would be minimal; regional traffic congestion and pollution would increase.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02940-2

Comment:

I can understand people in other areas not wanting to deal with the impact of an international airport, but it seems fairer and more efficient to distribute air traffic more evenly. The former El Toro airbase seems an ideal candidate, but as they say, NIMBY!

Response:

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

PC02941 Baron, Helen None Provided

PC02941-1

Comment:

I agree 100% with 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-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC02942 Beissert, Rev. Peg None Provided

PC02942-1

Comment:

The mistake often made is that bigger will be better. I have been in California since 1973 as a Presbyterian Minister - five of those years serving a church three miles from LAX. During that time one of our churches closed due to proximity to LAX. Road work to enhance access is causing a mess, as it has in the past also. I live in Rancho Palos Verdes. In one evening I counted more than 10 planes in the air at one time - the noise is increasing. Let's share both benefits and headaches

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

approach to meeting demand. 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.

PC02943 Moore, Roberta None Provided

PC02943-1

Comment:

For many years, aircraft departing LAX initiated their turns so that they were over Palos Verdes during the turn. This procedure guaranteed that the aircraft were too far up to have a noise impact in PV or any of the beach cities.

This procedure, when initiated, was widely publicized as a noise abatement measure. We were invited to observe the halos on the heads of the angelically considerate managers of these decisions.

For the last two years (or more), the aircraft noise over Hermosa Beach has been so high that I cannot hear my own, indoor, television when a plane passes over. Obviously, the airline managers have decided to save the cost of fuel rather than continue noise abatement procedures.

I had thought that the procedures were required by the FAA, and perhaps they are/were. Can you do anything to help enforce existing rules?

Response:

The FAA does not require noise abatement procedures, but does manage traffic to follow the procedures recommended by the airport when conditions of weather and safety permit. Please see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement. Also, in the South Bay communities, aircraft noise levels associated with the project actions will be much lower than those considered to be significant by all regulatory agencies. The area may be affected by noise from other airports, as well as ongoing modifications in air traffic routes out of LAX that are not related to the proposed Master Plan actions. For further information on this topic, please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding South Bay being overflowed by new routes.

PC02944 Smith, Norman None Provided

PC02944-1

Comment:

THE EXPANSION OF THE LAX IS NOT ACCEPTABLE. ALREADY, THERE ARE TOO MANY LOW FLYING AIRCRAFT OVER THE RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS OF THE SOUTH BAY. I SUPPORT YOUR WORK IN DEVELOPING ALTERNATIVE MEANS OF HANDLING AIR TRAFFIC.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

PC02945 Roberts, Beverly None Provided

PC02945-1

Comment:

I would like to remark on the total airport facilities in the southern California area. I live south of LAX and west of Long Beach. I am a pilot and fly over southern California a great deal. I find that when I use LAX as a passenger, the traffic and terminal congestion are about as bad as one could want without traffic coming to a dead halt more times than it does now. These are my feelings from looking down from above, and as a passenger using LAX. Noise is not a problem with me although some people in my area are paranoid about the noise.

LAX expansion- No. It is too congested now.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D, Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, has been designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient and efficient. Alternative D is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, which calls for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region.

PC02945-2

Comment:

Ontario: Should be some room for added flights.
Long Beach: Same as Ontario.

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC02945-3

Comment:

El Toro: Yes. It is far enough away from LAX to serve the San Diego and neighbors area of Southern California. The land is there. The basic runways are there. Some facilities are there. It seems to me to be the ideal location for another international airport. The complaint that it is unsafe I find interesting since the military used it without undue problems to my knowledge.

Response:

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

PC02946 Smith, Barbara None Provided

PC02946-1

Comment:

I fully support your approach to airport development. If LAX is enlarged along with the disastrous Playa Vista development will wreck havoc on the communities, the freeways & roads & ruin the beauty of our natural resources. The 2 ideas are linked in their detrimental impact. So you can see I oppose both LAX expansion & Playa Vista. Since I moved to Venice in '85 the traffic has already become a mess

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 Response to Comment AL00018-19 regarding the evaluation of cumulative impacts in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC02946-2

Comment:

& re: LAX on foggy days & nights when sound carries further we in Venice can hear the planes take off.

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.

PC02947 Collins, Jennie None Provided

PC02947-1

Comment:

NOISE POLLUTION WHEN PLANES FLY OVER THE PALOS VERDES PENINSULA

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay. Please also see Response to Comment PC00552-2 regarding noise impacts on the South Bay.

PC02948 Telles, April None Provided

PC02948-1

Comment:

I oppose the LAX Master in favor of a regional plan as well. I do believe the Master Plan would effect me negatively in terms of both traffic & pollution in the South Bay. I work in El Segundo & frequent LAX for business travel.

Response:

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

PC02949 Brunak, Christine None Provided

PC02949-1

Comment:

As we are Senior Citizens it would be very difficult for us to either move after living for 37 years in Westchester or accept the noise of the planes flying above and pollution which is killing our lungs! For us an expansion of LAX means disaster.

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. 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.

PC02950 Englert, Ken None Provided

PC02950-1

Comment:

NO MORE CONJESTION! LAX IS BEING OVER BUILT & TRAFFIC IN THE AREA IS IMPOSSIBLE & GETTING WORSE! IT IS ONLY LOGICAL TO DEVELOPE THE PALMDALE & ONTARIO AIR 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 and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02951 Mueck, Mariann None Provided

PC02951-1

Comment:

Our daughter lives near the #405 & Marina freeway crossing. She uses #405 for school (UCLA) and work. The grid lock happens many times - to up date the airport is probably necessary but extention would only expand the already existing problems.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC02951-2

Comment:

Inglewood area has all of the problems plus.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02952 Cosgrove, Tom None Provided

PC02952-1

Comment:

My family, and the families of my neighborhood, are concerned with the economic and environmental impact of the proposed expansion of LAX. Already on the West Side, there exists an excessive level of noise pollution and congestion, the magnification of which by the proposed expansion will only serve to lessen the quality of life of its residents.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, the economic impacts of the proposed project 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 and analyses provided in Technical Report 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR, and Technical Report S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02952-2

Comment:

The resulting decline in property values will be devastating to many local communities, including the lovely middle class neighborhood of Westchester. That, coupled with the current economic downturn, would wipe out a significant portion of area residents net worth.

Response:

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

PC02952-3

Comment:

At the same time, those living in communities to the north and east would face even worse traffic and congestion getting to LAX, and at LAX.

Response:

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

PC02952-4

Comment:

The city, much like Chicago and NY, is far better served all around by regional solutions.

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.

PC02952-5

Comment:

The LAX-only solution is ill-conceived, short-term, and not a solution a world class city would ever embrace.

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.

PC02953

Lawson, V.

None Provided

PC02953-1

Comment:

Suggestions

(1) Make Airport pay City of LA monies owed ie concessions etc. (No more secret deals)

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02953-2

Comment:

(2) Keep LAX as a passenger airport & also for special imports, perishables, blood etc.

(3) Farm out extra traffic & cargo to Palmdale Orange County and El Toro. Closer airports means less commute for passengers.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Neither the FAA nor LAWA have the authority to direct airlines to use one airport in favor of another airport. The Airline Deregulation Act of 1978, as amended, ended federal, state, and local governments role in determining the location for air service by airlines. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-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.

PC02953-3

Comment:

(4) Hold airport to a good neighbor policy. After all respect for one another as individuals and as communities was a necessity for living, even long before airplanes and airports were invented!

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02953-4

Comment:

(5) Improve the Airport within the limits that exist. Quieter jets better air-control etc. There are some very smart people out there hire them use their ideas.

Response:

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

PC02953-5

Comment:

Broken Promises

(1.) No more early turns after deadly crash in El Seg. in the 60's, they still do it.

Response:

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

PC02953-6

Comment:

(2.) No more condemned homes in neighboring areas. Promised action wasn't real estate speculation. Today they want more homes condemned for their expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation. No residential acquisition is proposed under Alternative D. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC02953-7**Comment:**

(3.) No more excessive noise promised MGM Grand Airline we'll be good neighbors. At night sleep is disrupted by engine testing

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-5.3 regarding night run up activity information about nighttime engine test activity.

PC02953-8**Comment:**

& even during the day the jets are so loud my neighbor can't hear me even when I'm speaking directly to him. We just point at the sky & wait for the jet noise to subside.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. However, please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. Regarding high noise levels at the commentor's property (located at 801 Bungalow Drive), to qualify for soundproofing, properties must be exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels. As shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S1 in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the 65 CNEL noise contour does extend south into the City of El Segundo at the subject property under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions and therefore this property is eligible for sound insulation under the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP). Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program. As presented in Section 4.2.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, within the 75 CNEL noise contour residential properties with exterior private habitable areas are considered to be incompatible with airport uses, event if interior noise levels are reduced to 45 CNEL. Although exposure of noise-sensitive uses to outdoor noise levels in the 65 to 75 CNEL range are considered to be compatible, areas exposed to these noise levels would still have some impact on outdoor speech and the quality of outdoor activities. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels. Please also see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 regarding existing high noise levels.

PC02953-9**Comment:**

(4) Many times houses shake in a way that makes you pause to see if it's a quake. Most of those occasions are created by "United" cargo flights.

Response:

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

PC02953-10**Comment:**

The Airport has always lied! I've seen & heard the truth for 40 years.

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

PC02954 Cinquini, David None Provided

PC02954-1

Comment:

I would like to applaud you for speaking out against the expansion of LAX.

Response:

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

PC02954-2

Comment:

I live approximately 35 miles east of LAX in the Whittier hills and when the airport is busy, there are one or two flights flying over my rooftop every minute. Sometimes, there are 747's that are flying lower than allowed.. There are flights that sound as if they will be using my roof as their landing strip, after 11PM. My neighbors and I have discussed this often and hope that they will not continue this pattern or add any more flights to LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. The commentor's location in Whittier Hills is directly under the Instrument Landing System (ILS) approach from the east into LAX. In this location, the comment is accurate that when the airport is busy, flights pass over the location very frequently. The location of this approach pattern will not change with any of the future alternatives. Regarding the altitude of the aircraft, the aircraft should be several thousand feet above the location's ground level during an ILS approach to the airport. At times, air traffic controllers will direct an aircraft to descend and maintain an altitude below the ILS glide slope to separate it from other aircraft in the vicinity. The aircraft would then intercept the glide path nearer the airport. Unless the aircraft is descended below 1,000 feet above the ground, the aircraft is not lower than "allowed", although it may be lower than expected or than is normal. Additionally, the sheer size of a 747 aircraft may make it appear to be lower than its actual altitude.

PC02954-3

Comment:

I understand the City of Los Angeles, Dept. of Airports owns approximately 18,000 acres of land for a new airport at Palmdale. I am aware that this has been discussed for the past 30 years.. From an article in the L.A. Times a few years ago, you spoke up with regard to using Palmdale Airport to relieve traffic at LAX, which I thought was a GREAT idea!!

Now that there is a new mayor in the city of L.A., Mr. James Hahn, maybe this will become a reality. What is not realistic is to spend twelve billion dollars to expand LAX or adding another airport in Orange County.

I have driven from my home to Palmdale in one hour and fifteen minutes.. I could live with that as well as many other people, to make the airports a 'safe' place to fly in and out of and to make the skys safer..

Response:

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

PC02954-4

Comment:

Please keep up the good work opposing 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.

PC02955 Simmons, Harold None Provided

PC02955-1

Comment:

I am not totally aware of the details of the LAX Master plan; most bureaucratic plans tend to be mired in confusion, and I probably wouldn't understand it anyway.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02955-2

Comment:

Simply stated, I support expansion of the regional airports, i.e., Palmdale and Ontario, as you do. Your comparison of LAX and Denver illustrates quite clearly why LAX should not be expanded-the airport is an island surrounded on one side by the ocean and by people on the other three sides. The population density alone makes further LAX growth irresponsible.

The issue of expanding the regional airports is hardly new. If Los Angeles is to continue to bulge, as it likely will, these airports must be the focus for added airline service, both passengers and freight. Airport growth must be coupled with rapid transit service, preferably rail, to strategic points in this far-flung city. In recent visits to St. Louis and Atlanta, I have been impressed by the speed, cost, and efficiency of the airport to downtown service. Much faster and cheaper than cabs or busses, plus utilization of clean and smooth-riding equipment!

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand.

PC02955-3

Comment:

No need to mention the added traffic congestion, plus air and noise pollution! These are a given around any airport, and no one can deny that the already busy South Bay has plenty of these negatives with the existing airport facilities.

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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02956 Ross, Jay None Provided

PC02956-1

Comment:

I live three miles south of the airport, and I oppose any expansion.

Like the freeway systems in southern California, the LAX airport is already too big, and even more detriments will result from expansion. We need to protect our neighborhoods and do what is right for the whole.

Response:

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

PC02956-2

Comment:

A better alternative is to invest this money in high-speed rail, which is not subject to weather storms, etc.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan, particularly Subtopical Response TR-ST-5.1 regarding the high speed rail connection.

PC02956-3

Comment:

The best air alternative is the regional plan to shift this extra growth to Palmdale and Ontario (though not to El Toro - that should be a regional park).

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

PC02956-4

Comment:

Please consider my alternatives and don't make the mistakes of past planners that have ruined southern California.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments PC02956-1 through PC02956-3 above.

PC02957 Quan, Wilson None Provided

PC02957-1

Comment:

At first, I would have been convinced that the LAX master plan was a good thing for the L.A. area as to jobs, and economic opportunity. Perhaps LAX still needs some improvements to improve the aging infrastructure there. But I am swayed by your statements about how the traffic has grown at LAX, as well as the number of passengers that are handled by LAX compared to the nation's newest airport at DIA.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels.

PC02957-2

Comment:

It appears to me to be unfair to have LAX shoulder all the expense, noise, and traffic congestion, both on the ground and in the air. The inconvenience to our traveling public on the eve of holidays tell the true story of how bad the congestion can get.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC02957-3

Comment:

I speak from personal experience, as an airline pilot, flying in and out of LAX, as well as being a resident in Redondo Beach. We have done a great job with our new 405 and 105 freeways to alleviate much of the congestion to the airport and have perhaps reached a good level of efficiency with LAX as it stands now. Trying to squeeze more chickens into this 10 pound bag....well you know the story.

Response:

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

PC02957-4

Comment:

I'm in agreement with you: Let the other regions of greater Los Angeles share some of their land and airspace. And, they would enjoy the convenience of having their own airport. Ontario (also run by the City of L.A.) as well as the proposed new Orange County airport are some of the airports that could well be developed to handle some of the passenger load LAX is being asked to shoulder.

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.

PC02957-5

Comment:

Of course this is my simplistic view. From an airline company point of view, bigger is better, of course, because they would rather have a single hub and spoke operation, and would prefer one large airport, over several smaller ones. Never mind the passenger inconvenience of commuting in traffic for hours. Not their problem.

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. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-2 regarding the role of deregulation in aviation planning and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC02957-6

Comment:

In summary, it is time to consider other approaches (not a play on words) to the LAX Master Plan. Approaches that look not just to the next five or ten years, but the next 25 or 30 years, that would best serve our Southern California area.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the Southern California Association of Governments Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meet demand.

PC02958 **Olympios, Stavros & Anne Marie** **None Provided**

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

PC02959 **La Ferla, Portia** **None Provided** **6/19/2001**

PC02959-1

Comment:

I am writing this letter in response to the survey you sent out regarding the LAX master plan. This issue is the most important quality of life issue for me, my family and my neighborhood.

Our home is our main financial investment. My husband and I feel that we invested wisely, paying a premium for a small (1500 sq. ft), single-family residence in a quiet neighborhood with good schools in walking distance to the beach. If we add a second floor, our home will have an ocean view encompassing most of the Santa Monica Bay. On quiet evenings, we can hear the waves, seals barking, and the croon of the foghorn. My husband and I work long hours in order to be able to afford our home.

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.

PC02959-2

Comment:

I have lived in the South Bay area since 1969, and in our present home since 1991. We never noticed any aircraft noise until 2 years ago. The roar of jets over our home has increased markedly since then. Heavy jets passing overhead between 10 PM and 2AM jolt us from our sleep.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. However, please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. Regarding high noise levels in the South Bay area, to qualify for soundproofing, properties must be exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels. As shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S1 in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, overall areas exposed to high noise levels (defined as 65 CNEL or greater) under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions do extend south into portions of the City of El Segundo. Therefore these areas are eligible for sound insulation under the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP). Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program. Overall the areas exposed to high noise levels in El Segundo have decreased over time. Also relative to single event noise levels that result in nighttime awakening (as established by the 94 dBA SEL noise contour), portions of El Segundo are located within the 94 dBA SEL contour under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions, as shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular, Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding South Bay overflown by new routes. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 regarding existing high noise levels.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02959-3

Comment:

If this noise continues and increases, it will erode the quality of life and real estate values in one of the most livable areas of Los Angeles, an area with an almost perfect climate and relatively little air pollution.

Response:

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

PC02959-4

Comment:

Families have no need of air conditioning or double paned windows since it is rarely very hot or cold. We could add these features to abate the noise, but we would increase our energy consumption and our energy costs and lose the breezes and the sounds of the sea that we bought our homes to enjoy.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels. Regarding the increase in energy consumption and energy costs, residential sound insulation provided under the ANMP uses acoustically-rated doors and windows, which prevent 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.

PC02959-5

Comment:

Our area already supports its fair share of noise and pollution from LAX, numerous power plants (including one 2 miles from our home), and oil refineries (3 within a 10 mile radius), not to mention oil tankers and cargo ships. Air traffic must be spread to other areas of the region to prevent increased air pollution, noise, and traffic. Expand the airports in Orange County and the inland areas where so many LAX passengers currently reside.

Response:

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

PC02960 **Hepler, Dennis & Cheryl** **None Provided** **11/2/2001**

PC02960-1

Comment:

This letter is to request information regarding our property in the Manchester Square area of Los Angeles. We own property at 5327 West 99th St.

As you are aware, the properties in this area of Westchester have been designated to be purchased by the Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) through a Voluntary Property Acquisition/Relocation program. According to past LAWA correspondence regarding the Airport's acquisition of our property, the first properties acquired by the Airport were based on "hardship." Initially our property did not qualify as a hardship acquisition, based on the LAWA guidelines. Now, consistent with those guidelines, we qualify as a hardship acquisition.

We are in a difficult situation of trying to rent a house with empty lots scattered throughout the neighborhood. As soon as a house was acquired by the LAWA it was razed. As of September our tenants have moved from our property to another location because they felt uncomfortable with the empty lots, and because many of their children's friends had moved away. Our property is now vacant and we are in a tough position of trying to find suitable tenants.

The information I am requesting is: when will the airport be purchasing our property? At the recent Board of Airport Commissioner's meeting on October 23, 2001, I asked the Airport Commission that question and was advised "this is the public comment session only." Therefore we are requesting an answer to this question in writing.

We would very much appreciate a response to this question as well as occasional information as to the progress and status of our property as it relates this program. This small effort on the part of the City of Los Angeles and the Airport Authority will go a long way in reestablishing accord with us as well as other property owners in this community.

Response:

Comment noted. According to LAWA's Residential Acquisition Division, since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR the commentator's property has been purchased by LAWA. Please see Topical Responses TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the Community of Westchester and Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

PC02961 **Davison, Sallie** **None Provided** **11/6/2001**

PC02961-1

Comment:

It took the terrorism of September 11th to focus attention on safety and security rather than a bigger Los Angeles International Airport.

Finally, some sensible ideas are being substituted for the LAX Master Plan that ignored everything but more growth.

Please include the following comments for consideration along with Mayor Hahn's 'Alternative 5' proposal.

Response:

Please see Response to Comments PC01881-31, PC02131-5, and PC02226-3 regarding safety and security issues. Also see Response to Comment AL00051-93 regarding economic conditions and Master Plan alternatives.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02961-2

Comment:

Comments on the LAX Master Plan EIR/EIS Alternative 5

The communities surrounding Los Angeles International Airport have had to bear the burden of the Jet Age Airport since it moved west of Sepulveda Boulevard late in the 1950s. More than 10,000 homes were lost, those families displaced, two public schools were closed and the Westchester Central Business District was forced to undergo major changes which continue today. The toll taken by the ever-expanding airport and cargo facilities has not ended and the outdoor living enjoyment in this wonderful climate has suffered.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-121 and Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding the opportunities to alleviate impacts associated with past or present airport activities at LAX. 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 provides a comprehensive analysis of Alternative D.

PC02961-3

Comment:

1) Safety has always been a major concern but little, if any-thing, has been said regarding the go-arounds and fly-overs of air-craft that have missed the runway or were ordered to make another attempt to land. It's scary to look out of the window of your home at the belly of a giant commercial airliner passing low overhead.

And what a shock it was to learn that the original control tower, atop the Administration Building, had a 'blind spot' which remained a problem for controllers until the new tower was construct-ed and operational in the early 1990s -- more than 30 years later!

The skies above LAX at the arrival and departure points are not limitless openings for aircraft. The more traffic in the air, the more serious the problem becomes for planes, the airport, and the hundreds of thousands of people on the ground. Increasing the size and capacity of LAX beyond serving 78 million annual passengers is unwise, undesirable, and unsafe from all standpoints. There must be a final end to the expansion of LAX and a determination to have the other Southern California airports carry their passenger and cargo burden.

Response:

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

PC02961-4

Comment:

2) Mayor James K. Hahn's proposal needs to be put into a written document with maps and figures that will allow the public to better understand what is being addressed. We need to be assured that the Mayor's 'Alternative 5' is permanent as a plan.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR

provided a comprehensive description and analysis of Alternative D, the fifth Master Plan Alternative, and was circulated for public review and comment.

PC02961-5

Comment:

3) No more condemnations of private property and/or businesses in Westchester. This area has already suffered extensive damage in an ongoing effort to reinvent itself to accommodate LAX and its in-creasing ground and air traffic. The extension of the North Runway over Sepulveda Blvd. will cause additional losses. It is time to say ENOUGH.

4) No Ring Road to serve the airport. It would create more hard-ships for the Westchester/Playa del Rey communities.

5) No new Western Terminal that would stimulate the airport's ability to increase passengers, more gates for planes and more 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. Alternative D does not include a Ring Road or the new West Terminal. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and residential and business relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. As discussed in TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester business district.

PC02961-6

Comment:

6) By providing more runway separation, what additional problems such as noise and safety will be foisted on the nearby communities of El Segundo, Westchester and Playa del Rey?

Response:

Comment noted. Those alternatives that move the outer runways north or south of their current alignments will generally result in the movement of the noise contours by a similar distance to the north or south. Safety will be improved by increased runway separation. 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.

PC02961-7

Comment:

7) In the effort to protect and secure the airline terminals, the proposal to move parking and check-in facilities to outlying areas fails to consider the needs of elderly and/or handicapped passengers who require more convenient resources. This is yet another matter that should be addressed since not all travelers are young and able-bodied.

Response:

All new facilities constructed under any of the build alternatives would comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Curbside assistance for the elderly and the disabled would be available.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02961-8

Comment:

8) Much more attention needs to be paid to the security of the passengers, their luggage, the upkeep of the planes, the employees, all check points and the cargo facilities. A larger airport makes that assignment even more difficult to carry out.

Response:

A description of the new security procedures that have been implemented at LAX in response to the events of September 11, 2001, were included in Section 4.24.3, Safety, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. These security procedures, as well as any new federal security requirements that would be incorporated as part of any of the Master Plan alternatives, would increase security and aviation safety at LAX. In addition, 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.

PC02962

Bell, Dorothy

None Provided

PC02962-1

Comment:

The FAA has too much clout in setting their own standards for their own agendas and that of the airlines. The Daily Breeze, dated Saturday, April 8, 2000, carried an article (one of many) concerning the lack of concern by the FAA and the airlines for the citizens of all the communities concerned about noise, pollution, and traffic, to say nothing of the risks and dangers of expansion at the airport. The FAA is known for renegeing on promises made. They have little regard for the taxpayers that support them (literally).

Response:

Comment noted. The FAA is a co-lead agency, along with the City of Los Angeles, in the preparation of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. These documents 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 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.

PC02962-2

Comment:

Our highways, particularly 405, are always jammed with cars going to and from the airport. All peoples living North of LA must come to LAX to pick up or drop off passengers, and fly themselves. It is almost impossible to set a time to reach a destination unless one left home at 5:00 A.M.

Response:

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

PC02962-3

Comment:

As early as July of 1998, I noticed a daily increase in the number of planes flying over the peninsula. I began to note the flights overhead. On 7-9-98 between the hours of 12 noon and 1:10 (1 hr. and 10

3. Comments and Responses

min.) 15 jets and low flying prop planes crossed over my home. That equates to about one low-flying plane every 4 minutes. On 2-6-99, between 3:15 P.M. and 4:36 P.M., 22 planes flew over. On 4-8-00, 25 low-flying planes crossed over from 10:06 A.M. to 11:55 A.M. This amounted to approximately 200 planes a day crossing over the same areas.

Noise has since abated due to diligent people and some officials to correct the problem. But, I feel certain that if this expansion is allowed to go forward, the noise, existing traffic problems at LAX itself, pollution, parking, safety in the air and on the runways will continue and there will be greater hazards and an abomination to the people (taxpayers and voters) who have to live with the consequences.

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 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.

PC02962-4

Comment:

There are thousands of people living in outlying areas of L.A. that would welcome the convenience and job opportunities of a working airport in their area. Let us be realistic about the problems this expansion would cause and stop thinking in terms of special interests, power and money for the few who would benefit by expansion. Ex Mayor Riordan is one of those - I pray our new mayor will rise to the occasion and fight for the rights of the people of L.A.

Thank you Jane Harman and Don Knabe for representing the majority of the voters. OUR AIRPORTS SHOULD BE REGIONAL...Lax is overburdened now and the expansion will not alleviate that problem and all the other problems it creates.

Response:

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

PC02963

Strom, Steven

None Provided

PC02963-1

Comment:

I moved to your district in September 2000, and I would like to offer my comments on the proposed LAX Master Plan from the perspective of a relatively recent arrival to the area. I currently live and work in El Segundo, and about four months ago I began looking for a condo or townhome that I could afford to buy that would be close to my place of work. I have to say from the outset that the existing size of LAX has already negatively impacted my search for affordable housing. I am adamantly opposed to any expansion of the current airport, and I strongly endorse the alternative plan that you have backed, which calls for a more equitable distribution of future air traffic increases to surrounding 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

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.

PC02963-2

Comment:

Please allow me to describe the manner in which LAX has impacted my move to Southern California. First of all, I am currently renting in El Segundo. The apartment complex where I live has no air conditioning, because it is close to the ocean. During this summer, when I have had to keep my windows open at night, the noise levels from the airplanes taking off and circling over the Pacific is so great that I have to run a loud fan and wear ear plugs just to be able to sleep! When I began looking for a place to buy, most of the properties shown to me were very near the airport, since these were in my price range. (I am in a middle-income bracket.) Sometimes the noise would be so loud when I was being shown a property, the real estate agent and I would have to scream loudly just to be able to hear each other.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. However, please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. Regarding high noise levels in El Segundo, to qualify for soundproofing, properties must be exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels. As shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S1 in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, overall areas exposed to high noise levels (defined as 65 CNEL or greater) under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions do extend south into portions of the City of El Segundo. Therefore these areas within the 65 CNEL are eligible for sound insulation under the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP). Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program. Overall the areas exposed to the 65 CNEL in El Segundo have decreased over time. Also relative to single event noise levels that result in nighttime awakening (as established by the 94 dBA SEL noise contour), portions of El Segundo are located within the 94 dBA SEL contour under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions, as shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As presented in Section 4.2.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, within the 75 CNEL noise contour, residential properties with exterior private habitable areas are considered to be incompatible with airport uses, even if interior noise levels are reduced to 45 CNEL. Although exposure of noise-sensitive uses to outdoor noise levels in the 65 to 75 CNEL range are considered to be compatible, areas exposed to these noise levels would still have some impact on outdoor speech and the quality of outdoor activities. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 regarding existing high noise levels.

PC02963-3

Comment:

There are already only a limited number of homes that are available locally to people in my income bracket. Any expansion of LAX would drive the number of such properties down even further.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation. Under LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative, Alternative D, no residential acquisition is proposed. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC02963-4

Comment:

The quality of life for areas adjacent to LAX - Playa del Rey, Westchester, and El Segundo -- is already degraded by the current amount of air traffic. Adding millions of air passengers to the overburdened

3. Comments and Responses

LAX can only result in a nightmarish situation for local residents. How, for example, can local corporations expect to attract new workers to the South Bay area with the accompanying increases in noise levels and traffic congestion that such an expansion will bring?

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 economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socioeconomics. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-N-6, particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-6.2 regarding more traffic means more noise. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC02963-5

Comment:

Thank you for taking the time to read my comments, and again I wholeheartedly endorse the regional airport plan as a viable and more rational solution to the problems posed by future increases in Los Angeles area air passengers.

Response:

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

PC02964 Hyra, J. None Provided

PC02964-1

Comment:

Our family has written at least a dozen comments to you and the FAA in opposition to any LAX expansion. The communities surrounding LAX have more than enough pollution, traffic, and noise. Enough is enough! Regional international airports are the 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. 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.

PC02965 Wong, Dennis None Provided

PC02965-1

Comment:

Enclosed are business letters and resident signatures of Los Angeles and San Bernardino County that would like to support the recommended Los Angeles Airport Master Plan.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please see responses to comment letters PC02966 through PC02975 and PFS00002.

PC02966 Wong, Kevin None Provided 8/30/2001

PC02966-1

Comment:

I am a current resident of Los Angeles County, and would like to support the recommended Los Angeles Airport Master Plan. I frequently fly up North, to Sacramento and Berkeley areas to visit friends, and often fly to Las Vegas, Nevada to have some fun.

The expansion plan of the Los Angeles International Airport would benefit the Los Angeles area greatly. It will also help to control the traffic congestion around Los Angeles and it's surrounding cities, helping the economic growth of the Los Angeles area.

I support the proposed Los Angeles Airport Master Plan Expansion.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02967 Dela, James None Provided 8/24/2001

PC02967-1

Comment:

As a resident of San Bernardino County, I would like to support the recommended Los Angeles Airport Master Plan. I travel to the LAX area quite often and am concerned about the continuous growth and demands at LAX. I feel that any type of improvement would relieve much of the traffic congestion in that area. The LAX Master Plan will benefit the airport and bring economic growth as well as job opportunities.

I support the proposed LAX Master Plan Expansion in making LAX a world class airport.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02968 May, D. United Poultry Inc.

PC02968-1

Comment:

On behalf of United Poultry, Inc. I would like to express my support for the LAX Master Plan expansion. As a business located in Downtown Los Angeles, we rely on passenger travel and cargo shipment transport via LAX. In addition, I regularly use LAX for business and personal travel. It is a "World Class" airport with upper class appeal. The reason for this is because Los Angeles is one of the major cities in the US. LAX needs to maintain that standard and continue to be a "World Class" airport. Therefore, we are pleased to hear your commitment to update and improve LAX.

I look forward to a new classier airport and thank you for dedication to this effort.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02969 Chang, David None Provided 8/18/2001

PC02969-1

Comment:

As a resident of Los Angeles County, I would like to support the recommended Los Angeles Airport Master Plan. I commute to the LAX area on a daily basis and am concerned about the continuous growth and demands at LAX. I feel that any type of improvement would alleviate much of the traffic congestion in and around that area. The LAX Master Plan will not only benefit the airport but also the surrounding communities bringing both economic growth and job opportunities.

I support the proposed LAX Master Plan Expansion in making LAX a world class airport. I urge you to continue your commitment to implement this plan.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02970 Wong, Gail D.K.G. Solutions 8/18/2001

PC02970-1

Comment:

I'm a small business owner relying on LAX for business travel and cargo transport - both nationally and internationally. My company depends on the efficiency of airmail/freight on a daily basis. We are hopeful that we will double our current capacity as other businesses are forecasting the same. In order to handle the increase in volume, LAX must stay competitive and look for ways to improve their efficiency of air travel.

I am writing this letter to let you know that we, at D.K.G. Solutions support the recommended LAX Master Plan expansion. We feel that not only will this plan pave the way to more economical benefits for the surrounding communities and businesses, but will also provide better services to travelling customers. We look forward to a more productive and functional airport in the near future.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02971 Lee, Carol None Provided 8/14/2001

PC02971-1

Comment:

As a resident of the City of Los Angeles, an employee at LAX, and a frequent traveler, I'm concerned about the continuous growth and higher demands at LAX. Stories such as traffic gridlock, lost shipment, delayed and/or cancelled flights are time consuming and costly for the general public as well as for all businesses in the community.

The proposed LAX Master Plan Expansion will definitely improve, if not alleviate these situations. I encourage you to continue your quest to implement this plan as it will benefit everyone.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02972 Wong, Judy None Provided 9/7/2001

PC02972-1

Comment:

As an international traveler with families living in Los Angeles, I frequently traveled via LAX. It is my opinion LAX is one of the more prevalent airports in the United States.

In the past ten years I have seen LAX sustain growth. I've seen it change over time using the latest technology and innovations to become one of the leading airports in the World. I would not want to see this airport lose its appeal and status. Therefore, I support the LAX Recommended Master Plan. If we don't implement this plan, all previous efforts in making LAX a world class airport would be wasted.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02973 Wong, Kelly None Provided 9/17/2001

PC02973-1

Comment:

As a San Bernardino County resident I would like to support the recommended Los Angeles Airport Master Plan. I commute to the LAX area on a daily basis and am concerned about the continuous growth and demands at LAX. I'm a frequent traveler and feel that any type of improvement would alleviate much of the traffic congestion in and around that area. The LAX Master Plan will also bring economic growth and job opportunities to the community.

I support the proposed LAX Master Plan Expansion in making LAX a world class airport. Since I live in the Inland Empire I would like to see more flights out of Ontario Airport I urge you to continue your commitment to implement this plan.

Response:

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

PC02974 Chang, Henry None Provided 8/20/2001

PC02974-1

Comment:

I WOULD LIKE TO EXPRESS MY SUPPORT FOR THE EXPANSION OF THE LOS ANGELES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT. I HAVE WORKED IN THE TRANSPORTATION FIELD AROUND THE LAX AREA SINCE 1979. I HAVE SEEN THE EXPANSION OF THE AIRPORT(BRADLEY INTERNATIONAL TERMINAL AND THE IMPERIAL CARGO COMPLEXES) AND HAVE SEEN THE ABILITY OF LAX TO GROW WITHOUT THE TROUBLES THAT MOST PEOPLE ARGUE ABOUT. THIS GROWTH HAS HELPED THE CARGO HANDLING CAPACITY AND THE TRANSPORTATION FIELD GREATLY. THIS EXPANSION HAS MADE THE TRANSPORTATION FIELD MORE EFFICIENT IN TIME AND MORE EFFICIENT IN THE MOVEMENT OF CARGOES.

THE LAX MASTER PLAN WILL INSURE THAT A GROWING SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA WILL BE ABLE TO HANDLE THE DEMANDS OF A GROWING TRANSPORTATION INDUSTRY(PASSENGER AND CARGO).

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02975 Hayashi, Kristyn None Provided

PC02975-1

Comment:

As a resident of Los Angeles County, I would like to support the recommended Los Angeles Airport Master Plan. I have family outside California and use LAX often. The expansion plan would be a great help because of the massive traffic congestion in the surrounding area. Not only will the LAX Master Plan make it possible to not have to leave over 2 hours early just to make it to the airport on time, it will also create new economic growth in the city of Los Angeles.

I support the proposed LAX Master Plan Expansion. I hope you continue to turn this Expansion Plan into a reality.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02976 O'Neal, Virginia None Provided

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00135; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC00135.

PC02977 O'Neal, Virginia None Provided

PC02977-1

Comment:

see attached

Response:

No specific comment has been provided regarding the attached news article in relation to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02978 Leighton, Andrew None Provided

PC02978-1

Comment:

Please add the considerable weight of your office to the voices of your constituents on the matter of L.A.X. expansion. Many of us here in the Southbay feel that there is more than enough air traffic and ground traffic that we have to deal with here without an estimated 37 million additional passengers annually that will be produced under the current plan. A plane would take off or land every 25 seconds. Isn't it time for our neighbors around John Wayne and El Torro to bear some of the burden of the economic expansion of the Southland?

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft

3. Comments and Responses

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.

PC02978-2

Comment:

A good look at the E.I.R. prepared by Los Angeles World Airports shows many flaws according to Barbara Lichman and her consulting firm. The year 1996 was used as the base year for the E.I.R. noise impact report. In 1996 there were twice as many aircraft in the fleet at LAX as there are today. As a result, airport officials have inflated current noise levels to minimize future increases.

Response:

In 1996, there were 763,866 total aircraft operations at LAX. In the Year 2000, there were 767,473 operations, an increase of less than half of one percent (see Table S-1 in Appendix S-B, Existing Baseline Comparison Issues - 1996 to 2000, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR). Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-1 regarding baseline issues and Subtopical Response TR-N-1.3 regarding noise modeling and baseline issues.

PC02978-3

Comment:

There are many good arguments out there to oppose LAX expansion. Understand that the best for those of us who make our homes here in your district is that we feel we are already observing the burden of the airport as it is and don't feel we should have to give anymore until our fellow Southlanders in Orange County pull their fair weight. Please support us in our time of need.

Response:

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

PC02979

Backes, Anne

None Provided

11/5/2001

PC02979-1

Comment:

- In light of the events of September 11th 2001, it is clear that more money must be spent on security at LAX. How will this redistribution of funding effect the budget/source of funding for the window replacement program and traffic mitigations described in the DEIR?

Response:

Project funding is not an environmental issue under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) or the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); therefore it is not addressed in the EIS/EIR. The proposed Master Plan improvements will be funded with a combination of monies from FAA Airport Improvement Fund grants, passenger facility charges, general airport revenue and airline fees. No tax dollars from the City of Los Angeles General Fund will be used to pay for any of the proposed improvements.

PC02979-2**Comment:**

- What kind of assurances does the public have that LAWA will not continue its piece-meal expansion of LAX under the guise of security enhancement? What form will these assurances take? This type of assurance should be something the public can document; will LAWA give this type of assurance to the adjacent community?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC02979-3**Comment:**

- I understand that LAX was "grandfathered" into compliance for certain safety criteria. There is a mandatory safety clearance required between airport property and public roadways. This requirement was passed after LAX was established, so LAX was "grandfathered" into compliance. Is the public's safety being compromised because of a loophole? Because of the importance of safety issues, especially, in light of new security concerns, shouldn't this safety requirement should be enforced at LAX? What current risk is the public exposed to because of non-compliance with this safety requirement at LAX?

Response:

Existing conditions at LAX do not create an unsafe environment. 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. 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 clearance for all aircraft types. For a more detailed discussion on the airfield and safety improvements made under Master Plan Alternatives A, B, and C, please see the Draft LAX Master Plan Chapter V, Section 3.3.1, and see the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum for Alternative D. Finally, please also see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC02979-4**Comment:**

- The DEIR mentions that LAWA intends to expand service at all airports, not just LAX. What is the timeline and/or schedule for these other expansions? What assurance is there that this schedule will be followed? Can LAWA or the FAA expand on its plans for these other airports and give a corresponding timeline to achieve this regional expansion? If LAWA or FAA cannot provide this information now in the DEIR, what assurances does the community around LAX have that the regional expansion will occur? What assurances can be given that the disproportionate use of LAX will not continue?

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR evaluated the impact of proposed master plan improvements at LAX. While there is always the likelihood that Ontario or other airports could handle a larger percentage of the region's O/D demand, this assumes that the airlines would provide a significant increase in flights to handle the demand. The clear choice among travelers and airlines is to use LAX because of its proximity to the most heavily populated areas in Los Angeles and its proximity to the CBD. A forecast was developed taking into account the most likely scenarios for passenger demand and air service among the regions other airports. Please see Draft EIS/EIR Section 1.2.2, Allocation of Service Among Regional Airports, for a description of these facilities and their projected role in meeting

3. Comments and Responses

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

PC02979-5

Comment:

- Are there restrictions on the types of aircraft allowed to fly in the middle of the night, between 10:00 p.m. and 5:am? What are these restrictions? Currently, 747 aircraft fly between these midnight hours, are these planes carrying cargo, passengers or both? If a passenger plane also carries cargo, is it considered a passenger or cargo plane?

Response:

There are no restrictions on the type of aircraft that may operate during night hours. Boeing 747 aircraft that fly at night carry passengers or cargo or both. A passenger plane carrying cargo is considered a passenger plane. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-5.4 regarding relationship of air cargo flights and night noise impacts.

PC02980

Acherman, Robert

None Provided

11/9/2001

PC02980-1

Comment:

I am writing again to express my disapproval with all of the LAX Master Plan concepts presented, including the No Project Alternative, which is misnamed as several projects are incorporated into what is supposed to be a no change baseline study.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-2 regarding No Action/No Project Alternative assumptions. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC02980-2

Comment:

The LAX Master Plan will not be able to meet the traffic mitigation contemplated in the Environmental Impact Report and Environment Impact Statement and the Proposed Airport Layout Plans as several traffic mitigation projects have changed. The Arbor Vitae Interchange project has been put on hold. Plans to use Sepulveda Boulevard have been dashed by the Los Angeles City Council this Wednesday when the proposal to expand Sepulveda Boulevard between Centinela and Lincoln was removed from the Coastal Transportation Corridor Specific Plan. Another traffic mitigation project in limbo is Playa Vista's improvement of the Culver Boulevard interchange at Lincoln Boulevard. The California Coastal Commission is set to make a decision on Playa Vista's plan.

Response:

The transportation analysis closely follows the requirements of NEPA and CEQA in incorporating data from local and regional transportation plans. It is acknowledged that some individual components of these regional plans may be removed and others included as the project progresses; however, the analysis was based on the best available data and is adequate for a program-level EIS/EIR.

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2, and in particular TR-ST-2.10 regarding assumptions used for the Arbor Vitae Street interchange on the I-405 Freeway.

PC02980-3**Comment:**

The world has changed since September 11th, including the world of air transport. So too must the thinking in airport planning. Traffic at LAX is down by about 30%. It's time to go regional-expand Ontario and build-up Palmdale into the truly modern airport that was promised more than 30 years ago. This is the time to make the infrastructure improvements at these two airports for the next 20 years while there is a lull in travel.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments AL00051-93, PC01881-31, and PC02131-5. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC02980-4**Comment:**

I am also opposed to Mayor James Hahn's fifth Alternative Plan which has not been properly prepared and noticed. While I support improving security at LAX, the world's third busiest airport, I will not support any plan that will move runways closer to the residents and businesses surrounding the airport.

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive description and analysis of Alternative D, the fifth Master Plan Alternative, and was circulated for public review and comment.

PC02980-5**Comment:**

The surrounding airport communities always pay a heavy toll when LAX expands. Westchester and Playa del Rey have lost and will lose more homes and businesses under all of the expansion plans.

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.

PC02980-6**Comment:**

Communities such as Inglewood, Lennox and El Segundo will be move heavily impacted by aircraft noise and pollution under all of the expansion plans.

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. Please see also Topical Response TR-LU-1 for a summary of overall effects on adjacent communities.

PC02980-7

Comment:

All communities in and around the airport will also suffer with increased traffic congestion and safety hazards.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. 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. Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PC02980-8

Comment:

Please join with thousands of residents, businesses and hundreds of local governments in opposing the LAX Master Plan and in supporting the regional solution to meeting our air traffic 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.

PC02982

Brands, Thomas

None Provided

6/15/2001

PC02982-1

Comment:

PLEASE SEE THE ATTACHED PAGES
(4 PAGE FAX INCLUDING THIS ONE)

In response to your survey and as a resident of Los Angeles, I oppose expansion of LAX and recommend the development of the Palmdale property for these reasons:

Response:

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

PC02982-2

Comment:

1. SAFETY

3. Comments and Responses

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

Response:

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

PC02982-3

Comment:

2. NOISE

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

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to Comment PC00171-3; please see Response to Comment PC00171-3.

PC02982-4

Comment:

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

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC00171-4; please refer to Response to Comment PC00171-4.

PC02982-5

Comment:

3. GROUND TRANSPORTATION

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

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC02982-6

Comment:

4. BUSINESS

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

Response:

This comment is essentially the same as Comment PC00171-6; please see Response to Comment PC00171-6.

PC02982-7

Comment:

5. AIRPORT ACCESS

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

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale for a discussion of multi-airport markets, airline economics and passenger choice.

PC02982-8

Comment:

6. AIR QUALITY

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

Response:

This comment is identical to Comment PC00171-8; please see Response to Comment PC00171-8.

PC02982-9

Comment:

7. COST

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

Response:

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

PC02982-10

Comment:

8. CONSTRUCTION

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

Response:

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

PC02982-11

Comment:

9. ALTERNATIVES

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

Response:

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

PC02982-12

Comment:

SUMMARY

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

Response:

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

PC02983

Brands, Thomas

None Provided

11/2/2001

PC02983-1

Comment:

The new plan for LAX upgrading, judging from the meager information available is still faulty for much the same reasons as the old or current one is:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

3. Comments and Responses

PC02983-2

Comment:

1. SAFETY

Even though safety has acquired a new dimension since Sept 11, 2001, the safety hazards that existed prior to that time have yet to be addressed.

The air space around LAX is already over saturated. Witness the Cerritos accident of a few years ago and various recent near misses of midair collisions over the Los Angeles area. LAX should be limited to the traffic for which it was designed, about 48 MAP, not the 78 MAP that currently exists and is being used for alternative 5, even though this number is a rollback from the 98 MAP that was proposed. Development of the Palmdale facility would alleviate the currently existing safety hazard. The safety problem is not just an LAX problem, it is a Los Angeles and vicinity problem. Airplane crashes are equal opportunity killers, both for passengers and those on the ground, regardless of which part of town gets devastated. These have nothing to do with terrorism, but have a much higher potential for loss of life and property.

Response:

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

PC02983-3

Comment:

2. GROUND TRANSPORTATION

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

Response:

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

PC02983-4

Comment:

3. BUSINESS

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

Response:

This comment is essentially the same as Comment PC00171-6; please see Response to Comment PC00171-6.

PC02983-5**Comment:****4. AIRPORT ACCESS**

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

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale for a discussion of multi-airport markets, airline economics and passenger choice.

PC02983-6**Comment:****5. AIR QUALITY**

Los Angeles already can not meet federal air quality standards. Pollution is a problem for the entire city of Los Angeles since the prevailing wind tends to send Westside pollution to other parts of town. Development of Palmdale should decrease overall pollution by reducing traffic congestion both on the ground and in the air.

Response:

Both the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the impacts of air pollution in and around the airport in Section 4.6. 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.

PC02983-7**Comment:****6. COST**

According to the Master Plan the proposed LAX expansion is supposed to take care of increased traffic until 2015. Then what? Palmdale? Why not do it right the first time? Why do an expensive and shortsighted plan first? The new facility at Palmdale could be designed from the ground up for maximum safety and still save money over any existing LAX upgrade proposal.

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.

PC02983-8**Comment:**

Besides, when we hear an estimate as high as 12 billion dollars, based on virtually all previous experience, that number is just for starters. It will inevitably go up from there. How much more money will then be required to alleviate the problems caused by additional traffic jams and pollution?

Twelve billion dollars should be more than adequate to develop Palmdale and improve its ground access with money left over.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC02983-9

Comment:

7. CONSTRUCTION

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

Response:

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

PC02983-10

Comment:

8. ALTERNATIVES

The alternatives in the Master plan and the EIR and the new alternative 5 are really just variations of the same plan. A true alternative would be to accommodate increased air traffic at other airports.

Response:

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

PC02983-11

Comment:

SUMMARY

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

Response:

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

PC02984

Smith, Lawrence

None Provided

PC02984-1

Comment:

Afterthought Safety & Security
To be Safe and Secure
I Magic Mountain

Farfetched - Number of people need to be successful ect. Imagine all the work to be safe and secure at Magic Mountain. An Airplane - Airplane I (one) arrives at LAX at 10:15 PM on Nov. 2, Airplane II ((2)) departs at what airport when?, how many people would need to go to Magic Mountain to make that run successfully, now if you used your LAX Master Plan 2015 or whats left of it would that \$ cover being safe and secure at Magic Mountain when Plane I (one) crosses _____

here?
2 & 3
here?

25 people in car one at this attraction at Magic Mountain at 10:15 on Day 3 of some promotion they have - so plane I-15 safely fly here to there, Magic Mountain is now guaranteed at least to be 10% successful including being safe and secure because your standards (LAX) of Safety & Security were tougher than theres (Magic Mountain) which makes Magic Mountain OK providing plane 1 (one) Ect get here to there ect.

Response:

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

PC02984-2

Comment:

Here's something that hits home
Il Carnival - Escuela De Montessori - 8820 Sepulveda Westway in Westchester.

This school has been at this location for years, lets say because of the location of the school the street the schools located on and what the school stands for its like a small piece of land thats brings nothing but confidence to your psyche because the school has taught youngsters for years to be useful to society. This is safety & security - Now not far away is LAX, now what will happen to this Montessori School by the year 2015? Is your confidence level in LAX its future at a high level? and how does this Montessori school in Westchester a fixture for years fate seem to be not to mention the Library down the Street in other words is this area a Westchester Landmark going to fall by the wayside because of LAX? Its future? and are the futures of these two (LAX, Montessori Area & surrounding area mutually exclusive of each other or intrined?

Response:

Section 4.27, Schools, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed potential impacts on schools from the build alternatives. Also see Response to Comment PC00267-4 for a discussion regarding impacts to schools and libraries in Westchester. Section 4.2.6, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR indicated that Escuela de Montessori, located at 8740 La Tijera, would be newly exposed to the 65 CNEL or increases of 1.5 dB or greater within the 65 CNEL under Alternatives A, B, C, and D, compared to 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions. As shown in Table S4.2.10 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Escuela de Montessori would also be newly exposed to high single event noise levels that result in classroom disruption under Alternative A, compared to Year 2000 conditions. Although Table 4.2-8 of the Draft EIS/EIR, Table S4.2-20 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, and Table 22 of Technical Report 1, Land Use Technical Report in the Draft EIS/EIR, indicate that Escuela de Montessori is proposed for acquisition under Alternatives A, B, and C, no acquisition of the Escuela de Montessori school building would occur, only 0.06 acre of the 1.32 acre parcel would be acquired to provide for airport facilities and improvements. This clarification is reflected in Section 4.2, Land Use, of this Final EIS/EIR. Also, Table 22 of Technical Report 1, Land Use Technical Report, has been revised to reflect this clarification. Please see Appendix F-C, Errata to the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, of this Final EIS/EIR. This clarification does not change the conclusions presented in Section 4.1, Noise, or Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, since Escuela de Montessori was analyzed for potential noise impacts. Since Escuela de Montessori is within the current ANMP boundary, this school would be considered eligible for sound insulation. See Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the ANMP.

Regarding libraries in Westchester, as identified in Section 4.26.4, Libraries, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the Westchester Branch Library was closed on March 29, 2003. The new Westchester-Loyola Village Branch Library was constructed on the site of the Loyola Village Branch Library, which closed in 2001. The 12,500 square foot Westchester-Loyola Village Branch Library replaced both the Loyola Village Branch Library and the Westchester Branch Library. As indicated in Section 4.2, Land Use, and 4.26.4, Libraries, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the Westchester-Loyola Village Branch Library would not be newly exposed to the 65 CNEL or increases of 1.5 dB or greater within the

PC02985-3**Comment:**

Enough is enough!! Get the wealthy developers and politicians off our backs. Spend the \$12,000,000.00 on improving our other airports and developing Palmdale.

We are living in the 9th decade of our lives and wish to continue with the same quality of life we've become accustomed 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 and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC02986

Rouseyrol, Andre & Barbara **None Provided**

10/29/2001

PC02986-1**Comment:**

We as residents of Westchester for the past 36 years are opposed to the expansion planned for LAX for the following reasons:

Response:

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

PC02986-2**Comment:**

1) SAFETY from overcrowding of the air corridors. To even accommodate 78 MILLION passengers per year is too high a volume.

Response:

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

PC02986-3**Comment:**

2) TRAFFIC is a nightmare for the residents now in trying to get to business; our area cannot handle any more cars .The plan to widen Sepulveda Blvd and/or Lincoln Blvd is not the answer to our traffic nightmare in Westchester. The safety of residents and school children on either boulevards should be the first concern. Overflow of traffic on the I-405 should not be directed thru Westchester via Sepulveda and Lincoln Blvds.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

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

PC02986-4

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.

PC02986-5

Comment:

4) LOSS of the Central Business District on Sepulveda Blvd and Lincoln Blvd. This is a community of people who value home ownership. The airport expansion has taken too many homes from this area already. Look to expand in areas that have more space to accommodate the needs of the air lines. We ask that you leave our Westchester as it is now..

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided additional discussion beyond that presented in the Draft EIS/EIR of potential acquisition effects on the Westchester Business District. As described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsections 4.2.6.2 through 4.2.6.4), acquisition within the Westchester Business District would be about 16 acres or 31 percent of the District under Alternative A, about 11 acres or 21 percent under Alternative B, or approximately 13 acres or 26 percent of the District under Alternative C. Under Alternatives A through C, relocation opportunities would be available for some uses nearby within Westchester Southside. Also, many of the uses 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.

Concerning residential acquisition associated with Alternatives A, B, and C, please see Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residents or Businesses of the Draft EIS/EIR. As further described in the section, 84 homes would be acquired under these alternatives with the residences relocated in compliance with the Uniform Relocation Act, state and local regulations, and FAA Advisory Circular 150/5100-17.

Also, as described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6.5) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, note that in contrast to the other build alternatives, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative), does not include any acquisition within the Westchester Business District and no residential acquisition is proposed. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 for further discussion of effects on the community of Westchester.

PC02986-6

Comment:

5) NOISE and AIR POLLUTION keeps increasing which destroys the family life. The residue in our bird-bath in the yard are proof of the increase in air pollution over the past years.

Response:

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

PC02986-7**Comment:**

Domestic airlines have been seen dumping fuel over Westchester.

Response:

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

PC02986-8**Comment:**

LAX is already one of the regions single largest sources of Nox emission.

Response:

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

PC02986-9**Comment:**

At the present time there are too 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.

PC02986-10**Comment:**

The expansion of Sepulveda & Lincoln Blvds. is only a short-term quick fix approach and should not be allowed to go forward for all of the above reasons. Any future transportation projects and/or developments in Westchester should be included in the Westchester-Playa del Ray Community Plan which is being updated at the present time. The Community Plan is 26 years old and does not show the true effect of the most recent major changes to this area.

Response:

The LAX Master Plan would help to separate regional airport traffic from local traffic, and satisfy future airport traffic demand while mitigating impacts to the surrounding street system. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC02986-11**Comment:**

HOW CAN YOU EVALUATE THE TRUE EFFECT THAT WOULD OCCUR SHOULD THE EXPANSION OF LAX BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED?

Until a plan for moving traffic to LAX is presented which does not effect the life and business community surrounding Westchester let us live our lives in peace. The Master Plan or the many Alternatives that have been presented are not the answers.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. This new option - Alternative D-Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, which calls for no expansion of LAX and, instead, 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.

PC02987 Clark, Anne None Provided

PC02987-1

Comment:

I have always been confused about why common sense is called common sense as it just does not appear to be very common. I am at a loss to understand how the expansion of LAX or the increase of traffic through LAX and surrounds could make any sense to any one. The following are just a few of the obvious reasons why this whole Master Plan and any considered incremental additions are in no way advantages to the local public.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic and circulation 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC02987-2

Comment:

Most people who live close to the airport fall into the lower income bracket. The reasons for this are obvious - people with money will buy and rent in areas as far from the airport as possible.

If residents of the LAX area are displaced, where can they go and what can they afford to buy or rent?

Response:

Residential relocation was addressed in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences and Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1, regarding property values, and Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding the residential relocation program.

PC02987-3

Comment:

In a time when there is a resurgence of gangs in LA probably due to poor education, dilapidated school buildings, lack of cohesiveness in the city, how can we justify subjecting youngsters in these areas to more pollution. This pollution takes many forms: poor air quality, additional noise, disregard for our fellow citizen, and the worst pollution of all - the haves vs the have-nots. Do you think we would be having this debate if the airport backed up to Brentwood or Bel Air?

Response:

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

PC02987-4

Comment:

I don't know if there is any scientific evidence, but I would guess that living in an environment filled with the above mentioned pollutions and violations of human needs must surely result in psychological despair. Again, it appears to be an overpowering of the less advantaged.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-190.

PC02987-5

Comment:

I would like each of you to take a moment and reflect how you would feel about your children being forced to live in an environment that is not in their best interest, What kind of message do you think that would send to them and how do you think it would affect their self-esteem and their attitude towards society? Are we trying to further polarize our city or can we adopt a policy of sanity that is in the best interest of ALL of our citizens.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02987-6

Comment:

Orange County and El Toro can and must handle their own residents' air travel needs and not expect Los Angeles to carry the whole load. It's not right, it's not fair and it certainly makes no sense, common or otherwise.

Response:

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

PC02988

Carr, Michael

None Provided

PC02988-1

Comment:

I realize my next statement may seem unrealistically naive, but since I know nothing about politics, please bear with me - -

In Los Angeles County and elsewhere, there is enormous opposition to LAX expansion in any form. Since Mayor Riordan, who championed this buildout is now off pursuing other goals to bring him glory, can't the president of airport commissioners be simply handed his walking papers to put a stop to this expansion madness? In a related thought, whose mandate are our "hell-bent on LAX expansion" commissioners following without Mr. Riordan to praise and support them?

3. Comments and Responses

Is there a power behind the scenes that the public doesn't know about that is going to keep this expansion steamroller in motion?

Perhaps this issue can be presented to Mr. Hahn; I doubt he'd pay any attention to this Westchester fanatic who is politically ignorant.

By the way, you and Councilwoman Galanter have proven yourselves to be incredibly conscientious. In most elections, I voted Republican or Libertarian. You broke through to get me to look past the stereotype of the "bleeding heart" Democrat image. I feel betrayed by Mayor Riordan who ended up pursuing policies that bore little or no resemblance to his platform eight years ago when I helped vote him into office. Any politician who lays plans for innocent people to be harmed while keeping him/herself out of such harm's way deserves to be thrown out of office, or worse.

Response:

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

PC02989 Eddington, Lyda None Provided 10/30/2001

PC02989-1

Comment:

** A RESOUNDING "NO" TO THE NEW LAX EXPANSION PLAN**
** A RESOUNDING "NO" TO THE WIDENING OF SEPULVEDA**

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. None of the Alternatives propose to widen Sepulveda Boulevard.

PC02989-2

Comment:

The City of Los Angeles has two other key airports besides LAX - Ontario & Palmdale. These must be developed as opposed to LAX. El Toro in Orange County should also be developed instead of LAX. Expansion of LAX is a ridiculous and short term quick fix approach. It must be stopped.

Response:

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 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.

PC02989-3**Comment:**

Under the "NEW" LAX expansion program, the noise pollution in our community would still mean more soundproofing of homes - are our front and backyards also going to be soundproofed? Should those of us with young children keep them inside our "soundproofed" homes constantly?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of residential soundproofing under the existing Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP) and how approval of the LAX Master Plan would revise the ANMP boundaries. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels and thresholds used to identify significant noise levels.

PC02989-4**Comment:**

What about the incredible increase in air pollution and traffic into the LAX area?

Response:

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

PC02989-5**Comment:**

YOU MUST NOT implement the "NEW" LAX expansion program. How many homes would be destroyed? How much of the Westchester Community would be torn apart? What happens when destroying Westchester isn't enough?

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC01350-5; please refer to Response to Comment PC01350-5.

PC02989-6**Comment:**

YOU MUST NOT widen Sepulveda Blvd. - the damage to the Westchester Central Business District would be horrific! Why do we need to widen Sepulveda Blvd.? Isn't it all a part of the master LAX expansion plan under a new heading?

Response:

Sepulveda Boulevard would not be widened through the Westchester Central Business District in any alternative.

PC02989-7**Comment:**

I implore you - the citizens vote "NO" TO DESTROYING WESTCHESTER!!!

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC02990 Eddington, Charles None Provided 10/30/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02989; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC02989.

PC02991 Keith, Wiliam None Provided 10/30/2001

PC02991-1

Comment:

In regard to airport expansion:

Please Do cap passengers at 78 million and Do increase security.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01018-29 regarding the authority of FAA and LAWA to limit future activity at airports. 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.

PC02991-2

Comment:

Please do not widen Sepulveda Blvd.

" Do not build a rim road

" Do not build a Western Terminal

" Do not move runways farther apart

" Do not destroy downtown 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. Alternative D does not include a rim road. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The proposed relocation of the runways in the various development alternatives is to accommodate a new parallel taxiway that will enhance safety of aircraft operations at the airport by reducing runaway incursions. For more information, please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC02991-3

Comment:

An Eastern check-in center might be beneficial.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D includes a new passenger facility - referred to as the Ground Transportation Facility - east of Sepulveda Boulevard in the area referred to as Manchester Square.

PC02992 Morris, Glynn None Provided 10/28/2001

PC02992-1

Comment:

The purpose of this letter is to express my support for the following aspects of Mayor Hahn's new proposal for modifications at LAX including the following improvements...

- Capping LAX annual passenger capacity at 78 million or less.
- No ring road.
- No western terminal.
- Elimination of central terminal parking garages.
- Construction of a new check-in and security facility with high speed people movers to terminals.

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC02993 Folan, Gail Y. & None Provided 11/5/2001
Patrick J.

PC02993-1

Comment:

See attached letter, incorporated herein in its entirety by this reference.

We are writing to voice our strong opposition to the expansion plans proposed for Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) and the EIR/EIS prepared in connection therewith. Any proposed expansion or addition of runways beyond the existing airport perimeter will be seriously detrimental to all of the surrounding communities, and the additional passenger and flight traffic created thereby would adversely impact both adjacent and remote communities.

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. Alternatives C and D do not include the construction of additional runways, but do include lengthening and relocation of runways to accommodate a new parallel taxiway to reduce runway incursions and improve airfield operations. For more information, please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1.

PC02993-2

Comment:

We are longtime residents of the Westchester community, adjacent to LAX. We enjoy living in an environment that still maintains a "small-town" feel despite the surroundings of a sprawling metropolis. Our two young children attend school in the community and we are active participants in local YMCA, church, park, AYSO and numerous other activities that bring our community together. Part of what makes this community so special is the large number of families and others of all ages who are willing to patronize local businesses in our revitalized business district, as well as live and play in the neighborhood without great fear for personal safety.

3. Comments and Responses

An increase in passenger and airline traffic at LAX, and/or the expansion, in any manner whatsoever, of LAX facilities beyond the existing airport boundaries (we do not, for example, support inclusion of any Manchester square property), would severely and detrimentally impact our community by bringing added noise, air and ground commuter traffic and pollution.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC02668-2; please refer to Response to Comment PC02668-2.

PC02993-3

Comment:

Additionally, since the events of September 11, it has been suggested that expansion of LAX to accommodate more passengers, planes and cargo would only serve to increase its potential as a target for terrorist activity.

Response:

Please see Response to Comments AL00051-93, PC01881-31, and PC02131-5.

PC02993-4

Comment:

Finally, but not any less significant, the expansion of LAX would destroy the ability of our community to exist peacefully next to LAX. Thriving businesses would be eliminated, requiring residents to shop elsewhere (adversely impacting remaining businesses and ultimately inconveniencing the consumer);

Response:

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

PC02993-5

Comment:

residents would become frustrated by unbearable noise and pollution levels from ground and air traffic; ground traffic transversing our community, without stopping to patronize any businesses and in great haste to make airline connections would raise great safety concerns for pedestrian traffic and neighborhood tranquility;

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC02668-5; please refer to Response to Comment PC02668-5.

PC02993-6

Comment:

and the increase in transient and/or temporary visitors does little to enhance the feeling of security and safety that comes with knowing your neighbors.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00378-2 regarding crime impacts.

PC02993-7

Comment:

All of the above would necessarily result in the destruction of life as we know it today in Westchester (and all of the other communities surrounding LAX). The skies above Los Angeles are already too crowded and pose known safety hazards. Efforts are being undertaken to preserve and improve upon neighborhoods and quality of life throughout Los Angeles. The health, safety and welfare of Westchester residents is of paramount importance, and, fortunately, there is a viable alternative to the expansion of LAX.

We support the efforts of those groups that have promoted a "regional" approach to airport expansion. It is time to stop wasting time and money on LAX expansion and instead refocus the issue to quickly and efficiently developing regional alternatives. In light of the September 11 events, this approach also gives the added benefit of decreasing the visibility of LAX as a possible terrorist target. While we agree, conceptually, that some safety issues with the LAX facility need to be addressed, it should be within the strict confines of maintaining or reducing current passenger, airline and cargo capacity, and be accomplished without any further destruction of homes or businesses.

Response:

Please see Response to Comments PC00051-93, PC01881-31, and PC02131-5. Please also refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC02994 Fisher, Lawrence Transportation California 11/5/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02609; please refer to the response to comment letter PC02609.

**PC02995 Cook, Richard B. & None Provided
Rena D.**

PC02995-1

Comment:

My simple response to this is NO.

I do not want increased traffic on the freeways and on the surface streets as surely this will happen. The plan (cost) to improve traffic will not be born by the airport but will fall upon the tax payers. Traffic improvement will not happen in a timely fashion or at all. The taxpayers will be required to foot the bill for building roads to ease the traffic congestion, not the Airline Industry.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00008-6 regarding funding and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC02995-2

Comment:

Congestion and gridlock will definitely be the order of the day.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC02995-3

Comment:

I find it difficult to enter Emerson Ave from my street 6722 W. 87 Th. St. now because of all the traffic trying to by-pass Sepulveda during the morning commute. I believe that the future plan is to open up Emerson Ave. to the Westchester Parkway, this will be an utter disaster as we will not be able to leave our homes due to the traffic jams on this street.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01250-5 regarding Emerson Avenue.

PC02995-4

Comment:

We will be inundated with more pollution from both Aircraft, Aircraft support vehicles and surface vehicles trying to get to the Airport.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the impacts of air pollution in and around the airport in Section 4.6. In general, the predicted air pollution impacts of any of the LAX Master Plan build alternatives would be lower than the predicted impacts of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution.

PC02995-5

Comment:

I do not want to have an Arbor Vitae off ramp at the 405 freeway as it will just clog up the already congested streets.

Response:

Please see Subtopical Response TR-ST-2.3 regarding the Arbor Vitae interchange. Subsequent to the publication of the 2001 Draft EIS/EIR, the FHWA withdrew its support for a half interchange at Arbor Vitae. The interchange is not part of the LAX Master Plan. FHWA policy is only to consider full proposed interchanges, not partial ones.

PC02995-6

Comment:

Extending the Green Line into Westchester will do nothing to alleviate traffic but will in turn bring more crime into our neighborhood.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan for more information. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed law enforcement in Section 4.26, Public Services, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester.

PC02995-7**Comment:**

LAX has gobbled up enough land already, they do not need to expand. Since most of the LAX passengers are not from LA but are coming from Orange county and Antelope Valley. It is time for other counties to take their share of the traffic. Stop dumping on us.

Response:

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

PC02995-8**Comment:**

Over the years we have seen friends loose their homes to this expansionist regime called 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. Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition.

PC02995-9**Comment:**

I notice that one of the plans of expansion is to destroy what little we have left of downtown Westchester plus the elimination of many, many homes. We recently got a new grocery store, drug store and many eateries that LAX wants to destroy by expanding this airport.

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided additional discussion beyond that presented in the Draft EIS/EIR of potential acquisition effects on the Westchester Business District. As described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsections 4.2.6.2 through 4.2.6.4), acquisition within the Westchester Business District would be about 16 acres or 31 percent of the District under Alternative A, about 11 acres or 21 percent under Alternative B, or approximately 13 acres or 26 percent of the District under Alternative C. 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.

Concerning residential acquisition associated with Alternatives A, B, and C, please see Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residents or Businesses of the Draft EIS/EIR. As further described in the section, 84

3. Comments and Responses

homes would be acquired under these alternatives with the residences relocated in compliance with the Uniform Relocation Act, state and local regulations, and FAA Advisory Circular 150/5100-17.

Also, as described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6.5) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, note that in contrast to the other build alternatives, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative), does not include any acquisition within the Westchester Business District and no residential acquisition is proposed. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 for further discussion of effects on the community of Westchester.

PC02995-10

Comment:

Additionally I can visualize increased noise pollution to anyone outside of a building.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC02996 Younglove, Charles None Provided 11/1/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02168; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC02168.

PC02997 Galanter, Ruth City of Los Angeles 10/25/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00106; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00106.

PC02998 Stefanski, Andrew None Provided

PC02998-1

Comment:

Enclosed, please find copy of my statement. I participated in 3 "workshops." Here are the results:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC02998-2

Comment:

1) Pollution Control. They admit that it will be more of it. They claim that by moving West take off points they can control it. My concern is that Wind may blow it back. No Answer.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00018-10 regarding placement of dispersion modeling receptors. The receptor locations used in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR are the same locations identified in the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternatives A through C that were described in Appendix G of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC02998-3

Comment:

2) Master Plan should be comprehensive and reaching far ahead. Present proposals stop at year 2015. What happens later? They do not know. No Answer.

Response:

The proposed Master Plan uses 2015 as a reasonable long-term planning horizon within which a comprehensive plan for improvements to accommodate future growth at LAX can be defined and implemented. This approach is consistent with that of other large-scale long-term planning program, such as the general plans for local jurisdictions, urban water management plans for water suppliers/districts, integrated waste management plans for counties, and other such programs.

PC02998-4

Comment:

3) Environmental Justice. Fumes are blown back East and more is to come making people sick. How can scholarships and token gifts compensate major loss of health when many people do not have medical insurance? No Answer.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-190.

PC02998-5

Comment:

Common Sense does not rule.

Airlines do not listen to the Mayor.

Mayor listens to Airlines.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC02998-6

The attachment included as part of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00278; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC00278.

PC02999

Scott, Douglas

None Provided

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02146; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC02146.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03000 Smith, Ted None Provided 9/20/2001

PC03000-1

Comment:

First, as an LAX Advisory Boardmember representing Culver City, I want to thank you for all of the hard work you and your staff have put into making the airport in it's activities to show some concern for it's neighbors.

However, I am concerned that our response to airport security should be real and meaningful, not just "fluff" to make a now scared public believe that they are safe. For instance, no curbside check-in and private vehicle drop-off is not meaningful security. But, better scanning equipment, like the one SAIC produces which highlights in color objects by their size and shape which could be potentially dangerous should be installed at all airports. I saw this machine in a demonstration approximately two years ago at a convention on security held at our airport. In addition, arming pilots, securing the cockpit from entry, air marshalls on some flights and airport security provided by an armed federal force are meaningful in stopping this atrocity from happening again.

I hope you consider the above in your discussions tomorrow in creating real security measures for the safety of the airport and the public in general.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02284-17.

PC03001 No Author Identified, None Provided 9/25/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02245; please refer to the response to comment letter PC02245.

PC03002 Curtiss, D.A. Curt None Provided

PC03002-1

Comment:

IMPACT OF NEW SECURITY MEASURES ON LAX EIR

The EIR does not address any of the issues created by the new security measures and their impact on noise, traffic, polution and whether the current terminals could handle the current passenger load.(At the time of the EIR, passengers were to be in the terminals for 1 hour (domestic) and 2 hours(international). That has now doubled Therefore, there are twice as many people in the terminal as before.) I am sure that there are many more problem areas. Has anyone considered the economic impact of the increased security, the loss of passengers, and the loss of income from the parking in the Central Terminal Area.

I think that the current EIR should be delayed until these and all the other questionable areas of the EIR are completely answered.

Response:

Comment noted. Appendix S-B, Baseline Composition Issues - 1996 to 2000, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed changes caused by the events of September 11, 2001. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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 has been created to respond to the needed improvements without expanding LAX. Please see Response to Comments AL00051-93 and PC02113-5 regarding safety concerns.

PC03003 Younglove, Charles None Provided 9/18/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02168; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC02168.

PC03004 Dawson, William None Provided

PC03004-1

Comment:

As a home owner and resident of Westchester, I am most concerned about the plans in progress to expand Los Angeles International Airport. The airport has already significantly degraded the quality of life in Westchester and surrounding areas. Further expansion will make living unbearable.

Safety, Noise, Air Quality and Traffic are major concerns.

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, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts to quality of life and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC03004-2

Comment:

But it would appear that Business and Money are the driving forces behind expansion. Who profits from expansion? The airlines? The FAA? The car rental agencies? The freight forwarders? Who pays for the expansion?

Response:

Comment noted. The economic effects of Master Plan alternatives were provided in Section 4.4.1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Employment/Socio-Economics, with supporting technical data in Technical Report 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03004-3

Comment:

And it is very apparent that the Airport responds to the needs of the Airlines and the FAA, not to the people of Los Angeles and their duly elected officials.

The front page article in the Daily Breeze (Reference 2) stated that the City Council unanimously voted to request the Environmental Impact Report to include a study of today's conditions. It would appear that the Airport Commission and the Environmental Planners are going to ignore the Council's request, and plunge forward with their already conceived plan for expansion.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

Although the conclusion of the Draft EIS/EIR 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.

PC03004-4

Comment:

With respect to safety, the news media has reported on the increasing number of runway incursions at LAX. Another front page article in the Daily Breeze, (reference 3) reports on a near collision off LAX. The air traffic controllers say the incident points up flaws in the airport departure procedure. And you wish to put more planes into the traffic patterns?

Response:

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

PC03004-5

Comment:

Living adjacent to LAX, one can readily recognize the changing operations. The increase in number of flights and larger planes, and the shifting of the big planes with the larger and noisier engines to the north runways. Does anyone really believe that the new larger engines are quieter than the older engines? Does anyone believe that the pilots or airport administrators show any concern for noise during their run-ups, take-offs and landings?

Response:

Total operations and numbers of larger aircraft are both expected to increase in future forecasts. Operations on the north complex of runways are expected to increase as well. These forecasts can be found in Table 4.1-7, Forecast Daily Aircraft Operations and Table 4.1.8 Runway Utilization Proportions by Aircraft Groups which are located in Section 4.1 Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR. Sub-Section 4.1.6 Environmental Consequences which is located in Section 4.1, Noise, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed changes related to Alternative D. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.2 and Subtopical Response TR-N-6.3. Also see Section 4.1.6.1.5 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for operations and fleet mix for Alternative D. Pilots and LAWA are both aware of the impact that aircraft make on the surrounding communities and they take steps to minimize the noise impacts. The airline operators have developed and implemented quiet flying procedures and LAWA has developed procedures to minimize the impact of aircraft operations. Please see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement.

PC03004-6

Comment:

When the news media make their daily report regarding air quality, I am sure they are not talking about Westchester. Perhaps they are talking about the air quality in Malibu, Brentwood or Palos Verdes, but not Westchester. Environmentalists have been concerned for years about the pollutants from automobiles. Only recently have I heard concerns expressed regarding diesel engines. How about the less efficient jet engines? Is any one concerned?

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality impacts, including the effects of jet exhausts, in Section 4.6, Air Quality.

PC03004-7

Comment:

Have you ever sat in your home and smelled jet fuel or kerosene fumes? Do you know of any of your neighbors who are heating with fuel oil or kerosene? We have placed requirements on all gasoline filling stations to control emissions while filling your tank. But who says how many pounds of unburned jet fuel can be pumped into the air in Westchester?

We used to smell the sewage treatment plant and the refinery in El Segundo when the winds were from that direction. But they have made vast improvements in their operations.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding fumes and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC03004-8

Comment:

Traffic? Even LAX administrators admit that it is a mess today. Have you ever seen two Hertz busses driving side by side on the lower level? Or experienced the mini busses or car parking busses circling the loop to maximize their fares? Why didn't the airport planners permit an off ramp from the 105 freeway onto airport property? Long range planning?

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. Note that because Alternative D eliminates the CTA, there would no longer be car parking buses circling the loop in that alternative. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways.

PC03004-9

Comment:

And one wonders about all the construction taking place at LAX when the plans are "still in preparation." It is hard to conceal the big equipment from the neighbors.

Response:

LAX is a large heavily-used public facility that operates 365 days a year. LAWA implements, on an ongoing basis, a very active operations and maintenance (O&M) program to provide a high level of safety, security, efficiency, and convenience for passengers, visitors, and employees at LAX. Various improvement and O&M projects in support of existing operations occur on a regular basis and are exempt from NEPA and CEQA. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed a variety of major improvements to LAX as proposed under four build alternatives designed in light of projected growth and demands at the airport.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03004-10

Comment:

When did you last conduct a sound and air quality survey in Westchester? Specifically in residential areas not covered by your sound proofing project, And at what time of day did you do a survey? At 2:30 in the morning when some big jet is roaring down the runway?

Response:

Comment noted. Noise and air quality analyses for the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR were conducted in accordance with accepted assumptions and practice. The noise metric used (CNEL) identifies noise across a 24 hour period including penalties for events which occur during the evening and at night. Air quality analyses were based on state and federal designed to be protective of human health and the environment. Please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for an analysis of nighttime single event noise. Nighttime aircraft operations are also addressed in Topical Response TR-N-5. Air quality is 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. Additionally, please see Response to Comment SPHMP00010-2 regarding noise monitors and air quality monitors in the Westchester community.

PC03004-11

Comment:

With respect to your Program Environmental Impact Report, I am sure that you can come to any conclusion that the Airport Commissioners feel will be in the best interest of the Airlines, the FAA. and the for profit businesses that feed on LAX. But somewhere you have an obligation to the people to provide relevant facts in understandable language.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03004-12

Comment:

I am a concerned resident of Westchester, hoping for some recognition of the limitations of LAX and the need to seriously consider 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.

PC03005

Prichard, Susan

**Hawaiian Avenue Elementary
School Parent Center**

4/6/2001

PC03005-1

Comment:

We are concerned about the expansion of LAX.

Response:

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

PC03005-2

Comment:

It is an accepted fact that childhood asthma in our neighborhoods is on the rise.

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.

PC03005-3

Comment:

Our community, Wilmington, is severely impacted by the needs of the Port of Los Angeles to serve the Los Angeles basin and California - trucks, trains, etc.. Additionally, we are surrounded by oil refineries. As you must realize these businesses tend to pollute our environment. Also, with the Alameda Corridor extension to the Harbor Freeway we can expect more diesel exhaust and tire dust.

Response:

Activities at the Port of Los Angeles are independent of those at Los Angeles International Airport.

PC03005-4

Comment:

In the recent past, residents have begun to hear more planes and helicopters overhead. The residents of San Pedro Hill (Palos Verdes, Palos Verdes Peninsula, and Rancho Palos Verdes) successfully lobbied LAX personnel to move the flight plan from their air space into ours. FYI, Long Beach Airport is also using Wilmington's air space for their flight plans too. This noise reverberates through walls and windows disturbing the sanctity of our homes. And, our homes tend to be built with less insulation than the homes in more affluent neighborhoods.

Response:

Wilmington is located far beyond the area of federal and state levels of significant noise impact resulting from operations at LAX. Noise levels would be even lower with the proposed Master Plan actions, as they would result in a decrease in turboprop operations that are routed over the area. Jet operations are routed south of the area beyond the Palos Verdes Peninsula. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay. Helicopters that operate at LAX have an operating agreement with LAWA which requires their operators to abide with Section 5, Helicopter Operating Procedures of the Aircraft Noise Abatement Operating Procedures. However, all other helicopters can operate near the shore and during the nighttime hours without any restrictions. Please see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement and Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03005-5

Comment:

Now, LAX is asking for an expansion. What can this mean for Wilmington? Mayor Riordan, with think it means more noise and more dirt in our sky. One more thing Wilmington is being asked to do for the benefit of the general whole.

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.

PC03005-6

Comment:

Mayor Riordan, please allow the Regional Planning Commission to follow through with the building of an international airport in Orange County.

Response:

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

PC03005-7

Comment:

We believe you and the powers that be are asking for trouble by trying to increase air traffic above Los Angeles. One plane into an oil refinery and Wilmington would disappear.

Response:

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

PC03006 La Rouche, Mark None Provided

PC03006-1

Comment:

As a resident of Los Angeles I am against any LAX expansion because the plan does not compensate the local communities for losses in property values, local city services and local businesses.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed land use impacts in Section 4.2, Land Use, economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, and public services in Section 4.26, Public Services. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 1 and 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical reports S-1 and S-3 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.

PC03006-2**Comment:**

First, for those living under the flight path their property values will fall further because no one wants to live under a flight path with increased pollution and noise. It will be left to the minorities and poor that don't have much of a choice.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values. Also see Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits and Topical Response TR-EJ-3 regarding environmental justice and regional context.

PC03006-3**Comment:**

Secondly, for the communities that are on the north side of LAX, no provision is made for the replacement or improvement of park and city services that will be displaced by the LAX expansion. Especially once it reaches Manchester Blvd and continues north as is expected if LAX is allowed to expand at all. Los Angeles is already behind on the park services that it should support.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00264-2 regarding expansion of parks and recreation areas.

PC03006-4**Comment:**

Also, the expansion plan does not compensate the residents for the loss in property values that will occur for residents that will EVENTUALLY live next to the airport and under flight paths.

Response:

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

PC03006-5**Comment:**

Lastly, the plan does not replace or compensate the community for any of the lost businesses consumed by the expansion plan. Basically, you are condemning 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. Under Alternatives A through C, relocation opportunities would be available for some uses nearby within Westchester Southside. Also, many of the uses being acquired are airport related and a number of the community related uses that would be acquired (a bank, an office supply store, a bar and beauty shop) would still remain available through similar businesses that are located in close proximity within the Westchester Business District.

Also, as described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6.5) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, note that in contrast to the other build alternatives, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative), does not include any acquisition within the Westchester Business District and no residential

3. Comments and Responses

acquisition is proposed. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 for further discussion of effects on the community of Westchester.

PC03006-6

Comment:

Again, I am against the LAX expansion.

Response:

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

PC03007

Yunker, Bob

None Provided

9/28/2001

PC03007-1

Comment:

I would like to see the people that live in the affected areas of the Antelope Valley have a chance to vote on whether or not we would like to have an International Airport or even an extension of any kind of LAX here. Of all the people I have ever talked to, not one is looking forward to having that airport here, the developers, Real Estate people & the Politicians seem to want it but don't ask ordinary citizens if they are for it. I have a feeling if the peoples voices could be heard there wouldn't be any large airport developed 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 and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC03008

Nilles, Darrell

None Provided

PC03008-1

Comment:

The expansion of an already overburden LAX would further harm the sensitive environment on the coastline.

It would create more noise for me since I am living 1 mile from the airport

We must spread the air transportation network out to the outlying areas where it will be more centralized for the people.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and sensitive coastal environments in Sections 4.10, Biotic Communities, 4.11, Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna, and 4.12, Wetlands, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendices D and J and Technical Report 7 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendices S-C and S-H of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03009 Germany, Edward None Provided

PC03009-1

Comment:

I think making Regional airports larger makes is better idea then Enlarging 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.

**PC03010 Peterson, Sr.,
Donald None Provided**

PC03010-1

Comment:

AS A NATIVE ANGELENO (80+ YEARS) I HAVE EXPERIENCED THE CHANGES TO THIS 'USED TO BE' GREAT CITY. I AM A LONG TIME RESIDENT OF WESTCHESTER (1947) AND I ABSOLUTELY ABHOR THE IDEA OF LAX EXPANSION. TRAFFIC AT THE PRESENT TIME IS HORENDOUS AND ADDING THIS ABOMINATION PLAYA VISTA' TO THE MIX IS GOING TO MAKE OUR GREAT AREA A VERY DIFFICULT PLACE TO EXIST.

Response:

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

PC03011 Topek, Mary None Provided 7/19/2001

PC03011-1

Comment:

We'd like to know why

1. The planes from LAX are flying so close to shore, instead of flying straight out over the ocean to gain altitude, before turning over our homes? Causing a possible dangerous situations.

Response:

Planes from LAX fly routes directed by air traffic controllers. To ensure the safety of flight, lighter, slower aircraft are sometimes routed along a course that diverges from the route flown by the larger louder aircraft. It would be impractical to efficiently operate the airport if all aircraft were required to climb to given altitudes over the ocean before turning from their initial departure courses. Propeller driven aircraft are kept at lower altitudes to further separate them from jets. The worst offenders from the noise standpoint (jets) are assigned routes that fly over the ocean until they have reached altitudes of 8-10,000 feet before crossing back over the coastline. Furthermore, the coast is paralleled by a flight corridor used by aircraft throughout the Los Angeles basin to fly into and from other airports in the area. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical

3. Comments and Responses

Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay and Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2 regarding early turns over areas north and south of LAX.

PC03011-2

Comment:

2. Why so many helicopters flying so close to shore? We use to have a helicopter in the am. & 1 in the p.m. Now, we have several a day + one between 10-10:30 p.m.

Response:

Helicopters that have an operating agreement with LAWA are required to abide with Section 5, Helicopter Operating Procedures of the Aircraft Noise Abatement Operating Procedures. Please see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement. However, all other helicopters can operate near the shore and during the nighttime hours without any restrictions on their location.

PC03011-3

Comment:

3. Why are you sometimes using a different take off pattern, that cause a constant load roar, 5 miles away from LAX.

Response:

Occasionally, aircraft depart to the east when the winds from that direction exceed the safe operating conditions for aircraft to lift off to the west. This also occurs during foggy or rainy conditions in the winter. Please see Response to Comment PC00158-3 regarding easterly departures.

PC03011-4

Comment:

4. Does it seem right that our waking & sleeping hours are being controlled by LAX. We now wear ear plugs at night and are still being awakened in the early mornings? Doesn't this sound like a 3rd world country where the "powers" that be, don't care about the well fair & safety of it's citizens?

Response:

Comment noted. Special flight procedures are in effect between midnight and 6:30 a.m. These procedures are not mandatory, but are generally used by air traffic controllers when practicable. Until recently, levels of significance for aircraft noise have typically been based upon the 65 CNEL, consistent with Title 21, Section 5006 of the California Code of Regulations and Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 150. For federal purposes the 65 dB CNEL is the threshold of significance for airport noise impacts. However, the Court of Appeal of the State of California has recently ruled that single event noise is of concern and should be addressed in CEQA documentation. Section 4.1, Noise, and Appendix D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR extensively addressed the effects of single aircraft events on nighttime awakenings and on school disruption.

PC03011-5

Comment:

The original excuse for allowing more flights over homes without gaining the proper altitude was the cost of fuel to the airlines. Well, since then the airlines are charging every passenger an extra fuel charge.- Well, we, citizens are paying higher fuel costs & no one to pass the increases to help us. - We don't see Hermosa Beach. Letting us drive through the park as a short cut, so we could save fuel.- They also won't let us go through the stop signals or set the signals, or go down 1 way streets. So why are the airlines allowed to take short cuts that cause disruptions to the beach city citizens?

Response:

Aircraft fly at the altitude assigned them by air traffic controllers to safely transit through an area. Fuel cost has little to do with the altitude at which the aircraft crosses back over the coastline after gaining height. Jet aircraft are climbed to assure separation from propeller aircraft underneath them, to achieve a noise level that is below the level of federal and state significance, and to separate them from aircraft operating at Torrance, Long Beach, Hawthorne and LAX that are below them. Flight routes were recently adjusted to provide even less overflight of South Bay communities by jets departing LAX. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay.

PC03011-6

Comment:

It is never quiet anymore. When we step outside our home, the 1st thing we hear is some type of aircraft noise.

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03011-7

Comment:

Enclosed is a list of noises from LAX & surrounding planes for Wednesday, July 18, 2001. We recorded from inside our home with the windows open.-

Noises from LAX, assorted planes, flying too close to shore, Daggett Loop, & taking off. etc.

July 18 2001 Wednesday

7:15 am. 8:17 am. left home 3:50 pm.

7:20	8:20	1:25 pm.	3:52
7:23	8:27	1:30	3:57
7:25	8:30	1:34	4:06
7:31	8:35	1:38	4:10
7:34	8:37	1:40	4:21
7:48	8:39	1:41	4:31
7:50	8:40	1:47	4:34
7:56	8:42	1:50	4:45
7:58	8:44	2:10	4:49
8:08	8:48	3:05	5:01
8:10	8:50	3:07	5:14
8:12	8:53	3:15	5:22
8:13	8:55	3:31	5:25
8:15	8:58	3:35	5:29
			5:37

15 Planes in 1 hr.

5:41 pm. 7:15 pm. 9:23 pm.

6:25	7:18	9:32
6:30	7:25	9:37
6:33	7:30	9:47
6:35	7:34	10:45
6:38	7:37	11:08
6:45	7:43	11:10
6:50	7:45	
6:56	8:05	
7:05	8:56	

3. Comments and Responses

7:08 9:08

As you can see we are not speaking about an occasional noise, but a constant noise, in fact, it is excessive!!!

Response:

Comment noted. The commentor's reside in Hermosa Beach. They may be affected by easterly takeoffs circling back to the west. During a recent 18 month period, 82 jets departed to the east when over-ocean procedures were in effect, an average of about one per week. As noted by the noise abatement procedures delineated in Topical Response TR-N-7, exceptions to the over-ocean procedures are available when weather of wind conditions require east traffic flow. LAWA will be pursuing Federal approval of a restriction to alleviate that situation by making over-ocean procedures mandatory when they are in effect between midnight and 6:30 a.m. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay. For more information on noise impacts on the South Bay, see Response to Comment PC00552-2.

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.

PC03012	Marchbanks, Patricia, Jennifer & Mel	None Provided	7/17/2001
----------------	---	----------------------	------------------

PC03012-1

Comment:

Thank you for your inquiry. My family and many friends are so concerned about the traffic conjection, exhaustion of our environment and the over crowding of our great area. We are totally against any 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, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and growth in Section 4.5, Induced Socio-Economic Impacts (Growth Inducement). 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.

PC03012-2

Comment:

The latest LAX record of "near misses" as reported recently in the L.A. Times shows the already precarious situation at LAX.

Response:

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

PC03012-3**Comment:**

Consider areas outside "the city" with open space which are not so near homes and buildings. Here, there would be room for development and/or expansion. Travelers could ease the burden on LAX.

Response:

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

PC03012-4**Comment:**

The developing along the already traffic burdened Lincoln Blvd. near Marina del Rey is another serious matter. The Playa Vista Project with it's 13,000 homes and 2.5 million square feet of offices and stores is obscene...

Response:

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

PC03012-5**Comment:**

not to mention \$168 million in tax-empt bonds to help finance the first phase of a private project.... which is over an old methane gas storage facility! Have our politicians projected what all this means!?

Politicians see revenue for L.A. with LAX - But at what cost!?

Response:

The Playa Vista project is unrelated to the LAX Master Plan.

PC03012-6**Comment:**

P.S. It now takes my daughter 45 minutes to get to work in Santa Monica which is 10 miles from her home in Playa del Rey.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03013 Harper, Katherine None Provided

PC03013-1

Comment:

The regional plan is the only sane solution. I live immediately north of the runway and am very dismayed at the prospect of having more noise and pollution. Please fight for the regional plan. Thank you.

Response:

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

**PC03014 Drucker, M.D., None Provided
William**

PC03014-1

Comment:

Living in Marina del Ray, as best as I can tell, I don't believe that the traffic & noise from an expansion will significantly affect my life.

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.

PC03014-2

Comment:

Pollution increases, though more subtle than noise traffic, may have a more serious impact on me. However LAX is at the ocean, whereas Ontario, San B., being in the smog belt, may be far worse for the whole inland population than it is from LAX.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. See also Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC03014-3

Comment:

If I understand the above statements from you, it seems that it is better economically, to have a regional system of airports versus expanding LAX.

Response:

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

PC03014-4

Comment:

If I am wrong about the pollution problems being greater inland, it would appear to me to be better to build one there. I want to also add here that a very important {and maybe - most important} consideration should be which one would have a worse impact on the environment - both land & air. and if they're both very bad, then we shouldn't build in either 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. The environmental impacts associated with developing a new airport or improving an existing airport depends on the specific location(s) being considered. When comparing the impacts between two sites, typically the differences in impacts vary for each environmental discipline. The proposed Master Plan involves improvements being considered for the existing LAX, with the nature and extent of such improvements ranging from essentially no improvements under the No Action/No Project Alternative to varying degrees of improvements under each of the build alternatives. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR disclose the impacts associated with each alternative and provide a basis for decision-makers to compare the environmental implications of each scenario. The LAX Master Plan does not propose the development of a new airport or improvements to an existing airport elsewhere.

PC03015 Momand, Sophie None Provided

PC03015-1

Comment:

A few questions please:

1. Just where would a regional airport be built?
2. We need to be more like Denver with zero residents within planned 65 db noise boundary
3. When does construction occur?

Response:

Comment noted. The alternatives being considered for the Master Plan provide for a range of improvements at LAX, and do not propose the development of a regional airport. Similarly, as an improvement program to an existing airport, it is not possible to have zero residents within the future 65 dB [CNEL] boundary. Section 4.1, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed changes to the 65 CNEL boundary resulting from each of the Master Plan alternatives, and provided mitigation measures for those cases where the future 65 CNEL contour associated with each build alternative is projected to increase the number of homes and population exposed to noise levels of 65 CNEL or more. The construction phasing for the proposed alternatives is described in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03016 Dynda, Marilyn None Provided 7/23/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01668; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01668.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03017 **Waller, Carole** **None Provided**

PC03017-1

Comment:

I am a resident of Playa del Rey and live adjacent to the airport property. I already live with the noise from jets taking off, even with the recent sound proofing installed. I am concerned the runways will be even closer & jets will be flying above our condominium.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternatives A and C would move the northernmost runway alignment closer to Playa del Rey, and create a greater likelihood of direct overflight of the commentor's dwelling. Alternative D would provide less opportunity of direct overflight. Each alternative development scheme carries with it a set of abatement actions. 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. For more information on this topic, please see Alternative-Specific Abatement Opportunities in Section 7.2 of Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report in particular Section 7.2.2 Alternative A and Section 7.2.4 Alternative C of the Draft EIS/EIR and Sections 4.1.8 and 4.2.8 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For more information on noise impacts on Playa del Rey, see Response to Comment PC00499-1.

PC03017-2

Comment:

I am also extremely concerned about increased traffic coming into the already overcrowded neighborhood. The freeways, and surface streets are already clogged with commuter and airport traffic. The proposed "loop" or freeway around the airport would significantly decrease access to my home.

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. Note that Alternative D does not include the Ring Road. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways.

PC03017-3

Comment:

We are already having to tolerate many new, un-wanted developments (Playa Vista, Marina del Rey, Playa del Rey). I am very concerned about over-crowding in a small area which is already densely populated. I strongly support a regional plan and urge LAX to remain within its borders.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No 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 Response to Comment PC00148-2 regarding potential impacts from Playa Vista.

PC03018 Mc Coy, Marilyn None Provided 7/23/2001

PC03018-1

Comment:

SINCE I LIVE IN EL SEGUNDO, THE COMMUNITY AND ALL OF ITS RESIDENTS WOULD BE GREATLY AFFECTED BY NOT ONLY THE ADDITIONAL NOISE AND AIR POLLUTION FROM ADDITIONAL INCOMING AND OUTGOING FLIGHTS, BUT ALSO BY THE TRAFFIC TO AND FROM THE AIRPORT. THIS IS NOT AN ACCEPTABLE OPTION IN MY OPINION.

Response:

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

PC03018-2

Comment:

NOT SURE WHAT THE ECONOMIC IMPACT WOULD BE ON DOWNTOWN EL SEGUNDO, WITH AN EXPANDED AIRPORT, BUT DOUBT THERE WOULD BE ANY. THERE MIGHT BE A NEED FOR ADDITIONAL HOTEL SPACE (WHICH WE ALSO DO NOT NEED), CANNOT SEE WHERE ANY FIRMS WOULD REQUIRE ADDITIONAL OFFICE SPACE. BELIEVE WE ARE PRETTY WELL MAXED OUT IN OFFICE BUILDINGS AS WELL.

Response:

Comment noted. The economic impacts of the project were addressed in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data in Technical Report 5 and Technical Report S-3. See also Response to Comment PC03412-6 regarding economic impacts of the LAX Master Plan alternatives on the City of El Segundo.

PC03019 Doron, Marcella None Provided

PC03019-1

Comment:

Opposed to LAX expansion. Enough is enough let other counties share in the noise, pollution etc.

Cannot keep up with the demand

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC03020 Whipp, Joseph None Provided

PC03020-1

Comment:

I live 15 minutes from LAX and pass by it often. The population of that area is growing so tremendously that anything that can be done to decentralize air traffic would be a blessing - auto traffic can be awful - exiting the 105 on to Sepulveda & Sepulveda N or Roscrans is always congested.

Make it convenient for people to fly from areas closer to their home - Don't Expand LAX!

Response:

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

PC03021 Tudor, Clay None Provided

PC03021-1

Comment:

I LIVE ON IMPERIAL AVE JUST SOUTH OF LAX IN EL SEGUNDO, I'VE HEARD THAT LAX MAY GO TO 5 RUNWAYS AND TEAR DOWN THE BUILDINGS ON THE SOUTH BORDER OF LAX, FOR ME IT WOULD BE TREMENDOUSLY NOISY. ITS PRETTY BAD NOW!

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures. In addition, please see Alternative-Specific Abatement Opportunities in Section 7.2 of Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, in particular Section 7.2.3 Alternative B of the Draft EIS/EIR and Sections 4.1.8 and 4.2.8 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For more information on noise impacts on the South Bay, see Response to Comment PC00552-2.

PC03022 Malkin, Ruby None Provided

PC03022-1

Comment:

Against LAX expansion. Supports JH in position

Response:

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

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

PC03023 **Eidsmoe, Martha** **None Provided** **7/19/2001**

PC03023-1

Comment:

This would greatly affect me.

I am on a fixed income. If I move I cant afford the cost. It would be a fiancle burden to me also If I stay the traffic would be much harder for me at my age of 72.

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 and Technical Report S-2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

PC03023-2

Comment:

I have lived in Westchester close to the airport since 1950. Ive seen the airport expand over the years. They have taken many homes out all around the airport.

The airport has much land on all side of it that they already own.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that no residential acquisition is proposed under Alternative D. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC03023-3

Comment:

I think what is wrong with this airport is that it has a bottleneck at the entrest to the airport. It does not make sence to me to build more roads into a bottle neck.

A better way would be to create new entrences into the airport on the allready exising land that the airport allready has acquired.

I think they could do this with out new roads into the airport If they used people movers something like Los Vagas has. They could even be under ground. They have property on all sides that could be used

The best location would be the east south side which is near the allready existin freeway 405 & 105 which would eliminate locale trafif.

If they need a north entry there is airport property extending to the sea and road coming from the north could be used. Lincon Maby

Response:

The concept the commentor refers to is similar to Alternative D, analyzed in detail in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03023-4

Comment:

what about landing airplanes on islands along calif coast and using helicopter to move on to the inland there could be helipaths built along the coast like I've seen on TV in some other countries

Response:

Comment noted. Landing airplanes on islands along the California coast is not considered to be feasible due to the high costs, construction difficulty, and environmental concerns.

PC03024 Allison, Louise None Provided

PC03024-1

Comment:

Thank you for opposing the LAX Master Plan and supporting a regional plan for air transportation.

Response:

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

PC03024-2

Comment:

We in the South Bay would be greatly affected by the increased traffic, noise and pollution from expansion of LAX.

Response:

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

PC03025 Abraham, Cora None Provided

PC03025-1

Comment:

I and my husband and two grown sons live a few blocks south of the Santa Monica Airport. The noise and pollution from the jets and small planes is incredible. The small trainer planes sputter and rattle as they circle over our house to land and take off again for trainer exercises.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC03025-2**Comment:**

Now I can see and hear jets taking off from LAX that turn as soon as possible and fly by on the south side of the house. The south-west side of LAX has become extremely noisy because so many planes are taking off, especially in the evening.

Response:

The commentor resides in Venice, near Santa Monica Airport. The comment refers to aircraft departing LAX in west flow and turning away from her residence. Conditions at the commentor's location are not expected to change with the proposed action. Please see Response to Comment PC00593-5 regarding early turns. Please also see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 regarding existing and future noise levels.

PC03025-3**Comment:**

Every jet that comes down the west-coast comes in over Venice and Ocean-Park, many right by and over my house, to land at LAX.

Response:

Turbo-jet aircraft arriving from the Pacific Northwest and Asia are routed over the Santa Monica VOR. The commentor is probably observing this arrival flow. These aircraft cross a point 10 miles west of Santa Monica at altitude of 10,000 feet and then descend to cross Santa Monica at or above 7,000 before proceeding eastbound.

PC03025-4**Comment:**

Then at night all the jets come from Inglewood directly over my house to land on the sand dunes. The jets let down the flaps under the wings of the airplane to help slow the airplane down because their brakes are not adequate to stop the plane. The lowered flaps cause a screeching sound as the plane goes over.

Response:

The commentor is correct in identifying that airframe noise does occur during an aircraft approach. Lowered flaps assist the aircraft operator in descending the aircraft without increasing the airspeed thus allowing the aircraft to land within its specified requirements and reducing the amount of braking required to stop safely. This increased airframe noise is considered in the modeling of aircraft noise levels.

PC03025-5**Comment:**

LAX Master Plan is going to put the noise to the West. Seems to me that an awful lot of noise and pollution has already been put to the west.

Response:

Since the ocean is completely compatible west of the airport it would be optimal to put as many aircraft over the ocean as possible. Depending on the alternative, some impacts will remain to the north, east and south of the airport under arrivals and along the sidelines of the flight path. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed land use in Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix E and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03025-6

Comment:

When I tried to ask the airport representative at the teach in in Westchester a few weeks ago about this she walked off and didn't answer me.

Response:

LAWA remains committed to public outreach and information and apologizes for any miscommunication.

PC03025-7

Comment:

I appreciate your working for regional airports and thank you very much for your efforts on our behalf.

Response:

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

PC03026

Allen, Bonnie

None Provided

PC03026-1

Comment:

The LAX Master Plan would have a significantly negative effect on me, my family and my neighborhood.
Please see the following pages.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC03026-2

Comment:

The LAX Master Plan would have a significantly NEGATIVE effect on me, my family, and my neighborhood.

My family moved into Westchester in 1947, and over the years we have seen LAX reduce our neighborhood's well-being, quality of life and property values by increasing noise, traffic, and pollution. We have witnessed LAX "do as they please" by gobbling up entire sections of neighborhoods despite extraordinary protests spanning years just so LAWA can increase their revenue from income from the car rental companies and airport parking lots that now occupy this land. Homes north of the airport and west of downtown Westchester have been taken as well, apparently as part of LAX's long-term expansion plans.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. 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. Section 3.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR and 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 Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the impacts of such acquisition and identified Master Plan commitments and recommended mitigation measures.

PC03026-3

Comment:

Now, LAX wants part of Inglewood and downtown Westchester, including the historic Paradise Building (the former location of the unique Paradise Theater with Oscar movie memorabilia stored in vaults in the floor and walls) and the Westchester Branch Library (where countless local children and adults have utilized its resources for decades).

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 concerning impacts to the community of Westchester. The Draft EIS/EIR, Appendix I, Section 106 Report, included findings of surveys performed to identify properties within the Area of Potential Effect (as defined by 36 CFR 800.16(d)) that may have potential architectural or historical significance, based on the National Register of Historic Places criteria. The Paradise Building (located within the area of potential effects) did not retain sufficient historical integrity to convey architectural or historical significance. As described in Section 4.26.4 of the Draft EIS/EIR, under the 1998 Library Bond Program, which is independent from the LAX Master Plan, the Los Angeles Public Library's Westchester Branch and Loyola Village Branch libraries would be consolidated. This would involve the permanent closure of Westchester Branch Library and the expansion of the Loyola Village Branch Library to create the combined Westchester-Loyola Village Library. This consolidation has since publication of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. 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 include any acquisition within the Westchester Business District.

PC03026-4

Comment:

So, LAWA wants a little more land to "modernize" LAX, telling us how good this will be for the surrounding neighborhoods. Do they think we are idiots? We've seen this all before. The only one who profits from the LAX Master Plan is LAWA.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the economics benefits of the project in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Report 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03026-5

Comment:

Let me tell you about our considerate LAX neighbor to our south. We have witnessed a "lost" jet plane preparing to land several miles to the north of the airport into our residential neighborhood - - right over our house. This jet flew over our house just barely missing our tree in the front yard and just clearing the telephone poles in the back yard. Ask me about the lack of concern, explanation and response from LAWA, the airline, and the FAA about this near disaster. Perhaps we would have received a more appropriate response had we contacted the news media, our local representatives and an attorney (for compensation for the damage to our house, and the severe ear pain and subsequent hearing losses we

3. Comments and Responses

suffered as a result of this incident. Tell me and my family that LAX "cares" about its residential neighbors. We know this is untrue.

Response:

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

PC03026-6

Comment:

Over the years, we have seen schools closed down due to LAX growth. Ask me about the disruption to those students' education as a result of these actions.

Response:

Comment noted. Impacts to schools were addressed in Section 4.27 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03026-7

Comment:

Ask me how often my teachers in Westchester schools had to stop classroom instruction, waiting for the noise from the airport to ease up so that the students could hear what was being said. Ask me how often instruction from a class I'm taking at Westchester Park has to stop due to airport noise.

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.

PC03026-8

Comment:

Ask me about waking up most of my childhood at 2 AM when the airport's jets revved up their engines. And ask me about the use of the "north-north" runway -- the noise from which was intolerable and kept everyone up at night. Although the airport discontinued the use of this runway years ago due to public protest, it has since been put back in use, contrary to LAWA's promises all those years ago.

Response:

Comment noted. The commentor is a resident of Westchester and is referring to Runway 6L/24R the northernmost runway at LAX. The airport has not discontinued use of the runway during nighttime hours. Section 2, Environmental Baseline (1996) and Section 3, Future Aircraft Operating Conditions located in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR provide runway utilization percentages for the 1996 Baseline, No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternatives A, B, and C. Section 2, Year 2000 Conditions and Section 3, Future Alternative D Conditions located in Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, provide runway utilization percentages for Alternative D. All alternatives confirm that Runway 6L/24R is used and will be used during nighttime hours.

The commentor may be confused with the nighttime restrictions. Section 1 (d) of the Aircraft Noise Abatement Operating Procedures and Restrictions which are identified in Topical Response TR-N-7 state that: Pilots shall not request usage of outboard runways (24R/6L and 25L/7R) for departure unless the pilot determines that in the interest of safety usage of these runways is necessary. However, while this rule is in place, landings are still allowed and it does not prevent aircraft from departing the runway in certain conditions. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also, 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. Additionally, please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations and TR-N-6 regarding noise increases.

PC03026-9

Comment:

LAWA wants us to believe that the traffic around the airport will improve if the Master Plan is adopted. Who are they kidding? The traffic around the airport and along the Sepulveda corridor is the worst it has ever been. Why? The airport construction on the Sepulveda tunnel and the not yet completed nor fully utilized Howard Hughes Center have increased the traffic. The latter's impact on traffic has yet to be fully realized, and there has not been enough done to alleviate the resulting, current traffic, let alone what we'll have in the future. I'm certain that the Hughes Center's EIR claimed that their project would address the traffic and they would be able to accommodate the increase in traffic, just as LAWA claims that their Master Plan will alleviate increased traffic. Just wait until the Playa Vista project is completed and people move into those new homes and begin to shop in the area. This is not properly addressed in the Master Plan. LAWA seeks to expand LAX in order to give the appearance of decreased traffic WITHIN LAX. Better mass transit is the solution to decreasing traffic within and around LAX. LAWA wants us to think that traffic will not increase by "modernizing" LAX via increasing its size in order to handle more flights. But, expanding LAX to handle more flights means more people, more traffic, more noise, and more pollution -- all to the detriment of LAX's residential and business neighbors.

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-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology. Regarding improved mass transit options, the new Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, Alternative D, which is analyzed in detail in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR incorporates remote passenger parking with people mover systems, which eliminates the need for an airport Ring Road nor a western passenger entrance from Pershing Drive. In addition, the Green Line is proposed to be extended north to provide access to LAX.

PC03026-10

Comment:

The incidence of asthma and allergy problems in my family are aggravated by 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.

PC03026-11

Comment:

I recall asking my parents when I was quite young what was that odd, stinking smell in the air. It was kerosene from the airplanes -- a noxious odor coming from the airport.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-4 odors and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC03026-12

Comment:

I recently painted the trim and doors white on our back patio and shed. Not long afterward, I was dismayed to see grayish-black spots all over the white surfaces. It was soot (AKA pollution) from the ever-expanding airport that covered the paint. In addition, whenever I dust my house, a few hours later, the dust is back again! These are indications of the airport's special, smelly, dirty gift to us: pollution.

Response:

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

PC03026-13

Comment:

This is what I and my family breathe into our lungs day in and day out. How does LAWA measure the impact of pollution on the health of my family?

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The human health risk assessments presented in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR were based on standard regulatory guidelines, approved scientific methods, and computer models consistent with the protective recommendations of federal and state health agencies. As required by CEQA, the human health risk assessments calculated health risks and hazards for people living in areas where impacts might be highest. The human health risk assessments also assessed risks and hazards for locations throughout a large geographic area that extended into communities adjacent to, and north, east, and south of the airport. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts

PC03026-14

Comment:

Where does increased flights and increased traffic equate to less pollution in their Master Plan? Let's all use some common sense!

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC03026-15

Comment:

LAX is used to getting what they want. In spite of solid opposition and rulings that have gone against them, LAWA representatives have defiantly pronounced that their Master Plan will go into effect. They assume that their opposition will just dissolve away over time. But, we have seen the way they operate, and we will fight for our quality of life. Expanding LAX means greater profit for LAWA, but the resulting increase in noise, traffic and pollution is not good for our neighborhood. Tiny "Mines Field" was never designed to become the international airport the LAWA envisions for the future.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC03026-16

Comment:

A regional approach for airline traffic is the only rational approach. A super- giant LAX handling the bulk of Southern California's air traffic is illogical. People from Orange County, Palmdale, and Ontario/ San Bernardino should not have to drive hours to fly out of LAX when they have airports in their own back yards that should accommodate them. Expecting LAX to handle the bulk of air traffic in the future is inefficient, and increases traffic and pollution throughout Southern California.

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.

PC03026-17

Comment:

The Palmdale airport is surrounded with vacant land and can be easily expanded without adverse impact to the surrounding neighborhood. The former Norton Air Force Base could also be utilized, improving the economy in the area.

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC03026-18

Comment:

Ontario could also be better utilized, and flights in and out of Ontario would increase if the ticket prices were more fair and competitive.

Response:

Expansion at Ontario is being planned for in its Master Plan update. 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-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03026-19

Comment:

The El Toro airport should be utilized for residents in the areas around Orange County.

Response:

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

PC03026-20

Comment:

What is the rationale for overburdening LAX and the neighboring region? The only reason is more profit for LAWA. The benefits and burdens of aviation travel for all of Southern California MUST be FAIRLY DISTRIBUTED THROUGHOUT Southern California. Do not allow LAX to swallow up more of Westchester and Inglewood, destroying our neighborhood and the quality of our 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-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC03028

Koenig, Richard

None Provided

PC03028-1

Comment:

Quite simply, I believe that the airports existing capabilities should remain & a rapid transit in & out should be implemented with dispatch.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

PC03029

Goodall, Gregory

None Provided

PC03029-1

Comment:

A recent report in the LA Times discusses safety issues at LAX. Clearly these issues need to be addressed. Beyond that however, LAX should not be expanded because it is within a large population. We can certainly utilize regional airports, and we should seriously consider building an airport in 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-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC03030 Mohler, Nancy None Provided

PC03030-1

Comment:

Traffic impact expected to be very bad. Any LAX expansion must be tied to significant additions to public transportation to the terminals.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan. Note that Alternative D, discussed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, includes an emphasis on public transportation links to the terminals, with a new Intermodal Transportation Center on the east side of the airport.

PC03031 Fisher, Susan None Provided

PC03031-1

Comment:

I live near the airport and will be directly affected by the increase in traffic, noise & pollution. I believe other areas with more space should expand their 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. 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.

PC03032 Riley, Lynn None Provided

PC03032-1

Comment:

I support any plan that does NOT include expansion of LAX. We already have enough congestion, noise, pollutants, traffic and general "madness" in this area!

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

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

PC03033 Schroeder, Eileen None Provided

PC03033-1

Comment:

Reduce LAX as Denver AP.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03033-2

Comment:

My Southwood residential area would not be affected as would those nearer but some action necessary instead of the annual "heming and hawing."

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03034 Sterner, Rick None Provided 7/14/2001

PC03034-1

Comment:

I have been a home owner in Playa del Rey 15 years and live 1 mile from the airport. The jets take off over the water near my house. I am an LAWA employee.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03034-2

Comment:

(1) I don't like the noise. It's the worst problem in my area.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for more information on and comparisons of noise and noise-related land use impacts under the baseline and Year 2000 conditions and the various Master Plan alternatives including new Alternative D. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PC03034-3

Comment:

(2) A fine black dust like ashes falls on my property and I suspect it is jet exhaust. Does it hurt my children? Two young toddlers

Response:

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

PC03034-4

Comment:

(3) Im concerned about the 1,302% increase in smog expected with expansion at LAX.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 concerning air pollution increase.

PC03035

Salk, Jean

None Provided

PC03035-1

Comment:

Our family has resided in Westchester for the past 7 years. Over the years, we have witnessed a number of changes to our community. Most of the development that Westchester has undergone has served to improve our access to shopping and entertainment. However, with development come increased traffic, congestion and pollution. Expansion of LAX is no different. Those of us who live adjacent to the airport are subjected to a daily diet of noise, exhaust, and inconvenience as we struggle to drive our children to school or make our way to work. There are better, more equitable alternatives to expansion of LAX. Given the statistics you site in your newsletter, we urge you to support the development of our regional airports and not 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. 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 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.

PC03036

McElhone, Elsie

None Provided

PC03036-1

Comment:

We are already affected by increased traffic, noise on the ground and overhead and pollution. Adding 29,000 more people in Playa Vista is insane. Every available spot in Del Rey, Marina del Rey and Playa del Rey is being filled with new housing construction.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03036-2

Comment:

Please move all non-passenger traffic to a new place; e.g., Palmdale. Restrict small planes from coming to LAX at least during certain hours. LAX leads the country in on ground misses of hitting other aircraft. This should tell us something, Columbus, Ohio operates one airport for passengers and another in a different location for other traffic and it is extremely successful. See L.A. Times article done earlier this year. Why are more planes flying over my house (Culver Blvd. and McConnell by 90 Freeway)?

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC00297-9 regarding offloading LAX flights to secondary airports such as Palmdale and Response to Comment PC00281-25 regarding the airport's ability to restrict flights. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC03037 Biffar, Helen None Provided

PC03037-1

Comment:

I am totally against the airport expansion and the express way interchange. We live on Airport Blvd. and have enough traffic and pollution 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.

PC03037-2

Comment:

I am in favor of upgrading what we have now and build up the regional airports as there are many. the population is expanding outward so why funnel it all into L.A.X. Several vacant airbases could be used for cargo and passengers

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.

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.

PC03037-3

Comment:

We have enough traffic, noise, and air pollution now let some one else share 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. 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.

PC03037-4

Comment:

Westchester would be desimated if the Arborvitae expressway and airport expansion were to occur.
Vote 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. Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC03038

**English, Jean J. &
David H.**

None Provided

7/23/2001

PC03038-1

Comment:

We believe that traffic at LAX (plane and car) needs to be alleviated by planning for regional expansion at Pt. Mugu, Palmdale and the Ontario area. If runways at LAX need to be reconfigured for air traffic safety, then that should be done, but LAX does not have to solve all the expansion problems for all of southern Calif.

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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03038-2

Comment:

The green line should be completed.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03038-3

Comment:

We do not believe El Toro should become a commercial airport. Let that become a huge open space recreational/park area.

Response:

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

PC03039

Owens, Nora

None Provided

PC03039-1

Comment:

When I bought my home in 1984, I thought the airport noise at my distance (in Westport Heights) was bearable and not a problem. Although occasionally air currents and/or storms at sea have caused me to hear considerably more noise, it has not been a major problem until recently, when I have heard more and more air traffic.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.2 regarding relationship between traffic levels and noise levels. The commentor may be hearing turbo-jet aircraft arriving from the Pacific Northwest and Asia which are routed over the Santa Monica VOR. These aircraft cross a point 10 miles west of Santa Monica at an altitude of 10,000 feet and then descend to cross Santa Monica at or above 7,000 feet before proceeding eastbound and landing on the north complex. 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.

PC03039-2

Comment:

Already the air pollution in Westchester is bad, with residents finding black gunk on patio furniture and windows, and I personally experience the occasional smell of jet fuel, which can't be healthy. I know city dwellers are exposed to all manner of air pollution anyway, but I don't think we need to expose our families and ourselves to the chemicals emanating from additional airplanes coming into LAX. We have enough air pollution, thank you.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts of toxic air contaminants, Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition, and Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding odors.

PC03039-3

Comment:

I am very concerned for property values, which have been going up in the past few years as people discover our lovely Westchester neighborhoods. Why do we have to ruin them?

Response:

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

PC03039-4

Comment:

Thank you for helping to stop the onslaught of 20 million more passengers + freight per year.

Response:

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

PC03040 Green, Marilyn None Provided

PC03040-1

Comment:

Sorry this is late, but I would like to voice my opinion in favor of a regional plan. I agree with your views and you have my support --

Response:

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

PC03041 Fry, Patricia None Provided

PC03041-1

Comment:

I am opposed to the expansion of LAX and in favor of expanding the other regional airports instead. Not only would this protect the residents of the South Bay from additional noise pollution due to increased flyovers, and from additional traffic headaches, but it would be of great benefit to the residents of inland and valley residents to have convenient access to air travel.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC03042 Bossen, L.E. None Provided

PC03042-1

Comment:

Noise makes resting or sleeping difficult - nerves can become frayed -

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.

PC03042-2

Comment:

Traffic congestion would increase accident rate, may add to road rage, add to commute time for people going to & from work; getting into & out of the airport -

Response:

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

PC03042-3

Comment:

Pollution makes for health problems; in some cases difficulty in breathing -

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.

PC03043 Goodrich, James None Provided

PC03043-1

Comment:

Get started on the direct route thru the mountains to Palmdale where massive amounts of land have been accumulated for an airport. Present routes are indirect & too long.

Response:

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

PC03044 Peck, Mary None Provided

PC03044-1

Comment:

Thank you for taking on the Airport Expansion Plan. I definitely feel that El Torro or Palmdale should assume part of the burden in transporting the many travelers from this area.

Response:

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

PC03045 Sullivan, Audrey None Provided

PC03045-1

Comment:

SOMETIMES WE FEEL AS THOUGH WE ARE IN A WAR ZONE FROM THE NOISE OF PLANES GOING OVER OUR HOUSE. OUR CARS AND WINDOWS ARE ALWAYS FILTHY FROM THE POLLUTION. TRAFFIC IS HORRENDOUS AT CERTAIN TIMES DUE TO THE AIRPORT AND THE WHOLE THING IS RUINING WESTCHESTER. PLEASE STOP THE MADNESS BY SENDING AIRPLANE TRAFFIC TO OTHER AREAS.

Response:

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

PC03046 Lansberry, Margaret None Provided

PC03046-1

Comment:

I live right in the heart of Westchester and the traffic in any direction is just impossible.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts and Topical Response TR-ST-7 regarding Westchester Southside traffic.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03046-2

Comment:

Also that black oily stuff that falls from the sky could not be good for any one.

Response:

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

PC03046-3

Comment:

Move some of this traffic to another 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. 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.

PC03047

**Nakamura, PhD,
George**

None Provided

PC03047-1

Comment:

I've often wondered why it was not possible to extend the LAX runways into the sea area where there's a lot of space. Many airports, like the one in Hong Kong, are built over water. Perhaps, it's not feasible in LA.

Response:

The process of evaluating potential concepts for the LAX Master Plan is described in Chapter 3, Alternatives (Subsection 3.1.3), of the Draft EIS/EIR and in Chapter V, Concept Development of the Draft Master Plan. As indicated in those discussions, alternatives that included ocean runways were considered. Ocean development was determined to be infeasible due to the high costs, construction difficulty, and environmental concerns. Please also see Response to Comment PC00998-1.

PC03047-2

Comment:

The presence of LAX near the #405 freeway result in a horrendous traffic on the freeway.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in

3. Comments and Responses

Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03047-3

Comment:

I would like to see regional airports expanded.

Response:

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

PC03048 Carr, Grace None Provided

PC03048-1

Comment:

As promised, please keep an open mind for regional plans and oppose the LAX plan!!

Please save my Grandson's home 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-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, and Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

PC03049 Valcourt, Andrea None Provided

PC03049-1

Comment:

This expansion will add noise pollution to our area. I live in Hermosa & already hear fly overs, especially after 10 PM, when the house is quiet.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N- 3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay. Also please see Response to Comment PC01879-5 regarding sleep disturbance.

PC03049-2

Comment:

It will also add to our traffic problems. I use LAX often & what should be a 15 minute can take 45 minutes, adding extra stress to my life as I hope I'll make my flight.

It will also impact traffic in the general vicinity - make shopping and dining even more inconvenient. I avoid this area (between Rosecrans & the airport) most day after 3 PM.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in

3. Comments and Responses

Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways.

PC03049-3

Comment:

I fear added pollution from those planes flying over my house. Check airport employee cars for the ill effects. My dad lived close to Burbank airport - not much point left after a few years.

Response:

Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC03049-4

Comment:

I support the regional approach which should also lower airfares everywhere.

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.

PC03050 Beck, Ashley None Provided

PC03050-1

Comment:

Being a resident of Hermosa Beach, CA, I am definitely affected by LAX in both noise and pollution.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC03050-2

Comment:

It seems that during the day "most" of the flights abide by the 8000 ft fly-over rule. At night, forget it. Some international flights as well as domestic carriers fly over so low that I can read the logo on their tail wing very clearly. Not to mention having my ears blasted by the noise.

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 of wind conditions require east traffic flow. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay.

PC03050-3

Comment:

The pollution that settles on our house has to be washed off our decks once a week. Its filthy.

Response:

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

PC03050-4

Comment:

I have kept pace with the issue of LAX expansion. I didn't see how it is possible considering that only bad can come from 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.

PC03051 Ratcliff, Thomas None Provided

PC03051-1

Comment:

Enough is enough in the LAX area, between the traffic and the noise and the up tightness of the public, we don't need any more distractions in our lives. Please if you do care, then use all your resources to stop any expansion of LAX.

Response:

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

PC03051-2

Comment:

And just another thought the Playa Del Rey area is a safe and extremely fragile animal refuse not to say a fly away for our endangered friend that share our planet with us.

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

PC03052 Wijesuriya, Asoka None Provided

PC03052-1

Comment:

I am a resident of Westchester. The proposed LAX expansion is definitely going to have an effect on my health. I am a congested heart failure patient and as it is, the pollution that is created by emission of air planes fuel, has an adverse effect on my breathing, creating loss of breath.

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.

PC03052-2

Comment:

I have lived in this house for the last 15 yrs. Last year I put my house in the market for sale, with the intention of moving out for health reasons. The prospective buyers were concerned abt the noise the airplanes make presently, and made no offer.

Response:

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

PC03052-3

Comment:

You could imagine, what I will have to face with the planned expansion - more noise, more traffic and more pollution. Without getting another chance to sell my house, I will be stuck here with more loss of breath.

Response:

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

PC03052-4

Comment:

It is nothing but right, for other communities in other areas to bare the burden of aviation traffic that force it upon LAX altogether.

Response:

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

PC03053 Weber, Frank None Provided

PC03053-1

Comment:

I ATTENDED THE FURAMA HOTEL LAX EXPANSION PLAN HEARING.

THE LAX EXPANSION IS A NO BRAINER!

10 LBS OF CRAP IN A 5 LB BAG.

PLEASE USE YOUR COMMON SENSE AND VOTE NO ON LAX EXPANSION.

Response:

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

PC03054 Crumpton, Evelyn None Provided

PC03054-1

Comment:

Dr. Crumpton is elderly and frail. She is awakened often by noise of airplanes and has difficulty getting back to sleep.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC03055 Tinley, John None Provided

PC03055-1

Comment:

How easy it is to tell others what to do. You try to legislate this every day. The issue with air transportation isn't black or white. You can not legislate where people fly to or from.

LAX is operating near capacity - larger, quieter airplanes will help people use LAX because of frequency/not easy of access.

People do not use satellite airports because of lack of frequency. The airlines are dictated to by passenger demand.

Spending money to modernize Ontario, Palmdale doesn't get the two together. What is needed is better use & publicity for the transport systems -- Metro, Metrorail, freeways & incentives for passengers & airlines to cooperate.

3. Comments and Responses

Negative don't do it. Nor does legislation. There is a lot of positive effort & coordination needed - the co-operation of city, county, airline, government & other resources to develop plans that will be acceptable to all parties - This has not been done. You are the responsible vehicle.

Response:

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

PC03056 van de Wouw, None Provided

PC03056-1

Comment:

[no comment]

Response:

No comments were included in this letter.

PC03057 Alpert, Dorothea None Provided

PC03057-1

Comment:

I live in Ranch Palos Verdes. Representatives from our community have made it abundantly clear that the noise and air traffic is making life (especially on the top of the hill) increasingly unpleasant and uncomfortable. I agree with Congresswoman Jane Harmon in opposing the LAX Master Plan.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, 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-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

PC03058 McGuire, Kathleen None Provided

PC03058-1

Comment:

I am a native of, and still reside in Redondo Beach, CA. I am very much opposed to the expansion of LAX. The main concerns are the noise of the planes as they fly over my home, the sheer number of such flights and the traffic. It seems to me that we should utilize the numerous bases that are closed but have some runways etc that could be expanded.

Response:

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

PC03059 Gerhardt, Joan None Provided

PC03059-1

Comment:

I want LAX expanded. I do not want to travel to a "regional" airport when I live and work 12 miles from LAX. Also LAX is an International hub, where the regional airports are not.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03060 Scott, Douglas None Provided

PC03060-1

Comment:

The pollution and noise from airplanes from LAX now occurs for 24 hours a day over Palos Verdes and the South Bay. Please route departures over the landing lanes and decrease the number of flights.

Response:

Comment noted. The commentor is a resident of Palos Verdes Estates and well outside the area affected by significant noise exposure (65 dB and greater) impact area. The physics of flight requires that aircraft depart into the wind and/or land into the wind. Since LAX is located adjacent to the ocean its aircraft depart to west and land from the east. Redirecting departures to the east in a head-to-head scenario with arriving aircraft would be unsafe, impractical and cause significant noise impacts to those communities surrounding the airport. Likewise, extending departures farther to the west when departing that direction would create unwarranted additional flight time and cost relative to the noise levels now generated by aircraft departing in that direction. Recent changes to FAA operating procedures that affect departures over the South Bay communities are not a part of the proposed actions of the Master Plan. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay. Additionally, for more information on noise impacts on the South Bay, see Response to Comment PC00552-2.

PC03061 Cheney, Russell None Provided

PC03061-1

Comment:

1) The signs on I-405 are mostly old & therefor misdirect much of the traffic to LAX, causing congestion & delays that are unneeded.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03061-2

Comment:

2) I am generally in favor of expanding LAX for the transportation needs of the local area, as is cost-effective.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03062 Cavanaugh, Marc None Provided

PC03062-1

Comment:

Observations over 25 year residency in Venice Beach.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC03062-2

Comment:

Traffic-

One has to avoid Lincoln Blvd., if on it - one has to calculate any Left turn like a chess game. If on foot, crossing at light OR cross walk is dangerous. I patronize Lincoln West side merchants without driving on Lincoln. Only patronize merchants on East side of Blvd. if coming from Eastside; use alleys only, not Lincoln.

Response:

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

PC03062-3

Comment:

Noise-

The noise while on 405 or Sepulveda/Rt 1 is horrendous.

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.

PC03062-4

Comment:

Pollution-

Since LAX expansion we have a fine white dust daily on everything inside & out.

Response:

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

PC03062-5

Comment:

Santa Monica Airport is overgrown and until about 2 years ago treated complaint with arrogance; then they got a PR campaign going.

Response:

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

PC03062-6

Comment:

BUT WE NEED STATE AND FEDERAL LAWS RE: LOW LEVEL CRAFT/NOISE/CAPACITY.

Response:

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

PC03062-7

Comment:

GO REGIONAL AND LEAVE LAX ALONE & DECREASE ITS USE.

Response:

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

PC03063

McFadden, A.

None Provided

PC03063-1

Comment:

I live at the beach, and the noise from planes taking off from LAX is already a nuisance. Marina del Rey's beach is a limited natural resource and deserves protection from the ever-increasing LAX noise. Please, don't let them ruin our beach any more than they already have - enough is enough. Protect the beach!

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AR00003-42.

PC03064

Thayer, Sandra

None Provided

PC03064-1

Comment:

Since 1968 I have lived in Westchester. During those years I have watched a wonderful community shrink and the airport noise and congestion increase dramatically.

The airport has consumed about half of beautiful (once) Playa del Rey, by my calculations, and a considerable portion of Westchester.

When will we be allowed to feel certain that our homes, businesses, and schools are not in danger of the blight of 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. 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 safety in 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-

3. Comments and Responses

1, S-2, 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 discussed in TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester business district.

PC03065 Freebairn, J. None Provided

PC03065-1

Comment:

Why not expand the use of Long Beach Airport which is as close as LAX and easier to get to.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02771-3 regarding the use of Long Beach Airport.

PC03066 Profumo, Terese None Provided

PC03066-1

Comment:

I feel that all homes in impacted area should be retrofitted at LAX expense. At present, any homeowner in the Airport suit of '68 are excluded unless they repay LAX. This is a separate issue - and especially if the plan goes through to expand LAX, homes need to be retrofitted. Inverse condemnation does not equal noise! If there is money to pay for those pillars of light etc. there is money to make life tolerable under the planes! Further info should be sought - the attorneys received one half of the settlement monies, yet home-owner is being held responsible for total amount!

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. However, please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP) and how approval of the LAX Master Plan would revise the ANMP.

PC03067 Ghastin, Robert None Provided

PC03067-1

Comment:

MY FAMILY IS OPPOSED TO ANY EXPANSION OF LAX AIRPORT, WHICH IF PERMITTED FOR THE SAKE OF THE AIRLINES GREED WOULD ONLY DETERIORATE OUR ENVIRONMENT. WE HAVE MORE THAN ENOUGH PROBLEMS TO COPE WITH - CROWDED STREETS & FREEWAYS, HIGH HOUSING COSTS, MORE SMOG & DUST: WHICH WOULD ONLY BE AGGRAVATED BY MORE AIRLINES, HIGHER ENERGY COSTS (GAS, ELECTRICITY & WATER) TO ACCOMMODATE THE PROPOSED EXPANSION, & INCREASED NOISE LEVELS IN SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and energy impacts in Section 4.17.1, Energy Supply. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC03067-2

Comment:

UNDERSTAND THE TORRANCE AIRPORT IS ALSO PROPOSING AN EXPANSION OF THEIR FACILITIES WHICH HAS BEEN BITTERLY OPPOSED BY RHE, PV, TORRANCE, ETC, RESIDENTS IN THE PAST WE KNOW TOO WELL WHAT THE OIL REFINERIES CAN DO TO OUR HEALTH -

Response:

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

PC03067-3

Comment:

WHAT ARE THE EFFECTS OF JET FUEL ON OUR HEALTH, VEGETATION & HOMES?

Response:

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

PC03068

Aichinger, Leo

None Provided

PC03068-1

Comment:

I concur with your opinions.

Response:

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

PC03069

Koch, Mary

None Provided

PC03069-1

Comment:

I am in total agreement with your position supporting a regional airport.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC03069-2

Comment:

As a resident of Playa del Rey for 42 years I have seen the Vista del Mar area bordering the western edge of the airport change from a charming residential community to an ugly trash infested crime ridden barbed wire enclosed wasteland.

Response:

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

PC03069-3

Comment:

During commuter hours Culver Blvd. is choked with cars taking up to 15 minutes to get through the village to Lincoln Blvd. (a distance of a mile) to avoid even worse airport congestion. Expanding LAX can only make matters worse.

Response:

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

PC03070

Schott, Eric & Diane None Provided

6/9/2001

PC03070-1

Comment:

Rather than expand LAX or create an El Toro Airport I think we should further develop & expand other existing regional airports such as Long Beach, Ontario, Palmdale, etc.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. 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.

PC03070-2

Comment:

We think that the proposed increased in flights would increase the traffic congestion in the vicinity of LAX far beyond anything reasonable.

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

3. Comments and Responses

airport area traffic concerns. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways.

PC03070-3

Comment:

In addition, more flights will create more air & noise pollution. All of this degrades our environment.

Response:

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

PC03070-4

Comment:

Other areas would probably benefit economically from expanded activity at their airports.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03070-5

Comment:

We think the LAX area is already saturated with 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.

PC03071 Ping, Vlasta None Provided

PC03071-1

Comment:

I think the burden of aviation should be shared by distributing the benefits and burdens with other areas. Palmdale and Ontario are the likely spots.

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.

3. Comments and Responses

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC03071-2

Comment:

The congestion is great enough now - too much to even drive to Westchester. My friends living in Inglewood have planes coming in directly over their house and the noise is awful. They haven't been able to grow tomatoes for years now due to pollution. My daughter teaches piano in her home in El Segundo and the noise is awful now without adding more to it. L.A.X. should not be expanded. The congestion now is at its peak as is the pollution and noise.

Response:

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

PC03071-3

Comment:

The planes now don't go out over the ocean, many cut across town and over the refinery.

Response:

Early turns over El Segundo have been a focus of public complaint for years. The airport has attempted to deal with the issue for years through the posting of signs at the end of each runway calling for flight to the coastline prior to turns, but occasional deviations from the procedure continue to occur. A part of the reason is the alignment of the runways relative to the community. The west end of the runways nearest El Segundo are closer to the community than the east ends (the runways are aimed more toward the community's west end), while the north runways are both farther away (except in Alternative A) and aimed away from the community. Consequently, it is much less likely that Westchester will be affected by early turns than El Segundo, particularly by aircraft that follow or attempt to follow the flight to the coastline procedure before turning. The mitigation actions for each alternative include a measure to assure takeoffs reach the coastline prior to initiating turns from centerline. This mitigation action would require two things. First, controllers would no longer have the flexibility to turn the slower aircraft out of the way of faster aircraft before reaching the coastline in order to increase the departure capacity of the runway. Second, pilot compliance with the procedure would have to be improved through better instrumentation. 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 airport.

PC03071-4

Comment:

Palmdale & Ontario would help our traffic and closer for people to fly out from their area.

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

3. Comments and Responses

of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding 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.

PC03071-5

Comment:

No expansion at L.A.X. Taking off is unsafe now.

Response:

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

PC03072 Jenkins, Rhona None Provided

PC03072-1

Comment:

1. Would create too much traffic. Playa Vista is being developed which will create a lot of congestion. Don't need more.

Response:

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

PC03072-2

Comment:

2. Will cause insurance rates to increase.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03072-3

Comment:

3. We already have a lot of noise from airplanes. Don't need more.

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also, please see Topical Response TR-N-3, in particular, Subtopical Response TR-N-3.3 regarding increased noise from increased air traffic.

3. Comments and Responses

**PC03073 Fickenscher, Edgar None Provided
H. & Katherine E.**

PC03073-1

Comment:

Because of previous commitments we were unable to attend the June 9 hearing on LAX expansion. We are unalterably opposed to further LAX expansion until other areas, including Orange County assume their fair share.

We live in Westchester and our area has done its share. We do not need more traffic, noise and pollution, and the loss of our identity. We would lose a good part of our business section and more homes under the LAX Master Plan.

Thank you for your opposition to this airport expansion plan.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. 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.

PC03074 Wald, Kirsten None Provided

PC03074-1

Comment:

I feel that there are many other places in the LA area (LA and surrounding counties) that an additional airport could be built. Those outlying communities need an airport closer so that they wouldn't have to drive and add to the pollution & traffic. Such areas as Lancaster and Tustin (El Toro) are prime places for additional airports.

Response:

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

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

3. Comments and Responses

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.

PC03074-2

Comment:

An expansion of LAX would affect traffic through my area, more noise w/more aircraft coming in, and generally more congestion. It is not the best plan... and I oppose it!

Response:

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

PC03075 Kraus, Frank None Provided

PC03075-1

Comment:

Please expand the airport. We need the economic growth it will bring to the South Bay and L.A., - When you expand the airport, please have the green line go into the airport, so passengers can use it for a direct link from outlying areas.

Response:

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

PC03076 Indgin, Lori None Provided

PC03076-1

Comment:

The politicians in favor of LAX expansion do so for only one reason: greed. They are in business with big businesses. LAX exp. is shortsighted and terminal.

Response:

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

PC03076-2

Comment:

The traffic on the 405 is already unbearable with speeds averaging 15 mph most days!

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC03076-3

Comment:

We live in Westchester, and our lawn furniture is filthy from the pollution.

Response:

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

PC03076-4

Comment:

The least amount of flights (additional) per day would be an extra 2000 or 120 per hour!

Response:

The existing (Year 2000) number of daily design day operations is 2,275. The Master Plan analysis determined that LAX was at its peak hour operational capacity in 1996. Because the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative C do not consider the addition of a new runway, both are constrained to the peak hour operational capacity of the existing airfield. Therefore, neither can accommodate a significant increase in operations beyond existing levels. With the addition of a fifth runway, Alternatives A and B could accommodate over 440 additional daily operations as compared to Year 2000 daily operations levels. Please see Chapter V, Section 3.3.2 of the LAX Master Plan for more information regarding the activity levels of the Master Plan alternatives. Please see Response to Comment PC00631-5 regarding increased operations. 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.

PC03076-5

Comment:

People have to drive from an 80 mile radius for international and more domestic flight choices! Give the outlying airports the convenience their residents deserve. Don't overtax LAX anymore! Nobody wins. Don't let the airlines & businesses who stand to profit run this show.

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.

PC03076-6

Comment:

None of your constituents wants this. To have ugly cargo areas replace the small businesses and last open spaces of Westchester would be a disgrace.

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 acquisition within the Westchester business district.

PC03077 Corrick, Jack None Provided

PC03077-1

Comment:

It was with the greatest delight that I received this mailing from you; stating your views on So. California airport development, and especially those concerning LAX. The ordinary people (and voters) of the South Bay and west side areas are given a little hope that someone, somewhere in government is listening to us rather than just to the big money NIMBYS of Orange County and the downtown L.A. special interest groups. Many people in our area feel that the die is already cast on a bigger LAX which may explain the lack of voter response at the city and county levels on this issue.

Please keep up the good fight for us. And PLEASE don't let those fine former military runways in Riverside and Orange counties go to waste.

Response:

Comment noted. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the role of the LAX Master Plan in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC03077-2

Comment:

To follow up on the short note I placed on your response form:

No one wants to live next to an air port or under its flight path. Nor do they want a 2 hour drive on a congested freeway to an overcrowded terminal for a delayed 55 minute flight. So something has to give. As with the energy problems the basic issue is an ever expanding population. Just as we cannot simply conserve our way out of the energy problem, we cannot force all of air transportation "eggs" into one overcrowded basket. There must be a many faceted solution to both of these problems.

Sooner or later the political leaders at all levels of government for Southern California are going to have to stand up and tell the NIMBYS and their more rabid environmental allies: Hey look around, what about this growth that is a burden for ALL of us. Why should you have your own little utopia at the expense of other segments of the population ? We must expand in all areas or strangle and die on an outdated and overcrowded infrastructure.

Response:

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

PC03077-3

Comment:

Already those of us living on the boundaries of LAX feel the rise in traffic not only the numbers flights but the car and most especially the truck (for mail and airfreight) congestion on our streets. Just look at the Sepulveda Blvd. off ramps for the 105 freeway, or the intersection of Aviation and Imperial Hwy. on any afternoon. So we cannot even begin to think about what an expanded LAX would bring to us.

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.

PC03077-4

Comment:

The wonderful L.A. city transit planners along with the Dept. of Airport planners spent hundreds of Millions on transit, yet there is no DIRECT rapid transit (Non Bus) route from the LAX passenger terminal to downtown L.A. or any other major business area. Their only answer for an expanded LAX, is more car, bus, and truck traffic on improved (read even larger) streets.

Response:

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

PC03077-5

Comment:

Ontario Airport, the former Norton and March Air Force bases, are on existing rail lines. The population growth is there, let them expand. Or at the very least, shift the airfreight and mail traffic there. And of course Orange County should share in the passenger traffic growth. (After a guy wrote to a local paper the idea of an Orange County surtax for LAX usage became very popular with us.) El Toro is on a passenger rail line, you can get from there to L.A. Union Station faster than from our unexpanded LAX.

Response:

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

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC03077-6

Comment:

As for the economic impact the demise of the aerospace industry in the Southbay, and NAFTA, have caused a real decline in middle and upper class employment. All business in our area has felt this decline and have cut back to match it. You can look at the parking lots of the remaining plants or the empty sites of the former ones and see the real economic story. I don't think that anyone believes that the congestion brought on by an expanded LAX coupled with an uncertain energy future will bring an economic upturn to the southbay.

Response:

Comment noted. The economic effects of Master Plan alternatives were provided in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data in Technical Report 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The two Technical Reports include data on economic impacts for all of the South Bay communities.

PC03078 Schilla, Maxine None Provided

PC03078-1

Comment:

I feel that an expansion of LAX would have a great impact on the South Bay area where I 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.

PC03078-2

Comment:

When I visited London, England, I took a train to center of London. It took about an hour, was inexpensive. What about an airport in Palmdale?

Response:

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

PC03078-3

Comment:

Inexpensive, fast train to various areas in L.A.

Response:

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

PC03078-4

Comment:

We don't want or need more traffic, air pollution, airplane noise over our beaches. STOP EXPANSION

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; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and impacts to coastal resources in Section 4.14, Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03079 **Morrow, Melva** **None Provided** **6/14/2001**

PC03079-1

Comment:

I know in my heart that the LAX Master Plan will cause the same stress, pollution, congestion, noise and dangers to my community as my friend in Manhattan Beach is currently suffering on a daily basis.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, 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-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC03079-2

Comment:

She wears ear plugs to bed and her complaints to the powers that be are side-stepped on a routine basis.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03079-3

Comment:

Her home is abnormally dusty and the low flying aircraft range from the supersonic to helicopters and two engine machines toting advertising banners. She has no peace.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03079-4

Comment:

If you lay on Manhattan Beach with your ear to the sand, you can detect a low rumble in the ground. I did so last summer. It is the sound of the mammoth cargo planes warming up and awaiting take-off. It is a chilling experience.

Response:

Comment noted. For more information on noise impacts on the South Bay, see Response to Comment PC00552-2. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03080 Eastes, Theodore None Provided

PC03080-1

Comment:

I would not be effected nearly as badly if the train had direct access to the terminals and our surrounding roads were not clogged with shuttle buses, vans, taxis, and other cars dropping off and picking up passengers, who could otherwise conveniently use public transportation to and from LAX terminals. Do the right thing!

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

PC03081 Kellems, Patricia None Provided

PC03081-1

Comment:

Twenty years ago I thought I found a nice quite home in a nice quite "Bedroom Community". I now share my bedrooms with 747, 707, 737 and any other plane that lands at LAX! You now want me to share it with even more planes?

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also, please see Topical Response TR-N-3, in particular, Subtopical Response TR-N-3.3 on the increase in noise associated with increased air traffic, and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC03082 No Author Identified, None Provided

PC03082-1

Comment:

I live in the Manhattan Village gated community. Right now my home is not in the flight pattern of LAX. My concern about expansion is ending up under the landing pattern that results in a decrease in my property value.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC03083 Zersen, William F. None Provided

PC03083-1

Comment:

I WOULD ONLY VOTE FOR A REGIONAL APPROACH TO AIRPORTS PROVIDING A MASTER REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN IS APPROVED AND FUNDED, i.e., LIGHT RAIL, CONTINUE GREEN LINE TO LAX,

Response:

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

PC03083-2

Comment:

HIGH SPEED RAIL BETWEEN PALMDALE, LAX, ONTARIO, ORANGE COUNTY & DOWNTOWN L.A.

Response:

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

PC03083-3

Comment:

ALSO, THE POSSIBILITY OF MAKING PALMDALE THE CARGO HUB AIRPORT.

Response:

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

PC03083-4

Comment:

WHAT WE DON'T NEED IS MORE BUSES. TAKE A GOOD LOOK AT OTHER CITIES THAT HAVE LIGHT RAIL GOING DIRECT FROM THE AIRPORT TO DOWNTOWN!

Response:

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

PC03084 Jones, Christine None Provided

PC03084-1

Comment:

Please do not enlarge LAX or it's capacity. Please increase utilization of other airports: Burbank, Ontario, John Wayne. I live in a quiet beach community about 6-8 miles from LAX. Our density, traffic & polution is problematic enough without aggravating these problems by enlarging LAX!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed population growth in Section 4.5, Induced Socio-Economic Impacts (Growth Inducement), 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. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. Decisions to develop the airports are the responsibility of local government.

PC03085 Lee, Richard K. None Provided

PC03085-1

Comment:

I definitely do not like to see the LA airport expanding any more!

Response:

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

PC03086 Koch, Robert None Provided

PC03086-1

Comment:

I am in favor of the suggested regional development approach, but not at the expense of expansion. LAX congestion in the air and on the ground must be improved. That is #1 priority.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC03087 Halloran, III, James None Provided

PC03087-1

Comment:

IN MY VIEW, THERE ARE A FEW "FACTS" PRESENTED ABOVE...TO WIT:

(1) GOVERNMENT STUDIES (E.G., FOR COMMUTER RAIL SYSTEMS) ALWAYS (A) OVERSTATE THE BENEFITS AND (B) LOW-BALL THE COST ESTIMATES;

Response:

The commentor is referring to facts provided on a form prepared by Congresswoman Jane Harman's office. This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03087-2

Comment:

(2) YOUR POPULATION GROWTH ESTIMATES ARE MEANINGLESS, SINCE THEY ARE DRAWN FROM VASTLY DIFFERENT BASES (E.G., SOUTH BAY VERSUS RIVERSIDE COUNTY); WHAT ARE THE PERCENTAGES?

Response:

The commentor is referring to facts provided on a form prepared by Congresswoman Jane Harman's office. This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03087-3

Comment:

(3) YOUR LAX-DENVER PRICE TAG PROJECTIONS ARE UNDOUBTEDLY NOT ADJUSTED FOR INFLATION; IN REAL DOLLARS, DENVER MAY HAVE COST MUCH MORE PER MAP.

Response:

The commentor is referring to facts provided on a form prepared by Congresswoman Jane Harman's office. This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03087-4

Comment:

THE LAX EXPANSION PLAN IS EXTREMELY SHORT-SIGHTED: THE LAND AVAILABLE FOR RUNWAYS, TAXIWAYS, TERMINALS, PARKING, ETC., IS ABSOLUTELY LIMITED,

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC00260-1 regarding physical constraints.

PC03087-5

Comment:

AND TRANSPORTATION SERVICES ARE SO POORLY PLANNED (105 FREEWAY, LIGHT RAIL, BUSES, ETC.) THAT IT WILL BE AN UNMITIGATED DISASTER FOR THE SOUTH BAY AND WEST SIDE.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03088 Quiring, Kathryn None Provided

PC03088-1

Comment:

Traffic, Traffic, 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, 3, S-2a, and S-2b.

PC03089 Delaney, Tracy & Paul None Provided

PC03089-1

Comment:

We have lived in P.D.R. for 4 1/2 years & already notice increased noise since we moved in. If LAX expands the noise would be constant & larger planes would mean louder noise.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, particularly Subtopical Response TR-6.3 regarding larger aircraft means more noise. Additionally, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. For more information on noise impacts on Playa del Rey, see Response to Comment PC00499-1.

PC03089-2

Comment:

Our hearing, I'm sure, would be effected & enjoying our outdoor yards would be difficult.

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 Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC03089-3

Comment:

My 4 year old already suffers some asmatic symptoms wich increased pollution would certainly effect. I wonder if this proximity already effects her lungs. I've been told that many children living near the airport suffer the same symptoms.

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

PC03089-4

Comment:

The wetland preserve will surely be effected with increased noise & pollution also.

Response:

It is unclear which wetland preserve the commentor is referring to. It is assumed that the commentor is referring to the Ballona Wetlands, approximately less than one mile from the LAX Master Plan boundaries. Master Plan improvements were determined to result in no cumulative impacts to wetlands, the endangered Riverside fairy shrimp, and other sensitive biotic communities because implementation of proposed mitigation measures would reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels. The potential impacts of noise levels and air quality on sensitive biotic communities and sensitive species of flora and fauna within Master Plan boundaries were analyzed in Section 4.10, Biotic Communities, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Impacts to biotic resources in the Ballona Wetlands were anticipated to occur in conjunction with the Playa Vista Second Phase Project as originally proposed; however, the subject project was substantially reduced in size and scope in November 2002. As currently proposed, the Playa Vista Second Phase Project, now referred to as the Village at Playa Vista Project, has no improvements or development proposed within the Ballona Wetlands.

PC03089-5

Comment:

The traffic is already horrid & will be increasingly worse as Playa Vista & the Marina Del Rey project progress, adding additional airport traffic will be a disaster.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03089-6

Comment:

Bottom line, expanding L.A.X. will effect the health of all those in the surrounding communities.

Response:

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

PC03089-7

Comment:

It will also effect the health of the environment including the wetland preserve, the beaches & marine life.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC03089-4 regarding the potential impacts to wetlands within the LAX Master Plan boundaries and cumulative impacts to wetlands.

Please see Response to Comment AL00033-414 regarding the potential impacts associated with increased pollution on beaches and marine life.

PC03089-8

Comment:

The Playa Del Rey, Westchester & El Segundo communities are all very family oriented with many young children. These cities have been wonderful places to raise children. The neighborhoods are well kept & reasonably safe for being a part of L.A. Expanding L.A.X. would drop the property values & make the communities much less desirable. L.A. needs safe communities to raise their children. We should be proud of these communities & support them not destroy them.

Response:

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

PC03089-9

Comment:

Palmdale & Ontario & Orange County including El Toro should pick up the expansion. L.A. should not have to handle their growing populations - especially Orange County.

I understand that Palmdale would like the cargo portion of the business. L.A. shouldn't be so greedy!

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC03089-10

Comment:

Please help, my family will personally be effected, & our community would be changed in a negative way.

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.

PC03090

Morton, Annette

None Provided

PC03090-1

Comment:

I think each region should have its own airport, it would eliminate traffic from LAX etc. and air pollution.

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

3. Comments and Responses

intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding 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, 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.

PC03091 Kennedy, Alanna None Provided

PC03091-1

Comment:

We in the Lunada Bay community of Palos Verdes Estates will be greatly affected - We do have some airport noise now and we do have increased pollution due to all the planes that have their flight pattern going over our community. This will make our area less desirable to live in and therefore have a negative effect.

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.

PC03091-2

Comment:

We have often had to call and complain about helicopter noise and their flight patterns also -

Response:

Helicopters that have an operating agreement with LAWA are required to abide with Section 5, Helicopter Operating Procedures of the Aircraft Noise Abatement Operating Procedures. Please see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement. For all other helicopters there are no restrictions for helicopters flying over residential areas. Since most of Los Angeles is an urban area it would be difficult to prohibit helicopters from operating over residential areas. However, Potential Noise Abatement Measures are addressed in Section 7.1 of Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR, in particular Section 7.1.2, Airport Regulation Changes.

PC03092 Gasperi, Ernest None Provided

PC03092-1

Comment:

NO - EXPANSION

Response:

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

PC03093 Matlin, Olga None Provided

PC03093-1

Comment:

The airport "Master Plan" may be a bad idea, but I am far more concerned about the corruption and incompetence levels of the LAPD, and the fact that they are turning my beloved city into a "police state." If some justice could be initiated in that direction, you would have my support in all your endeavors.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03094 Tsutsui, Sumiko None Provided

PC03094-1

Comment:

I am not affected by the planes & traffic because I live in No. Torrance;

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03094-2

Comment:

my daughter & her family lives in Westchester on Sepulveda near Howard Hughes Parkway & the traffic is so heavy it takes me several minutes to cross over to the other side. I can't imagine the traffic getting any worse with 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.

PC03095 Flacy, Delaine None Provided

PC03095-1

Comment:

What do I think? I think what LAX wants LAX will get.

Ex Playa Del Rey Resident

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC03096 Allen, W. None Provided

PC03096-1

Comment:

I would like to see the Hawthorne airport included in ANY LAX expansion plan. It's proximity to LAX and runway length make it a prime candidate for a commuter reliever airport.

Response:

After the public review process, the Hawthorne alternative was eliminated as not practical in the foreseeable future because of the excessive time required to implement it, airline concerns, and strong opposition from the City of Hawthorne.

PC03097 Panetta, Marco None Provided

PC03097-1

Comment:

We are for the necessary expansion as a regional plan since a healthy economy needs it.

We believe that the impact on traffic & pollution can be minimized by linking LAX to the public trains (METRO subway) right to the terminal.

Response:

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

PC03098 Bolling, Brian None Provided

PC03098-1

Comment:

I HAVE LIVED IN MANHATTAN BEACH SINCE THE MID 1950'S, AND HAVE LIVED IN THE NORTHWEST PORTION OF THE CITY FOR THE PAST 20 YEARS. AS I WRITE THIS LETTER I CAN HEAR THE CONSTANT NOISE FROM THE AIRPORT WHICH SEEMS TO INCREASE WITH EACH PASSING YEAR. I LIVE SEVERAL MILES AWAY. THINK OF THOSE WHO LIVE MUCH CLOSER IN THIS HIGHLY POPULATED AREA. THE NOISE AND AIR POLLUTION FROM WHAT HAS BEEN IDENTIFIED AS THE BIGGEST POLLUTER IN THE STATE SHOULD NOT BY ALLOWED TO EXPAND FOR THE OBVIOUS IMPACT ON THE PEOPLE WHO LIVE AROUND IT. I WAS HERE FIRST!

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-N-6 regarding noise increase, 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.

PC03099 **Hammer, Barbara** **None Provided**

PC03099-1

Comment:

The noise and pollution would increase - we already have straying planes too low over Man. Bch. I taught in El Segundo Schools some years ago and the noise and pollution were awful. It would cause enormous traffic jams. Traffic is already a mess.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PC03099-2

Comment:

It would seem to me those folks out in the valley areas where the other possible sites are would appreciate being closer and with less planes then less noise, etc. We just cannot enlarge 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. 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.

PC03100 **Heyman, E.
Jacquelyn** **None Provided**

PC03100-1

Comment:

We have lived in the Westchester Community since 1951. The impact of LAX on this area has been tremendous - not good. The expansion plan now proposed will only make it 100 times worse.

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.

PC03100-2

Comment:

The traffic on Lincoln, Sepulveda and the 405 Freeway is way too much due to airport traffic.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03100-3

Comment:

Our carpets get so dirty from tracking in black soot that is on our sidewalks and driveways that we have to have them cleaned far too often.

Response:

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

PC03100-4

Comment:

The planes are taking off all night long.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01879-5 regarding sleep disturbances. 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.

PC03100-5

Comment:

We live just north of the airport - south of Manchester & west of Lincoln on 88th Place.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03101 Bhumitra, Marina None Provided

PC03101-1

Comment:

Please do not permit more growth at LAX and its vicinity. Let each of the counties have their own major 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.

PC03102 Profet, Julie None Provided

PC03102-1

Comment:

I chose to live in Manhattan Beach instead of El Segundo because I didn't want the noise pollution. Now, this expansion will bring a lot of undesirable pollution!

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase. Recent changes to FAA operating procedures that affect westerly takeoffs are not a part of the proposed actions of the Master Plan. However, turns over the Manhattan Beach area are addressed in Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay. For more information on noise impacts on the South Bay, see Response to Comment PC00552-2.

PC03103 Dageford, Gerald None Provided

PC03103-1

Comment:

Count me in among the anti LAX expansionists for the reasons set forth in your newsletter. I favor a regional approach instead.

Response:

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

PC03104 Oakes, E. Murriel None Provided 6/15/2001

PC03104-1

Comment:

dangerous!

Response:

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

PC03104-2

Comment:

I am enclosing a letter I wrote in 1969 to the L.A. Times. I believe it was - another called "The Rape of Westchester" was printed locally.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03104-3

Comment:

To once again go through this, only more severely with Parks, Libraries, Municipal buildings, Senior Centers and everything else we have built here gone is like moving us to a far far land.

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 or acquisition of municipal buildings or senior

3. Comments and Responses

centers. As described in Sections 4.26.3, Parks and Recreation, and 4.26.4, Libraries, there would be no significant impacts due to acquisition on parks or libraries 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. 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.

PC03104-4

Comment:

The noise - all day & all night mostly because of the freight planes is intolerable -

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-5.2 regarding east flow operations at night and Subtopical Response TR-N-5.4 regarding relationship of air cargo flights and night noise impacts. Aircraft noise mitigation was described in Section 4.2.8 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Sections 4.1.8 and 4.2.8 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. 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.

PC03104-5

Comment:

you can't sleep, our health is affected.

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.

PC03104-6

Comment:

Can't open windows & hear in your house - summer is especially bad.

Response:

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

PC03104-7

Comment:

The bird bath had so much deisel fuel on it I quit watering the birds. Any plant with water around it is the same.

Response:

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

PC03104-8**Comment:**

We are dying here, and I hope you care. I have a heart condition, asthma, other health problems, irritated by this pollution, never mentioned.

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.

PC03104-9**Comment:**

I can't drive the 405 & get anywhere in time. Lincoln ave can take me an hour to get to my Drs in Santa Monica. That's 10 miles.

Response:

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

PC03104-10**Comment:**

We moved here in 1952 2 blocks North of Manchester 1 mile W. of Sepulveda Blvd. Due North of the North Runway - that wasn't there, then.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03104-11**Comment:**

It is a growing opinion with me that a new militant organization is growing----the militant tax payer. He is sure to turn down every bond on the April ballot, and with good reason.

He has been a patient fellow, this taxpayer, but he can surely find better ways to spend his money than replacing fire gutted schools, and vandalized school property that amounts to millions of dollars.

He is not the overflowing fount of excess money the politicians think. He has given up new cars, clothes, that color TV he's wanted for years, even dental and medical care, he and his family should have, to hang on to that little piece of property called "home".

He must have been long asking himself why he must continue to pay and pay, while the School Board throws money away with both hands, He must grow quite enraged as he sees them make political decisions first, not those concerning the welfare of his children's education.

Yep, he and we have grown militant as the Airport like a giant octopus closes this school, threatens that one, makes study impossible in a dozen more, pollutes the air with the belch of noxious gases from it's jet's giant engines. And deafens the children, our little kids sitting helplessly while the monster grows and devours, and our politicians play the grand sonata, "You scratch my back, and I'll scratch yours."

3. Comments and Responses

Yep we are militatnt. If the Airport Is allowed to drive us from our homes by destroying the schools, forget it chum, we'll go to the desert, and let the loveliest piece of residential homes in Westchester become a high rise apt area, a manufacturing mesa; a terminal for \$ \$\$\$ hungry politicians to see with satisfaction, the tourists have a ride from the airport to their places of businesses down town.

But you want us to pay the bill too, mister, and to that I say, it's a little too much. Many of you have become millionaires when this area was bean fields and you put up a few cracker box houses for us to buy. Now you want those back, from us pawns, and you want to play another game. How often we hear "It has always been in the greater Westchester PPlan" as if that made it the 11th commandment. I say then, that some of the developers on both levels are nothing but fraudulent thieves, crooks and miserable liars. I hope as they cavort among the 400 socially, and are touted in the biggest papers as Society and business leaders, that we view them for what they are, crooks, who operate inside the law if they can, and outside of it if it can be undetected, and to their advantage.

I say let the Airport pay the cost of replacement of schools, let them sound and air proof them. Let them figure out what is supposed to be happening to their little ears and lungs when the stint in school is over, if they live across the street.

I submit to you that none of these hardbitten dollar ravenous scavengers gives a damn. He will go on draining and ruining this community and asking the taxpayer to pay for it as long as we all shall stick it out here, and when at last emphysema, bronchial asthma and deafness of our children have driven us from the this lovely (once) community, then Let the buzzards fight over the remains. I'm sure it is all in the Greater Westchester plans.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Section 2.8 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Human health impacts were addressed in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. 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.

PC03104-12

Comment:

A world famous allergist my kids all went to said "one jet taking off" puts as much pollution in the air as 10,000 cars running 24 hours! Count them! One taking off every 3 minutes! Where is the AQMD?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase. Please see Response to Comment PC00797-8 regarding aircraft emissions.

PC03104-13

Comment:

Yesterday I was told of a Patron who the Airport has forced from her home & paid a bare pittance. This a repeat of the 5000 forced out before. The airport has begun & is on its way with their plan, without any environmental survey. No one there is ever responsible.

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 and Response to Comment PC01051-6 regarding property acquisition.

PC03104-14

Comment:

Please, Jane Harman, you asked, please do all you can to develop Palmdale with a fast train to L.A. Look at the thousands of homes out North of L.A.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 which discusses high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC03104-15

Comment:

and make Orange Co. develop El Toro air base. -

Response:

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

PC03104-16

Comment:

Fine then to fly from LAX

Response:

LAX is a public facility and is supported by grants from the FAA. It is illegal to charge different fees to users of the same facility and thus discriminate among users.

PC03105 D'Lott, Barry None Provided

PC03105-1

Comment:

I think incentives to use Ontario, Palmdale and Burbank and Long Beach would make a lot of sense.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC03106 Nau, Kara None Provided

PC03106-1

Comment:

My family & I are opposed to the LAX Master Plan. We feel that the traffic & pollution & noise burden should be distributed amongst the regional airports in Orange, San Bern., & Riverside Counties. If the Master Plan is implemented, we would consider moving from 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 and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air

3. Comments and Responses

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

PC03106-2

Comment:

Traffic is becoming unbearable with the development of Playa Vista (on Lincoln Bl.) & will only get worse with the LAX master plan buildout.

Response:

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

PC03106-3

Comment:

And on some days the smell of jet fuel pervades the air as far as 83rd St & Lincoln Bl.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding odors.

PC03106-4

Comment:

Please Please Please no LAX Master Plan!!

Response:

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

PC03107 Remstein, Irma None Provided

PC03107-1

Comment:

I oppose the expansion of LAX since the noise of jet and smaller planes flying over the Palos Verdes Peninsula after leaving LAX affects the sleep of residents and their daily activities.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels, Topical Response TR-

N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, and Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

PC03107-2

Comment:

The regional airports would serve their communities growing needs for convenient air travel.

I commend you for your efforts in favor of regional airports and the needs of the residents of the South Bay.

Response:

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

PC03108 Fenton, Harold None Provided

PC03108-1

Comment:

Sorry I do not understand the implications of your LAX vs Denver statistics.

However, the benefits as well as the disturbances of more air fields should be shared by all equally if possible.

We should encourage progress and 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.

PC03109 Trotter, Julia None Provided

PC03109-1

Comment:

Please stop the LAX expansion!

Move LAX 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03110 Koga, R. None Provided

PC03110-1

Comment:

No expansion of LAX.

The traffic on I 405 & I 105 is super saturated. No more room for loading passengers.

Response:

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

PC03111 Lambert, Mitchell None Provided

PC03111-1

Comment:

The approval of plans for the Playa Vista development will compound traffic problems in itself. Add that traffic burden to that already impacting the freeway and arterial routes in the South Bay and Westside communities, and the result will be gridlock. Even without airport expansion, growth in this area is overwhelming the transportation infrastructure. Given that local governments seem disinclined to recognize and address these growth-related issues, it becomes more important to look at the bigger picture, and propose a regional solution to air traffic needs.

Response:

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

PC03112 Creig, Quila None Provided

PC03112-1

Comment:

I totally support your regional plan. This is the only one that makes sense. We have already shouldered more than our fair share of the burden of traffic, noise and pollution in this area.

Response:

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

PC03112-2

Comment:

With the additional traffic and pollution from the Playa Vista development in our area, we will either be trapped in our homes or driven out of this area completely. The quality of life, from Santa Monica to Palos Verdes, is becoming unbearable. If it continues to deteriorate, my husband and I will be leaving.

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.

PC03113 Afshar, Renee None Provided

PC03113-1

Comment:

Expanding LAX will increase plane noise over my Redondo home

Response:

Comment noted. Recent changes to FAA departure procedures to the west are not a part of the proposed actions of the Master Plan. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay. For more information on noise impacts on the South Bay, see Response to Comment PC00552-2.

PC03113-2

Comment:

& clog up already crowded surface streets around the airport.

Response:

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

PC03113-3

Comment:

Let people in the valley & OC expand their own airports - reducing traffic to & from LAX!!

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC03114 Davidson, Wanda None Provided 6/9/2001

PC03114-1

Comment:

Please include my name as one who supports your position on the LAX Master Plan. I feel LAX has expanded further than its capability 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.

PC03114-2

Comment:

There are other areas that can be explored. The problem is they will not put money in the local governments pocket. LAX can be turned into an International Airport only and we can go to Palmdale, Ontario, Long Beach or Orange County for local flights.

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.

PC03114-3

Comment:

I am sick of hearing the big jets making their turns at night, I try to go to sleep anywhere from 12 or 1 a.m. and can hear them. I live in Torrance and its bad enough with the local airport. My house is now located in their takeoff pattern. I do not wish to compound the situation with the LAX Master Plan.

Response:

The commenter 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 of wind conditions require east traffic flow. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay. Also please see Response to Comment PC01879-5 regarding nighttime awakenings.

PC03115 Prestup, Jill None Provided

PC03115-1

Comment:

I agree with you on the Master Plan for LAX. I oppose it! It is obvious the airport expansion will result in more traffic, noise & pollution!

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase. It should be noted that under Alternative D, air pollution and noise pollution are expected to be less than under the No Action/No Project Alternative. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC03115-2

Comment:

I would like to see the 'fees' the airport pays the city increased! The airport can surely afford it & the city can use the money.

Response:

Comment noted. It is not legal to use fees generated by a commercial airport for non-aviation uses.

PC03116 Nelson, Karen None Provided

PC03116-1

Comment:

I agree that LAX cannot take the burden of So. Calif. aviation needs. I support your regional plan.

Response:

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

PC03116-2

Comment:

I have lived in Playa del Rey since 1972. The increased traffic on the north runway already awakens us at night and prohibits us from enjoying the patio.

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. In addition, please

3. Comments and Responses

see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels, Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, and Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

PC03116-3

Comment:

The 405 freeway has become a parking lot. Our quality of life has greatly diminished because of the noise and traffic.

Response:

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

PC03116-4

Comment:

When picking up a relative at LAX last week it took 45 minutes to drive one loop. Please fight for regional relief.

Response:

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

PC03117

Fiori, Lillian

None Provided

PC03117-1

Comment:

I am a supporter of yours. LAX Expansion - is not in the best interest of our community - for a myriad of reasons - including the Playa Vista impact which will choke the residents in every way. I favor a regional airport 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. Please see Response to Comment PC00148-2 regarding potential impacts from Playa Vista.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

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.

PC03120-2

Comment:

And especially El Toro must be converted into a commercial airport since there are so many restrictions on John Wayne Airport.

Response:

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

PC03121

Wallis, Ira

None Provided

PC03121-1

Comment:

THE QUESTION IS TOO SIMPLISTIC FOR A SERIOUS ANSWER AND AS I WILL NOT BE INVOLVED in just adding to the obvious reply, let us move on to the more realistic issues. As every rational person would support a cessation of build out at LAX, what is there left to do? How about a referendum? Let those people who would be affected respond. The results are predetermined. Who supports the expansion of LAX? LAWA and possibly FAA, no one else of any stature. COULD YOU KINDLY TELL ME WHAT THE QUALIFICATIONS ARE OF Jim Ritchie? What is his educational background? What is his industrial experience? What does he propose as the plan if his expansion is rejected? CAN WE GET RID OF HIM BY EITHER FORCING HIS SUPERVISOR TO FIRE HIM? I am certain that his is a non elected job.

Response:

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

PC03121-2

Comment:

As I said in the Easy Reader letter and to which you kindly replied, the options are for visionaries, No Stop Gap measures, but long term, Palmdale with a connecting MAG LEV TRAIN is but I thought.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 which discusses high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC03122 Pilmer, Robert None Provided

PC03122-1

Comment:

I agree that LAX expansion should be limited and other airport sites pressed into service. On the other hand, some expansion must be expected and the access to LAX significantly improved by bus, rail etc. Our location is not affected by traffic, pollution or noise.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Also, please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

PC03123 Hicks, Robert None Provided

PC03123-1

Comment:

LAX Master Plan would increase noise and pollution in Hermosa Beach caused by take off "cheaters" to the present rules for east-bound flights.

Response:

Comment noted. 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-6, exceptions to the over-ocean procedures are available when weather of wind conditions require east traffic flow. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay. For more information on noise impacts on the South Bay, see Response to Comment PC00552-2. 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.

PC03123-2

Comment:

A regional airport plan makes far more sense as 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

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.

PC03124 LeVantine, Daniel None Provided

PC03124-1

Comment:

It is painfully obvious, that the architects of the LAX Master Plan have tunnel vision. They would appear to be less interested in what would best serve Los Angeles, and the surrounding communities, then they are for what appears to be certain "special interests." The LAX Master Plan, in any of its iterations, would significantly aggravate the already congested LAX/South Bay noise and air noise pollution, as well as freeway and surface street, traffic flow. Any plan that purports to address the needs of the expected major increase in air traffic to this area, that does not include all of the facilities available, is short sighted and significantly flawed.

A Master Plan, yes. But let's get real.

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-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.

**PC03125 Brownrigg, Leonard None Provided
& Valerie**

PC03125-1

Comment:

We are fundamentally opposed to the proposed expansion of Los Angeles International Airport for a number of practical and obvious reasons.

Response:

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

PC03125-2

Comment:

The surface vehicular traffic in the area is already at saturation point and will only worsen with the developments already planned, primarily Playa Vista.

Response:

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

PC03125-3

Comment:

In addition, it is impossible to mitigate the lack of air space. Per the recent front page article in the Los Angeles Times, LAX is currently one of the most dangerous airports in the country due to congestion. It is only a matter of time before there is an accident, and the idea of expanding the airport is irresponsible. Regional airports are the solution. Don't let the airlines appropriate public air space.

Response:

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

PC03126 Rodts, George None Provided

PC03126-1

Comment:

Let's eliminate excessive vehicle traffic into the airport. All passengers shuttled in from parking lots - no car rental or hotel buses.

Response:

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

PC03126-2

Comment:

A drastic solution - relocate airport to Palmdale & shuttle everyone in to L.A. Like Norita Airport in Japan

No MORE LAX EXPANSION!!

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 which discusses high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC03127 Daly, J. Ross None Provided

PC03127-1

Comment:

ONE OF THE WORST PROBLEMS WITH LAX PRESENTLY IS THE TRAFFIC FROM AUTO RENTAL AND HOTEL BUSESSES. WE NEED ALSO THE 105 FREEWAY EXTENDED TO THE AIRPORT. THE BUS PROBLEM COULD BE SOLVED BY ADDING A ROADWAY JUST FOR THEM AND THEY SHOULD HELP PAY FOR IT.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01454-1 regarding project components.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03127-2

Comment:

THE LONG BEACH AIRPORT COULD BE USED FOR MORE TRAFFIC AND IT SHOULD BE. ALSO VAN NUYS AND PERHAPS PALMDALE. UNLESS THE EXPANDING IS CURTAILED AT LAX MORE PROBLEMS WILL OCCUR.

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA do not control the development of Long Beach Airport. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC03127-3

Comment:

UNITED AIRLINES IS NO LONGER A PLEASURE TO USE. IT IS TOO BIG AND BUSY AT LAX. I AM A SILVER WINGS MEMBER NOW 81 YEARS OLD.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03128

Johnson, Ellen

None Provided

PC03128-1

Comment:

I favor regional airport expansion. I am opposed to LAX expansion. I live about 5 miles from the airport. The freeways in the area are already congested, as are the streets, as is parking. Regional expansion would also relieve LAX congestion, because people could use a airport closer to their homes.

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. 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.

PC03128-2**Comment:**

Expanding LAX to increase capacity is not logical, and opposes common 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.

PC03129 Phillips, Kathleen None Provided**PC03129-1****Comment:**

I think the airport is too crowded now. Why not use Ontario or John Wayne airports & expand them.

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC03129-2**Comment:**

Getting in the airport is a mess, why not leave all passenger cars outside & drop people off & have a van or tram take them to their plane.

Response:

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

PC03130 Edwards, Gail None Provided**PC03130-1****Comment:**

I agree that we should develop the regional airports - especially El Toro. That of course is not popular - it's a NIBY situation with the people of OJ County. LAX should be helped with as much development as possible especially a light rail to downtown and other destinations using the air rights above the 405, 110 and the 10. No Subways. Palmdale doesn't want it. The population isn't there. The Inland Empire yes! Especially Ontario. Add March or Norton to help out.

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-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. Please see

3. Comments and Responses

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

PC03131 Diette, Joan None Provided

PC03131-1

Comment:

I live in Westchester. We are now sandwiched between 2 stupid, miserable plans for disaster - LAX expansion & Playa Vista development. Gridlock on Sepulveda & Lincoln will impact the entire So Bay/Westside. We will choke our streets with cars & our lungs with pollution. Please fight to stop these man-made disasters.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00018-19 regarding the evaluation of cumulative impacts in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PC03132 Rosen, Mayde None Provided

PC03132-1

Comment:

I carpool through the Marina everyday between Westchester & Santa Monica. I am horrified to think what the building there will produce in the way of traffic & pollution.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03132-2

Comment:

The lack of green space in LA is a tragedy for the local people. Anything that can be done to make this park lane would be a boon to us all.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03133 Rudy, Donald None Provided

PC03133-1

Comment:

I think it's a mistake to use Denver as a role model. I've been there and its awful! I would certainly like the region to bear the impact, not just LAX. If you want a good role model, look at Hong Kong!

Response:

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

PC03134 Howe, Jim None Provided

PC03134-1

Comment:

WE LIVE IN EL SEGUNDO NEXT TO LAX. WE HAVE LIVED HERE FOR 17 YEARS & HAVE SEEN THE INCREASE IN BOTH AIR & STREET TRAFFIC TO THE DETREMENT OF THE QUALITY OF LIFE. THE ANSWER TO THE LAX EXPANSION IS TO DISTRIBUTE THE EXPANSION TO REGIONAL AIRPORTS INCLUDING LONG BEACH, JOHN WAYNE, EL TORO, AND ONTARIO.

Response:

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

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed 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.

PC03135 Baker, Doug None Provided 6/17/2001

PC03135-1

Comment:

I agree with your position. The area around LAX cannot support the ground transportation to and from the airport, and the airport noise severely degrades the quality of life in nearby communities. Moreover, regional airports are just good common sense.

By the way, a useful improvement to LAX without expansion would be the improvement of public transportation systems all the way to the airport.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. 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 on quality of life, and Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

**PC03136 Lupo, Paul J. & Kay None Provided
B.**

PC03136-1

Comment:

We agree with you, Jane. LAX is very crowded. The use of the regional airports & their expansion seems like a much better idea. However public transportation between these regional airports is imperative.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No 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-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

PC03137 Walton, Barry None Provided

PC03137-1

Comment:

I live in the Venice area. Noise pollution already a disappointing addition to a beautiful place. This would merely add to this problem.

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.

PC03137-2

Comment:

I am soon to move to the Valley and if LAX becomes the dominate hub for the area I will be forced to drive there to pick-up more people.

Response:

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

PC03138 McGinn, Dawn None Provided

PC03138-1

Comment:

Please do not expand. We have been affected by the traffic, noise, and pollution resulting from the airport since the last expansion, improvement-progress (?).

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;

3. Comments and Responses

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

PC03138-2

Comment:

What good is the economic impact on us & our community when it makes the people sick?

My husband died in 2000 - because of lung & heart complications. He was always outside - jogging, gardening, making things etc. can you truthfully say the polluted air he breathed helped him?

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.

PC03138-3

Comment:

If Palmdale & Lancaster & Ontario still want the overflow - LET THEM HAVE IT!

Response:

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

PC03139

Kruhm, Paul

None Provided

PC03139-1

Comment:

I SUPPORT YOUR POSITION IN ITS ENTIRETY

Response:

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

PC03140

Mattson, Rita

None Provided

PC03140-1

Comment:

When my home was taken in the Southern end of Playa del Rey, the LAX Airport Commissions promised they would never touch our community again, and would limit growth to 40,000,000. Well,

3. Comments and Responses

there have been 3 takings since then and it seems their word means nothing. I and now 76 years old and have had it with their peice meal takings of this beautiful sea side community.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding past and present activity levels at LAX.

PC03140-2

Comment:

It is very hard to brethe and the noise is so hard on the nervis system. It is criminal in my opinion.

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, 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.

PC03141 Ryavec, Mark None Provided

PC03141-1

Comment:

I have thought for many years that it would be ridiculous to expand LAX.

Response:

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

PC03141-2

Comment:

The traffic on Lincoln is horrendous now and there are no real options to provide more north/south capacity.

Response:

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

PC03141-3

Comment:

Since I remember that you previously served on the Armed Forces Committee, you might be able to pursue a pet thought of mine. When my dad retired from the Navy he and my mom occasionally would fly "space available" out of Point Mugu Naval Air Station. I dropped them off there once and noticed that they were flying commercial jets out of there to transport SeaBees around the world. Imagine a joint use, expanded Mugu Naval Air Station serving Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties, the north-western San Fernanco Valley and even Malibu. Yes, the airlines would have to develop new cargo facilities and distribution centers in that area, but it would spark the economy there, give a dual use to the Air Station, and bleed off a tremendous amount of air travel from LAX. I ran the idea by a friend of mine who was a manager at SCAG and he in turn ran the idea by SCAG's air transport planner who said that Mugu Air Station was one of the few viable options to expansion of LAX. Might you look into it?

Response:

Use of NAS Point Mugu was more thoroughly discussed in Chapter I, Air Transportation in the Los Angeles Region, of the Draft LAX Master Plan. The Navy does not consider joint-use of NAS Point Mugu by commercial air carriers to be practical at this time. Such operations are considered incompatible with the existing military mission. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC03142 Wright, David None Provided 6/8/2001

PC03142-1

Comment:

Your regional airport plan is much to be preferred.

Response:

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

PC03143 Link, Margaret None Provided

PC03143-1

Comment:

I am against LAX Expansion. Regional Plan sounds good!

Response:

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

PC03144 Stevens, Jr., Walter None Provided

PC03144-1

Comment:

I oppose the LAX Master Plan. Increase noise would further deteriorate the current noise pollution from LAX. The noise hurts property values.

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-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03145 Gustafson, Victoria None Provided

PC03145-1

Comment:

I AM OPPOSED TO THE LAX EXPANSION & STRONGLY BELIEVE THAT A REGIONAL AIRPORT ALTERNATIVE IS A MUCH BETTER SOLUTION. THESE ARE THE MAIN REASONS I AM OPPOSED:

Response:

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

PC03145-2

Comment:

INCREASED TRAFFIC TO EL SEGUNDO & SURROUNDING AREAS WILL UNBEARABLE. IT IS ALREADY TERRIBLE DURING RUSH HOUR (4 HRS. OF THE DAY, 5 DAYS A WEEK). MY HUSBAND WORKS IN EL SEGUNDO & EXPERIENCES THIS ON A DAILY BASIS.

Response:

Comment noted

PC03145-3

Comment:

MORE CARGO ACTIVITY WILL INCREASE TRUCK TRAFFIC & ALONG WITH IT DIESEL EMISSIONS (POLLUTION).

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic. Alternative D, which was addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, would not increase cargo handling facilities at LAX. As 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. 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.

PC03145-4

Comment:

NOISE FROM AIRCRAFT IS ALREADY UNBEARABLE - MORE NOISE FROM MORE FLIGHTS WILL DEEPLY AFFECT OUR QUALITY OF LIFE AS SOUTH BAY RESIDENTS.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02952-1. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program, and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC03146 Borelli, Ann None Provided

PC03146-1

Comment:

Traffic: The 405 Freeway is heavily congested and time of day or night as it is now Expanding airport would aggravate situation so much more.

Response:

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

PC03146-2

Comment:

We cannot absorb any more noise than we are experiencing 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.

PC03146-3

Comment:

Pollution would increase not only for the airport but as it is black soot from the traffic to & fro on the freeway covers everything within a radius of miles. Fruit on the trees is covered with black soot from the pollution now.

Response:

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

PC03146-4

Comment:

No, no - no 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03147 Witte, Robert None Provided

PC03147-1

Comment:

I like the idea of spreading the impacts over other 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.

PC03147-2

Comment:

How does LAX expansion impact me? As a Redondo Beach resident occasional flyover noise is the most notable due to flight/takeoff path changes in the last 2 years.

Response:

Comment noted. The proposed operations associated with 89 MAP range from 2,141 in Alternative C to 2,535 in Alternative B. As a result of comments heard for Alternatives A-C and No Action/No Project Alternative was developed. Alternative D is designed to serve approximately 78 MAP and 2,121 average annual day operations. The amount of noise to which any one area is exposed will vary based on the distribution of the traffic throughout the community. The amount of noise to which any one area is exposed will vary based on the distribution of the traffic throughout the community. In the South Bay communities, including Redondo Beach, aircraft noise levels associated with the project actions will be much lower than those considered to be significant by all regulatory agencies. The area may be affected by noise from other airports, as well as ongoing modifications in air traffic routes out of LAX that have nothing to do with the proposed Master Plan actions. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay, and Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2 regarding early turns over areas north and south of LAX. Please also see Response to Comment PC000552-2 for noise impacts on the South Bay.

PC03147-3

Comment:

I don't do too much flying but have a couple of visits a year from people I pick up & drop off at the LAX which I do not enjoy with the LAX traffic. Street traffic around LAX is not too much worse than elsewhere.

Response:

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

PC03148 Foster, H. Charles None Provided

PC03148-1

Comment:

I am strongly opposed to further expansion of LAX. All impacts will be negative from my perspective:

Response:

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

PC03148-2**Comment:**

- Increased traffic & pollution on the 405 Freeway and surface streets including Sepulveda Blvd.

Response:

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

PC03148-3**Comment:**

- Increased noise/pollution from additional air traffic flying over and around the Palos Verdes peninsula.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC03147-2 regarding noise 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. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC03148-4**Comment:**

- Increased risk of an air disaster with the additional air traffic.

Response:

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

PC03148-5**Comment:**

I perceive no benefits to myself or my family from this expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed environmental impacts both adverse and beneficial in Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03149 Haberland, Ernest None Provided

PC03149-1

Comment:

The surface streets feeding automobiles to the airport are totally unable to handle the passengers on and off the airport property. When the new jumbo size passenger planes are in full service, two landings in an hour will require about 600 automobiles to take the passengers off the property.

At the same time there will be about the same number bringing in new passengers to fill up the outbound planes.

The capacity of the streets feeding the airport is totally inadequate to handle both the airport and normal traffic that has nothing to do with the airport.

All the streets within several miles of the airport will be a disaster for traffic.

Plus the fact that the roads on the airport cannot handle the traffic. They cannot handle the present traffic let alone a bunch more.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Please see Section 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding the elements of the proposed alternatives that would reduce traffic congestion in the central terminal area (CTA). The overall results would be more airport parking and fewer vehicle trips to the CTA, which is designed to reduce traffic congestion even at elevated airport traffic demand.

PC03150 Forman, Sandra None Provided

PC03150-1

Comment:

I am totally against any expansion of LAX. The traffic is impossible 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 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.

PC03150-2

Comment:

Noise & pollution would significantly reduce my property's value.

Response:

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

PC03150-3

Comment:

I see LAX as a tragic accident just waiting to happen. It doesn't belong in the heart of a major city. A sensible transit system must be part of a plan to move it to a less populated area.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. Also, please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

PC03151 Chambers, Bob & Dana None Provided

PC03151-1

Comment:

We favor the expansion of all three airports LA., Ontario and Palmdale.

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.

PC03151-2

Comment:

We also would like to see more money spent on new generation traffic control systems.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03152 Shakstad, Spencer None Provided

PC03152-1

Comment:

MAIN ISSUES #1 TRAFFIC, SEPULVEDA AND IMPERIAL & 105 FWY AT SEPULVEDA OFF RAMP, ANY TIME OF THE DAY IS GRIDLOCKED.

PC03153-2

Comment:

WE'RE AFFECTED BY AIRPORT CONGESTION (405 & PCH) ALMOST DAILY AND OFTEN FIGHT CONGESTION WHEN USING LAX FACILITIES.

Response:

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

PC03154 Posin, Donna None Provided

PC03154-1

Comment:

I live two miles from the LAX Runway. I would be affected by the noise and pollution.

Response:

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

PC03154-2

Comment:

I am already waking in the night coughing from pollutants & would be more affected if there was more air traffic.

Response:

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

PC03154-3

Comment:

I am also extremely concerned about the traffic. The 405 freeway is already at a standstill most hours of the day between Rosecrans & Culver Blvd. Those exits between are the access to LAX. The 105 freeway has already been altered to permit 2 lanes to exit at LAX & there are still back-ups for 1/2 a mile. Last thursday morning it took me 40 minutes to drive through the 'U' to drop a passenger at terminal 4. Please tell me how this area can handle more traffic.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. 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 Section 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR because it presented the elements of the proposed alternatives that will reduce traffic congestion in the central terminal area (CTA). The overall results would be more airport parking and less vehicle trips to the CTA, which is designed to reduce traffic congestion even at elevated airport traffic demand.

PC03154-4

Comment:

I believe the people living in Orange County & the S.F. Valley need to take on their own burden for air travel. The load must be distributed, especially because much of the traffic is from passengers transferring to overseas flights who do not have the choice of using another local airport. I love using LAX & believe El Toro, Palmdale, John Wayne, Ontario & Palmdale must be developed to accommodate their local population.

Response:

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

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.

PC03155 DeRogatis, Teresa None Provided

PC03155-1

Comment:

I OPPOSE THE EXPANSION OF THE LAX 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.

PC03155-2

Comment:

1) MAJOR ARTERIES TO & FROM MANHATTAN BCH & LAX ARE ALREADY GRIDLOCKED (SEPULVEDA, AVIATION) - ADDT'L TRAFFIC CANNOT BE HANDLED BY RESIDENTS ATTEMPTING TO GO TO & FROM WORK.

Response:

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

PC03155-3

Comment:

2) NOISE LEVEL IS ALREADY TOO HIGH

3) WE HAVE ENOUGH 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.

PC03155-4

Comment:

4) WHY DO REASONS HAVE TO BE ECONOMIC? WHY CAN'T WE JUST PRESERVE THE COMMUNITIES FOR THEIR CURRENT AESTHETIC QUALITIES.

Response:

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

PC03156 Walsh, Stanley None Provided

PC03156-1

Comment:

I have no details re the LAX expansion plan. But I question the idea of closing LAX and moving service to Palmdale.

If you've ever flown into the new Denver airport you will understand why I now prefer to fly into Colorado Springs and drive to the city of Denver.

Limiting service to LAX would be acceptable. Use El Toro also.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

**PC03157 Holland, Bernard S. None Provided
& Jennie F.**

PC03157-1

Comment:

WE ARE OPPOSED TO THE LAX MASTER PLAN FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS

Response:

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

PC03157-2

Comment:

(1) OUR HOUSE AT 8925 KITTYHAWK AVE IS ONE OF THOSE DUE FOR DEMOLITION

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00040-46 regarding residential acquisition. Please also see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation issues. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. No residential acquisition is proposed under Alternative D.

PC03157-3

Comment:

(2) REGIONAL AIRPORTS AT LANGCASTER AND ONTARIO SHOULD BE EXPANDED RATHER THAN INCREASE THE TRAFFIC AT LAX

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC03158 Heneban, Mary None Provided

PC03158-1

Comment:

I oppose the expansion of LAX. Traffic will become even more unbearable than it is now & pollution will become worse! Los Angeles does not need more pollution, or traffic! It is my opinion that transportation on the ground (above the ground railways & trains) should be looked into for consideration!

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03159 Jaeger, Don & Audrey None Provided

PC03159-1

Comment:

We agree with you, Jane - LAX should not be expanded and regional airports should be expanded.

Many of our neighbors are already bothered at night by the jumbo jets that fly over the peninsula.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No 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-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC03160 Kabouchy, George None Provided

PC03160-1

Comment:

No one wants an airport or power plant nearby. In this case I believe LAX is becoming a dangerous place to fly from or to. Palmdale is the way to go.

Response:

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

PC03161 Hartman, Randall None Provided

PC03161-1

Comment:

I AGREE WITH YOU THAT WE SHOULD EMPHASIZE A REGIONAL APPROACH TO OUR AIR TRANSPORTATION EXPANSION NEEDS AND NOT FOCUS ON EXPANDING LAX.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC03161-2

Comment:

I WOULD EVEN BE FOR CREATING AN INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT IN PALMDALE WITH RAIL SERVICE TO & FROM, AND LEAVING LAX FOR DOMESTIC SERVICE AND/OR EXPANDING ONTARIO.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 which discusses high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC03161-3

Comment:

I THINK WE SHOULD ALSO (LIKE MOST OTHER COUNTRIES) NOT PUT ALL OF OUR EMPHASIS ON AIR TRANSPORTATION AND CREATE HIGH-SPEED RAIL LINKS IN THE FOLLOWING CORRIDORS:

- a) L.A - SAN JOSE - SAN FRANCISCO
- b) L.A - VEGAS
- c) L.A - SAN DIEGO

Response:

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

PC03161-4

Comment:

Oppose the Master Plan support Regional Approach

We can improve our economy & reduce our traffic

- 1) Pollution
- 2) Worker transportation
- 3) High speed rail is to S.Fa Las Vegas (France/Russia)

World Class City?

Reduce our traffic altogether

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, 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, and 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports 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 and Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand.

PC03162 Cassetta, Sharon None Provided

PC03162-1

Comment:

I was unable to make it to the meeting at the Furama so I am using this space to let you know I am for Alternative "C". - No additional Runway. I live in Playa Del Rey and would greatly be affected by Alternative A or B.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03162-2

Comment:

I am in agreement that the other Southern California airports should be utilized & support LAX. Thank you for your fight to make this possible.

Response:

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

PC03163 Thompson, Rose None Provided

PC03163-1

Comment:

LAX cannot handle more aircraft traffic. I would suggest another airport to be built in Riverside County to access that 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.

PC03164 Hixson, S. None Provided

PC03164-1

Comment:

I agree with your assessment of this LAX situation. Both Ontario & Palmdale is where the expansion should take place. Both Riverside & San Bernardino Counties are growing in population by leaps & bounds each year. Not only do these Airports need to expand their facilities - it also means many more jobs for those Counties, and less traffic congestion for Los Angeles.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03164-2

Comment:

Unfortunately the City of Los Angeles wants the "whole Apple Pie", and the expansion will never cease. Twenty three to twenty seven hundred flights per day, their next goal, that probably means pushing it somewhat to just over three thousand - until the next expansion [[[

Response:

Detailed discussions of the number of operations associated with the Master Plan alternatives were provided in Chapter 5, 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.

PC03164-3

Comment:

I reside in Cross Creek Village, Playa del Rey, right next to the North runway practically. Hour after hour day after day, night after night the roar fo the mighty JET - its not un-common to not be able to hear the Television during take-offs, with the windows closed.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. However, please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. Regarding high noise levels at the commentor's property (located at 7765 West 91st Street), to qualify for soundproofing, properties must be exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels. As shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR the subject property is located within the 1992 fourth quarter and 1996 baseline 65 CNEL contour. As shown on Figure S1 in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, under Year 2000 conditions the subject property is outside the 65 CNEL contour. Also relative to single event noise levels that result in nighttime awakening (as established by the 94 dBA SEL noise contour), the subject property is located within the 94 dBA SEL contour under 1996 baseline conditions but not under Year 2000 conditions, as shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, Topical Responses TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program, and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels. Please also see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 regarding existing high noise levels.

PC03164-4

Comment:

In the past month I have noticed homes going up For Sale, in the area to the rear of Westchester High School, on 91st Street. Neighbors already fearing the influx of noise and congestion. We appreciate your efforts Congress-woman, but I think its a lost cause - the City of Los Angeles wants those "big bucks. And they will get their way.....

Response:

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

PC03165 Jensen, Elizabeth None Provided 7/8/2001

PC03165-1

Comment:

I was out of town on June 9th so could not attend the meeting. I lived in Playa del Rey for 20 years until being bought out by the city of LA because of LAX. They lied to us then.

Response:

Comment noted. This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR or the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03165-2

Comment:

The airport should have moved to Palmdale years ago. I very much appreciate your efforts to contain it & keep LAX from ruining even more desirable property with noise and pollution.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, 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.

PC03166 Millington, Manuela None Provided

PC03166-1

Comment:

I would prefer not to have LAX expanded.

Response:

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

PC03166-2

Comment:

Living in Manhattan Bch, I now hear flights over my house - which is not what the agreed plan was during 12am-3am. When weather is questionable all flights seem to be rerouted over Manhattan & Hermosa Beach.

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

3. Comments and Responses

TR-N-7, exceptions to the over-ocean procedures are available when weather or wind conditions require east traffic flow. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay. Also please see Response to Comment PC01879-5 regarding nighttime awakenings.

PC03166-3

Comment:

I feel the surrounding airports need to absorb their communities travel, not have more commuting happening in and out of LAX.

Response:

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

PC03167 Manetta, Maria None Provided

PC03167-1

Comment:

I AGREE WITH YOU - THE REGIONAL PLAN IS OUR BEST OPTION HERE. MY NEIGHBORHOOD WOULD BE SIGNIFICANTLY IMPACTED BY THE INCREASED NOISE, POLLUTION, AND TRAFFIC UNDER THE LAX MASTER PLAN.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR SUPPORT AND EFFORTS TOWARDS THE REGIONAL PLAN.

Response:

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

PC03168 Fernandez, Joseph None Provided

PC03168-1

Comment:

Stop - We are already choked with grid-lock. We cannot tolerate any more smog, people pollution, and grid lock, in this area. The politicians for many many years have not looking at the quality of life here. The politicians have been our major problem. Quality of life in South Bay is not one tenth as good as it used to be in say 1970. Not only the airport - but unlimited immigration has killed us.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. 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. In addition, 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.

PC03169 Shellman, Carl None Provided

PC03169-1

Comment:

I THINK THE LA AIRPORT IS TOO LARGE ALREADY.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03170 Panella, Brian None Provided 6/8/2001

PC03170-1

Comment:

Please be advised that I am opposed to any further expansion of L.A.X.

Response:

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

PC03170-2

Comment:

The noise factor is bad enough but the air quality from jet fuel exhaust and residue is terrible.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-3 regarding potential air pollution impacts. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC03170-3

Comment:

The unbridled expansion of housing in the Marina and Playa Del Rey areas will add to our traffic congestion as it is. More traffic to LAX is obscene!

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03171 Grinnell, Shirley None Provided

PC03171-1

Comment:

My family and I at present are affected by the noise especially during the night hours - disrupting our sleep.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to nighttime awakenings in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with

3. Comments and Responses

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.

PC03171-2

Comment:

I am very concerned about any future expansion of LAX & do hope that you can prevent the proposed expansion.

Response:

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

PC03172 Hassoldt, Judith None Provided

PC03172-1

Comment:

The hugh number of homes/businesses developed in the Eastern areas will be better served by developing inland airports.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03172-2

Comment:

Why would you destroy the valuble coastline properties to draw in from the East counties? This state benefits greatly from the high tax values of the P.V. area. This area will change dramatically with increased jet noise!

Response:

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

PC03173 Shabes, Cynthia None Provided

PC03173-1

Comment:

I oppose the LAX Master Plan, also. My husband and I live and work in the area and would really be affected by the increase in traffic. We've lived here 18 years and have been upset by the large increase in traffic, noise & pollution. It's time to put a stop to all this expansion.

Response:

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

PC03175 Edwards, Geoff None Provided

PC03175-1

Comment:

My home in Playa del Rey will be adversely affected by all three; traffic, noise, & pollution. Let's just face a simple fact - LAX is full. Fact 2 - we need no more planes arriving here! If other areas want more air traffic, they know how to get it - otherwise let's put up the sign that says No More Vacancy

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-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.

PC03176 Cripe, Lyle None Provided

PC03176-1

Comment:

POPULATION IN THE LAX VICINITY INCLUDING MY CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH WILL CONTINUE TO GROW. LETS NOT DELUTE OUR QUALITY OF LIFE FURTHER BY INTRODUCING AN NEGATIVE IMPACT THAT IS WITHIN OUR CONTROL TO AVOID. BETTER THAT AN OCCASIONAL AIRLINE PASSENGER BE INCONVEINENCED THAN THOUSANDS OF PEOPLE HAVE THEIR DAILY LIVES MADE MISERABLE BY EXPANDING LAX AND WE HAVEN'T EVEN MENTIONED THE NEGATIVE IMPACT ON PROPERTY VALUES IN MANHATTAN BCH.

Response:

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

PC03177 Bright, Carole None Provided

PC03177-1

Comment:

Send all commercial flights to Palmdale - LAX handles too much now.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC03177-2

Comment:

Noise & safety level dangerous now. Utilize land appropriately. I live blocks away from LAX. See too many flybys now -

Response:

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

PC03177-3

Comment:

And the residue from jet fuel is becoming dangerous for my elderly mother who lives with me.

Response:

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

PC03178 Clover, Rebecca None Provided

PC03178-1

Comment:

Opposed to LAX expansion etc. STOP IT 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.

PC03180 O'Mara, Anne None Provided

PC03180-1

Comment:

Traffic in the South Bay is tremendous, including along Sepulveda Blvd & the 105 freeways - much supporting LAX. It makes no sense for people to drive 50 or more miles to LAX when they can have airport services close to home. It contributes to smog, unnecessary use of cars, gasoline, clutters the highways - there is no reason to expand LAX except to protect the eardrums of residents in the areas of other airports. We have ears too!

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. 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.

PC03180-2

Comment:

Also the Metrorail system ought to go directly to LAX.

Response:

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

**PC03181 Policastro Dinsdale, None Provided
Mary**

PC03181-1

Comment:

I think it is important to mention that there is a huge number of young families in the Redondo (thru) Playa del Rey area. In addition, our areas heavily encumbered with a number of undesirable public companies such as the refinery & water treatment plant...we shouldn't have to shoulder more of the burden. As the parent of two small children, I am concerned about LAX's expansion on my community & our children's future. We have plenty of other airports in the area that I believe would be happy to accommodate add'l passengers & air traffic to better service their community.

Response:

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

PC03182 Papaccio, Philip None Provided

PC03182-1

Comment:

Read your flyer on the status of LAX expansion. I wanted you to know that I support you completely in this matter.

Response:

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

PC03183 Blair, Dorothy None Provided

PC03183-1

Comment:

Registered Republicans who support JH and agree with 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.

PC03184 Michael, Robin & Rita None Provided

PC03184-1

Comment:

We are already affected by airport traffic, airplane noise, and pollution from the airport. We want to see more regional airports so that our quality of life does not continue to erode in the South Bay.

Response:

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

PC03185 Brookes, E. Alan None Provided

PC03185-1

Comment:

I like the regional plan

Too much noise & traffic in LAX now

Why expand? LAX?

Connect regional airports with high speed rail or high speed transports

Response:

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

PC03186 Roberson, Ed None Provided

PC03186-1

Comment:

Jane this time I think your right!

Response:

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

PC03187 Long, Joyce None Provided

PC03187-1

Comment:

NO! NO! NO!

To expansion in the south Bay. The area has already been burdened with too much noise, congestion and pollution from the existing 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; 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.

PC03187-2

Comment:

It makes no sense to expand LAX when the demographics show where the expansion should take place which is not in the south bay.

Response:

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.

PC03187-3

Comment:

As a resident of Redondo Beach for over 16 years I have been plagued in the last 5 yrs. with aircraft noise hovering overhead awaiting landings. From my kitchen window on a Sun. night I can count a lineup of 12 planes awaiting landing and hovering from the northeast on their approach to LAX,

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. These aircraft on approach to LAX do not hover over Redondo Beach area. However, as a resident of Redondo Beach the commentor is correct in identifying that in a northeasterly direction, at night, aircraft are in a visible line on approach to LAX to land at either one of the parallel runway complexes. This approach has not changed over the previous five years. For more information on noise impacts on the Southbay, see Response to Comment PC00552-2.

PC03187-4

Comment:

Again I plead no more expansion. Just lighten our load so the quality of our life can be back to what it should be

Response:

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

PC03188 James, John None Provided

PC03188-1

Comment:

I support your efforts to Stop the LAX Expansion. I support regional airports. The noise in Playa Del Rey is too loud 24/7.

Response:

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

PC03189 Dworski, David None Provided

PC03189-1

Comment:

Both my wife and I oppose the LAX Master Plan. As a person who travels extensively out of LAX on business across the U.S., I know how impacted the current airport - and surrounding communities - are by sheer numbers of people travelling. A larger LAX will not solve the problem. A regional plan will.

Response:

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

PC03190 Strauss, Betty None Provided

PC03190-1

Comment:

I believe developing regional airports is essential. It could relieve the horrendous traffic problems on the ground around LAX and share the burden of noise, pollution, etc. over the entire region.

I often use the Oakland or San Jose airports when flying into the San Francisco Bay area. They are a joy to use compared to the congestion of S.F. airport.

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. 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.

PC03190-2

Comment:

Thank you for your efforts. This is one more example of local politicians not taking the long view.

Response:

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

PC03191 Greenhill, Gloria None Provided

PC03191-1

Comment:

- ALL CARGO SHOULD BE ROUTED THROUGH PALMDALE -

Response:

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

PC03191-2

Comment:

- "BRADLEY" TERMINAL INTERNATIONAL PAX SHOULD GO THROUGH PALMDALE OR ONTARIO.
- SHUTTLES MUST OF COURSE BE PROVIDED AT PALMDALE AND ONTARIO -

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC03192 Russell, Linda Jo None Provided

PC03192-1

Comment:

I am already affected by the noise! The sky rumbles constantly. Expanding will only make it worse. From time to time I also smell fuel and hear planes fly directly overhead. I've lived here all my life. In the past I could hear nothing coming from the airport. Things have really changed.

Response:

The commentor is a resident of Hermosa Beach. She is concerned that growth of service at LAX to accommodate 89 MAP will create more noise impacts on South Bay communities. The proposed operations associated with 89 MAP range from 2,141 in Alternative C to 2,535 in Alternative B. Environmental baseline conditions had 2,077 flights. On average, the flights will be individually quieter than they were in 1996, but they may be more frequent. The amount of noise to which any one area is exposed will vary based on the distribution of the traffic throughout the community. In the South Bay communities, including Hermosa Beach, aircraft noise levels associated with the project actions will be much lower than those considered to be significant by all regulatory agencies. The area may be effected by noise from other airports, as well as ongoing modifications in air traffic routes out of LAX that have nothing to do with the proposed Master Plan actions. For further information on this topic, please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay and Subtopical Response and TR-N-3.3 regarding changes in noise levels relative to changes in air traffic. Air quality (smell) issues were addressed in Section 4.6 Air Quality with technical data located in Appendix G.

PC03193 Samples, Stella None Provided 6/8/2001

PC03193-1

Comment:

We are a buyers dream or to the people who want to bring their business pals in & live in boxy condos w/a 2.5 million dollar view of a dying ocean - we're a community that needs some boosting. What about the small businesses that have thrived here for 30 some odd years. It hurts me to tears to think this side of LA has no other value to developers than 98 billion dollar cash cow. Well bring that 98 billion dollars in here & watch the shores erode, the trash build up, the air get darker w/smog, the foliage go brown & watch this cash cow grow old, broken & used up very fast. And then of course there'll be serious environmental problems & on the heels of that millions of dollars of studies to find out what the problems are. And I tell you now it is SIMPLE GREED. . .

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed coastal impacts in Section 4.14, Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers; solid waste in Section 4.19, Solid Waste; public services in Section 4.26, Public Services; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses is provided in Appendices G and J, and Technical Reports 4, 7, 10, and 16 of the Draft EIS/EIR, and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-7, and S-10 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.

PC03194 **Nota, Dean** **None Provided**

PC03194-1

Comment:

I oppose the current Master plan for the LA Int airport. I live in Hermosa Beach where the noise from overhead jets and the smell of jet fuel is already ruining our quality of life in the South Bay. Auto mobile traffic in and around the airport is already maxed out! How can the proponents of this plan mitigate the impacts of such an increase in growth? The answer is that they can't.

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. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding fumes. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC03195 **Ciuffini, Anthony J. & Lucille** **None Provided**

PC03195-1

Comment:

We agree. LAX is we believe at or near capacity. Traffic is sometimes impossible. Regional airports make good 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. 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.

PC03196 **Van Zandt, Gary** **None Provided**

PC03196-1

Comment:

I am totally against any additional expansion of LAX. It is time to require outlying airports to add capacity.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC03197 Mendes, Elaine None Provided 6/10/2001

PC03197-1

Comment:

The traffic, noise & pollution are terrible 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.

PC03197-2

Comment:

I have lived in the same house for 25 years, and the increased dirt from aircraft & cars is very noticeable.

Response:

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

PC03197-3

Comment:

Please encourage a cap on LAX growth and better rail transit to LAX to ease some of the congestion.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01018-29 regarding the authority of FAA and LAWA to limit future activity at airports. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Additionally, the design of Alternative D includes the proposed development of an intermodal transportation center (ITC) with passenger access to and from the existing MTA Greenline, and an automated people mover system connecting the ITC with a consolidated rental car facility and the Central Terminal Area.

PC03198 Plosay, III, John None Provided

PC03198-1

Comment:

In the 15 years I have lived in Redondo Beach, my daily commute past LAX has risen from 25 minutes to 60 minutes to reach Santa Monica. We need to severely restrict the growth around LAX. Even now the South Bay is overbuilt and the lifestyle which attracted us, is rapidly disappearing.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation and growth in Section 4.5, Induced Socio-Economic Impacts (Growth Inducement). Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03199 **Gottlieb, Alvin** **None Provided**

PC03199-1

Comment:

FREEZE LAX size to AVOID FURTHER CONTAMINATION of the SOUTH BAY 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.

PC03199-2

Comment:

EXPAND The OutLying AIRPORTS to DECREASE inconveniencing outlying PASSENGERS & SHARE the BURDEN

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.

PC03199-3

Comment:

including ONTARIO/EL TORO/ONTARIO/John Wayne/PALM SPRINGS/BIG BEAR/ c HIGH SPEED train Interconnecting

Response:

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

PC03200 **Scott, Judith** **None Provided**

PC03200-1

Comment:

I am against, firmly against the expansion of the LAX as most if not all people whose living space would be affected. The most frustrating thing is feeling a lack of cohesiveness w/others who are just as adamant as myself. Cohesion or the appearance of cohesions is available & supported thru the media to the powers that want the expansion. They have several names & one voice. We are just people who work very hard every day to come home to news that our neighborhood is changing & there is little to be done about it.

3. Comments and Responses

Meetings have been held in secret for months, or years & there it is on the six o'clock news. We are a community riddled w/gang activity or as the real estate market sees fit.

Response:

A major component of the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR work program is public participation and outreach. LAWA has had press releases, newsletters, neighborhood info packets, public workshops, and a web site in order to communicate with neighbors and interested parties. 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.

PC03202 Rubin, Sherwin None Provided

PC03202-1

Comment:

There is already too much pollution and noise impacting the neighborhoods east of LAX. These are poorer communities. Why should their health be impacted even more with an expansion of LAX?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-190.

PC03202-2

Comment:

Connect the 4 regional airports w/ high speed rail.

Response:

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

PC03203 Alshunofa, Iyad None Provided

PC03203-1

Comment:

The traffic at 405 Fwy jammed all the time. I put my son at the dorme at UCLA because of heavy traffic at 405.

I pay 9 thousand \$ dollars to avoid the heavy traffic caused by LAX airport. Airport caused noises, pollution to our residential 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.

PC03204 Shaw, Wilfred None Provided

PC03204-1

Comment:

We are very fortunate to have an airport facing the ocean with usual West - East wind patterns. This is probably the lowest "noise pollution" per resident in the U.S. Airport traffic merits expansion. Also the convenience of residential travellers to flight access is probably the highest in the country.

My residence is 5 miles south of the airport on the N-S coast. I have no objection to significant increase of the LA Airport traffic.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03205 Purvis, Ivy None Provided

PC03205-1

Comment:

I SUPPORT A REGIONAL AIRPORT GROWTH PLAN. IT SEEMS FAIR, AND WHAT MOST PEOPLE WOULD AGREE WITH, IT'S COMMON 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.

PC03206 Tonkinson, John & Jane None Provided

PC03206-1

Comment:

Having reviewed the LAX Master Plan and your comments recently, I can say that we agree with your position only in part. We do feel that the other counties and airports such as Long Beach, Ontario, and John Wayne need to share the traffic burden. However, it is clear that increasing population and commerce will drive demand greatly upwards in the coming years. Therefore, major improvements at LAX are necessary even with the regional sharing approach. If half measures are adopted now, it will be only a matter of time until they will be overtaken by growth. We would therefore support Alternative A of the Master Plan, which seems to be the most effective way to increase LAX capacity.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03207 Meade, Gladys None Provided

PC03207-1

Comment:

Keep up the good work! LAX expansion is not necessary and we must pursue regional airport solutions. New leadership in City of Los Angeles may be helpful in widening the perspective from the past sole concentration on LAX. Let's hope so and push for 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.

PC03208 Slane, James None Provided

PC03208-1

Comment:

I AM DEFINITELY OPPOSED TO FURTHER EXPANSION AT LAX. I HAVE LIVED IN THE SAME HOUSE FOR 21 YEARS. THE NOISE LEVEL FROM LAX HAS STEADILY RISEN AND IS BECOMING UNTOLERABLE.

Response:

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

PC03208-2

Comment:

HOW MANY DOMESTIC & INTERNATIONAL PASSENGERS ARE FROM THE SAME AREAS IN ORANGE COUNTY THAT OPPOSE INCREASED TRAFFIC IN THEIR SKIES?

Response:

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

PC03208-3

Comment:

THE GREEN LINE MISSING LAX THE LAST TIME WAS A JOKE, YET THE AIRPORT PLAN IS VERY UNCLEAR AS TO HOW IT WOULD WORK THIS TIME AND WHAT KIND OF PASSENGER COUNT WOULD BE INVOLVED.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan. The percent of air passengers forecast to use transit was kept conservatively low in the technical analysis for the LAX Master Plan.

PC03208-4

Comment:

LASTLY THE ENORMOUS PARKING STRUCTURES AND INCREASED TRAFFIC FLOW ON VISTA DEL MAR ARE POORLY THOUGHT OUT ESPECIALLY IN COMBINATION WITH THE PLAYA VISTA DEVELOPMENT

Response:

The analysis of the parking structure's impacts is summarized in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology, in particular Subtopical Response TR-ST-2.2 regarding the Playa Vista Project.

PC03209 Arrowood, Margie None Provided

PC03209-1

Comment:

Obviously you increase the number of flights where the people will be. Enlarging LAX increases to a crawl the traffic on Sepulveda/PCH to get there. It also wastes gas for people coming from the outlying areas to get to LAX for a flight. A Monorail should be included in the outlying airport expansions plans.

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-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand.

PC03209-2

Comment:

No one uses Santa Monica Bay. Why? How about LAX ferries from Santa Monica & north to LAX and South Bay & San Pedro from the South to LAX to relieve existing traffic.

Response:

The development of a water ferry service for LAX is not considered to be a feasible means of relieving existing or future traffic associated with LAX and could result in new significant environmental effects. The economic viability of developing and operating such a service would require a substantial market base with a high volume of daily passengers. If there is only a low or moderate volume of daily passengers, as would probably be the case because the primary user would be local to Santa Monica and San Pedro areas (i.e., passengers traveling from more distant areas would probably drive direct to/from LAX, as opposed to traveling through coastal traffic in order to reach a ferry port located near LAX), the frequency of ferry trips would be very limited and undesirable for most travelers. Moreover, the potential environmental impacts and permitting difficulties of obtaining the necessary approvals for such a ferry service would be substantial. The approximately four-mile beach area immediately west of LAX is occupied by Dockweiler State Beach, which is a state beach within the California coastal zone. The approvals necessary for the development of a water ferry port anywhere along this beach area

3. Comments and Responses

would face major challenges, if even considered by the affected permitting agencies. Development of a water ferry port at a coastal location outside of Dockweiler State Beach would increase the distance and difficulty of the landside shuttle service between LAX and the port, and further diminish the desirability of this system for use by travelers. A more feasible option for reducing vehicle traffic associated with LAX is included in each of the proposed build alternatives, that being expansion of the FlyAway shuttle service. Encouraging the public's use of this service is integrated into the design of Alternative D by limiting direct public access to the Central Terminal Area to only FlyAway shuttles. Additionally, all of the build alternatives include provisions for increased use of the MTA Greenline, which furthers the ability of each alternative to reduce vehicle trips.

PC03210 **Howe, John** **None Provided**

PC03210-1

Comment:

STOP the whole project. Why should we deal with the increased traffic on the Freeways & air pollution. Let the people of Orange County Fly out of El Toro. Most of them moved there knowing it was an airport/Air Force base. The 405 is already a disaster. Century Blvd gets clogged up - the LAX entry & exit gets jammed.

Response:

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

PC03210-2

Comment:

Make El Toro a Full International Airport & expand Ontario Airport. Let Orange & S/B counties Residents Fly out of their own counties.

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC03210-3

Comment:

Let the airlines transfer some of their activities to other Locations.

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. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-2 regarding the role of deregulation in aviation planning and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC03210-4

Comment:

NO MORE 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.

PC03211 Gerhardt, Paul None Provided

PC03211-1

Comment:

LA purchased more than adequate acreage in Palmdale to develop a major airport. I believe that all cargo planes and many passenger flights could use Palmdale if a hi-speed route to LA was part of the development.

Response:

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

PC03211-2

Comment:

I believe Ontario and John Wayne should be utilized so that people in these areas would not have to drive to LAX and further increase our already overwhelming traffic.

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC03211-3

Comment:

We do hear planes flying over at night. More flights, more traffic and more pollution can only result from maximum development of LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; 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-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03212 McIlroy, Donald None Provided

PC03212-1

Comment:

[no comments]

Response:

No comments on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR were included. It is noted that the commentor submitted an information sheet provided by Jane Harman entitled "Facts about LAX and Regional Airports."

PC03213 Craig, Sharon None Provided

PC03213-1

Comment:

I live in Westchester about one mile north of LAX. The traffic on the 405, 105, Sepulveda, & Lincoln are pretty much gridlocked Monday AMs & Friday PMs & often other times as well.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts, and Topical Response TR-ST-7 regarding Westchester Southside traffic.

PC03213-2

Comment:

It's unfair to have the entire So. Calif. population traveling to LAX when they could convert El Toro to a large airport so easily.

Response:

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

PC03213-3

Comment:

They should also expand Palmdale & make it easily accessible by rail or other rapid transit.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 which discusses high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC03214 Benson, Janne None Provided

PC03214-1

Comment:

I am totally against the LAX Master Plan. LA has enough traffic and pollution.

Response:

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

PC03214-2

Comment:

I understand that Pershing Dr. would no longer be for public use & that is UNACCEPTABLE.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02274-3 regarding Pershing Drive.

PC03214-3

Comment:

The noise is so bad where I live & can hardly hear myself think. This must Decrease; not increase.

Response:

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

PC03214-4

Comment:

And the pollution is most likely killing us. Look at the number of cancer patients in LA

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.

PC03214-5

Comment:

Let other cities take the load off

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.

PC03215 Einhorn, Ruth None Provided

PC03215-1

Comment:

The expansion of LAX will negatively impact the quality of life of the people in the surrounding areas. I am appalled by the attempt to ruin this area by causing disastrous air pollution levels and high noise levels. This will be harmful to the mental a physical health of the people involved.

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, 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 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.

PC03216 Andrews, John None Provided 6/18/2001

PC03216-1

Comment:

LAX is already too big and too overcrowded making air travel a real pain for all except those whose limos drive to the plane.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03216-2

Comment:

LAX is dangerous and awaiting a disaster. If last year's flight which went into the ocean had made it back to land or LAX hundreds more might have been killed.

Response:

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

PC03216-3

Comment:

We need a new, huge, airport way out in the sticks built for the 21st Century with rapid transit to/from downtown LA and Lax. Lets us start it now!

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand.

PC03217 Curtis, Allen None Provided

PC03217-1

Comment:

It seems imperative to me that the air traffic load be spread equitably among several airports which serve So. Calif. LAX cannot & should not carry all the load and should not be expanded until other locations have assumed their fair share.

Response:

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

PC03218 LeGrice, Yvonne None Provided

PC03218-1

Comment:

I completely support your position on the LAX master plan.

Response:

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

PC03218-2

Comment:

Traffic around LAX is ridiculous, and could certainly be reduced by flying passengers to airports closer to their final destinations.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC03218-3

Comment:

I believe business suffers from traffic congestion, since people are reluctant to shop in areas that pass by LAX.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. See also Topical Response TR-LU-1 for a summary of overall traffic effects on adjacent communities.

PC03218-4

Comment:

Please continue your work on this issue.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03219 Timko, Coretha None Provided

PC03219-1

Comment:

EL TORO IS THE WAY TO HELP THE OVERBURDENED LAX - ORANGE CO. SHOULD HAVE A MAJOR AIRPORT.

Response:

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

PC03220 Mc Garry, Chris & Charin None Provided

PC03220-1

Comment:

We vehemently oppose the proposed LAX expansion.

It is unnecessary and uneconomical. Our lives and the lives of thousands of homes around the LAX would drastically be disrupted by the noise, traffic, pollution.

Please reconsider El Toro or 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-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed 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.

PC03221 Pinto, Bernice None Provided 6/13/2001

PC03221-1

Comment:

Traffic going south to the Airport is horrendous. I live in Westchester v our community is bombarded with noise, airplane emissions that literally ruin our plants (and our lungs). Now, you want to expand further into Westchester. What is wrong with utilizing the facilities in Palmdale for Cargo planes etc - I have lived in Westchester for 52 years & I am tired of my life being endangered by the Airport, Make another community miserable - not only 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. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale, Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition, Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, and Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects. 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.

PC03221-2

Comment:

In regard to plants - when I have problems with black spots on leaves of roses - I call Jasen & Perkins (a catalog company selling plants). When I explain my problem to them they immediately ask if I live near the airport - I tell them about 3 miles away - & then I am told all the deterioration on the leaves is caused by airplane emissions.

Does anyone ever consider what could be happening to our lungs - If this is so detrimental to the plants God help our children!

Response:

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

PC03221-3

Comment:

Please stop them from expanding LAX further into our community - or whats left 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.

PC03221-4

Comment:

P.S: We are an elderly community & the airport offers sound-proofing - But to avail yourself of this sound proofing you must take down you drapes your venetian blinds etc. Needless to say most of us

3. Comments and Responses

are arthritic & cannot do this & can't afford the cost of hiring some one for this chore - so we have to live without the soundproofing - your brochure was received on June 13th!

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

PC03222 Triplett, Janice None Provided 6/18/2001

PC03222-1

Comment:

I'm writing this note for my 85 year old parents. They built their home in 1950 and have lived on Airport Blvd. for over 50 years. Now, their quiet neighborhood is in danger of becoming an expressway that would connect the traffic from the 405 freeway to Westchester Parkway to LAX. PLEASE STOP this expansion project as it would cause many negative effects on this community in the form of diesel soot, noise, and air pollution as well as destroying quiet neighborhoods and the quality of life people have worked hard for.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts to quality of life, Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping. It should be noted that Alternative D added subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, does not include the LAX Expressway or the Ring Road.

PC03222-2

Comment:

PLEASE WORK TOWARDS alternatives that would reduce the traffic and provide access to regional airports.

Response:

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

PC03223 Thoman, Sally None Provided

PC03223-1

Comment:

I cannot comment directly on the plan - never seen it. However, I do know that I DO NOT SUPPORT 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.

PC03223-2

Comment:

When we moved to Manhattan Beach (over 10 yrs ago) my husband & I commented how quiet it was at night - we had lived 1 block off a major street in our prior address in Redondo. Now, we lay awake in our bed listening to airplanes landing & taking off from LAX until 2 am and starting up again before dawn.

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 of wind conditions require east traffic flow. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3, Aircraft Flight Procedures, and particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1, South Bay overflowed by new routes and Topical Response Topical Response TR-HRA-2, regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Response to Comment PC00599-4 and TR-N-5, regarding nighttime aircraft operations. An analysis of nighttime single event noise impacts and mitigation are provided in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03223-3

Comment:

As a stay at home mom, I see & hear planes flying overhead (yes, they DO fly over my house, despite what LAX officials seem to claim) all day long. Not only do I not support expansion, I would like to see the beach city fly overs halted and the ocean "turn" point moved further offshore.

Response:

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. New procedures were recently implemented that rerouted take off traffic southwest of the airport to reduce the exposure of South Bay communities to noise from jet overflights. Among the mitigation actions included in the Draft EIS/EIR is a measure requiring all takeoffs (both jet and propeller aircraft) to proceed to the coastline prior to initiating turns. For further information regarding aircraft operations and mitigation suggestions, please see Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-4.1 regarding additional mitigation actions suggested for flight activity and Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding South Bay overflowed by new routes and Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2 regarding early turns over areas north and south of the airport.

PC03224 Lasser, Thomas None Provided

PC03224-1

Comment:

- EL TORO AS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT!
- JOHN WAYNE TO GENERAL AVIATION WITH COMMUTER & CHARTERS

Response:

Comment noted. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. Neither the FAA nor LAWA have the legal authority to forbid the use of a public service airport to

3. Comments and Responses

general aviation or commercial air services. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC03224-2

Comment:

- MODERATE EXPANSION OF LAX TO KEEP ECONOMIC ENGINE GOING!

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03224-3

Comment:

- LAX EXPANSION MUST INCLUDE GROUND/ROAD UPGRADES

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.

PC03224-4

Comment:

- "LONG RANGE" PLAN FOR PALMDALE

Response:

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

PC03224-5

Comment:

- KEEP REGIONAL AIRPORT PLAN GOING!

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.

PC03225 Oldmen, Monika None Provided

PC03225-1

Comment:

I am against 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.

PC03225-2

Comment:

I live in Marina Del Rey and work in El Segundo. The traffic just to get out of the Marina area feels nearly as if I am driving in Manhattan, N.Y. It is way to congested.

Response:

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

PC03225-3

Comment:

The air feels dirty. El Segundo is a great little town but the air is also polluted from the airplanes etc..

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-3 regarding near-airport impacts from air pollution.

PC03225-4

Comment:

Many people that live in Westchester would like to sell their homes, they are scared of the pollution, airport expansion and noise. The beach areas are becoming to industrial. I can see myself moving further south by next year or so. It is very unfortunate. Let other airports expand.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and coastal zone impacts in Section 4.14, Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendices D and G, and Technical Report S-1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR, and Appendices S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values, and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the role of the LAX Master Plan 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03226 Glavis, Jr., George None Provided

PC03226-1

Comment:

We have too much traffic, noise, and pollution already. We don't need any more. Your plan is good.

Response:

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

PC03227 Clyman, Jeffrey None Provided

PC03227-1

Comment:

I agree with your opposition entirely. Besides the increased noise from the aircraft, I am especially concerned about about I-405, which is already impossible during most hours more cars and trucks is one thing, but it's ten times worse when they are all just sitting bumper-to-bumper on the so-called freeway, pouring tons of junk into the air I must breath.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology. Please also see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PC03228 Harris, Stanley None Provided

PC03228-1

Comment:

I OPPOSE ANY EXPANSION OF LAX. FORTUNATELY, A FACILITY OF ADEQUATE AREA IS AVAILABLE AND IS NEARBY. PALMDALE. THANK YOU FOR YOUR STAND ON THIS MATTER.

Response:

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

PC03229 Ross, Jay None Provided

PC03229-1

Comment:

No airport expansion at all! Build high-speed rail to reduce the long-distance crunch! Preserving the neighborhoods of Westchester is much more valuable than adding more flights. We've already destroyed too many homes at Dockweiler/Playa Del Rey & with freeways in the name of "progress"!

Thank you for standing up to LAX! This issue is extremely important!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, and Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand.

PC03230 Caudill, Paulette None Provided

PC03230-1

Comment:

I'm pleased to hear that you oppose the expansion of LAX and that you are in favor of a regional solution. I live in El Segundo and would bear the lion's share of the impact.

Response:

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

PC03230-2

Comment:

The noise is already such that you can not sit out on the porch and hold a conversation.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC03230-3

Comment:

The traffic on the 105 Freeway is at dangerous levels at the airport off ramp which can not presently adequately handle the load. I can not imagine adding more airport traffic.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment PC01838-1. Please see Response to Comment PC01838-1.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03230-4

Comment:

Pollution would of course increase which does not bode well for us since our city is one of the worst in terms of pollution wise with hyperion on the West, Chevron on the East and Airport on the north.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC03230-5

Comment:

Over all our quality of life will be even more adversely affected.

Response:

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

PC03231 Heise, Donna None Provided

PC03231-1

Comment:

I am with you. I support a regional airport plan & oppose the LAX expansion plan.

The surrounding airports & counties (Orange) should provide for expansion of their air traffic.

We local south bay residents don't need extra traffic & air flights over our cities.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, 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.

PC03232 Carter, Frank None Provided 6/11/2001

PC03232-1

Comment:

We have been living here since 1945 (before the tunnel on Sepulveda was built) and the noise level has increased every since. At present the noise and the dirt from the jet exhausts is very high and we don't think we should tolerate any more. As seniors (87 & 91) this is very disconcerting.

Response:

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

Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC03233 Taft, Richard None Provided

PC03233-1

Comment:

I am opposed to LAX expansion primarily due to current and increased air pollution. This black soot covering everything is from the planes accelerating over the ocean. In addition we continually breath the fumes.

Response:

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.

PC03233-2

Comment:

LAX is an unfortunate location. It is occupying fine beach front land. I hope with your help LAX will gradually be relocated to other sites.

Response:

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

PC03234 Cassell, Shirley None Provided

PC03234-1

Comment:

The traffic noise and pollution would be just terrible. It is very very bad 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PC03234-2

Comment:

Airplanes fly overhead then if you call in you are a liar. Also they try to get you to call other numbers, telling you the number you called is no longer good.

It looks like they are trying to force people out of their homes. It is a shame.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. 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.

PC03235 Johnston, Teresa None Provided

PC03235-1

Comment:

I'm all for a regional plan - that will take the pressure off the L.A.X. I live less than 10 miles away & would hate to see an expanded version of the airport in any way.

Response:

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

PC03235-2

Comment:

During certain times of the year, you can smell the exhaust fumes of the airplanes - more of them would add to that lack of clean air (as well as more car traffic around LAX).

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding odors.

PC03236 Holzman, Robert None Provided

PC03236-1

Comment:

I am a Frequent Flyer and I see no need for futur expansion. Expand Regional Airports like Long Beach etc

Response:

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

PC03237 Dossat, R. None Provided 6/11/2001

PC03237-1

Comment:

I hear the planes flying over every day and I am heartily in accord with 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-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03238 Feeley, Ronald None Provided 6/12/2001

PC03238-1

Comment:

By expanding LAX, would bring more traffic, noise, dirt, polluted air, angry people, etc. We are already known as a state, which cannot get anything done right. Lets break the pattern.

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.

PC03239 Price, Edward None Provided

PC03239-1

Comment:

My comments are that we shouldn't put all our planes and cars in one place. Definitely not LAX.. TRAFFIC IS A MESS, BOARDING IS A MESS. PALMDALE, ONTARIO, AND EL TORO SHOULD ALL BE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORTS. NIMBY'S CAN SACRIFICE SOMETHING FOR THE GREATER GOOD. IT DOESN'T MAKE SENSE TO TRY TO SHOEHORN MORE INTO LAX.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

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

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. 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.

PC03240 Gillespie, Jack None Provided

PC03240-1

Comment:

Noise Pollution, Extra Traffic, significant Traffic jams on Sepulveda during high airport Traffic hours, deterioration of communities.

Response:

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

PC03240-2

Comment:

I have lived on the north & south side of LAX for 40 years. The Westchester community was devastated by LAX expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-121 and Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding the opportunities to alleviate impacts associated with past or present airport activities at LAX. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC03240-3

Comment:

Expand to Palmdale or Ontario or Orange Co. (where a complete Airport sits already to go).

Response:

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

PC03241 Bond, Corliss None Provided

PC03241-1

Comment:

The noise level has gradually increased over these last few years. I'm opposed to LAX expansion. I have property in El Segundo and Manhattan Beach. The noise level has increased in El Segundo dramatically.

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

PC03241-2

Comment:

The pollution from the planes is a big concern for me. This is really evident at my property in El Segundo.

Response:

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

PC03241-3

Comment:

We need to be concerned with our quality of life, not just commercial gains @ LAX.

Response:

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

PC03241-4

Comment:

I would like another official hearing - with more notice.

Response:

There were a total of 18 public hearings with notice given. Please see the web site www.laxmasterplan.org. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process.

PC03242 Viking, Julie & Jack None Provided

PC03242-1

Comment:

LAX is already too large & too crowded. Expanding other airports will not only reduce congestion at LAX but will make travel more convenient for residents in the outlying areas.

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.

PC03243 Noetzli, Marguerite None Provided

PC03243-1

Comment:

Briefly - The airport & the 405 traffic can be unbearably congested - Any more traffic will be much worse. So many people have to travel 30 - 60 miles to get to LAX. Decentralized airports would be an immense improvement!

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC03244 Wildasinn, Patricia None Provided

PC03244-1

Comment:

I do use LAX because it is close to my home and I'm sure others that live in outlying areas would appreciate an airport near their home and not have to travel miles to an already crowded and congested LAX - and the way people travel today it will only get worse - When possible I use the train or ship - But than I'm retired and can take my time --

Response:

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

PC03245 Ogden, Ellen None Provided 6/10/2001

PC03245-1

Comment:

You are so right! LAX airport is already too busy! People from other areas have to go to LAX to catch the plane when they could be going from a closer airport. I support you completely.

Response:

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

**PC03246 Luther, Dr. Kenneth None Provided
W. & Linda A. B.**

PC03246-1

Comment:

1) THE PROXIMITY OF LAX TO OUR HOUSE KEEPS PROPERTY VALUE DOWN.

Response:

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

PC03246-2

Comment:

2) DUE TO THE NOISE LEVEL, IT IS VIRTUALLY IMPOSSIBLE TO LEAVE WINDOWS OPEN TO RECEIVE THE COOL OCEAN BREEZE.

Response:

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

PC03246-3

Comment:

FOR SANITY SAKE ONE MUST SHUT WINDOWS & USE A/C WHICH WE ALL KNOW USES MORE PRECIOUS ELECTRICITY.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program. Regarding the use of air conditioning and corresponding increase in electricity consumption, residential sound insulation provided under the ANMP uses acoustically-rated doors and windows, which prevent 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.

PC03246-4

Comment:

3) LAX NEEDS TO ADOPT A DOMESTIC ONLY POLICY FOR INCOMING & OUTGOING FLIGHTS. SEND ALL CARGO & INTERNATIONAL FLIGHTS TO PALMDALE.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding split domestic/international operations. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC03246-5

Comment:

4) NO JET ENGINE TUNE UP & REPAIR DURING HOLIDAYS, WEEKENDS & THE HOURS OF 9:00 PM & 6:00 AM.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. According to the airport's Noise Abatement Rules, ground run-ups are not allowed at night between 11 p.m. and 6 a.m., but they do occasionally occur. When that happens, Airport Operations personnel are authorized to shut the run-up down on the spot. According to Scott Tatro of the Environmental Management Bureau, abuse of the restriction may be turned over to the City Attorney's office for action in accordance with violations of the users operating agreement. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-5.3 regarding night run-up activity, and Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement.

PC03247 Schulz, Max None Provided

PC03247-1

Comment:

The noise of overhead planes has increased appreciably in the past year, especially at night, and every indication is that the LAX Master Plan would multiply that noise to an unacceptable decibel level. The effect on the desirability of living in Manhattan Beach will be to bring it closer to that of those communities - South Westchester & North El Segundo - immediately surrounding the airport.

Response:

LAWA will be pursuing Federal approval to restrict easterly takeoffs 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 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement, exceptions to the over-ocean procedures are available when weather of wind conditions require east traffic flow. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay. Please also see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC03248 Ortiz, Vilma None Provided

PC03248-1

Comment:

I live in the Westchester area and LA expansion would negatively affect my quality of life. This plan would increase noise and traffic in my neighborhood.

Response:

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

PC03248-2

Comment:

Also there is good reason to expect that LA expansion will negatively affect property values.

Response:

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

PC03248-3

Comment:

Most importantly this plan would negatively affect our sense of community.

Response:

Comment noted. Land use impacts were addressed in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting documentation provided in Technical Reports 1 and S-1. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC03248-4

Comment:

Please oppose LA 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.

PC03249

Reiser, Joseph

None Provided

PC03249-1

Comment:

I live near LAX - The increased noise has concerns for Adjacent home owners who live on Imperial Ave due increased planes taking off landing near Imperial Ave

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.

PC03250

Turner, Carol

None Provided

PC03250-1

Comment:

I am very strongly against expanding LAX. Palmdale and Ontario need to be enlarged and El Toro should certainly still be a valid consideration. I believe LAX has already been expanded beyond its capacity to continue to expand it seems to be an easy out for a lot of people.

Response:

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

PC03250-2

Comment:

The expansion of LAX would have a very negative effect on an already overstressed community and impact negatively on the surrounding cities.

Please do all in your power to stop that LAX expansion.

Response:

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

PC03251 **Matthes, Ruth** **None Provided**

PC03251-1

Comment:

The traffic in & around the airport is unbearable.

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.

PC03251-2

Comment:

Also the fall-out from planes must be bad for our lungs, because its terrible on the cars & windows.

Response:

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

PC03251-3

Comment:

Let Orange Co. have some of the mess. Palmdale would work also!

Response:

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

PC03252 Christian, Betty None Provided

PC03252-1

Comment:

I oppose the expansion of LAX because there are other nearby options; such as Palmdale and El Toro. It would also ease traffic in and around LAX if both of these areas were developed in to International airports. Also perhaps there is more suitable room for expansion at Ontario international.

Response:

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

PC03252-2

Comment:

Regardless I am very much against 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.

PC03253 Kopit, Sarah None Provided

PC03253-1

Comment:

I completely agree that LAX is busy enough, if expansion is needed it should happen at the regional airports outside LA.

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.

PC03254 Knight, Jim None Provided

PC03254-1

Comment:

LAX HAS NOT ACCOUNTED FOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS WITH A 45% INCREASE OF MAP SINCE THE LAST EIR WAS DONE AT 40 MAP. THIS IS IN VIOLATION OF CEQA, AS THERE ARE CLEARLY SERIOUS IMPACTS INCLUDING PUBLIC SAFETY ISSUES.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

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

PC03254-2

Comment:

THIS INCREASE IN AIR TRAFFIC CRAMMED INTO THIS TINY AIRPORT 1/10 SIZE OF DENVER IS SOLELY DRIVEN BY FINANCIAL INTERESTS OF CORP. AIRLINE CO'S AT THE EXPENSE OF QUALITY OF LIFE AND THE HEALTH OF THE SURROUNDING COMMUNITY. THIS MUST STOP! IT IS POOR PLANNING (IF ONE CAN CALL IT PLANNING AT ALL) AND NO "ECONOMIC ENGINE" SHOULD EVER OVERRIDE THE HEALTH AND SAFETY OF THE VERY CITIZENS IT PREPORS TO SERVE.

Response:

Comment noted. Human health impacts were addressed in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC03255 Grossman, Merle None Provided

PC03255-1

Comment:

I am already affected by take off patterns that are very different from just a few years ago - I live two blocks from the ocean in Manhattan Beach, and planes are so low flying they drown out all sound. I actually think are about to crash into my house.

Response:

With implementation of the LAX Master Plan, aircraft noise levels in the South Bay communities, including Manhattan Beach, would be much lower than those considered to be significant by all regulatory agencies. The area may be affected by noise from other airports, as well as ongoing modifications in air traffic routes out of LAX that are not related to the proposed Master Plan actions. For further information on this topic, please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1, regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay, and Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2 , regarding early turns over areas north and south of LAX.

PC03256 Garcia, Anthony None Provided

PC03256-1

Comment:

I AM AGAINST EXPANSION AND GROWTH OF LAX. THE HUMAN AND VEHICULAR CONGESTION WILL BECOME INTOLERABLE AND POLLUTION WILL BECOME ABOMINABLE. THE AREA IS ALREADY CONGESTED WITH INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL ENTERPRISE. IT IS ALSO OVERPOPULATED WITH RESIDENTIAL HOUSING. TRAFFIC ALREADY CRAWLS ALONG ITS THOROUGHFARES. GROWTH WILL BRING THINGS TO A STANDSTILL, CONGESTION WILL PREVAIL DAY AND NIGHT, POLLUTION WILL BE UNESCAPABLE.

Response:

Comment noted. 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; growth impacts in Section 4.5, Induced Socio-Economic Impacts (Growth Inducement), and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix E, 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.

PC03256-2

Comment:

LAX SHOULD ONLY BE ALLOWED TO MAKE CHANGES TO MEET AIRPORT DESIGN STANDARDS AND TO ENHANCE SAFETY. LAX SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO GROW!

Response:

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

PC03257

Echt, Sarah

None Provided

PC03257-1

Comment:

I'm so glad you're supporting a regional plan. There simply is no more room for growth at LAX. Travelers who have the option are already choosing smaller airports (Burbank, O.C. etc).

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.

PC03257-2

Comment:

I work in El Segundo. The 405 and 105 freeways are already extremely congested, and the resulting gridlock from LAX expansion would be unbelievable. Please try to put the additional capacity where it makes sense, not here.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC03258 **Byron, Carl** **None Provided** **6/21/2001**

PC03258-1

Comment:

I partially agree with your position re: the LAX master plan & the regional airport plan. I feel that both LAX & the regional airports need expansion and/or development. While some aspects of the LAX Master Plan need improving, reconsideration, revision & more public input, that airport should for the next decade be considered the primary international airport for the LA metro area - as such it requires urgent modifications as well as additions to its runways so that the existing air traffic at LAX can operate more safely & smoothly. I would be in favor of more development of the regional airports you cite, as well as increased funding for more efficient & state of the art expanded public ground transport to any & all airports throughout the region.

Response:

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

PC03259 **Basinger, Ryan** **None Provided**

PC03259-1

Comment:

I oppose the expansion of LAX because I believe it would greatly increase the traffic in my area as well as others and especially the 405 freeway. My area is bad enough. My neighbors and I are planning to have speed bumps on our streets because of all the people using our street as a pass-thru between La Tijera & Sepulveda.

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. Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways.

PC03259-2

Comment:

I believe the noise and pollution from the expansion would greatly increase as well. The skies are too congested with planes lining up to land.

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 safety impacts

3. Comments and Responses

in Section 4.24.3, Safety. 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-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety, Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase, and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PC03260 Tobias, Edna None Provided

PC03260-1

Comment:

I am a Hermosa Beach resident and homeowner who is totally in favor of the LAX expansion plan. In my opinion, it appears to boil down to safety vs. need for quiet. I choose safety first. The skies around LAX are dangerously over crowded. Expansion is the only answer. Frankly I do a lot of yearly international travel and flying in and out of L.A. would be more enjoyable if there weren't so many delays attributed to lack of airport accessibility both on and off the ground! I vote for doing the right thing--expanding LAX.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03261 Olney, June None Provided

PC03261-1

Comment:

We have enough noise and traffic problems now. To increase usage of LAX could only make it worse. Encourage air traffic into Palmdale, Ontario and/or 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. 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.

PC03262 Farasopoulos, Ashley None Provided

PC03262-1

Comment:

I definitely oppose the expansion of LAX. Traffic is already horrendous near the 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03262-2

Comment:

The sound would encroach further into areas that don't need any more noise such as El Segundo, Westchester and Playa Del Rey.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase. Please also see Response to Comment PC00499-01 regarding noise impacts on El Segundo, Westchester and Playa Del Rey.

PC03262-3

Comment:

These are nice communities that need to be preserved not wrecked by money hungry capitalists.

Response:

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

PC03263 Garcia, Maureen None Provided

PC03263-1

Comment:

The common sense approach is the regional approach. The South Bay & West Side are overly congested 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.

PC03264 McCarter, Dorothy & L.D. None Provided 6/12/2001

PC03264-1

Comment:

We share your position on a regional plan and support your efforts. At times the noise is very offensive.

Response:

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

PC03265 Develet, Jean None Provided

PC03265-1

Comment:

SHRINK the AIRPORT!!!

Response:

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

PC03265-2

Comment:

Having lived under the North runway for several years on Rindge in Playa Del Rey, I have firsthand knowledge of the noise pollution caused by LAX. At my residence all conversation stopped til the 4 engine jets left the area. The vibration & noise is totally intolerable.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. Regarding high noise levels on Rindge Avenue, to qualify for soundproofing, properties must be exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels. As shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S1 in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Rindge Avenue is located within the 1992 fourth quarter, 1996 baseline, and Year 2000 65 CNEL and greater noise contour. Also relative to single event noise levels that result in nighttime awakening (as established by the 94 dBA SEL noise contour), portions of Rindge Avenue are located within the 94 dBA SEL contour under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions, as shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the communities of Westchester/Playa del Rey, Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program, and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels. Please also see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 regarding existing high noise levels, and Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibrations.

PC03265-3

Comment:

I personally witnessed a heavily burdened 4 engine plane barely miss house tops as he proceeded toward the ocean down Ney St. He took several miles to ascend over the ocean above a few hundred feet. A disaster barely avoided.

Response:

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

PC03265-4

Comment:

As you indicated above LAX does not belong in LA. LAX belongs in the unpopulated northern deserts e.g. Mojave, Palmdale, etc., on 34,000+ acres.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03265-5

Comment:

High speed transit rail/bus should then transport passengers to/from LA. LAX should SHRINK not expand!

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC03265-6

Comment:

Here in Palos Verdes jets taking premature southern turns (instead of going out into the ocean) have caused significant noise recently.

Response:

The amount of noise to which any one area is exposed will vary based on the distribution of the traffic throughout the community. In the South Bay communities and Palos Verdes, aircraft noise levels associated with the project actions will be much lower than those considered to be significant by all regulatory agencies. The area may be effected by noise from other airports, as well as ongoing modifications in air traffic routes out of LAX that have nothing to do with the proposed Master Plan actions. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay and Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2 regarding early turns over areas north and south of LAX.

PC03266

Ando, Frances

None Provided

PC03266-1

Comment:

I do not want LAX expanded. Traffic in the area is bad enough as it is. Noise also is bad in neighborhoods.

Response:

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

PC03266-2

Comment:

I do not want more planes going in & out of LAX & feel all non-passenger flights should be moved to Palmdale even though costs would rise for us as consumers.

Response:

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

PC03267 Ward, Catherine None Provided

PC03267-1

Comment:

The traffic on P.C.H. is bad enough now, without adding more employees at the airport.

Response:

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

PC03267-2

Comment:

We need housing for affordable prices instead of parking at the airport.

Response:

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

PC03268 Woodley, Teresa None Provided

PC03268-1

Comment:

I live next to the airport and almost every airline is in violation of flying over the city of El Segundo and directly over the building I live in. I do not appreciate being woken up in the morning with planes fly-over at 5:00 am. I do not appreciate being woken up in the middle of the night with freight planes taking short cuts over my building!

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. The Master Plan 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 MM-N-5 and MM-LU-2 in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR). The commentor lives about as near the departure end of the south runway complex as possible, and well within the area eligible for sound insulation under all LAWA guidelines. Sound insulation programs are administered by the surrounding communities, and El Segundo has chosen not to participate. The conditions the commentor describes will continue throughout the length of the planning period. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC03268-2

Comment:

An increase in air traffic will drive me out of LA and into Nevada. I have lived in El Segund since the mid 1950's and have watched the airport grow and increase in polution, traffic and noise. Its time for other airports to expand and take responsibility for the citizens that live within their bounderies.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; and noise

3. Comments and Responses

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.

PC03268-3

Comment:

Maybe we should start to fine the pilots when they violate the city's airspace.

Response:

The use and control of airspace is preempted by the federal government. Please see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-7.5 regarding fines for violations of noise abatement procedures.

PC03269

**Uscolovsky,
Alexander**

**Humans Preservation &
Protection Fund**

7/29/2001

PC03269-1

Comment:

I support completely a regional plan to fairly distribute the benefits and burdens of air transportation across our region through a fair regional aviation system and thus avoid growth on the over-burdened LAX. However, to provide this regional aviation system is really practical, the reliable, effective, low-cost, and environmentally friendly ground transportation is crucial to reduce congestion and improve access to regional airports thus securing unconditional airport connectivity.

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.

PC03269-2

Comment:

Since the ground public transportation technologies now being used (light rail/subway and bus/shuttle) can hardly - or even if - meet this need because of either the use of the same congested highways by buses/shuttles or expensive and prolonged construction and troublesome maintenance of dedicated railways, we, small but energetic group of specialists consisting of Mr. Alexander Uscolovsky, Product Developer, and Ms. Lena Levinson, M.S., Transportation Engineer at Caltrans, submitted the proposal to LA County Board of Supervisors (Mr. Antonovich) to develop and implement the safe, environmentally friendly, and cost effective transportation alternative within the Los Angeles region.

Response:

Comment noted. Only proven transportation methods have been considered in the LAX Master Plan.

PC03269-3

Comment:

While relieving traffic congestion, air pollution, fuel consumption, and airport connectivity, this alternative offers cost effectiveness and the flexibility of the bus, as well as ridership appeal, travel time, and dependability of the dedicated rail owing to the use of passenger / cargo hovercrafts to connect any given destinations being located along the shoreline and the existing regional channel network, including but not limited to regional airports (LAX, Van Nuys, Burbank, John Wayne) and ports (San Pedro, Long Beach).

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03269-4

Comment:

Hovercrafts are vehicles which ride on the air cushion, whereby capable of high speed and comfortable riding. Great advantage of hovercrafts over conventional vessels is their being fully amphibious vehicles which are best applied to any relatively flat drying or shallow routes not requiring any infrastructure like dredged channels, docks, piers, etc. Namely such kind of routes is provided by existing channel network of Los Angeles. Therefore, hovercrafts should be ideal transportation alternative under these unique conditions of the Los Angeles region. Moreover, the confined cross section of the existing channels should promote effective protection against the vehicle's engine noise and enhance the hovercraft's efficiency due to reduction of scattering air pressure out from beneath the vehicle.

While having high performance, hovercrafts are distinctively environmentally friendly and safe, because: their excessive air pressure amounts insignificant figure (about 1 - 2 % of atmospheric one) and, while very unlikely to occur at all, they can hover over animals and birds causing no harm to them; their lower levels of noise are fairly mild so that wading birds often feed within meters of the hovercraft's routes; dedicated track (channels) and soft skirt together with air cushion produce bouncing instead of crash in very seldom collisions, thus providing with extreme safety proved by hovercraft 's exceptional safe record.

Response:

Comment noted. Only proven transportation methods have been considered in the development of the LAX Master Plan.

PC03269-5

Comment:

Commuter service into city centers (Downtown), regional airports (LAX, Burbank, Van Nuys, John Wayne), and to remote communities (say, Oxnard, Malibu, Santa Ana-Anaheim, Irvine, etc.), usual for the Los Angeles region, can be the most effective application of this hovercraft technology. Passengers of hovercrafts will enjoy cushioned comfortable ride at low levels of noise emissions, high speed, ultimate safety, assured dependability, and clean air of dedicated waterways, while being taken from remote locations directly to their destinations, including transfer from airports and tourist centers.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03269-6

Comment:

Thus there is an acute current need to develop the general design of the cost effective, safe, and environmentally friendly public transportation alternative for the Los Angeles region based on hovercraft technology to demonstrate its technical and economical merit and feasibility, and the possibility, within the resources and capabilities of Southern California to bring this alternative from the concept into the use. The need might be met through creating a task team within the Southern California Regional Airport Authority for developing the preliminary general design of the proposed transportation alternative and concurrently coordinating the cooperation with appropriate governmental agencies involved as well as private enterprises like our Humans Preservation and Protection Fund just recently established and being in need of funding.

Response:

Comment noted. Only proven transportation methods have been considered in the development of the LAX Master Plan.

PC03270

Sinay, Kia

None Provided

6/19/2001

PC03270-1

Comment:

Thank you for your interest in the impact of the proposed LAX expansion and the critical and detrimental effects it would have for our community.

We recently purchased a home in the Playa del Rey community overlooking the wetlands, a natural preserve for the white egrets, the blue herons, the variety of the hawk family.

Response:

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

PC03270-2

Comment:

Currently, we hear the noise of the airport from early morning hours until late evening, with jet noise incessantly.

Response:

Comment noted. Aircraft noise mitigation is 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 are 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 provides mitigation measures for aircraft noise in Sections 4.1.8 and 4.2.8. For more information on noise impacts on Playa del Rey, see Response to Comment PC00499-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 regarding existing and future noise levels.

PC03270-3

Comment:

Congestion from traffic on the 105 Westbound Freeway to exit for the airport (at Sepulveda - North) is present continuously.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment PC01838-1. Please see Response to Comment PC01838-1.

PC03270-4**Comment:**

The beach in Playa del Rey is plagued so severely with air traffic that my husband and I must travel south to enjoy the beauty and serenity of the coast.

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). As described in Topical Response TR-LU-2 noise levels over the Playa del Rey community would decrease under all of the build alternatives compared to 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions, with the greatest decrease projected to occur under Alternative D. For more information on noise impacts on Playa del Rey, see Response to Comment PC00499-1

PC03270-5**Comment:**

Permitting the proposed LAX expansion would increase airport traffic in and out of the airport (increase in travelers, and employees), congesting Sepulveda and the 105 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. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts. Please also see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways.

PC03270-6**Comment:**

increase the jet noise overhead at the beach and in our home;

Response:

LAWA will be pursuing Federal approval to restrict easterly takeoffs circling back to the west on their departures to Asia 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-6 regarding noise increase, exceptions to the over-ocean procedures are available when weather of wind conditions require east traffic flow. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding South Bay overflow by new routes. Please see Response to Comment PC00499-01 regarding noise impacts on Playa Del Rey.

PC03270-7**Comment:**

destroy the natural home for so many species of wildlife in the wetlands.

Response:

There are no natural wetlands within the Airport Operations Area (AOA) or the Los Angeles/EI Segundo Dunes. Of the 52 ephemeral wetted areas within the AOA evaluated for the presence of wetland soils,

3. Comments and Responses

hydrology, and vegetation, none of these sites were characterized by hydric soils or wetland vegetation. Nine (equivalent to 1.3 acres) of the 52 ephemerally wetted areas, those containing cysts of the Riverside fairy shrimp, were determined to be atypical wetlands pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. These ephemerally wetted areas are not natural wetlands, but rather the result of construction activities, such as borrow and fill, in support of airport operations and expansion since 1950. As was described in Section 4.11, Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, direct and/or indirect impacts to the 1.3 acres of ephemerally wetted soils containing cysts of the Riverside fairy shrimp shall be mitigated to below the level of significance with implementation of mitigation measure MM-ET-1. In addition, as was described in Section 4.10, Biotic Communities, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, direct and/or indirect impacts to ephemerally wetted areas occupied by the western spadefoot toad shall be mitigated to below the level of significance with implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-BC-4.

PC03270-8

Comment:

These are all detrimental and negative impacts that could be averted.

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.

PC03270-9

Comment:

We would also suffer a decrease in our property value; a decrease in our value and quality of life in this community; decrease the beauty of one of the nations last remaining wetlands and wildlife preservations, all due to the proposed expansion of LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed impacts to endangered and threatened species in 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 TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on 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.

PC03270-10

Comment:

Please help us to save our home, our community, our wetlands and wildlife preserve. We so desperately need your support and assistance in deterring the proposed LAX expansion.

I urge you to drive through our neighborhood and see the signs posted in protest of the proposed LAX expansion. To listen to the families, the residents of our community would mean preventing the proposed expansion of LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed impacts to surrounding land use and biological resources and wetlands in Section 4.2, Land Use, Section 4.10, Biotic Communities, and Section 4.12, Wetlands. Supporting technical analyses and data are provided in Appendix E, Appendix J, Technical Report 1, and Technical Report 7 of the Draft EIS/EIR, and in Appendix S-H and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that

3. Comments and Responses

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

PC03271 Rothrock, Lawrence None Provided

7/7/2001

PC03271-1

Comment:

The LAX Master Plan is a plan of intolerable congestion particularly surface traffic, noise pollution, etc. The surface traffic flow problem, i.e., passenger arrival/departure is the center of this situation. Adding runways will not help. Modernizing this situation with increased double decking, mass movement devices for transiting people could help but at great expense. Adding runways only compounds the situation.

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Regarding improved mass transit options, the new Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, Alternative D, which is analyzed in detail in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, incorporates remote passenger parking with people mover systems, which eliminates the need for a Ring Road nor a western passenger entrance from Pershing Drive. In addition, the Green Line is proposed to be extended north to provide access to LAX.

PC03271-2

Comment:

The best solution is to expand the passenger handling capacity at BUR, ONT, SNA, with some assistance through commuter lines out of SMO, VNY, LGB, TOA, and RIV.

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.

PC03271-3

Comment:

I have listened to a presentation of the proposed LAX Master Plan, courtesy of membership in the Aero Club of Southern California. In addition, I have been a licensed commercial pilot with multi-engine and IFR capability and have been operating a single engine aircraft under AARTC control since 1966. For 43 years, I was employed in Flight Test Operations, both administrative and operational, at Northrop Grumman Corporation.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03272 Reardon, Philip None Provided 6/19/2001

PC03272-1

Comment:

Everyone that is breathing knows about the current traffic situation on the West Side of Southern California.

Airport expansion must go to the areas where population is expanding.

Response:

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

PC03272-2

Comment:

The combination of Playa Vista and LAX expansions is a disaster waiting to happen.

Response:

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

PC03272-3

Comment:

From my experience (with a different project) the EIR treated the traffic problem with benign words that disguised the true scope of the problem.

I believe an expose' of the LAX EIR mitigation may be a good point of attack.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03273 Paul, Howard None Provided 8/7/2001

PC03273-1

Comment:

I am writing this letter to encourage you to put an end to any Federal Funding that could go towards the funding of the expansion of LAX. I am familiar with many of the developments that make it seem that the expansion will not be approved. I am also aware of some things that are unethical if not possibly illegal in the effort by the Department of Airports (D.O.A.) to get the Master Plan completed. You'll notice I used the word completed, not approved.

Several years ago I was playing golf with a woman and the conversation turned toward the LAX Master Plan. Having been to several meetings about it I voiced my opposition to the plan and she told me that

3. Comments and Responses

she was an attorney for the D.O.A. She further told me that at a recent meeting Jack Driscoll stated, "The plan was going to happen. It was just a matter of how much it was going to cost." This is a strange comment considering the long and lengthy process that was ahead of the D.O.A. before the plan could be approved. The Environmental Impact Study hadn't even been completed yet! Here are the reasons I believe Jack Driscoll made this comment.

- 1) The city/D.O.A. has continued to purchase land east of the airport where the extended runways would go if the plan were approved.
- 2) The D.O.A. has recently completed the widening of a taxiway, which required the widening of the underpass on Sepulveda Blvd. Also part of the Master Plan.
- 3) I have heard from other people that the plan is to continue the expansion piece by piece and not call it a Master Plan.

Response:

Acquisition currently underway east of the airport is being conducted independently of the Master Plan. The taxiway widening referred to by the commentor was not included in any of the Master Plan build alternatives. Rather, the project was a capital improvement project planned, approved, and constructed independent of the Master Plan. The City of Los Angeles has not, and is not legally able to, implement components of the Master Plan until the Los Angeles City Council certifies the Final EIS/EIR and approves one of the alternatives, makes written findings, and adopts a statement of overriding considerations, and the FAA issues a Record of Decision.

PC03273-2

Comment:

Has anyone looked at the last expansion plan and reviewed the result? Since I moved here in 1987 I had to do this and found some interesting things that go to the lack of creditability of the D.O.A.

- 1) The expansion plan called for the land on 3 holes of the Westchester Golf Course to be used for the LAX expansion. The course would be redesigned with the 3 holes replaced. Westchester Golf Course is still a 15 Hole Golf Course some 20 years later!

Response:

Under Alternatives A, B, and C the existing Westchester Golf Course would be expanded by 6 acres, providing the opportunity to add three additional holes.

PC03273-3

Comment:

- 2) The expansion plan called for a light rail system to go into LAX. Twenty years later there is no light rail into LAX. When I pursued the answer to why I found out that after the plan was approved a study was done that found people would not use the train because their baggage would fall or lean up against their legs. I find this to be strange. If this reason was justification for not putting the light rail system in then why was the light rail system kept as part of the expansion plan? Was the report actually done before the expansion was approved and released the plan was approved because it had a negative impact on the expansion?

Response:

Although past studies may have indicated that people would not use transit due to luggage concerns, future technology and transit car design may allow for easy transport of luggage. As a result, it was concluded that a transit component would be appropriate to include in the analysis, even though the percent of passengers assumed to use rail was kept conservatively low in the analysis. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03273-4

Comment:

Now that it is clear that there is a creditability issue it brings me to ask these questions.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC03273-5

Comment:

1) Did the Environmental Impact Report (E.I.R.) reflect the traffic impact including the Play Vista Project traffic projections? If so, how do we know for sure?

Response:

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

PC03273-6

Comment:

2) Did the E.I.R. include all the significant expansions and repopulation of office space in the area? For example, just south of LAX on Sepulveda Blvd., several high-rise office buildings have been renovated or are in the process of being renovated. Many of these buildings are not yet fully rented.

3) Did the E.I.R. include the traffic from the 2,200 new homes that have been proposed by Boeing to be built on adjacent land to Long Beach Municipal Airport? Imagine the congestion around the Long Beach Municipal Airport, the 405 / 605 junction, and the 405 / 710 junction with this housing development and the increased traffic from the proposed LAX expansion.

4) Did the E.I.R. take into consideration the impact on traffic that the unofficial "Alameda Corridor" project would add? This unofficial part of the LAX Master Plan is to use the area along the 105 freeway to be developed into a light industry area for businesses that require warehousing and office space combinations. This plan as reported in the newspapers would create \$15 - \$20 per hour jobs. This is a good thing, but has anybody considered where these \$32,000 - \$42,000 a year employees will live? With this income they will be forced to seek homes to the east and northeast. This will put an even higher load on the traffic flow and roadway infrastructure. Has this been factored in? If so where?

Response:

All "related projects" were coordinated closely with surrounding jurisdictions and transportation agencies. That is, all planned development projects from each area jurisdiction were accounted for in the analysis, together with the traffic generation characteristics (including employees) for each. This was explained in detail in Technical Report 3b of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03273-7

Comment:

The bottom line is any further expansion of LAX makes no sense except for the City of Los Angeles and a few developers. An expansion of LAX will help bring tax money in to the City of Los Angeles and huge profits to the developers on the inside track. The entire region will suffer from the over congestion caused by the proposed Master Plan expanding LAX. There are good solutions out there. We need only to look. This will only happen when the talk of expanding LAX is over. I urge you to get Congress to agree not to fund the LAX Master Plan. Then, and only then will we be able to take a rational and focused approach to solving the needs of Southern California's future air traffic 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. 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-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

**PC03274 Norcross, JoAnn & None Provided
 Robert**

PC03274-1

Comment:

PLEASE SEE ENCLOSED LETTER

My wife and I are strongly opposed to the proposed LAX Master Plan for the following reasons:

Response:

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

PC03274-2

Comment:

Traffic

Even at the present level of passenger traffic at LAX, Sepulveda, Century, Imperial and Lincoln Blvds are barely able to handle surface traffic particularly at peak travel times. Any significant increase in passenger traffic at LAX could result in frequent GRIDLOCK forcing more street traffic into surrounding neighborhood streets in order to move at all. Altho we agree with developing a perimeter road around LAX and extending the light rail into the airport (where it should have been in the first place) this couldn't come close to solving the traffic congestion.

A related issue is traffic around the interior double decked airport roads. I would suggest members of the FAA try personally driving around those roads at current peak times and attempt to drop off or pick other FAA "passengers". Again this is at present levels of passenger 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. Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or the Ring Road.

PC03274-3

Comment:

Noise and Pollution

The families in Inglewood, Hawthorne, El Segundo, Playa del Rey and Westchester have for many years borne the brunt of the noise and pollution of LAX. They have benefited by some reforms with quieter and less polluting modern jets but this trend would be reversed by an increase in take off and landings. This would be completely unfair to those living and doing business in the area.

3. Comments and Responses

We are firmly in favor of a regional plan for air transportation 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. 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.

PC03275

Lamothe, Rae

None Provided

6/9/2001

PC03275-1

Comment:

I received your recent mailer. I am writing to let you know that as a resident of Playa del Rey I support the modernization and expansion of LAX.

The airport has not been improved or modernized since the 1984 Olympics. Unfortunately, LAX is a rather dismal gateway to our fine city. The surface transportation has reached near grid lock, with no end in sight. There is no reason to believe that the passenger volume will decrease anytime soon.

Given the fact that Los Angeles will continue to be desirable as a destination, how can we best capitalize on our success? My review of the Draft EIR indicates that the proposed ring road and extension of the green line to LAX are a great start to alleviating the present and future congestion. The addition of a terminal on the west end of the property will also assist in the redistribution of the passenger and automobile traffic.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03275-2

Comment:

Many of the arguments I heard in opposition to the LAX Master Plan are illogical at best. The suggestion that we divert air traffic to Ontario and Palmdale is unrealistic. When was the last time you flew out of Ontario? When was the last time an overseas tourist was destined for Lancaster? The Venice Boardwalk remains the #1 tourist attraction in Southern California. I operate a business in Santa Monica, and trust me, my clients are not interested in flying out of Ontario, John Wayne or anywhere other than LAX. Despite the incentives offered by LAWA, the public simply is not willing to travel in land. Although the population in the Inland Empire is increasing in leaps and bounds, it does not follow that passenger volume is increasing in a similar pattern. Passenger demand is still predominantly generated from Downtown to the Westside. Westside business needs a modern, efficient airport.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00025-3.

PC03275-3

Comment:

The argument that an expansion at LAX will double the volume of cargo is equally flawed. The majority of cargo arrives in the bellies of passenger flights. The assertion that an increase in cargo volume will mean an increase in the number of large cargo planes at night is simply wrong. LAX could easily accommodate a two fold increase in cargo craft with no improvements. Cargo carriers do not need the

3. Comments and Responses

surface improvements recommended by the LAX Master Plan. My clients, colleagues and neighbors do. Cargo carriers already perform much of their work at night, when the roads are relatively empty.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC00025-4; please refer to Response to Comment PC00025-4.

PC03275-4

Comment:

Last but not least, the Master Plan includes a new 18 hole golf course. The present 15 hole course is among the most used public courses in the State. A full 18 hole course plus an additional 9 hole course on the water would be a wonderful asset for Westchester and Playa del Rey.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00025-5.

PC03276 Streets, Bob None Provided

PC03276-1

Comment:

Attached is a copy of the letter I sent to LA.W.A. with my comments on the expansion plan for L.A.X. I was amazed that they provided no facility to email comments. I suppose they just want to make it more difficult to make comments. Thank you for your efforts.

Response:

Comment noted. The attachment referred to by the commentor is identical to comment letter PC00150; please see responses to comment letter PC00150.

PC03276-2

The attachment included as part of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00150; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC00150.

PC03277 Black, Deborah None Provided

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00157; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC00157.

PC03278 Lindner, Dorothy None Provided 6/16/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00534; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC00534.

PC03279 Bahr, Corena None Provided

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00540; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC00540.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03280 Meyer, Cherrill None Provided 6/18/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00547; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC00547;

PC03281 Lindstrom, Dean & Margie None Provided 7/25/2001

PC03281-1

Comment:

Enclosed are the comments on the LAX Expansion Plan that we submitted. Long before the LAX expansion is completed, it will be obvious that growth at Palmdale, Ontario and Riverside will be necessary. That is where the population and business growth will take place during the next 15 to 20 years. So then we will spend many more billions in addition to the \$12 billion spent at LAX. It just doesn't make good sense.

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.

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.

PC03281-2

Comment:

We appreciate the work you are doing to make this a sensible and cost effective regional development. Incidentally, when you had the AARP sponsored debate in Torrance, I was the person that asked what you would do in Congress to have an impact on the LAX expansion. I would say that you have gone beyond your statements that night.

Response:

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

PC03281-3

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 at 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.

PC03281-4

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 living in Westchester. The time required for people from north and south of LAX already is excessive; the expansion will compound. 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.

PC03281-5

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:

Comment noted. Please see 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, 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.

PC03281-6

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:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC01684-4; please refer to Response to Comment PC01684-4.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03281-7

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.

PC03281-8

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.

PC03281-9

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:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC01684-7; please refer to Response to Comment PC01684-7.

PC03281-10

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 you. 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 content of this comment is identical to comment PC01684-8; please refer to Response to Comment PC01684-8.

PC03281-11

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 and safe plan for air transportation growth.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC03281-1.

PC03281-12

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.

PC03281-13

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.

PC03282

**Graves, Nancy &
Wayne**

None Provided

7/29/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC01822; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC01822.

PC03283

Halpine, Susana

None Provided

7/31/2001

PC03283-1

Comment:

As a resident of Playa del Rey and hopeful future homeowner in the Westchester area, I very much appreciate your efforts to stop the LAX Master Plan. However, I am very concerned that the basic tenets of the Plan will be implemented under the new guise of "Modernization."

3. Comments and Responses

According to the LA Times article, "Regional Airports Likely Destination for LAX Overflow," many of the objectionable aspects of the proposed LAX expansion will take place in the name of "Modernization." (7/26/01, C1) And Westchester would still take the brunt of the expansion.

For example, the northern runway will move North, the ring road extension of the 405 will run along a residential area, and the travelers will increase to 89 MAP, which in turn raises the noise level and air pollutants. Aren't these the same unhealthy and unacceptable changes to our community that the Master Plan is proposing?

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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the role of the LAX Master Plan 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. Alternative D does not include the Ring Road or relocation of Runway 6L/24R.

PC03283-2

Comment:

I, of course, understand there are very serious safety issues currently at LAX that must be addressed. On the other hand, Long Beach, John Wayne, Burbank, and the proposed El Toro airports all have caps on the number of flights. Why can't similar caps be implemented on LAX?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01018-29 regarding the authority of the FAA and LAWA to limit future activity at airports. The existing capacity limits and policy constraints at Long Beach Airport, John Wayne Airport, and Burbank Airport, as described in Chapter 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR, were in effect prior to enactment of legislation that essentially precludes airport capacity limits. The existing capacity limits at those airports were "grandfathered" and remain in effect today. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC03283-3

Comment:

I urge you to stop the proposed expansion of LAX, whether its called the "Master Plan" or "Modernization."

Response:

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

PC03284

McAllister, Violet

None Provided

PC03284-1

Comment:

You ask how would we? We are now being subjected to all of the above.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03284-2**Comment:**

But in particular NOISE. We can no longer enjoy the coveted Calif outdoor living.

Response:

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

PC03284-3**Comment:**

One prays for the marine layer to come in as it seems to alleviate some of the noise. It is almost unbearable when the Santa Ana Condition occurs. Come down & hear for yourself. It is unbelievable & this is a constant noise with take offs & landings.

Response:

Comment noted. Weather does play a role in the perception of noise. When the Santa Ana conditions are in effect, the wind tends to blow from the north and east thus carrying noise. The commentor is a resident of El Segundo and is located near grid point H03. For specific forecasted noise levels see Section 5, Location Impact Analysis, in Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided additional noise impact information in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use.

PC03284-4**Comment:**

PLEASE I would like the same compassion for El Segundo & all the other affected communities as was shown to the few (by comparison) residents of LA who were disturbed by leaf blowers. They were disturbed an hour a week, but the council felt so sorry for them that they banned leaf Blowers.

If only LA had half of that compassion & feel for us who live constantly with this problem.

Response:

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

PC03284-5**Comment:**

El Segundo is a very nice family oriented community. It was here before LA expansion starting with Mines Field but little by little it has encroached upon us. Especially when it expanded to the West of Sepulveda & then building the longest runway to the South closest to El Segundo.

I have lived in my house a long time, this is my HOME. My husband was born in El Segundo. My 5 children schooled here. I would hate to be forced out because of an ever-rising unhealthy environment.

Response:

Comment noted. Human health impacts were addressed in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03285 Kasabian, George None Provided

PC03285-1

Comment:

WE LIVE NEAR LAX & THE NOISE & TRAFFIC HAS INCREASED LATELY. THE INLAND AREAS & ORANGE COUNTIES SHOULD HAVE THEIR OWN LARGE 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-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, 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.

PC03286 Stassi, Loretta None Provided

PC03286-1

Comment:

Please do not expand LAX. I am a senior and find life getting harder each day.

Response:

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

PC03286-2

Comment:

Rarely do I drive since the traffic on PCH is frightening even now.

Response:

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

PC03286-3

Comment:

On still nights the sound of the jets robs me of much needed sleep.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC03287 Atencio, Carmen None Provided

PC03287-1

Comment:

I live in the City of El Segundo, a family community. We have enough pollution, we are between the refinery and LAX. The noise is annoyed. No money in the world could buy the health of my family. I do not support the LAX Master Plan.

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

PC03288 Halley, Charles None Provided

PC03288-1

Comment:

There's no way that LAX can or should grow enough to handle the expected increases in air travel volume. The regional airports should get the money and flights to service their local populations.

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.

PC03288-2

Comment:

As a resident of Torrance, equidistance between LAX and Long Beach, I'd love to be able to take more flights from the Long Beach airport.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02771-3 regarding the use of the Long Beach Airport.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03289 Gibbon, Barry None Provided

PC03289-1

Comment:

It seems absurd to funnel more traffic into an already jammed area. The benefits of regional airports will allow the city to grow in a far more reaching way.

Do not expand LAX.

Response:

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

PC03290 Tanzola, Carolyn None Provided

PC03290-1

Comment:

The plans are all a joke & no doubt unstoppable now. This unfair growth burden on LAX (& Westchester) is a criminal act on the "victims" who have lived here since 1962, in particular. Again, the rights of the little people are ignored in the name of "progress," & government revenues (for LA here now). The airport did it before, & now it will do it again! It all seems so hopeless to me, especially knowing how government has worked during the "Clinton administration of neglect and lying corruption for eight years" at the Federal level.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC03291 Jones, Patricia None Provided

PC03291-1

Comment:

The traffic is maxed out already. The off ramp to the airport often has a long line.

Response:

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

PC03291-2

Comment:

The owners around El Toro don't want to accept the fact that some of the airport passengers & traffic must go from Orange Co.

Response:

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

PC03291-3

Comment:

If better control of noise & pollution from aircraft was enforced perhaps other areas would have fewer objections. Other cities main airports are far out of the city.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement and Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding air quality mitigation. The main airports of a great majority of the other major cities in the United States are located within their built-up urban areas and their surrounding communities experience the same problems and concerns as are experienced around LAX. Examples of such cities are Chicago, Atlanta, New York, San Francisco, Boston, Seattle, and Miami.

PC03292

Babior, Lauren

None Provided

PC03292-1

Comment:

- of course expansion is ABSURD. Last week it took me 25 minutes to get from the entrance of L.A.X. to American Airlines Arrivals. Then it took me 35 minutes to exit the airport.

Please help!!

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03293

Latimer, James

None Provided

PC03293-1

Comment:

The only concern I have is traffic congestion.

Response:

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

Response:

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

PC03296 Distaso, Theresa None Provided

PC03296-1

Comment:

As a South Bay resident the LAX Master Plan would negatively affect my life as far as traffic is concerned. Traffic in Manhattan Beach, especially on Rosecrans due to recent development, is already very heavy and this would only make things worse.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00557-3 regarding traffic on Rosecrans Avenue and I-105. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC03296-2

Comment:

People in Orange & Riverside counties need decent size airports to alleviate some of this congestion.

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.

PC03297 Kelber, Jeff None Provided

PC03297-1

Comment:

I agree that a regional airport plan is a much better idea than further expansion of LAX. I and my family live in Manhattan Beach, so obviously for our quality of life we'd prefer not to have the added pollution, noise, & traffic that expansion would include. The airport has no economic impact on me, & I don't feel that the viability of Manhattan Beach depends on the airport either.

Thank you for opposing further 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 and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. The

3. Comments and Responses

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.

PC03298 **Carlier, Paul & Michele** **None Provided**

PC03298-1

Comment:

WE ARE AGAINST THE LAX MASTER PLAN!

LAX AND A LARGE AREA AROUND IT ARE ALREADY CHOCKED UP. WE LIVE IN NORTH TORRANCE. WE EXPERIENCE NOISE, AIR POLLUTION & TRAFFIC CONGESTION, BECAUSE OF PREVIOUS LAX ENLARGEMENTS/IMPROVEMENTS. WE DO NOT NEED MORE.

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.

PC03298-2

Comment:

THE PALMDALE AIRPORT HAS BEEN BUILT (SUPPOSINGLY) TO RESOLVE THE PROBLEMS WE HAVE NOW AND THOSE IN THE FUTURE. LET US USE IT!

Response:

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

PC03299 **Parker, Frances** **None Provided**

PC03299-1

Comment:

The South Bay area is quite densely populated already & more homes & offices are being added constantly. Ex, Grant Ave. in Redondo Beach 1 church property sold - 12-16 town homes built.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-137 regarding growth inducement impacts associated with the LAX Master Plan alternatives.

PC03299-2

Comment:

Pollution - more people, more planes,=more toxic fumes,

Response:

Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-2 regarding toxic air pollutants.

PC03299-3

Comment:

Economics - more power, higher costs for utilities, roads, possible power blackouts.

Response:

The impacts of the LAX Master Plan alternatives on utility systems were addressed in Section 4.25, Public Utilities, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03299-4

Comment:

The Air Force has given an air force base to the City of San Bernardino. There are control tower, runways & maintenance facilities already in place. This airport is less likely to be closed by fog. It can serve LA & Orange County when these areas are fogged in as well as Mountain and desert areas and resorts in these areas.

Response:

Comment noted. Use of San Bernardino International Airport is more thoroughly discussed in Chapter I, Air Transportation in the Los Angeles Region, located in the Draft LAX Master Plan. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC03300 Jacobson, Jean None Provided

PC03300-1

Comment:

So many more planes coming & going if they expand, is sure to cause accidents. We have been lucky so far. Don't ask for trouble by expanding.

Response:

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

PC03301 Ware, III, Myra None Provided

PC03301-1

Comment:

In my opinion, according to the above projections Denver does meet the need. It would build out an airport in the region that is eager for growth and it sounds like common sense to me.

Who could pass up \$98 billion to their region. This regional approach is good. What do I think? LAX is to busy now. Denver has more acres, Price Tag is cheaper, good location because of noise.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03302 Richter, Fern None Provided

PC03302-1

Comment:

The traffic situation is a big problem - Lincoln, Sepulveda and La Tijera are only streets leading out of Westchester and are overloaded now - what will happen when or if the Airport expands and Playa Vista is finished?

Response:

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

PC03302-2

Comment:

Also the pollution now is so bad - my window sills and patio is black & greasy from the planes - I'm a 55 yr resident!

Response:

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

PC03303 Raad, M. None Provided

PC03303-1

Comment:

We oppose airport expansion. We already have terrible pollution from the airport from the fumes & 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, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding fumes. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC03303-2

Comment:

The freeways & streets are not equipped to handle more traffic. Not to mention the impact of Playa Vista on congestion.

Response:

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

PC03304

Calof, Arlene

None Provided

PC03304-1

Comment:

Other areas should divide the responsibility of having increased air traffic.

Response:

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

PC03304-2

Comment:

I live in Palos Verdes, looking out toward the ocean. More air traffic would bring more noise (day & night.)

Response:

Number of Design Day Operations associated with the four build alternatives in 2015 ranges from 2,279 for Alternative D to 2,319 for Alternative C to 2,719 for Alternatives A and B. Environmental baseline Design Day Operations were 2,235. On average, the flights will be individually quieter than they were in 1996, but they may be more frequent. The amount of noise to which any one area is exposed will vary based on the distribution of the traffic throughout the community. In the South Bay communities and Manhattan Beach, aircraft noise levels associated with the project actions will be much lower than those considered to be significant by all regulatory agencies. The area may be effected by noise from other airports, as well as ongoing modifications in air traffic routes out of LAX that have nothing to do with the proposed Master Plan actions. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.3 regarding more traffic means more noise.

PC03304-3

Comment:

There would be more pollution if fuel is dumped before landing.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC03304-4

Comment:

More danger of crashes.

Response:

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

PC03304-5

Comment:

My property value would probably go down.

Response:

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

PC03305 Shenouda, Romel None Provided

PC03305-1

Comment:

The LAX Airport is already extremely busy and the traffic is horrible between 11 AM to 8 PM. The parking is very hard to find, and it just seems like the airport is moving toward bad conditions.

Response:

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

PC03305-2

Comment:

The new plan would bring even more noise, traffic, and pollution to our comfortable 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; 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.

PC03305-3

Comment:

Ontario should be opened as an international airport as well as Palmdale. This would relieve us here.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC03305-4

Comment:

I strongly disagree with the LAX Master Plan!

Response:

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

PC03306 McManis, Kevin None Provided

PC03306-1

Comment:

The LAX Master Plan clearly overburdens the west side of LA with more noise, traffic, and pollution. My wife and I strongly oppose the Plan. We should enact a regional airport plan that addresses growth in outlying areas of LA. If this plan is enacted, our quality of life will worsen to the point where we will probably leave the State of California. Please find another more reasonable alternative!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; 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.

PC03307 Priest, Thomas None Provided

PC03307-1

Comment:

First of all, thanks for your involvement on this issue. Secondly, I have just one question for LAX planners...Why does ANY cargo come into LAX?? Ontario is the logical location for cargo terminals, w/ all the trucking & railways out there...w/ no cargo @ LAX, passenger traffic could increase

Response:

Comment noted. Please Section 4.3.2, Cargo Demand, located in Chapter I, Air Transportation in the Los Angeles Region, of the Draft LAX Master Plan. Also please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC03307-2

Comment:

and there would be little appreciable expansion needed @ LAX. Simply RE-DESIGN the Imperial Highway corridor & call it good enough! Net traffic would be about the same (I'm guessing....)

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 for a discussion of 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.

PC03308

Repaich, Margaret

None Provided

6/12/2001

PC03308-1

Comment:

The Lax Master Plan, It is unnecessary , we all ready have far to much Traffic, Pollution and noise. I see nothing wrong with air traffic being routed to Palmdale. Why are you trying to force this on us? Are you thinking of us or is it greed? We people that live in L.A. pay Tax upon Tax every time we turn around, its time we should get some consideration on what we want. No expansion on the Air Port.

Response:

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

PC03309

Blades, Frank

None Provided

PC03309-1

Comment:

CONGESTION IN AND AROUND LAX WILL NOT BE SOLVED BY EXPANSION. THE SOLUTION TO THE PROBLEM IN MY OPINION IS THE UTILIZATION OF AF PLANT 42 (PALMDALE) TO SERVE NORTH LA COUNTY AND PARTS OF SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY AND THE EL TORO MARINE AIR STATION TO SERVE ORANGE AND PARTS OF RIVERSIDE AND SAN DIEGO COUNTYS.

Response:

Comment noted. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC03309-2

Comment:

A RAILWAY RIGHT OF WAY EXISTS BETWEEN PALMDALE AND LA UNION STATION. THIS COULD BE EXPANDED AND WITH HIGH SPEED TRAINS, ALA JAPAN, THE TRIP BETWEEN THE PALMDALE AIRPORT AND DOWNTOWN WOULD BE SOMEWHERE WITHIN A 35 TO 45 MINUTE RIDE. THINK ABOUT IT!

Response:

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

PC03310 Harrington, John None Provided

PC03310-1

Comment:

I'm trusting Jane Harman to vote the right way!

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03311 King, Robert None Provided

PC03311-1

Comment:

We will be adversely affect by the LAX Master Plan in several ways.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC03311-2

Comment:

(1) Noise - though noise is an issue presently - it is only the reversing of runways or an occasional loud plane that disturbs us. We investigated this before moving into our Airplane Home. However, the Master Plan shows a runway extension over Sepulveda Blvd. This extension will place aircraft on the runway parallel to our home - we look at a house in a location that is similar (under the current footprint) and the outside noise was unbearable. The house had sound proofing but the outside deck noise was so loud you could not hold a conversation.

Response:

The commentor is correct in identifying that the runway extension to 24R may increase noise impacts on his residence. At LAX Runway 24R in the north airfield complex is extended to the east under all four development alternatives (Alternative A-D) to provide comparable takeoff length for heavy aircraft that are currently available on the runways in the south airfield complex. The length of runway remaining west of the current runway end (between 9,050 and 9,350 feet, dependent upon the alternative) is adequate for most narrow-body and many wide-body aircraft takeoffs. These aircraft could be assigned takeoffs from the existing runway end and aircraft requiring longer takeoff rolls could be assigned the full length, but this is not a formal recommended noise abatement measure. In no manner does this equate to the use of the runway by two departing aircraft at the same time - it merely reduced the taxi length for some aircraft that can safely depart short of the full runway length. This measure was more fully evaluated in Section 7.2, Alternative Specific Abatement Opportunities, of Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 3.1.6, Alternative D Noise Mitigation, of Appendix S-C1, Supplement Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The commentor's residence is located between grid point I07 and J07 where the CNEL levels would increase between 0.2 and 4.4 decibels as shown in Table S-13, Regular and Special Grid Point Assessment - Aircraft CNEL, under the various alternatives when compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative. For specific forecasted noise levels see Section 5., Location Impact Analysis, identified 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. Additionally, please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels, Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and the related Appendices 1, Land Use Technical Report, and S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03311-3

Comment:

(2) Health - I am an Asthmatic. I found in EIR a suspected link between air pollution and Asthma - my condition would worsen w/ more air traffic.

Response:

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

PC03311-4

Comment:

(3) Traffic - The Master Plan creates a new major throughway on Airport blvd. near our home making our quiet street a logical alternative for those who want to get around traffic. The Plan also proposes a ring road that bring freeway traffic and noise closer to our home.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00934-6 regarding Airport Boulevard. Please note that Alternative D would not include an LAX Expressway or a Ring Road.

PC03311-5

Comment:

(4) Economic - we were able to move into one of the last affordable areas in Los Angeles five years ago - We are both teachers and the rapid rise of real estate in Los Angeles prevents us from buying a similar home (2 bd + 1 bath) in the Los Angeles Area. We may be forced to relocate out of the city.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

PC03312 Leichter, Leo None Provided

PC03312-1

Comment:

If you review my correspondence to you, you'll know what I think. We need to legislate a Moratorium on Building, until we have energy to support our infrastructure. Southern Calif and specifically your district will become an environment of ant with no room to move! Stop building and give us reasonable energy!

Response:

Comment noted. Energy was addressed in Section 4.17, Energy Supply, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03313 Aregger, Walter None Provided

PC03313-1

Comment:

Have Orange County people traveling overseas and to east coast to use El Toro Airport and not LAX. The LAX Airport is too crowded now - why expand it. The only area that can be used is the Imperial Cargo area of the airport, however, there are too many tall buildings already built along Imperial Avenue.

Response:

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

PC03314 Tisius, David None Provided

PC03314-1

Comment:

I believe that LAX does not need much more traffic than it already handles. We already handle too much. At times it is a real mess, with all the crowding. I favor the scheme you and your group advocate for regional development on a rational basis to divert more traffic to other regional airports.

Response:

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

PC03315 Yarema, Geoff None Provided

PC03315-1

Comment:

WE HAVE 2 IMPORTANT THINGS TO ACCOMPLISH AT LAX.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC03315-2

Comment:

(1) PROHIBIT, AND ENFORCE NO, OVERFLIGHTS OVER BEACH CITIES. I AM COUNTING 4-5 MANY NIGHTS AFTER MIDNIGHT! AND I LIVE IN HERMOSA!

Response:

The commentor may be affected by easterly takeoffs circling back to the west on their departures to Asia. During a recent 18 month period, 82 jets departed to the east when over-ocean procedures were in effect, an average of about one per week. 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

3. Comments and Responses

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-6 regarding noise increase, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.2. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1.

PC03315-3

Comment:

(2) WE NEED BETTER SURFACE ACCESS INTO LAX JUST TO HANDLE EXISTING CAPACITY. EXTEND GREEN LINE, BUILD AUTOMATED PEOPLE CIRCULAR BETWEEN ALL TERMINALS AND EXTEND CENTURY FREEWAY DIRECTLY IN TO AIRPORT.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03316 Allen, Vicki None Provided

PC03316-1

Comment:

NO ON AIRPORT EXPANSION.

ITS HARD ENOUGH TRAVELING THE STREETS NOW. THE LAX EXPANSION WILL MAKE IT IMPOSSIBLE TO GET AROUND THE SOUTH BAY / WESTCHESTER AREA. OR EVEN TO EXIT THE AREA TO TRAVEL TO DIFFERENT PLACES.

Response:

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

PC03317 Zabinsky, John None Provided

PC03317-1

Comment:

I totally agree, LAX should not be expanded. Roads to LAX are already congested & there is no relief in sight for them. Thanks for your splendid work. The flying public need help but also does the day by day working public who must use the roadways & must suffer the delays.

Response:

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

impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2, 3, S-2a, and S-2b.

PC03318 Knight, Kenneth None Provided

PC03318-1

Comment:

I am opposed to increasing air and surface traffic at LAX much beyond its present capacity. The money spent on this program perhaps could be used more wisely by upgrading outlying, underused airports and by providing efficient, low-cost surface transportation such as rail or bus services linking them to each other and to metropolitan centers.

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-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

PC03319 Amberg, George None Provided

PC03319-1

Comment:

Passenger traffic should be handled at LAX - Burbank - Long Beach - John Wayne etc -

Response:

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

PC03319-2

Comment:

Freight at Palmdale - Ontario - El Toro etc.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. Please see Response to Comment PC00599-54 for more information about cargo activity.

PC03320 Edmonds, Chris None Provided

PC03320-1

Comment:

I am strongly opposing LAX Expansion & the Arbor Vitae Expressway. I understand this would include making Airport Blvd. an expressway. We would be affected by so much more traffic, noise from the airport & increased traffic in the neighborhood.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and 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 and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts. It should be noted that Alternative D, added subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, does not include the LAX Expressway.

PC03320-2

Comment:

Pollution is a big concern for me & my family with the potential cancer it can cause.

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.

PC03320-3

Comment:

Please don't pass 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.

PC03321 Kasabian, Helen None Provided

PC03321-1

Comment:

Have been a homeowner in the Westchester area since 1950. Have seen the airport grow from "Mines Field" to LAX. The time has come to share the traffic and pollution problems to other reegans of the

3. Comments and Responses

County. Spread the 12 billions dollars to the different areas which could create jobs. Did attend the June 9th meeting. I think the community said it all.

Response:

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

PC03322 Schultz, William None Provided

PC03322-1

Comment:

We must have a regional approach. LAX expansion will have a negative impact on our local community.

Regional airports like Palmdale and Ontario are the only true answer.

Having been a long time resident of Upland and Ontario, I would have welcomed the additional economic benefits an expanded Ontario airport would bring.

Response:

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

PC03323 Robinson, Patricia None Provided

PC03323-1

Comment:

Am behind you 150% - Someone has to take a stand - The South Bay can't absorb more traffic, congestion - We have done our part - Don't care if I have to drive a distance to take a plane - Was very disturbed by the turbo noise around 11:30 most nights - Haven't been bothered lately.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No 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-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03324 **Namnam, Joe &
Rose Marie** **None Provided**

PC03324-1

Comment:

We live about 1/2 mile north of LAX and when the airplanes take off the sound is unbearable when our doors or windows are open. We oppose the expansion of the airport because if it passes, could you imagine how much more noise it would begin to our area and it would cause use to move from this area which we dearly love. We hope they consider other areas such as Palmdale or Ontario for their expansion.

Response:

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

PC03325 **Karg, Ferdinand** **None Provided**

PC03325-1

Comment:

THE TRAFFIC AROUND THE AIRPORT IS ALREADY TOO MUCH. THE AIR POLLUTION IS ALSO OVER THE BEARABLE LIMITS. OUR AREA IS ALREADY TOO CONGESTED.

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.

PC03326 **Magne, Marianne** **None Provided**

PC03326-1

Comment:

I am in favor of developing regional airports.

I oppose the LAX expansion because the west side is already over developed.

Response:

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

PC03327 Ottman, Doris None Provided

PC03327-1

Comment:

Enlarging the LA airport would effect me a lot. I live right off old Imperial - three houses from it. The noise is horrible even though I am nearly deaf. I moved to my home in 1942 when there was no airport. I gradually got worse as it grew. My husband went deaf. He is gone now. I also gradually got more troubled by the airport as it grew.

Response:

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

PC03327-2

Comment:

The value of my house is less than it would be if it wasn't in this location.

Response:

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

PC03327-3

Comment:

Please try to do all you can to stop this enlarging 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.

PC03328 Berrett, Catherine None Provided

PC03328-1

Comment:

Expansion at LAX is unwarranted. Housing for employees near LAX is almost non-existent at a price employees can afford whereas housing at Palmdale is plentiful and reasonable. Our freeways near LAX are jammed now and traffic spills over into residential neighborhoods - Sepulveda is impassable at every holiday weekend near LAX. Palmdale has the roads, schools, and potential for shopping that is not possible around LAX unless present homeowners are displaced and our neighborhoods bulldozed to accommodate trucks, terminals, & the services they need to support them.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding off-airport traffic impacts. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03329 Phillips, Nancy None Provided

PC03329-1

Comment:

I can not believe that the idea to expand LAX has ever gotten this far. The airport is already on top of so many stores and homes.

Response:

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

PC03329-2

Comment:

We live in Westchester. Just north of Manchester and the rumbling of the planes rattles our windows; granted they could stand to be replaced but the noise is constant.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03329-3

Comment:

We can't have our windows open if we want to watch a movie in the evenings because the planes are so loud. When we first moved in a year ago, my 2 year old would become frightened whenever one of the louder jets would fly by.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR or the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. However, please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. Regarding high noise levels at the commentor's property (located at 8360 Vicksburg Avenue), to qualify for soundproofing, properties must be exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels. As shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S1 in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the subject property in Westchester is located outside the 1992 fourth quarter, 1996 baseline, and Year 2000 65 CNEL contour. As also shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions, the 65 CNEL contour is completely within the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL contour. The 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL noise contour establishes eligibility for sound insulation under the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP) as described in Topical Response TR-LU-3. Also relative to single event noise levels that result in nighttime awakening (as established by the 94 dBA SEL noise contour), the subject property is located within the 94 dBA SEL contour under 1996 baseline conditions but not under Year 2000 conditions, as shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels, and Topical Response TR-N-6, in particular, Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 regarding existing high noise levels.

PC03329-4

Comment:

Also, my father has to do business in Santa Ana frequently but flies into LAX because there aren't as many options in Orange County. Traffic could definitely stand to be lightened through expanding the other airports. LAX is plenty big.

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC03330 Sweeney, Joseph None Provided

PC03330-1

Comment:

My interest is for the general welfare of the people.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03331 Hollenbaugh, Gayle None Provided

PC03331-1

Comment:

I HAVE LIVED IN SOUTH BAY SINCE 1980. FIRST MANHATTAN BEACH NOW HERMOSA BEACH. IN THE PAST 2 YEARS I HAVE NOTICED AN INCREDIBLE INCREASE IN AIR TRAFFIC OVER MY HOME. I AM TOLD THAT HB IS NOT IN THE FLIGHT PATH FOR COMMERCIAL CARRIERS, YET EVERY EVENING LIKE CLOCKWORK AFTER 12 MIDNIGHT - AIRCRAFT FLY OVER MY HOME - THE NOISE IS LOUD & DISCOMFORTING. I CAN'T IMAGINE WHAT AN EXPANSION IS GOING TO DO TO OUR LIVING CONDITIONS HERE.

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 regarding flight routes relative to area of the South Bay. Additionally, please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-5.2 regarding east flow operations at night

PC03331-2

Comment:

I USED TO OWN A HOME IN A NICE BEACH COMMUNITY - NOW WITH THE NOISE & INCREASED TRAFFIC I FEEL LIKE I LIVE IN NEW YORK CITY.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC03331-3

Comment:

I HAVE CALLED TO COMPLAIN ABOUT THE AIR NOISE & HAVE NEVER GOTTEN ONE RETURN PHONE CALL.

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 a 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. All incoming identified noise complaint calls are logged and were 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.

PC03331-4

Comment:

I WOULD BE HAPPY TO VOLUNTEER ON ANY COMMITTEE THAT IS AGAINST THE AIRPORT EXPANSION.

Response:

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

PC03332 Junginger, Rolf None Provided

PC03332-1

Comment:

THE SOUTH BAY AREA IS ALREADY OVERPOPULATED, SATURATED WITH TRAFFIC, WAY TO MUCH POLLUTION,

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed growth in Section 4.5, Induced Socio-Economic Impacts (Growth Inducement), 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.

PC03332-2

Comment:

AIRPLANE OVERFLIGHTS AT NIGHT (TORRANCE AREA).

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 Subtopical Response TR-N-7.1, exceptions to the over-ocean procedures are available when weather or wind conditions require east traffic flow. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1, regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay. Also please see Response to Comment PC01879-5 regarding nighttime single event noise impacts and mitigation.

PC03332-3

Comment:

IT WOULD BE IRRESPONSIBLE TO PROCEED WITH THE EXPANSION OF LAX. THE ALTERNATIVE AND BETTER CHOICE WOULD BE PALMDALE AND PERHAPS 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.

PC03333

Krohn, Chandra

None Provided

PC03333-1

Comment:

I AM AGAINST THE 'LAX MASTER PLAN.' MANY PEOPLE COMMUTE TO LAX FROM OTHER REGIONS. WE SHOULD HAVE OTHER AIRPORTS IN THOSE REGIONS INSTEAD OF ADDING MORE CONGESTION TO LAX AREA. I LIVE IN MARINA DEL REY AND FREQUENTLY PICK UP AND/OR DROP OFF PEOPLE AT LAX. ON BUSY DAYS (SUCH AS HOLIDAYS OR WEEKENDS) IT IS SO BUSY AT LAX I CANNOT IMAGINE MAKING IT LARGER.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC03334 Krekeler, Katherine None Provided 6/2/2001

PC03334-1

Comment:

My husband and I have lived in Westchester for 20 yr and 14 yr, respectively. We have two school-age children who attend a local school. Our children play soccer and little league at Neilson Park near LAX. We are involved in our community, our church, our children's school and their sports programs. We live in a lovely neighborhood with wonderful neighbors whom we know and care about. The expansion of LAX with the added noise, pollution, traffic and congestion would destroy so much of what we cherish in Westchester. Please vote against 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; 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.

PC03335 Horst, Bernice None Provided

PC03335-1

Comment:

Westchester will be greatly affected by Playa Vista as far as traffic, etc are concerned. An enlarged LAX would worsen the situation. Regional is better.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Please also see Response to Comment PC00148-2 regarding potential impacts from Playa Vista.

PC03336 Van Hoven, James None Provided

PC03336-1

Comment:

As a resident of the So. Bay for over 70 yrs. I have witnessed many changes, some very desirable, some not. I feel the proposed expansion of LAX would have an extremely adverse effect on the area.

Response:

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

PC03336-2

Comment:

Traffic congestion which is already bad could come unbearable, probably expanding to outlying areas and making a bad situation even worse.

Response:

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

PC03336-3

Comment:

Air quality, which is now quite good could be severely effected.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC03336-4

Comment:

I truly believe spreading the benefits and burdens around the area is the best solution from the following standpoints: Fairness, efficiency, convenience and common 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.

PC03337 Dotson, Gabrielle None Provided

PC03337-1

Comment:

Traffic is already so terrible around LAX - it's a bottleneck on the 405 already -

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, Airport Area Traffic Concerns.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03337-2

Comment:

I say, let's keep LAX the size it is, and give people more flight options out of Burbank, Long Bch, etc.

Response:

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

PC03338

Snapp, Janet

None Provided

PC03338-1

Comment:

Thank you for your support against the LAX expansion.

Response:

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

PC03338-2

Comment:

The Master Plan will create traffic problems on the freeways b/c all of LA should not be flying from only 1 major airport!

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC03338-3

Comment:

I'm sure moving the runways closer to residents will increase noise & 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.

PC03339 Cotton, Ken None Provided

PC03339-1

Comment:

(1) Increased traffic in an already congested area

Response:

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

PC03339-2

Comment:

(2) Increased noise from above & below (planes & cars)

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also, please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 regarding existing and future noise levels.

PC03339-3

Comment:

(3) Pollution is always accompanied by an increase in traffic - now add an increase in air traffic - sheer madness

Response:

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

PC03339-4

Comment:

(4) The economic impact is negative - Travelers only increase business for hotels & restaurants - minimal impact on ancillary business because the travel to other areas to get away from, guess what?) noise, traffic & pollution away from the airport.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

As was discussed in the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, a regional airport such as LAX directly impacts the regional economy through business and government activities that take place at the airport, spending for a variety of goods and services by airport passengers, and the manufacture of goods that are shipped by air. These direct impacts lead also to further "ripple effect" impacts throughout the economy. The economic impacts of the project 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 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03339-5

Comment:

Use your influence to open other air ports in Orange County & Riverside. Enough is Enough in the So. Bay.

Response:

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

PC03340 Vermillion, Charles & Iris None Provided

PC03340-1

Comment:

We are opposed to the LAX Master plan for expansion & feel other outlying airports should be allowed to grow.

Response:

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

PC03341 Harper, Rebecca None Provided

PC03341-1

Comment:

I have lived in Los Angeles for nearly 30 years and have watched noise and traffic around the airport increase to unbearable levels. Because it is located so close to the beach areas any expansion would further pollute and destroy what is left of one of the last serene areas in Los Angeles county. Please do not build anymore when so many other logical options are available!

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; coastal zone impacts in Section 4.14, Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers; 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. Also, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding

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

PC03342 Lyon, John None Provided

PC03342-1

Comment:

I'M IN FAVOR OF REGIONAL AIRPORTS. BY THE TIME THEY GET THROUGH EXPANDING LAX - THE COST, TIME, INCONVENIENCE, & TRAFFIC IT WILL BE TOO SMALL AGAIN!

Response:

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

PC03342-2

Comment:

AND WHAT ABOUT THE STREETS LEADING TO LAX? ARE THEY GOING TO ENLARGE ALL THE STREETS TO HANDLE THE GROWING TRAFFIC?

Response:

The project's traffic impacts and mitigation plan is presented in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, and Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PC03343 Payne, Estelle None Provided

PC03343-1

Comment:

I would prefer the regional plan for Southern California.

LAX is a nightmare already. Why make it worse?

Why should people in outside areas have to drive so far to take a plane?

Response:

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

PC03344 Bailey, Tracey None Provided

PC03344-1

Comment:

I believe Inglewood would be at a disadvantage with the addition of additional structure at the LAX sight.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below. In addition, please see Section 4.1, Land Use, and Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR which describe the impacts to Inglewood.

PC03344-2

Comment:

Roads are too narrow to support the additional commutes.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, in particular Subtopical Response TR-ST-4.1 regarding increases in traffic in an already congested area.

PC03344-3

Comment:

Plus the noise level of the new or overhaul aircraft could cause great incidents with the routes and xtra flights

Response:

Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.2 regarding more traffic means more noise.

PC03344-4

Comment:

Diverting the expansion will greatly draw youngsters toward the job market on the East of L.A.

Response:

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

PC03345 Gandia, Joan None Provided

PC03345-1

Comment:

I live in Westchester, an old established neighborhood. The traffic and pollution is already very bad. Sepulveda is a mess most of the time. There are a lot of retirees here who are affected by the traffic and pollution. The homes are expensive and we deserve to live in some peace and quiet, which is why we bought here in the first place. The load should be spread around to the other airports.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. 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.

PC03345-2

Comment:

Also object very strongly to the plans for Arbor Vitae and opening up Airport Blvd. Airport Blvd. is 1 house away from me. We now walk our dogs and walk for exercise in peace. This would be totally destroyed, bringing in strangers, crime etc. Please help us.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed 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.

PC03346 Kaiser, Sitara None Provided

PC03346-1

Comment:

I agree with your alternate regional (airports) plan for the expansion - instead of expansion of the existing airport - L.A.X. - the reasons shown above are sufficiently convincing to support 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-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC03347 Brueck, Donald None Provided

PC03347-1

Comment:

I OPPOSE THE LAX MASTER PLAN. THE CURRENT AIRPORT OPERATIONS DEGRADE OUR LIVING CONDITIONS THROUGH NOISE AND AIR POLLUTION. THE MASTER PLAN DOES NOT SERIOUSLY ADDRESS THESE ISSUES AND WILL MAKE THINGS WORSE.

SEE ENCLOSURE.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC03348 Sotsky, Angelina None Provided

PC03348-1

Comment:

I have lived in the South Bay most of my life. I have noticed in the last few years a dramatic increase in noise from LAX.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase and Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay. LAWA will be pursuing Federal approval to restrict easterly takeoffs circling back to the west on their departures to Asia 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 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement, exceptions to the over-ocean procedures are available when weather of wind conditions require east traffic flow.

PC03348-2

Comment:

I recently had a baby so I am up many times throughout the night and I can hear plans flying above all night long! The LAX officials are totally lying if they say no plans fly over Hermosa Beach in the middle of the night (& day for that matter).

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 of wind conditions require east traffic flow. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay. 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.

PC03348-3

Comment:

I am so saddened to find out that the people that are supposed to be protecting our environment and way of life here seem to be on "vacation." I hope you can do something to protect our community. You have my support if you do.

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.

PC03349 **Munson, Alden & Jane** **None Provided**

PC03349-1

Comment:

We are greatly concerned about the current plans for airport expansion. The recent studies regarding safety at LAX would indicate that more planes will only increase the unsafe conditions. "Near misses" could easily become more frequent and increase the changes of catastrophic events.

Response:

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

PC03349-2

Comment:

As frequent users of both LAX and the Sepulveda Blvd corridor we can't imagine how bad the effects would be on local traffic. There is no place to accommodate more traffic and it is already a serious problem in this area. We would be seriously impacted by additional traffic in the South Bay.

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.

PC03350 **Rowe, Joan** **None Provided**

PC03350-1

Comment:

Expansion of LAX would severely impact my neighborhood in every aspect, - traffic, noise, and pollution. I would have to move as it would render my condo unlivable.

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.

PC03351 **Nuzzo, Ruth** **None Provided**

PC03351-1

Comment:

I have lived on 76th St in Westchester since April of 1949. The changes caused by LAX expansion are to numerous to mention. Noise, Pollution, Traffic conditions, must be looked into and improved. Strongly support development of other airports, such as Palmdale and Ontario. It is grossly unfair to

3. Comments and Responses

expect the residents of our local and surrounding area to sustain additional upheaval and loss of businesses.

Response:

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

PC03352 Crecy, Steven None Provided

PC03352-1

Comment:

LAX IS MAXED-OUT. EXPANDING LAX ONLY MEANS MORE NOISE, CONGESTION, AND POLLUTION FOR SOUTH BAY RESIDENTS.

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.

PC03353 Petillon, Lee None Provided

PC03353-1

Comment:

As usual, you are ahead of the curve! Anyone who has traveled somewhere from LAX knows that it is now a congested mess. To increase it roughly 50% from the present passenger figures, would intensify the traffic and other congestion

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC03353-2

Comment:

and would not fairly allocate traffic to other airports such as Long Beach, Ontario, John Wayne and the El Toro Air Base, since an increasing percentage of LAX passengers come from Orange County.

3. Comments and Responses

The only way that these traffic loads can be fairly allocated among the various airports is to adopt a regional airport plan rather than putting all of the growth pressure on LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. Neither the FAA nor LAWA have the authority to direct airlines to use one airport in favor of another airport. The Airline Deregulation Act of 1978, as amended, ended federal, state, and local governments role in determining the location for air service by airlines. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Please see 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.

PC03353-3

Comment:

I believe what you are doing is supported by the vast majority of people in the South Bay.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03354

Morton, Gerry

None Provided

PC03354-1

Comment:

We need to spread our airports out - Tokyo apts 50 mi from city center - Need hi-speed rail to Palmdale & El toro - Ontario for So Cal wide access - even Oxnard (PT Mugu) as feeder for Ventura County travelers.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC03355

Jalbert, Ula

None Provided

6/11/2001

PC03355-1

Comment:

We live in West Torrance and I believe we would be affected by the noise of jets going over which we get now at any time of night, which fly real low, and wake everybody up.

3. Comments and Responses

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 of wind conditions require east traffic flow. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1.

PC03355-2

Comment:

I'm sure we will get some pollution from this also.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC03355-3

Comment:

As you know we already have plenty of traffic around here.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03356 Taylor, G. Kevin None Provided

PC03356-1

Comment:

I FULLY SUPPORT THE REGIONAL PLAN FOR OUR AIR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS. PLACING ALL OUR EFFORTS IN JUST L.A EXPANSION IS POOR PLANNING - YOUR WIDER VISION JUST MAKES GOOD 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.

PC03357 Scott, Doreen None Provided

PC03357-1

Comment:

It just does not make sense to over-burden an already congested airport. This applies to air and ground transportation.

It does not make sense to have people drive long distances to arrive at a congested airport.

3. Comments and Responses

It does not make sense to have people driving on already congested freeways to reach the congested airport.

It does make sense to enlarge other airports and to make airports more accessible to all people living in other areas.

Way to go, Jane Harman! I'm all in favor of the Regional Plan.

The South Bay Beaches will be further affected for traffic, noise and pollution if the LAX Master Plan is adopted.

Response:

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

PC03358

Gesford, Jean

None Provided

6/8/2001

PC03358-1

Comment:

I may be a dinosaur, but I would like to suggest that the humans need to put the brakes on population growth. True, technology often comes to the rescue in obvious ways like more power plants in California at great monetary cost and great cost to the environment but regional planning would do well to consider reasonable limits to human population as well as reasonable uses of the environment. More is not necessarily better. Good luck in dealing with the many problems facing lawmakers and citizens alike.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03359

**Money, Lloyd J. &
Ruth R.**

None Provided

PC03359-1

Comment:

We would be adversely affected by traffic noise & pollution from expansion of LAX.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC03359-2

Comment:

Probably increased traffic would have a negative effect on the surrounding area's economy.

Response:

An increase in local traffic volumes can have both positive and negative impacts on local business activity, depending on many other variables. For example, higher traffic volumes can result in a larger pool of potential customers for some businesses. On the other hand, increased traffic volumes may cause some potential customers to use alternative routes and utilize other businesses. The net effect of these individual choices cannot be predicted with any certainty. In any event, local traffic volume changes are unlikely to have any significant impact on the operation of the City of Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles or regional economies. The economic impacts of the project were addressed in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data in Technical Report 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. 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.

PC03359-3

Comment:

A regional airport plan seems to make sense, especially in light of the projected population growth in areas far away from LAX.

Response:

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

PC03360 Friedman, Martin None Provided

PC03360-1

Comment:

I support your concept of a Regional Airport 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.

PC03361 Baruch, Jerome None Provided

PC03361-1

Comment:

TRAFFIC With completion of Playa Vista and Howard Hughes Center, traffic will be gridlocked during peak hours. LAX expansion would greatly add to the misery.

Response:

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

PC03361-2

Comment:

NOISE Have you ever lived in a house close or near a "747" jet aircraft revving up?

Response:

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

PC03361-3

Comment:

POLLUTION Noise and air pollution are already high within a mile from LAX. Expansion would greatly exasperate the problem.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses were 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.

PC03361-4

Comment:

ECONOMICS Expansion will bring in marginal businesses and will reduce healthy economic growth.

Response:

The economic effects of Master Plan alternatives were provided in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR with supporting technical data in Technical Report 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03362 Rosendahl, Thomas None Provided

PC03362-1

Comment:

We should distribute the traffic to other airports. Maybe all cargo could go to Toro and only passenger traffic to LAX. Other airports should be opened up. There must be no further burden on the residential

3. Comments and Responses

areas around LAX. Let Orange Co. get involved and share some of the load! Its noisy enough here 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-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-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, and Response to Comment PC00281-19 regarding cargo operations. 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 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.

PC03363 Yeaton, Michelle None Provided

PC03363-1

Comment:

4 blocks South of the airport. The airport is already very loud so I think if they did expand it would be much worse and I'm afraid our home value would go down.

Response:

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

PC03363-2

Comment:

We have a lot of black "fuel" build up on and around our home.

Response:

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

PC03363-3

Comment:

I hope some other airports can take up the slack.

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.

PC03363-4

Comment:

Limit the cargo planes - Fed ex, ect. To fly out of Palmdale and use LAX only for passenger planes.??

Response:

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

PC03364 Noble, Trudy None Provided

PC03364-1

Comment:

the LAX Master Plan has got to be stopped. I have lived in El Segundo for almost 30 years and every day I am reminded of LAX, when I breeze the air and hear the noise. It is unthinkable to have an increase of airtraffic and cartraffic due to what the LAX Master Plan stands for. If we wouldn't have alternatives i.e. other airports in the area, I could understand if one would choose LAX. Please do everything possible to stop this insane future planning.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; 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.

PC03365 Weinberger, Howard None Provided

PC03365-1

Comment:

- I DON'T BELIEVE YOUR FIGURES THAT PREDICT VERY LOW GROWTH FOR WEST SIDE AND SOUTH BAY. FOR INSTANCE NEAR MY SON'S HOUSE (CLOSE TO NATIONAL AND SEPULVEDA) EVERY THIRD HOUSE IS EITHER BEING REPLACED BY SOMETHING MUCH LARGER OR IS UNDERGOING MAJOR ADDITIONS. NEAR WHERE I LIVE (MARINA DEL REY) NEW APARTMENT/CONDO CONSTRUCTION IS 4 AND 5 STORIES, IN CONTRAST TO MY 2 STORY TOWN HOUSE.

Response:

The commentor is referring to information provided on a form prepared by Congresswoman Jane Harman's office. This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03365-2

Comment:

- EVEN IF LAX CAN BE MODIFIED TO HANDLE MORE TRAFFIC, STREETS LIKE LINCOLN BLVD WILL BE CONTINUOUSLY OVERLOADED ALL DAY AND EVENING LONG. ONLY A MAJOR MASS TRANSIT SYSTEM COULD PROVIDE RELIEF, BUT COST WOULD BE PROHIBITIVE - POPULATION DENSITIES ARE STILL NOT HIGH ENOUGH.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Regarding improved mass transit options, Alternative D incorporates remote passenger parking with people mover systems, which will eliminate the need for a Ring Road or a western passenger entrance from Pershing Drive. In addition, the Green Line is proposed to be extended north to provide access to LAX.

PC03365-3

Comment:

- AS FAR AS I AM CONCERNED, I DO NOT WANT LA'S POPULATION TO INCREASE. I SEE NO BENEFITS TO ME, ONLY A LOWERED QUALITY OF LIFE.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03366 Cullen, Kathleen None Provided

PC03366-1

Comment:

We think LAX is large enough already! We are against expansion. We are tired of "urban sprawl" - let's slow down!

Response:

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

PC03367 Vivian, Marilyn None Provided

PC03367-1

Comment:

Enlarging LAX would create many more problems than developing in less densely populated Palmdale area. It would also create jobs in that region that are needed by families living there. The noise, congestion and disruption around LAX is already at a breaking point. Please expand in an area that benefit in so many ways. I was raised in Hawthorne & now live in Torrance. I did live in Apple Valley for seven years and saw the needs there in the high desert.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, 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.

PC03368 Baker, Winton None Provided

PC03368-1

Comment:

Realign the distribution of passenger and freight

1. Use Lancaster for all freight, both international and domestic. Its locality is placed near interstate highways in all directions.

Response:

The closest LAWA operated airport facility to Lancaster is Palmdale Regional Airport. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC03368-2

Comment:

2. Use Ontario for passenger service to the inland empire.
3. John Wayne airport Orange County passengers
4. Burbank and Long Beach for passengers in their respective areas.
5. Lax for international only.

Response:

Comment noted. Neither the FAA nor LAWA have the authority to direct airlines to use one airport in favor of another airport. The Airline Deregulation Act of 1978, as amended, ended federal, state, and local governments role in determining the location for air service by airlines. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC03368-3

Comment:

6. All airports to be connected by hi speed rail.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC03369 **Whitmeyer, John** **None Provided**

PC03369-1

Comment:

Local surface traffic affects the surrounding area including the Pacific Coast Highway leading to LAX.

Expansion of LAX means more scheduled flights resulting in more surface traffic. LAX appears to ignore the surface problems already in place with apparent no thought to future handling.

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.

PC03369-2

Comment:

Airlines should be made to use other regional Airports as their base operations - - i. e. British Air uses Heathrow - - Delta Air uses Gatwick. Such assignment of carriers ought to be designated to other local regional airports as in the London example.

Response:

The use of foreign gateway airports is controlled by bilateral agreements and is not comparable to the domestic situation in the LA Basin. Commercial aviation between countries is governed by bilateral air service agreements that have been negotiated between the United States and its trading partners. Historically, these bilateral agreements have been restrictive and were designed to protect national flag carriers from competition. Most of these agreements imposed significant restrictions on airline operations by limiting the destinations served, the number of airlines permitted to serve the market and the level of fares levied. As the commentator cited, British Airways serves London from Heathrow, while Delta Air Lines is restricted to using Gatwick. While many of the original bilateral agreements remain in effect, the U.S. government has recently advocated "open skies" agreements which permit unrestricted international air service between participating countries, allowing each country's airlines to fly between any city (i.e., origin gateway) in its home country and any city (i.e., destination gateway) in participating countries.

Since passage of the Federal Airline Deregulation Act of 1978, U.S. airlines decide which domestic airports they will serve. As a general rule, airlines will choose airports near the highest concentrations of conveniently located customers. Airlines will only provide air service where demand exists. For instance, in regions with multiple airports, airlines tend to concentrate their air service at a single, well-located primary airport for economic efficiency. Passenger demand cannot simply be moved to another airport. In fact, under federal law, it is very difficult for local, regional or federal officials to force airlines to serve one airport over the other. LAWA has tried subsidies to encourage airlines to serve outlying Palmdale, with only limited, temporary success. The airlines provide service at the airports where demand exists. Without demand from the traveling public, airlines deploy their assets to serve the greatest number of passengers and earn the best return on their investment. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-2 regarding the role of deregulation in aviation planning.

PC03369-3

Comment:

Along with that should develop high speed rail connections to all airports - - we cannot rely on freeway access - - presently overused and often fraught with dangerous conditions.

Response:

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

PC03370 Ruiz, Christopher None Provided

PC03370-1

Comment:

It is unfair to force Westside residents to bear the burden for Orange County and other areas that want the Airport/Expansion. Sepulveda is already gridlocked! 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 and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation 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.

PC03371 Parham, Bernice None Provided

PC03371-1

Comment:

My husband & I favor a regional plan for air transportation in which benefits and burdens are shared by neighboring counties in the L.A. area. Noise pollution as well as congested streets are of concern to us. We appreciate your efforts to improve conditions in our district.

Response:

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

PC03372 Herdt, Norman None Provided

PC03372-1

Comment:

We are furiously opposed to the airport's proposed \$11.4 billion expansion. We believe that this proposal will destroy surrounding communities with devastating noise, pollution and traffic increases.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

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

PC03372-2

Comment:

We want future air traffic increases to be spread among 10 other airports throughout Southern California, including one on the site of the former El Toro Marine base.

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC03373 Olson, Kermit None Provided

PC03373-1

Comment:

A system of regional airports encompassing all of Southern California is the only way to go! LAX is as big as it ever should get. LAX handles a huge volume of air traffic on a relatively small piece of land. The traffic problems at LAX already resemble "a zoo". To enlarge LAX will create a situation bordering on "chaos". It is already not a pleasure going there! The increasing volume of air traffic must be spread around to other airports! I'm 64 years old and have lived in L.A. all my life. L.A. is famous for being short-sighted when looking into the future. So, my vote is NO ON THE LAX MASTER PLAN - YES ON A REGIONAL AIRPORT SYSTEM.

Response:

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

PC03374 Lockenour, Jerry None Provided

PC03374-1

Comment:

The airline industry needs to rethink its "spoke & hub" systems which forces 90% of the US air traffic through a few large hubs. There needs to be more - point-to-point service which better utilizes the nations total airport capacity. Then when LAX needs expanding to support it local area needs - then by all means - I support it.

Response:
Comment noted.

PC03375 Sidney-Fryer, None Provided
Donald

PC03375-1

Comment:
I am completely behind Jane Harman's plan for a regional airport alternative. Let us implement the original So. Cal. Regional Airport Authority, and give priority to airports eager for more growth like Palmdale and Ontario. LAX is absolutely BIG ENOUGH - no further expansion is needed there.

Response:
Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC03376 Pacheco, Tom None Provided

PC03376-1

Comment:
Judging from the trial flight patterns the FAA has allowed commercial air carriers to experiment with, I would sumize that expansion would negatively impact our quality of life in Redondo Beach. I purchased my home in So. Redondo, to be close to work, yet far away from undesirable noise. I have adjusted to the noise from Torrance Municipal Airport (although it sometimes allows pvt. Jets), but I believe expansion @ LAX would be an unnessary imposition on our health & safety. I have been scared out of bed in the middle of the night by comm. aircraft, by sound levels I believe greater than 100 db. Flying very unusual ft patterns. Although these have subsided in recent months I have a grave concern these disturbances would resume if expansion is allowed.

Response:
Larger jets such as the Boeing 737-500, 737-700, the 757 and Airbus series of aircraft are equipped with Flight Management System (FMS) technology. However, many aircraft, particularly propeller-driven aircraft are not yet so equipped. The Angel 2 Departure (now named "Holtz") is not a published departure available to all carriers. At this time it is still in the test phases through a signatory agreement between the FAA and a handful of airlines. 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 LAX to address Angel 2 departures. Operations from Torrance Airport are not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The number of design day operations in 2015 under each of five alternatives would increase over environmental baseline conditions, as was indicated in Table S3-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. On average, the flights will be individually quieter than they were in 1996, but they may be more frequent. The amount of noise to which any one area is exposed will vary based on the distribution of the traffic throughout the

3. Comments and Responses

community. In the South Bay communities, including Redondo Beach, aircraft noise levels associated with the project actions will be much lower than those considered to be significant by all regulatory agencies. The area may be effected by noise from other airports, as well as ongoing modifications in air traffic routes out of LAX that have nothing to do with the proposed Master Plan actions. For further information on this topic, please see Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay and Subtopical Response TR-N-3.3 regarding existing and future noise levels.

PC03376-2

Comment:

I strongly support focusing on exploring the expansion of Palmdale & Ontario & heven forbid "El Toro" along with the infastructure to accomodate transportation to these hubs.

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-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.

PC03376-3

Comment:

I have inclosed disturbances I have experienced for your review,

Response:

Comment noted. The commentor is concerned that growth of service at LAX will create more noise impacts on South Bay communities. The proposed design day operations in 2015 will increase in number compared to environmental baseline conditions, although such increases would be substantially less under Alternative D than under the other three build alternatives. The amount of noise to which any one area is exposed will vary based on the distribution of the traffic throughout the community. In the South Bay communities, including Redondo Beach, aircraft noise levels associated with the project actions will be much lower than those considered to be significant by all regulatory agencies. The area may be effected by noise from other airports, as well as ongoing modifications in air traffic routes out of LAX that have nothing to do with the proposed Master Plan actions. For further information on this topic, please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay, which addresses recent changes in flight procedures near the area, and Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2 regarding early turns over areas north and south of LAX. Please also see Response to Comment PC000552-2 regarding noise impacts on the South Bay.

PC03376-4

Comment:

please be assured you have my complete support for what ever alternative you can develop.

Response:

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

PC03377 **Peattie, Gary & Marianne** **None Provided**

PC03377-1

Comment:

We are opposed to the expansion of LAX! We support regional airports. Our community already is plagued with air pollution and noise pollution. We are planning on moving from the area because of the air & noise pollution. But for our neighbors sake, we want no more 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. 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.

PC03378 **Miner, Joan** **None Provided**

PC03378-1

Comment:

We live near Lincoln Blvd. in Venice where traffic has become increasingly dense in recent years. Currently it takes 40 minutes to travel less than 5 miles during peak traffic hours. For this reason alone the impact of further airport expansion does not make sense.

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.

PC03378-2

Comment:

The smart thing to do is to expand Palmdale and Ontario airport while offering low cost shuttle transportation to those areas.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC03378-3

Comment:

In addition, the noise pollution created by evening airport noise has become intolerable. In the summer we are forced to keep our windows closed at night to quiet the "air rumble" of airplanes overhead.

PC03379-2

Comment:

Expand Ontario, Palm Springs, and John Wayne;

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PC03379-3

Comment:

I am at the point of such frustration over overcrowding that I do not look forward to the summer season. Help us!!

Response:

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

**PC03380 Murphy-Johnson, None Provided
 Patricia**

PC03380-1

Comment:

Do all you can to limit growth & development. Spread it around. It seems like LAX is "maxed-out" 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. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC03381 Blum, Edward None Provided

PC03381-1

Comment:

LAX should be limited to current size. Don't expand the present size but expand 3 or 4 airports to expand the new capability required 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03382 Davison, Sallie None Provided

PC03382-1

Comment:

LAX HAS ALREADY DESTROYED 10,000 HOMES AND FORCED THE CLOSURE OF TWO PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE WESTCHESTER AREA. NOISE AND TRAFFIC HAVE TAKEN A HEAVY TOLL ON SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES AND CAUSED LOSSES IN THE BUSINESS DISTRICTS THAT HAVE NEVER BEEN COUNTED. TO CONTINUE FURTHER EXPANSION COMPOUNDS THE PROBLEMS WE'VE HAD TO FACE FOR THE PAST 30+ YEARS.

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. 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.

PC03382-2

Comment:

GROWTH IN SO. CALIF EXTENDS BEYOND LOS ANGELES AND OTHER AIRPORTS MUST CARRY THEIR SHARE OF THE CARGO AND PASSENGER LOAD. TO CONCENTRATE MORE ANTICIPATED GROWTH AT LAX, TO THE TUNE OF \$12 BILLION, IS SHORT-SIGHTED AND FAILS TO SERVE THE NEEDS OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA'S TRAVELING PUBLIC.

Response:

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

PC03383 Johnston, Deidre None Provided

PC03383-1

Comment:

I am worried about what this will do to our neighborhood. We have a well kept neighborhood that is quiet and safe. If this "freeway extensions goes through - there goes a beautiful quiet area! The noise & additional smog will just hurt us and our children more. Please keep fighting for our children and 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; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and 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, and 14 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-9 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.

PC03384 Smyth, Ann Marie None Provided

PC03384-1

Comment:

I oppose a "regional" airport plan which would spread the problem, increase activity in small airports, spread pollution and noise to more residential areas, decrease property values, create dangerous flight patterns and generally make life obnoxious.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03385 Banks, Lindie None Provided

PC03385-1

Comment:

I prefer that regional the airport plan be 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.

PC03386 McRae, Paul None Provided

PC03386-1

Comment:

I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHERE THE WATER TO SUPPORT 3 MILLION MORE PEOPLE WILL COME FROM FIRST. THE PROJECTIONS FOR S.B. AND RIVERSIDE COUNTIES ARE NOT REALISTIC IF THERE ARE INSUFFICIENT RESOURCES AVAILABLE. NEVERTHELESS, A REGIONAL PLAN MAKES MORE 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. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the potential impacts associated with each alternative being considered for the LAX Master Plan. It is beyond the scope of the project and the EIS/EIR to address the future water supply and demands of San Bernardino and Riverside Counties.

PC03387 Armistead, Jr., Fred None Provided

PC03387-1

Comment:

We have to divide up the air traffic between LAX and regional airports such as Palmdale & Ontario.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC03387-2

Comment:

The LA County Santa Monica Bay Cities suffer badly from LAX increasing noise and flights making short flight patterns over ocean against rules.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement and Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay.

PC03388 Jacobs, Iris None Provided

PC03388-1

Comment:

I support regional airports. Each area's population is large enough in population to support its own airport. Even if LAX expands, its only a temporary measure. Southern Calif's growth is too rapid to not have a regional airport plan.

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.

PC03389 DuBois, Gary None Provided

PC03389-1

Comment:

I AM ADEIMATELY AGAINST AIRPORT EXPANSION AT LAX. IT WILL CAUSE MY PROPERTY VALUE TO DROP DRASTICLY. I HAVE LIVED HERE FOR 23 YEARS & HAD PLANNED TO RETIRE & STAY HERE. WITH AIRPORT EXPANSION I WOULD BE FORCED TO SELL MY PROPERTY & MOVE OUT OF STATE! I WILL VOTE AGAINST ANYONE WHO SUPPORTS AIRPORT EXPANSION.

Response:

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

PC03390 Immel, Ralph None Provided

PC03390-1

Comment:

A carefully planned and well coordinated regional plans seems to be the only feasible way to resolve the problem of increased population growth and expanded airport facilities in Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties. Your efforts certainly have our support.

Response:

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

PC03391 Beaumont, Jesse None Provided

PC03391-1

Comment:

As a resident of Palos Verdes Estates, I strongly object to any increase in the size and capacity of LAX.

Statistics showing the number of daily flights arriving and departing the LAX airport are frightening, and the confusion and traffic that a passenger presently experiences are sufficient argument against any enlargement.

I have arrived and departed from airports in Orange County, Salt Lake City, Boise, Idaho Falls, Billings and West Yellowstone. With the exception of Salt Lake City, the ease and pleasure of traveling small airports bear no comparison to the present unpleasant confusion and delays at LAX.

LAX should not be allowed to enlarge when nearby satellite airport sites are available.

Response:

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

PC03392 Garthaus, Kaye None Provided

PC03392-1

Comment:

Every night I lie awake waiting for the next plane to rumble over our house. Please help!! We have been waiting a long long time!

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03393 Hovagimian, Mary None Provided

PC03393-1

Comment:

Do not believe in "LAX Master Plan" - Inadequate. Believe each and every airport should be developed to the fullest capacity - planning for future use.

Response:

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

PC03393-2

Comment:

Impact on Community: Very important! Note! How & where the planes shall fly is important. Insurance on property does NOT cover any damage occurred by airplane(s). Shall have to sue City, County and State, etc for damages for lack of air control.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03394 Rothstein, Robert None Provided

PC03394-1

Comment:

WE SHOULD RELOCATE ALL FREIGHT OPERATIONS AWAY FROM LAX & MOVE THEM TO PALMDALE. THIS RECOMMENDATION WAS POSED TO THE LAX MASTER PLAN OVER 20-YEARS AGO BY THOMAS W. FLOYD WHO DID AN IN-DEPTH STUDY OF THE MASTER PLAN IN HIS ROLE AS A SYSTEMS ANALYST FOR THE NORTHROP CORPORATION. MR. FLOYD INDICATED THAT MORE THAN 20 PERCENT OF AIR TRAFFIC AT THE TIME WERE AIR FREIGHT OPERATIONS. HIS STUDY RECOMMENDED MOVING ALL OF THIS LOAD TO PALMDALE, LONG BEFORE THE 14 FREEWAY WAS BUILT & WITH THE AVAILABILITY OF RAIL SERVICE TO PALMDALE. THIS PROPOSAL MAKES EVEN MORE SENSE TODAY. OUR SURFACE STREETS ARE GRID-LOCKED. A GOOD DEAL OF WHICH CAN BE BLAMED ON THE VERY LARGE NUMBERS OF TRUCKS CARRYING FREIGHT BOUND TO AND FROM LAX.

Response:

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

PC03395 Dickens, Richard None Provided

PC03395-1

Comment:

WE ARE PLEASED TO KNOW OF YOUR STRONG OPPOSITION TO THE PROPOSE LAX EXPANSION. OUR VIEW THAT ONE POSITIVE WAY TO SOLVE SOME OF THE PROBLEMS IS TO COMPLETELY ELIMINATE ALL AIR FREIGHT FROM LAX. IN SO DOING THERE CAN BE ADDED TERMINAL SPACE, MUCH LESS AIR TRAFFIC, AND CONSIDERABLE EASING OF TRAFFIC ON

3. Comments and Responses

THE 405 CAUSED BY TRUCKS THAT DELIVER AND PICK AIR FREIGHT FROM AND TO LAX. MOVE ALL AIR FREIGHT TO AN AIR FREIGHT TERMINAL IN PALMDALE.

Response:

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

PC03395-2

Comment:

ADD MORE PASSENGER SPACE TO ONTARIO - AND PUSH HARD FOR THE OPENING OF AN ORANGE COUNTY MAJOR TERMINAL AT EL TORO.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC03395-3

Comment:

WE HOPE SOME OF THESE IDEAS WILL FINALLY GET ACROSS TO THE "MR BIGS" IN WASHINGTON - AND WESTCHESTER CAN ULTIMATELY REMAIN THE COMMUNITY WE HAVE LIVED IN AND ENJOYED FOR OVER 50 YEARS.

Response:

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

PC03396 Nierhake, Juan None Provided

PC03396-1

Comment:

My big concern is the traffic congestion. I fly LAX maybe once a month and notice buses from as far away as Santa Barbara and Disneyland. Let's spread the impact - good and bad - to our neighboring counties.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts. Please also see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC03396-2

Comment:

I would support rail service from LAX to Union Station (downtown).

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan, in particular Subtopical Response TR-ST-5.2 regarding light/conventional rail connections and Subtopical Response TR-ST-5.4 regarding the Metro Green line extension to the west terminal complex. Alternative D would connect a people mover to an Intermodal Transportation Center near the Aviation station of the Green Line, with no extension of the Green Line necessary for terminal access. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03397 Armstrong, June None Provided

PC03397-1

Comment:

HAVE ATTENDED 3 MEETINGS AGAINST EXPANSION. ALL THE ARGUMENTS ARE VALID AND VITALLY IMPORTANT TO OUR CITIZENS WHO LIVE AROUND THE AIRPORT.

ABOVE AND BEYOND THE HEALTH & NOISE ISSUES, I'D LIKE YOU TO INCLUDE IN YOUR ARGUMENTS THE DREADED POSSIBILITY OF A "BRAIN & POPULATION DRAIN." I SEE AND HEAR FROM THE PROFESSIONAL PEOPLE THAT THEY WOULD MOVE OUT OF THE AREA RATHER THAN LIVE WITH NOISE & POLLUTION. ALL OF OUR UP-GRADED NEIGHBORHOODS WOULD SOON BECOME DOWN GRADED, AND THAT WOULD SERIOUSLY AFFECT OUR VOTER ATTENDANCE.

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, human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 4, 5, and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-3, S-4, and S-9 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.

PC03398 Ruch, Vickie None Provided

PC03398-1

Comment:

I concur with Congresswoman Jane Harmon's position statement on the reverse side of this form.

Response:

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

PC03398-2

Comment:

In particular, the air pollution from more fly-overs to this area concerns me as a medical provider. After living in L.A. Co. for 23 years, I've been treating an increasing # of new asthma cases, included adult-onset in nonsmokers. Unfortunately, I have also become one of those health statistics. In addition to its many other attributes, my husband & I chose to buy our single family house in Manhattan Beach

3. Comments and Responses

because of its relative lack of air pollution & its usual presence of ocean breezes. I breathe easier here. Why should we pay so much to live in a place where this vital health aspect can be destroyed @ LAX expansionists? Whims?

Response:

This comment is essentially the same as PC02613-21; please see Response to Comment PC02613-21.

PC03398-3

Comment:

Thank you for listening to Congresswoman Jane Harman & her coalition. It just makes health sense.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03399 McGuire, John None Provided

PC03399-1

Comment:

The critical problem is runway incursions. LAX has the highest and growing number of near-collisions on the ground. Remember when the controllers landed the USAir 737 on top of the Skywest Merlin/Metroliner? I fly out of LAX 2-3 times a week. Twice w/i the last year we had to go around at the last moment due to an incursion (once on United, once on Frontier). With larger 767-400's, 747-400's, 737-800's etc. we could easily have 300-400 dead, and statistics don't lie - the accident will happen and probably soon. Construction will only increase accident probability.

Response:

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

PC03399-2

Comment:

Palmdale should have been developed & linked by high-speed rail 20 yrs ago.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No 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-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand.

PC03400 Johnson, Edward None Provided

PC03400-1

Comment:

I've looked over the area surrounding LAX, and I see no way to expand it without moving a lot of people out at great inconvenience and astronomical expense.

Response:

This comment is essentially the same as Comment PC02613-26. Please see Response to Comment AL00040-46. Also see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation issues.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03400-2

Comment:

There are several possibilities in the San Bernardino - Riverside area. The old Norton AFB (now S.B. airport) and then there is a county airport out in that area, too. The county airport I used to pass on my way to California City. Also California City was actually established 20 years ago to handle housing for people who would be working at the Palmdale expanded facility - supposedly to take part of the load off of LAX. I understand they had even constructed a tunnel at some point to facilitate rapid transit to Los Angeles. I am sure that one of those facilities would be a much more adaptive alternative to further expanding LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA do not control the development of former air bases.

PC03401 Libit, Jordan None Provided

PC03401-1

Comment:

I wholeheartedly agree with Jane Harman's position in opposition to the proposed LAX Master Plan. The issue of air transportation should be a regional issue, with all communities sharing in the benefits and the burdens. Let's develop a visionary plan that includes increased use of Ontario Airport, Palmdale Airport, March AFB, El Toro, and John Wayne Orange County Airport. Plans should include coordination with ground transportation and aggressively combat "NIMBY" attitudes in Orange County. The LAX area already has too much ground traffic, noise, and pollution.

Response:

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

PC03402 O'Brien, Robert None Provided

PC03402-1

Comment:

AT PRESENT, ONE OF THE GREATEST PROBLEMS AT LAX IS THE TRAFFIC; IF YOU HAVE EVER HAD TO DRIVE AROUND AND AROUND THE PARKING TERMINALS, YOU CAN UNDERSTAND THE FRUSTRATION OF DELIVERING OR PICKING UP ANYONE. ANY EXPANSION AT LAX WOULD ONLY COMPOUND THE PROBLEM.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PC03402-2

Comment:

THE TAKE OFF AND LANDING DOES NOT BOTHER ME, BUT WITH EXPANSION IT COULD.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03402-3

Comment:

GO FOR REGIONAL - PLAMDALE NEEDS THE JOBS -

Response:

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

PC03403

Smith, George

None Provided

PC03403-1

Comment:

I agree that we should utilize Regional Airports, rather than to continue to expand LAX. Additional growth of LAX will certainly increase traffic, pollution and noise, which we surely don't need. LAX should stick with it's current boundaries, and not expand any more. Traffic around LAX is already excessive, and further growth of LAX would only produce more.

Response:

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

PC03404

Lurvey, Lawrence

None Provided

PC03404-1

Comment:

I live in Playa del Rey. The noise from LAX makes it hard to talk on the phone with the windows open.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels. 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, noise levels continue to

3. Comments and Responses

decrease over time over the Playa del Rey area. However, as shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, under 1996 baseline conditions some areas of Playa del Rey are exposed to significant high single event noise levels (shown as the 94 dBA SEL) that are currently outside the residential sound insulation or ANMP boundary (defined as the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL noise contour). Under the LAX Master Plan, the ANMP boundary would be revised to include those areas exposed to the 94 dBA SEL and outside the current ANMP boundary. For more information on noise impacts on Playa del Rey, see Response to Comment PC00499-1.

PC03404-2

Comment:

Every few weeks I have to wash the grime off the house from the jet exhaust. More runways would only add to this problem.

Response:

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

PC03404-3

Comment:

I feel that we must regionalize the airport system.

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.

PC03404-4

Comment:

Under the current system, traffic on Sepulveda & the 405 fwy is always heavy into LAX. And driving around inside LAX to pick up passengers is unbearable. From my house it takes me 10 minutes to reach LAX but 30 minutes to drive the circle once. We need to establish rail links between the airports and Union Station,

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

PC03404-5

Comment:

and high speed rail should be used instead of commuter flights in heavy routes, as recommended by the RAND Study.

Response:

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

PC03405 Scanlan, Robert None Provided

PC03405-1

Comment:

Living on the North side of the airport we are not affected too much by noise. My complaint is the traffic & increase trucking.

Response:

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

PC03405-2

Comment:

My problem is being located downstream from LAX & with much offshore breeze & foggie conditions at Lax area, we in this area constantly are pombarded with wet jet fuel, on bldgs - cars, roofs etc. With this rain it requires constant washing off this jet fuel residue from the above mentioned items - fences - woodsiding - window sills etc.

Response:

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

PC03406 Reams, Paul None Provided

PC03406-1

Comment:

EL TORO MARINE BASE HAS BEEN IN PLACE FOR AT LEAST 60 YEARS, WITH AIRFIELD. TAKE SOME OF THE LOAD OFF LAX AND OTHER AIRPORTS BY HAVING THE SOUTHERN MOST PART OF CALIFORNIA SHARE THE BURDEN. THERE IS A LOT MORE AREA ACCESSIBLE FOR AIR STRIPS & TERMINALS.

Response:

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

PC03407 Collins, Virginia None Provided

PC03407-1

Comment:

The problems of air travel to and from So. Cal. will not be solved by enlarging LAX. The construction alone would cause chaos. More trucks on the 405 - thanks but no no thanks!

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. Construction impacts, including construction-related traffic impacts, were addressed in Section 4.20 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03407-2

Comment:

So. Cal. needs a huge inland airport where there is space to provide support services and room for future expansion. If steps are not taken soon to get a large inland airport the growth of those possible sites will preclude ever getting a proper site.

Response:

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

PC03408 Hosack, Grant & None Provided
Marcella

PC03408-1

Comment:

We live on The Strand along the Ocean in Hermosa Beach. The fly-over and noise problem has gotten progressively worse over the last few years! We hear the noise late at night and in the early morning hours, which interrupts our sleep. Our Hermosa Beach City Officials have been fighting this but apparently with no progress. This is even before any increased LAX expansion, which would obviously bring in even more traffic and noise.

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. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations and Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response, TR-N-3.1.

PC03408-2

Comment:

We also have concern about the increasing probability of catastrophes over our beach and our own home.

Response:

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

PC03408-3

Comment:

Clearly, all of this devaluates the value of our million-dollar- plus properties in this area!

Response:

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

PC03408-4

Comment:

We appreciate your concern and look forward to a solution to the current problems as well as an acceptable alternate to the currently flawed LAX Master Plan.

Response:

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

PC03409 Graham, Ruth None Provided

PC03409-1

Comment:

I do favor the Regional Airport Authority approach. Expansion of LAX would not affect me directly but even with the "improvements" made in the past it is a mess. We all have stories of our trials meeting passengers or trying to get out ourselves. The comparison with Denver doesn't seem fair. We have nothing like the 34,000 acres there. It is a pleasure to use their facility.

Response:

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

PC03410 Rumage, William None Provided 6/26/2001

PC03410-1

Comment:

The effects of the airport expansion would be horrendous on the people who live in Westchester. I am against any & all airport 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. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03411 Swerdfeger, Tracy None Provided

PC03411-1

Comment:

I oppose the LAX Master Plan. The area is already impacted enough & it doesn't make sense not to utilize the other airports. With making LAX the main focus it not only increases noise but also freeway congestion which no one wants regardless of where someone lives.

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. 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.